



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 152 No. 085
Thursday, February 12, 2026

Speaker: The Honourable Francis Scarpaleggia



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Thursday, February 12, 2026

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

• (1000)
[English]

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (C), 2025-26

A message from Her Excellency the Governor General transmitting supplementary estimates (C) for the financial year ending March 31, 2026, was presented by the President of the Treasury Board and read by the Speaker to the House.

Hon. Shafqat Ali (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the Supplementary Estimates (C), 2025-26.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions amongst the parties, and if you seek it, I believe you will find unanimous consent to adopt the following motion:

That, notwithstanding any standing order or usual practice of the House, Ways and Means Motion No. 8, notice of which was tabled on January 28, 2026, be deemed concurred in on division, and a bill based thereon standing on the Order Paper in the name of the Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, entitled “An Act to give effect to the Red River Métis Self-Government Recognition and Implementation Treaty and to make consequential amendments to other Acts”, be deemed to have been read a first time.

The Speaker: All those opposed to the hon. member moving the motion will please say nay. It is agreed.

The House has heard the terms of the motion. All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

WAYS AND MEANS

MOTION NO. 8

(On the Order: Government Orders:)

January 28, 2026—The Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations—Consideration of a ways and means motion to introduce an Act to give effect to the Red River Métis Self-Government Recognition and Implementation Treaty and to make consequential amendments to other Acts.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

RED RIVER MÉTIS SELF-GOVERNMENT RECOGNITION AND IMPLEMENTATION TREATY

(Bill C-21. On the Order: Government Orders:)

January 28, 2026—The Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations—Bill entitled “An Act to give effect to the Red River Métis Self-Government Recognition and Implementation Treaty and to make consequential amendments to other Acts”.

(Bill introduced and read the first time)

* * *

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

ACCESS TO INFORMATION, PRIVACY AND ETHICS

Hon. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.) Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among the parties, and if you seek it, I believe you will find unanimous consent for the following motion:

That the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics be the committee designated for the purposes of section 14.1 of the Lobbying Act.

• (1005)

[Translation]

The Speaker: All those opposed to the hon. member's moving the motion will please say nay.

There being no dissenting voice, it is agreed.

The House has heard the terms of the motion. All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

(Motion agreed to)

Business of Supply

[English]

PETITIONS

THE ENVIRONMENT

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to rise to present a petition on behalf of the constituents of Saanich—Gulf Islands. They have raised this concern with me in person as well as in this petition. They call the attention of the House to the ongoing joint ecological, social and economic crises, sometimes referred to as a “polycrisis”, and they ask that the Government of Canada extend leadership in that area to recognize how many system boundaries are being exceeded. In other words, the ecological ability of the caring capacity of the planet for human activity is being exceeded through massive human consumption, industrial symptoms and, particularly, the climate crisis.

They call on the government to provide national leadership on environment and sustainability, education, and the importance of leaning on indigenous knowledge and wisdom. They call on the House and ask the government to support educators, communicators and community leaders, who are trying to raise awareness and action for a sustainable future.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition today from residents of Canada about Bill C-9, a bill that would remove the good-faith religious defence clause from the Criminal Code of Canada. Bill C-9 would allow the government to criminalize passages from the Bible, the Quran, the Torah and other sacred texts and to prosecute those who express deeply held religious beliefs with a punishment of up to two years in prison.

Freedom of expression and freedom of religion are fundamental rights that must be protected, so the petitioners are calling on the Government of Canada to withdraw Bill C-9, protect religious freedom, uphold the right to read and share sacred texts, and prevent government intrusion into faith.

[Translation]

FISHERS OF MONTMORENCY—CHARLEVOIX

Gabriel Hardy (Montmorency—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the people of Montmorency—Charlevoix are once again calling on the Liberal government to work with our fishers in preparation for the upcoming fishing season in the St. Lawrence River. The river's striped bass population is out of control. This species is a highly efficient predator that is placing significant stress on other species, many of which are already fragile and very important to our region's economy.

What the fishers are asking for is simple. They want their needs to be taken into account and they want to be consulted during the process. They are also calling for federal authorities to come to the area to see the extent of the damage for themselves and for the government to reopen recreational fishing in a strictly controlled manner using quotas, as is already permitted at the mouth of the St. Lawrence.

Fishing season is just around the corner. It is high time for the government to listen to the people, listen to fishers and take constructive action on their behalf.

[English]

THE ENVIRONMENT

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition today from Canadians and Vancouver Islanders who are deeply concerned about ghost gear, which is abandoned, lost or discarded fishing gear. It is among the deadliest sources of plastic pollution.

These petitioners note that ghost gear kills fish; impacts wild Pacific salmon, marine mammals, seabirds and turtles; damages habitats; creates microplastics; and even hazards navigation and active harvesters, hurting coastal economies. They point out the dedicated funding for retrieval, prevention, repair and recycling works creates skilled jobs in partnership with indigenous communities, small businesses, fishers, harbour authorities and recyclers, especially in rural and remote regions.

The petitioners are calling for the reinstatement and expansion of the permanent and multi-year ghost gear fund, which was cut by the Liberal government.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would ask that all questions be allowed to stand at this time.

The Speaker: Is that agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

● (1010)

[English]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—AUTOMOTIVE STRATEGY

Raquel Dancho (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC) moved:

That, given that,

- (i) over 5,000 auto sector jobs have been lost since the Prime Minister came to office,
- (ii) the number of cars produced in Canada since 2016 has fallen by half, from 2.3 million in 2016 to 1.2 million in 2025,
- (iii) the Prime Minister has introduced an auto strategy that subsidizes electric vehicles made in foreign countries,
- (iv) the Prime Minister's plan now requires Canadian workers to pay taxes that subsidize foreign-made vehicles they can't afford,

the House call on the government to fix their auto strategy by:

- (a) scrapping the subsidies for foreign-made electric vehicles entering Canada that forces Canadian workers to subsidize \$50,000 new cars;
- (b) removing the GST on Canadian-made vehicles; and
- (c) using their existing authority to reduce the amount of tax withheld on severance payments issued to workers at the GM CAMI facility in Ingersoll.

She said: Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 43(2)(a), I hereby divide each of the future Conservative caucus slots into two.

Before I get started on our important opposition day motion, I ask members to allow me to put a few words on the record concerning Tumbler Ridge and the devastating tragedy that happened just two days ago in that beautiful, peaceful community in British Columbia. I know all of our hearts are breaking for the families impacted by this. What has happened there is a parent's worst nightmare. I wanted to extend my condolences on behalf of Kildonan—St. Paul and Winnipeg to that community. We grieve with them. May God be with them all at the darkest of times.

Members of Parliament are sent to Ottawa to represent their communities, to represent Canadians, and the official opposition is tasked with the responsibility of holding the government accountable for its promises and actions. Shadow ministers have the additional responsibility of holding ministers and the decisions in their departments accountable.

Last week, the Minister of Industry, along with the Prime Minister, announced what they have told Canadians is their strategy for what is transpiring in our auto sector. It is very serious what is happening in our auto sector, and I will go through a few of the issues I have with the announcement and with the approach.

This is very serious. There are 5,000 families already out of work as a result of the Trump tariffs and the impact they are having on the Canadian auto sector. In 5,000 families, one of the income earners has lost their job. This is in addition to tens of thousands of manufacturing jobs lost, along with other offshoot jobs from the auto sector and other manufacturing sectors.

This comes after a decade of decline in our auto sector. Members may recall that in 2016, 2.3 million cars were manufactured in Canada. Less than 10 years later, that number is down to 1.2 million. In a decade, our output in the auto sector, the cars we are manufacturing, has declined almost by half, and now we are being hit with 5,000 job losses in just the first year of the Trump trade war and its impact on our auto sector in Canada.

The Liberal government has been in power for the last decade. How has it approached this? Just a few years ago, and I believe it was in 2022, the government, in partnership with Ontario, announced the largest subsidies in Canadian history for electric vehicles. It was not for gas-powered vehicles, where we were seeing the decline in manufacturing and the hits that were starting over the last decade, and it was not for where it is experiencing the most losses today. Just a few years ago, \$52 billion in subsidies were announced for the manufacture of an electric vehicle supply chain for electric vehicle batteries and electric vehicles themselves.

Unfortunately, in recent months, the wheels have been coming off the bus on a lot of those commitments. For example, the keystone of that \$52-billion commitment was the NextStar Energy manufacturing plant in Windsor, which was supposed to make elec-

Business of Supply

tric vehicle batteries for Stellantis, one of the major car auto manufacturers in Canada. Just recently, Stellantis announced that it would be selling off its 49% stake in that to LG Energy, so now it may be making some car batteries, but it will also be making battery cells. It is no longer going to be the keystone of electric vehicle battery production that it was supposed to be when these massive commitments from the taxpayer were made.

If we look further, there are additional losses in this sector. For example, last month GM, which was also subsidized by these subsidies, announced a \$6-billion writedown on its EV operations, warning it may post additional EV-related losses later this year. Meanwhile, of course, the Quebec government is attempting to recover nearly one-quarter of a billion dollars from the Northvolt facility there from a Swedish EV manufacturer that has gone bankrupt.

Also, Ford announced a \$19.5-billion writedown on EV production lines after years of trying and failing to make electric vehicles profitable in the North American market. In fact, Ford's chief executive said, "It didn't make sense to keep plowing billions into products that we knew would not make money".

That is in line with what Stellantis just recently said: "The charges announced today largely reflect the cost of over-estimating the pace of the energy transition that distanced us from many car buyers' real-world needs, means and desires." Really, he was citing customer preference as the struggles in the electric vehicle market, so it is struggling. What was promised to Canadians, with the largest subsidies in Canadian history, has the companies severely struggling.

• (1015)

The companies have said that despite these massive commitments from the taxpayer, organized by the Liberal government and the Ontario government, this is simply not profitable. It is really unbelievable given, for example, that the NorthStar battery plant was a 100% subsidy for those batteries, and still the car company said it was not good for its bottom line and that it was bailing out.

What that speaks to is that this does not seem to be working in the North American market. There are a number of reasons. Electric vehicles are popular elsewhere, but they do not face, for example, the same weather Canada faces; we are a very cold country. We are also the second-largest country on earth. People travel long, long distances. To get from one city to another, people would have to charge their car multiple times, especially in winter. There are some serious problems with electric vehicles. As well, affordability is a big issue; they are quite expensive vehicles.

Business of Supply

Last week, the Liberal government tried to do something about that, which I am now going to go into. It announced an EV subsidy of \$2.3 billion for Canadians to purchase electric vehicles, so billions more are being poured into the electric vehicle sector from the Liberal government. Despite all of the losses, failures and delays, it is continuing to double down on this.

It is a front-loaded program. The minister has explicitly said that the purpose of this is to make it most generous in the first year of the five years it will be available. Her rationale was that the government wants to encourage people to quickly, and in a great volume, buy electric vehicles. It is fine if that is its policy, but our auto sector is struggling and losing thousands of jobs in this tariff war. One could think, "Great, people can buy electric vehicles manufactured in Canada," except that we only make one electric vehicle, the Dodge Charger, which is an electric vehicle muscle car, in essence. Though it may be a great car, I am not sure if it is the first choice for many families. Still, I am sure it is a very good car, and I am glad Canadians make it. However, that limits the opportunity for Canadians to support Canadian jobs with this over-\$2-billion, taxpayer-funded subsidy that is subsidized by working Canadians. The auto sector workers themselves are now subsidizing the purchase of electric vehicles.

Where are Canadians going to buy electric vehicles from? It will be from foreign countries. The last time the Liberals had a similar subsidy, 99% of it went to foreign auto sectors because Canada is not manufacturing the electric vehicles, so people are choosing to buy foreign ones. That is fine; Canadians can buy whatever car they want. If they want an electric vehicle, good for them. That is great. They can buy all kinds of cars. The problem is that if we are going to spend taxpayer dollars, the very dollars taken from the workers in the auto sector losing their jobs, should that money not be focused on the Canadian auto sector?

Why is the Liberal government sending money to subsidize the auto sectors of foreign countries? Again, we are talking about quite generous supports, \$5,000 in the first year. Again, this is going to be front loaded, so the biggest sales are likely to be made this year, according to what the minister has said.

That leads me to my last point. We are seeing 5,000 job losses from the Trump administration's actions. The tariffs the U.S. is putting on the Canadian auto sector are costing us thousands of jobs, and many more to come are unfortunately likely. Now the Liberal government has introduced an electric vehicle subsidy, and electric vehicles made in the United States are eligible for this subsidy. The tax dollars of Canadian taxpayers, including the workers in the auto sector, are going to go to subsidize the purchase of electric vehicles manufactured in the United States. Why on earth are Canadian tax dollars and the hard-earned dollars from the auto sector workers themselves going to benefit the American auto sector?

For us, it is unconscionable. What we would do is introduce a tax cut: the federal sales tax off of all new cars made in Canada. That is what we would introduce so that the auto market in Canada is supported and there are more sales generated across the board in Canada. That is what Conservatives are proposing. It is a more fair approach, and it supports the Canadian hands that make Canadian-made cars, not the American electric vehicle sector. We should not be supporting that.

It is unconscionable that the tax dollars of auto workers losing their jobs are going to subsidize the purchase of electric vehicles made in Trump's America.

● (1020)

Karim Bardeesy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the intervention and I look forward to participating in the debate shortly.

The text of the motion says, "the House call on the government to fix their auto strategy by", and then lists three items. What is not listed in the three items that the opposition is saying need to be fixed is the increased tailpipe emissions standard that we are proposing in our auto strategy.

Does my colleague and her side support that tailpipe emissions standard?

Raquel Dancho: Madam Speaker, I have enjoyed working with the member on the industry committee, and I am glad he brought this up because this is an interesting thing. The Liberal government positioned its announcement last week as an end to its EV mandates as well, which Conservatives, of course, have been leading the charge against, given the impossible-to-meet standards previously of 100% electric new vehicle sales in Canada by 2035. We heard loud and clear from the auto sector that that would literally decimate the auto sector.

However, if we look closely at the Liberals' announcement, they have now lowered that to 75%. It is still a decimating number. They expect only electric vehicle sales of about 75% in Canada with these standards. This means the standard for those tailpipe emissions reductions is going to be so stringent that it is going to force the auto sector to do this. Our concern is that this is basically the EV mandate by another name.

I can go on to my next response. I have a lot to say about this. In fact, I could do a 10-minute—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): Questions and comments, the hon. member for Lac-Saint-Jean.

[*Translation*]

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Madam Speaker, one of the Conservatives' main arguments in their motion today is that the government is subsidizing vehicles made in foreign countries. I believe the Conservatives are referring mainly to the United States.

Business of Supply

We know that Quebec and Canadian taxpayers subsidize the oil and gas industry in Canada, and 80% of this industry is owned by American interests, so if we follow the Conservatives' logic, then we should be putting an immediate stop to these subsidies. Does my colleague agree with me?

[English]

Raquel Dancho: Madam Speaker, I do wonder if the member's constituents are comfortable with their tax dollars going to benefit the electric vehicle sector in Trump's America. I would say likely not. I know there is a big disagreement in the House about supporting Canada's oil and gas sector, which of course supports a lot of money coming to all provinces, including Quebec, from the GDP generated from the oil and gas sector. Conservatives are very grateful that we have this natural resource that has brought so much wealth and opportunity to Canada. Again, our auto sector as well brings a lot of wealth, over \$16 billion annually, and 600,000 direct and indirect jobs. Our tax dollars should be focused on supporting this sector, not the American EV market.

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, we hear Conservatives talk about how Canada is too big and the transition is too bold, but we can look to Norway, where it is cold, where they travel long distances, and they have had huge success, so geography should not be an excuse. What we need is the Conservatives to support a Canadian auto strategy that protects workers, supports tackling climate change and builds vehicles here at home.

Why are they not getting on board? We know workers support actually building, and these investments are critical to the auto industry.

Raquel Dancho: Madam Speaker, I find the question from the NDP quite perplexing. Is he suggesting we should not be supporting our auto workers in the gas-powered sector of our economy? The vast majority of auto workers in this country, well over 100,000, are directly employed by gas-powered cars. Despite \$52 billion in taxpayer commitments from the Liberal and Ontario governments, the EV sector is failing in this country. Writedowns are in the billions from companies saying that despite all the generous subsidies from the taxpayer on behalf of the Liberal government, the wheels are falling off the bus. I find it odd that the member is not standing up for the gas-powered auto workers in this country and instead only perhaps for one plant that is building electric vehicles. I find it odd that the NDP would take that position.

• (1025)

Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong, CPC): Madam Speaker, here is an interesting fact. In the last 20 years, 80% of the vehicles Canadians bought were manufactured in Canada. There is no reason we cannot return to that. I see that the Conservatives have planned to cut taxes on vehicles and invest here.

Does the member agree we should also be making more vehicles here in Canada?

Raquel Dancho: Madam Speaker, yes, I would like to see the auto sector here return to its former glory of 10 years ago, when we were producing 2.3 million cars. This is what our auto sector workers need. They are not going to get it from the Liberal subsidies.

John Brassard (Barrie South—Innisfil, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is indeed an honour to rise today to speak to the opposition day motion. Before I begin my remarks, I too want to express my sincere sympathies and condolences to the people of Tumbler Ridge, B.C. It was an incredible tragedy, and I want them to know that I and the people I represent in Barrie South—Innisfil are thinking of them. We send our love and our comfort to them during this unimaginable time. Having gone through tragedies ourselves, losing two police officers in 2022, we know the coming days will be dark days for the community of Tumbler Ridge, but the love and comfort of our nation is with them. Members in this place certainly expressed that yesterday.

We are dealing with an opposition day motion on an EV mandate, and I want to focus on three things that the opposition is asking for today. Number one is scrapping the subsidies for foreign-made electric vehicles entering Canada, which force Canadian workers to subsidize \$50,000 new cars. Two is removing the GST on Canadian-made vehicles. This was something that was in our Conservative platform in the last election, as a measure to spur on Canadian sales of Canadian-made vehicles. The last thing is for the government to use its existing authority under section 153 of the Income Tax Act to help the workers in Ingersoll who have been devastated by job losses and, worse yet, have had to pay taxes, right now, on their severance pay. We are trying to help those workers in that regard.

In 2023, the then Trudeau government implemented an electric vehicle mandate that would require 100% of vehicles sold in Canada to be electric by 2035. For years, Canada's Conservatives have been clear that forcing 100% of new vehicle sales to be electric by 2035 was unrealistic and created prolonged uncertainty for manufacturers and workers making long-term investment decisions. The one thing businesses cannot afford is uncertainty and doubt when making those decisions.

By cancelling the EV mandate recently, the Prime Minister and the Liberals signalled and admitted that Conservatives were right all along. However, their solutions will still leave Canadians and Canadian workers behind. Canadians cannot afford to keep paying into EV subsidies for vehicles they cannot afford and that are not built by our workers. The announcement by the government wastes \$97 million in taxpayer money on its environmental crusade and ideology. Of this spending, \$84 million will go toward EV charging stations across the country, with no connection between the amount of funding and the number of chargers delivered. This adds more fuel, frankly, to the fire that was last week's announcement that the Liberals will be spending \$2.3 billion in subsidies that will mostly go to foreign EVs.

Business of Supply

When looking at the numbers, Conservatives found that in 2023, 99% of EV rebates went to foreign-made cars. There is only one Canadian EV that is made in Canada and qualifies for the rebate, and that is the Dodge Charger EV, which is unaffordable to most. They simply cannot afford it, as part of the middle class.

Canada's own auto sector is hurting, and Canada's workers are being put out of jobs. Since 2016, vehicle production has been cut nearly in half, from 2.3 million cars per year to 1.2 million in 2025. Real GDP in auto manufacturing fell another 10% in November alone, and 5,000 auto sector workers have been laid off in the last year.

As a member of Parliament from central Ontario, I am very proud of the investment that Honda Manufacturing has made in Alliston. There is a significant concern not just among the members of Parliament from central Ontario but among those workers, those thousands of workers, many of whom live in my riding of Barrie South—Innisfil. They are quite concerned about the state of the auto sector as it stands right now under the Liberal government.

For the 1,200 workers at the CAMI facility in Ingersoll who have been laid off, the severance pay and lump sum payouts are reduced by the minimum tax rate, meaning that over 50% of their payouts are held by the government until these workers file their taxes.

● (1030)

Canada's Conservatives are asking the Liberals to use their existing authority to reduce the amount withheld in these payments, which can simply be done by the finance minister under section 153 of the Income Tax Act.

Instead, the government has labelled helping laid-off workers as political malpractice, announced a rebate that will subsidize American-made EVs, and committed a swath of taxpayer cash for EV charging stations. While Donald Trump continues to slap additional tariffs on our auto workers, the Prime Minister decided to give Americans access to this \$2.3-billion subsidy.

Canadian taxpayers should not have to subsidize American EVs when the trade conflict with the U.S. has already cost 5,000 Canadian auto manufacturing jobs and 37,000 manufacturing jobs since the Prime Minister took office. He needs to answer as to why Canadian tax dollars would subsidize American EVs and to stop this insult to workers, who have seen production leave to the U.S. They will be the ones who are now paying the price.

I will provide some examples of vehicles that are manufactured in the United States but sold in Canada under the \$50,000 manufacturer's suggested price that may qualify for this: The Volkswagen ID.4, which has a suggested price of \$46,000, is assembled in Chattanooga, Tennessee; the Chevy Bolt is manufactured in Kansas City; the Tesla Model Y is manufactured in Austin, Texas; and the Ford Escape plug-in hybrid is manufactured at the Louisville assembly plant in Kentucky.

Here are other identified eligible electric vehicles that are made outside the U.S.: The Chevy Equinox EV is assembled in Mexico; the Hyundai Kona Electric is manufactured in South Korea; the Fiat 500e is manufactured in Italy; and the Nissan Leaf is manufactured in Japan. There are other examples of vehicles that are made in

South Korea, Japan, the United States and other places, like Mexico, where Canadian workers will be subsidizing the purchase of these EVs under this new scheme and regime that was announced by the government.

Auto workers are losing their jobs. There are hard-working, middle-class taxpayers right now who can barely afford the essentials and the necessities of life. They are being asked, under this new scheme, to subsidize vehicles that are not going to be manufactured in Canada, resulting in more uncertainty and more doubt within the automotive sector with respect to where this investment is going.

As an example, the member for Kildonan—St. Paul said that we have seen \$53 billion put into the EV sector that is basically money that has been poured down the drain. We see a retrenchment now in the investments by auto manufacturers and the auto sector on the EV mandates, largely because the largest consumer market in the world, which is the American market, has moved away from EV mandates. However, here we are in Canada, doubling down on a failed policy as a result of ideology that is going to cost Canadian workers billions more hard-earned dollars to subsidize not just a failing industry but also vehicles made in the United States.

Today, Canada's Conservatives are standing up not just for those auto workers and the 600,000 people who are employed in the auto sector, either directly or indirectly, but also for those hard-working Canadians who pay their taxes, are having trouble paying their bills, and are now being asked by the Liberal government to subsidize vehicles that are going to be made in other countries. It is wrong. This motion attempts to address that. It is another solution proposed by Canada's Conservatives to fix what has gone wrong over the last 10 years as a result of the failed economic and ideological policies of the Liberal government.

● (1035)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, what is very apparent is that the Conservative Party of Canada does not have any concept of what it means to build and have a Canadian strategy on automobiles. I hope to be able to expand on that in great detail when I get the opportunity to address this issue.

Talk about incompetency and an inability to show Canadians that they have an automobile strategy; this is truly amazing.

Could the member opposite tell us if there are any provincial Progressive Conservative governments that provide electric vehicle subsidies? Is he aware that it does take place and that it is only the Conservative Party of Canada that is so naive?

John Brassard: Madam Speaker, I am not surprised by that intervention.

Business of Supply

As I stated in my speech, the reality is that 99% of EV subsidies supplied by this government actually went to foreign auto manufacturers. If the government is interested in solving this crisis, two things need to be done. Number one is to invest in the Canadian sector and take our suggestion of reducing the GST off the purchase of new vehicles. That would help spur on the purchasing power of Canadians.

Number two is what the Prime Minister promised he would do in the last election, and that is to negotiate a deal with the American administration on the tariff situation. He said that he would do that by July 21, 2025, and at this point, there has been no resolution. The Prime Minister actually made false statements to Canadians that he was going to solve this problem, and here we are with 5,000 workers out of work and a manufacturing sector that is dealing with doubt and uncertainty and has been decimated as a result.

[Translation]

Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague. I appreciate him very much. We sit together on the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics.

The arguments currently being made by the Conservatives fly in the face of the saying “What is good for the goose is good for the gander”.

On the one hand, they feel strongly about financial support for the oil industry, which is primarily owned by the Americans. The Conservatives see no problem in using Canadian taxpayers' money for that purpose. On the other hand, when it comes to EVs, that becomes a problem.

Why the double standard?

John Brassard: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question. I have a great deal of respect for him. We work very hard together at the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics.

[English]

Members will not be surprised by my response. There is obviously an ideological difference in terms of the natural resource sector, what it means to Canada and what it means to providing great wealth to our nation. Similar to the auto industry, there are hundreds of thousands of people employed in the natural resource sector, either directly or indirectly. We have the third- and fifth-largest reserves in the world.

The ideological attack over the last almost 11 years by this government, endorsed and supported by other parties in this place, has resulted in a loss of great wealth to our nation. I have spoken about this before in this place. We have lost hundreds of billions of dollars in revenue as a result of these ideological attacks on our natural resource sector.

As a nation, we would be standing on our own two feet, notwithstanding the tariff war with the United States, if we had that \$200-plus billion in our hip pocket. We would be a nation that would be resilient, and we would be free of any threats of tariffs that come from the United States.

• (1040)

Raquel Dancho (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC): Madam Speaker, I would like to give the hon. member an opportunity to outline some of the things that Conservatives would do. He touched on this in his speech.

I know we have a number of things we would do for workers to support the entire auto industry in Canada. Perhaps he could outline some of the things we would do if we were in government.

John Brassard: Madam Speaker, the short response is we would do exactly the opposite of what the current government is doing, because what it has been doing over the last 10 years has not only failed our auto sector but failed auto workers and, by extension, those who have a connection to the auto industry.

Karim Bardeesy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House on this very important issue today.

I would like to start by sharing my condolences on behalf of the people of Taiaiaiko'n—Parkdale—High Park with the people of Tumbler Ridge and of Kitigan Zibi Anishinabeg First Nation on the horrific attacks of the last 48 hours. May the light that we all generate in our worlds help them and shine with them in their moments of darkness.

I want to thank my colleagues from Kildonan—St. Paul and Barrie South—Innisfil for their interventions. This issue matters because we are an auto-producing nation; we are a driving nation. Automobile production is fundamental to the economy not only of southern Ontario but across Canada. The automotive experience is something that is fundamental to almost all Canadians.

[Translation]

We are entering the fifth era of auto manufacturing in Canada. The Prime Minister recalled the early days of the auto industry in Canada, a history that began in the 19th century. For most of the 1900s, Canada had its own auto manufacturing plants.

[English]

The auto pact really brought in the second era of automobile manufacturing.

[Translation]

The auto pact between Canada and the United States really boosted Canada's automotive economy, especially in southern Ontario. It created thousands of jobs and generated billions of dollars for our economy.

That era was beneficial for our economy. It led to the development of both automotive facilities and the workforce. These workers continue to lead today's automotive sector, and we still depend on that sector, particularly in southern Ontario.

However, the emergence of Japanese manufacturers, along with their methods and ability to manufacture automobiles more efficiently, influenced subsequent government policies, here as elsewhere in North America. It also influenced the public's preferences, as they wanted to buy more Japanese cars.

Business of Supply

In the 1980s, the country's leaders and public policy makers, our predecessors, decided to invite Japanese manufacturers to set up operations in Canada, notably in southern Ontario. It was beneficial for us in that it created more jobs and new manufacturing facilities, and it grew our economy. That era also lasted about 20 years.

We then entered the fourth era of the North American auto economy, the era of government subsidies worldwide. This development was accelerated by the 2008 economic crisis, and governments chose to establish closer partnerships with American automakers as well as automakers in Japan and other countries. At the end of the fourth era, governments partnered with automakers to attract investment in the sector.

We are now entering the fifth era of the automobile manufacturing industry in Canada and across North America. This new era is being shaped, as the Prime Minister noted, by a rupture in the free trade system and the world order and the need for middle powers like Canada to find new partners.

• (1045)

[*English*]

We are now in the fifth era of automobile manufacturing in Canada, a time when our old alliances and our old ways of doing things are under tremendous stress, primarily from the trade threat to the south but also because of new technologies, new consumer tastes and the new desires that we have to build the country in a different way. This is an era of opportunity for Canada.

The auto strategy that we have put forward builds on the incredibly strong capital base, technological base and base of both consumers and workers, who are the best workers in the world and I will get to that shortly, to make this transition so that we are no longer solely dependent on one market. It will allow consumers and workers to share equally in that future.

As members probably know, this is a sector that is incredibly contributive to the economy of Canada and, in particular, southern Ontario. In 2025, it contributed approximately \$16.8 billion to our GDP and 125,000 direct jobs in the sector through assembly, parts and related jobs, not to mention the related jobs in dealerships or servicing.

The entire economy of transportation that is auto-related in Canada is a very strong one. Of the 1.2 million to 1.3 million vehicles we manufacture now, approximately 90% are currently exported to the United States. The opposition is telling a bit of a story around the manufacturing sector. It seems to be implying that we are selling primarily to Canadians. Obviously, Canadians are buying some vehicles that are manufactured in Canada, but the primary destination for Canadian-made vehicles is currently not Canada; it is elsewhere.

The auto strategy has a really good three-part approach to build up and defend the sector.

First, it really focuses on new investment. It repositions the strategic response fund. We now have a \$3-billion auto-dedicated strategic response fund so that Canada's federal government can partner with others that are making those new investments in their plants.

We know new investments in auto manufacturing, like so many other manufacturing investments, do not create the number of jobs that they used to, but that is okay. They create well-paying spinoff jobs that continue to depend on those excellent auto workers who have been working in the sector for decades, and they build on the existing automotive footprint that is already there.

The \$3-billion strategic response fund dedicated to the auto sector, which is part of our auto strategy, is a key part of the work that is going to help us usher in this fifth era of automobile production in Canada, but it is also building on a recent track record of investment. The Minister of Industry is in active discussions with a number of companies to attract more investment. I will note that the Conservative motion did not mention some of the recent investments that have been announced in Windsor and St. Thomas. There are recent investments being made right now by Ford in Oakville to retool its plant. There are investments that have allowed Toyota, for instance, in Cambridge and Woodstock to manufacture only RAV4 hybrids, which indicates the evolution of consumer tastes.

New investment is fundamental to economic growth. New investment is what this auto strategy delivers. New investment is the first part of our auto strategy.

The second part of our auto strategy relates to electrification and sustainability. There are a number of elements, and I want to go through them in turn.

First, my colleague from Kildonan—St. Paul mentioned the electric vehicle availability standard. We have decided, in consultation with the sector, to remove that and go to a tailpipe emission standard. I was disappointed by my colleague's response to my question, because the motion implies that the auto strategy, in their words, does not need to be fixed by abandoning that policy, which is very key to our approach. I think there is quite a fundamental difference.

I continue to be disappointed. I have been in the House now for nine months. I still have not heard an idea for fighting climate change from the other side that finds traction with the other side.

The really important thing about the electrification and sustainability aspects of this policy is that they are intimately connected to that fifth era. I referred to the third era, in which Japanese automakers were bringing the kinds of vehicles that consumers wanted with the kinds of production standards that were not yet known to people in Canada. The policy-makers of that time made a brave choice in embracing that, despite the political fallout, despite the prospect that it might be alienating to some people currently in the sector and despite the fact that it might alienate some sense of national identity, because our national identity around automotive production was so tied to American automaking.

• (1050)

Those choices by those policy-makers decades ago had the benefit of attracting automakers that are now responsible for almost three-quarters of the automotive production in Canada this year. It was those choices to invite new investment and a new way of doing things that have set us up to be at the place where we are now, still manufacturing automobiles by the hundreds of thousands, even despite the tremendous trade threats.

The national electricity strategy, which is under our auto strategy, embraces where people are going. I would note that it involves potential rebates, not for companies, but for consumers. It is the consumers who will be benefiting from these rebates. They will be buying vehicles, often with Canadian-made parts. It also involves rebates to manufacturers, whom we are actively courting, for setting up new manufacturing facilities here in Canada. These are rebates that follow on from a policy that is embraced by such automaking giants as Korea, Japan and Mexico, all of which have EV rebates and manufacture EVs. This is part of the movement where Canadians are going and where the sector is going.

There are two other key parts. I mentioned the tailpipe emissions standard. Right now, the U.S. administration is considering measures that would completely undermine the current tailpipe emissions standard-setting authority that exists in the United States, so there is a major question for Canada. As we look at this next generation of automaking, which is going to be electric, in line with evolving consumer standards and consumer tastes and in line with the climate priorities that we all embrace, where are we going? What kinds of standards do we want? What kinds of environmental standards do we want?

This new auto strategy embraces the use of tailpipe emissions standards, which have been so effective. Canada has, historically, copied the Californian standards, and Californian standards are what helped drive the manufacturing footprint of North America and the world to be more sustainable. We are now saying that tailpipe emissions standards work, they have the effect of reducing our emissions and they have the effect of driving, in a way that is useful and collaborative with the automakers, the kinds of efficiencies and climate change-reducing measures we need.

I was quite disappointed to hear, and it was news to me, that the opposition does not embrace those tailpipe emissions standards in the auto strategy. I welcome what their suggestion would be on that.

I also want to refer to the charging infrastructure that was included in this announcement. There is over \$1 billion for that. We know that in rural Canada and in cold-weather places throughout Canada, there is a desire for more charging infrastructure. We know that in cities, like those in my riding of Taiaiaiko'n—Parkdale—High Park, multi-unit residential buildings that have scarcely available street parking need more electric charging. This strategy will unlock the massive Canadian sector that is ready and primed, including companies like Parkland, which is in the more conventional energy space to embrace the electric future by providing investments that do not, in this case, benefit just southern Ontario, but spread across Canada.

Business of Supply

This kind of investment is what consumers are looking for. They are looking for that help to reduce their range anxiety. They are looking for that little prime that helps them decide, “Yes, I want that electric vehicle, which is better for the planet, is great for driving and can get me from place to place.” They want the reassurance that they can, in fact, get from place to place with a bit of support for charging along the way. This investment and the announcement of a national electricity strategy are key to that.

Again, the fifth era of automobile making in Canada is about the plants and the parts, but it is also about the software. It is about the electricity infrastructure that we need to build from coast to coast, which will actually make Canada's auto sector spread further and create economic benefit, not just in southern Ontario, but across Canada.

That is the second part of the strategy.

The third part of the strategy is an important set of supports for workers. My colleague, the Minister of Jobs and Families, has referred to the important role of EI eligibility for those workers who have been laid off and making sure that it is available quickly. The strategy also includes \$570 million for up to 66,000 workers to engage in work sharing. These are the kinds of supports we need if we are all in it together.

• (1055)

Underlying this three-part strategy of investment, electricity sustainability and a focus on the workers, whom I will say a bit more about at the end of my speech, is the trade context. I was a bit disappointed that the motion made no mention of the trade context. We have had hundreds of questions from the official opposition about the auto strategy or related to auto policy, either here or in committee, yet there is almost never a mention of the trade context that has caused us to be in this situation to begin with.

I would invite the opposition members to join us in condemning the illegal and unjustified tariffs in any intervention they make, as I am doing right now, so that we can be unified and press back, as, indeed, automaking areas of the United States are doing against the illegal and unjustified tariffs, to indicate that we are all in this together. If we do that, I think we are more likely to get a trade result that will be better for Canada.

Luckily, we do not need just words. We actually have policies that help reinforce our trade position, including the strengthening of the remission framework in the auto strategy. Basically, if we build it here, we can import more cars here for sale tariff-free. That is the basic sketch of the trade remission strategy. We think it works and it will have the effect of reducing some of the concerns the official opposition has.

Business of Supply

In the spirit of cross-partisanship of recent days, I want to refer to a couple of things. I had the privilege of being at the Toyota plant with the rollout of the new RAV4 hybrid 2026 edition in Woodstock. I was joined by my friends from Oxford, Cambridge and Kitchener South—Hespeler. We heard about the plant, the team members and the quality of that plant. It is a plant that has been recognized by JD Power, and by Toyota internally, as being a top-in-the-world plant. It is a company that has never had a layoff in its 40 years of presence in Canada. In that moment, the members I referred to and I were aligned. It was a proud moment for Canada and southern Ontario. It was a sign of what can be done.

It was also a sign of the future of this sector, because, indeed, Toyota has the potential down the road to have an electric vehicle platform made at the Woodstock plant. It is manufacturing only hybrids there, going from solely an internal combustion engine to a hybrid vehicle option now. This has the benefit of going where Canadians are going, where manufacturing is going and where consumers are going.

I have not accompanied my colleagues, but I know the member for Windsor West appreciates the presence of the NextStar plant. I know my colleague from Elgin—St. Thomas—London South appreciates the presence of the PowerCo plant and the government investments there. Maybe they cannot say they support these government investments in these jobs, but we know they appreciate the jobs there. We know those communities are benefiting. We know that when the mayor of St. Thomas says no one has seen him stop smiling, it is because he has the sense that the direction we are going toward in attracting investment, building on the workforce we have and embracing the electrification sustainability future that we, the planet and consumers want and need is good for his community.

I invite my colleagues opposite to reflect on the prospect of how these measures will benefit their communities. This strategy, which focuses on investment, electrification sustainability and the workers, is part of a fifth era of automaking in Canada. It is one in which we are still deeply connected to the United States, but we have to grow our interdependence to attract new investments from other countries and spread that investment across Canada. It is one that recognizes that we are connected, but that by taking these measures, we can be more sovereign.

It is a set of bold choices, and I urge the opposition and all Canadians to look at the benefits of this strategy. For those reasons, I will be opposing this motion.

• (1100)

Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong, CPC): Madam Speaker, the Liberal government has cancelled the mandate to have 100% electric vehicles by 2035, but it has replaced it with a tailpipe emissions requirement that only EVs can meet. That is really the same thing.

Is the member aware that the Liberal government has no plan to create the infrastructure across the country that would be needed to achieve that target? There is also no plan to put enough electricity in the grid to achieve the target.

Karim Bardeesy: Madam Speaker, I will refer my colleague from Sarnia—Lambton to some of the electricity generation projects that are happening in her area of the province, and in par-

ticular Bruce. I will refer her to the major projects we have outlined, including SMRs in the Darlington area. I will also refer her to the strategy itself, which has a national electricity strategy to come and a charging infrastructure strategy to come.

In relation to tailpipe emissions, this is an area of disagreement between us and the official opposition. We know automaking can exist in concert with strong emissions standards. We saw that with the California emissions standards, which we all embrace and adopt. The question is, are we going to be more sovereign and adopt tailpipe emissions strategies that are in line with what Europe is doing and what California is doing, or are we going to hold ourselves back?

We think these kinds of decisions can help drive investment in the right kind of way, without the kind of punitive measures that were in the electric vehicle availability standard. We believe they are also good for the environment and good for consumers.

[*Translation*]

Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to point out that one of the policies the government announced quite recently is the reintroduction of subsidies for electric vehicles. Today's Conservative motion slams those subsidies.

That led me to the following thought.

The government ended its electric vehicle subsidy program not that long ago, which resulted in a chaotic situation in 2025.

Does the reintroduction of this program not show that the government's action was a mistake?

Karim Bardeesy: Madam Speaker, as the member mentioned, it was necessary to reinstate these incentives. We saw that removing these incentives had an unintended and perhaps unforeseen impact on the EV market.

Studies by the Canadian Climate Institute indicated that these incentives are needed to promote the economy and spur EV sales.

That is why we did the responsible thing, in my opinion, and reintroduced these incentives.

[*English*]

James Maloney (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have a long-held view that opposition day motions are actually obstruction day motions, and today seems to be no exception. These motions clearly are designed to create and perpetuate a false narrative. In this case, the Conservatives are perpetuating a false narrative that this auto strategy is designed to help American auto manufacturers.

I would like the member to address that false narrative, and at the same time explain how this is going to help enhance the Canadian electric vehicle manufacturing sector.

Karim Bardeesy: Madam Speaker, my colleague from Etobicoke—Lakeshore is a champion for economic development in all its forms, and especially for clean and sustainable development. This is what the strategy does. It embraces the consumer choices that are emerging, the Canadian content of those vehicles that the hon. member referred to and also the multiplication that comes from an electric future, where the economy benefits not just in those auto-producing jurisdictions, not just in Cambridge, Woodstock and Oshawa, but across Canada.

That is what a strategy like this that embraces electrification means. It means more jobs in the Maritimes. It means more jobs in Quebec. It means more jobs in western Canada. It means more jobs in the north. It means those supply chains, software providers, electricity providers and innovators contributing to the economy that the hon. member referred to benefit, and it actually puts pressure on the Americans to respond in kind.

• (1105)

Kerry Diotte (Edmonton Griesbach, CPC): Madam Speaker, the Prime Minister and other Liberal MPs have often said that we have a trade war going with the U.S.A., so how is subsidizing the purchase of new U.S.-made vehicles with \$5,000 in Canadian tax money helping us win that trade war?

Karim Bardeesy: Madam Speaker, I was hoping my colleague across the way would use the window I created to condemn the tariffs. I am a bit disappointed he did not do that, but I will take the question anyway.

The fact is that, as I mentioned, 90% of the vehicles we manufacture here are exported to the United States. We think these rebates, first, respond to consumer desires; second, help build the electric future we need, can have and can attract; and third, are good for the economy.

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Madam Speaker, we have seen the impact that Donald Trump's tariffs have had on auto and forestry. We are seeing layoffs at CAMI. We have seen jobs lost in communities on Vancouver Island, whether it be in Crofton or Chemainus, temporary or permanent. The government has been slow in getting income supports and relief out to workers.

When will the government scale up income supports for those workers who have either been displaced or lost their jobs permanently, fix the EI delays and deliver benefits to these workers?

For forestry, for example, there was a \$1.2-billion package. Only \$50 million of that is earmarked for workers. Hopefully we can get an answer from the Liberal government.

Karim Bardeesy: Madam Speaker, we made a major move forward in ensuring EI eligibility, which was made earlier through some previous legislation. If there are particular cases the hon. member has around supports that are not moving fast enough, either through Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada or another department, I would be happy to work with him or to refer those cases to the appropriate colleagues.

Helena Konanz (Similkameen—South Okanagan—West Kootenay, CPC): Madam Speaker, today a family of five needs a car and decides that, because we live in a democracy and they cannot be coerced into what kind of car to buy, they are going to try an

Business of Supply

electric vehicle. What does the hon. member say to them? They also want to buy Canadian. They want to help Canadians keep their jobs.

What does the hon. member say to them, a family of five, when all that is available to them today is a Dodge Charger?

Karim Bardeesy: Madam Speaker, that is exactly what this policy hopes to create in future years. I mentioned the era of Japanese automaking, when policy-makers made a brave choice to invite Japanese automakers in, despite substantial opposition. That resulted in the kind of consumer choice that now exists. I believe that these investments will create the kind of consumer choice that the hon. member is referring to.

[*Translation*]

Bienvenu-Olivier Ntumba (Mont-Saint-Bruno—L'Acadie, Lib.): Madam Speaker, my colleague just did a fine job presenting our new automotive strategy.

I would ask him to re-explain to our friends across the way how this automotive strategy will help us in practical terms to protect jobs, support workers and build a strong industry here in Canada.

Karim Bardeesy: Madam Speaker, my colleague fights every day for workers and the auto industry, here in Canada and in his riding.

We are bringing in specific measures for workers who need help and we think that the investments we are trying to attract will create jobs not only in southern Ontario, but across Canada, especially in ridings that have economic potential in the technology sector or in the climate sector.

Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Madam Speaker, today we are debating a motion on this Conservative opposition day. On Tuesday, we also had another Conservative opposition day.

I wanted to mention this because on Tuesday, when I saw the topic of the opposition day, I thought that for the first time, the Conservatives had chosen a topic that had nothing to do with promoting oil or abandoning the fight against climate change. It seems that was too good to last because they are back at it already. Today's motion is pretty much telling us they do not want electric vehicles, and that these vehicles are the worst thing that could happen to our country.

Business of Supply

I will confess to my Conservative colleagues right away that I have an electric vehicle. In fact, I have two, because my partner has an electric vehicle as well. If that makes me the devil, then so be it. For me, electric vehicles provide an opportunity to use less gas and to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, especially because as members of parliament, we do a lot of driving in the course of the year. Obviously, I think my choice contributes to lower greenhouse gas emissions. However, I do not mean to make those who have made a different choice feel guilty. I do understand that we all have different personal circumstances.

That said, I would like to discuss this motion in more detail. To put it mildly, the motion before us contains a number of half-truths.

Before I go any further, I would like to say I will be sharing my time with the member for Oxford.

The point being made at the beginning of the motion is that over 5,000 jobs have been lost since the Prime Minister came to office. Perhaps we can put that into perspective.

First, there is the implication that the 5,000 jobs lost were lost because of electric vehicles. However, we are fully aware that job losses in Canada's auto sector are due to American tariff policies because Americans want these jobs to move to the U.S. The losses have nothing to do with any policies on the electrification of transportation. Let us be clear about that and not make up stuff.

Second, when it comes to jobs, there is space to reflect and ask ourselves whether the electrification of transportation contributes to job creation and whether there have been such opportunities. In any case, in Quebec, we have expertise in this field. An Ernst & Young report released in 2025 states that Canada's electric vehicle industry has created over 130,000 jobs over the past 10 years. I think 130,000 jobs is a good deal all around.

I think it would be a good idea to support this sector. Over the past year, I have met with many representatives from organizations in the field of transportation electrification. They had serious concerns about the government's Conservative-inspired policies and its backtracking on issues related to the fight against climate change and transportation electrification. They even told me that they were worried about the future of the electrification industry in this country. They saw that the signals the government was sending were dangerous for the industry's long-term prospects in this country. I think we should keep that in mind.

● (1110)

Point (iii) of the Conservative motion before us states that “the Prime Minister has introduced an auto strategy that subsidizes electric vehicles made in foreign countries”. It is important to understand that the policy that has been implemented is not aimed at favouring vehicles manufactured abroad; rather, it is aimed at encouraging manufacturers to sell electric vehicles and subsidizing these vehicles. The policy specifies that only products imported from countries where Canada has a free trade agreement are eligible for the \$5,000 subsidy.

I do not understand why the Conservatives are saying that Canada is helping the U.S. This policy seems more like a challenge to the free trade agreement with the U.S. In my opinion, far from

being pro-American, this policy actually states that, if we do not reach a free trade agreement, American-made vehicles might no longer be eligible for this subsidy, so the U.S. would have every interest in negotiating.

There is one more treat for Canadian manufacturers. Canadian manufacturers are not even subject to the \$50,000 cap on the vehicle value. I feel like I am promoting the program, but I must say that the government does do good things once in a while, though it does not go as far as we would like. In fact, it often tries to have it both ways: following pro-oil policies while doing a little bit for transportation electrification, just enough to keep the sector from starving.

That said, I would like to talk about another point in today's Conservative motion. Point (iv) states that “the Prime Minister's plan now requires Canadian workers to pay taxes that subsidize foreign-made vehicles they can't afford”. According to the conditions for obtaining the \$5,000 subsidy, the vehicle must be worth \$50,000 or less. Is that more than consumers can afford?

Of course, \$50,000 is a substantial amount. However, we see that the average selling price of vehicles in Canada was \$63,400 in 2025, so this is below the average price of vehicles. If people are buying vehicles at an average price of \$63,000, how can we say that \$50,000 is too expensive for the average person? There is something a little contradictory about what the Conservatives are putting forward. I am not saying that everyone can afford to buy a \$60,000 or \$50,000 car, but it is precisely vehicles that cost less than \$50,000 that are eligible for the subsidy. Cars that cost \$25,000, \$30,000 and \$40,000 will be eligible.

With this in mind, we hope that Canada will work to ensure that less expensive vehicles, including those from the EU, will eventually be available here. That is not the case, currently, and it is one of the things we find problematic. Electric vehicles obviously need to be affordable so that ordinary people can afford to buy them. To achieve this, local manufacturers need to be encouraged to produce these vehicles. At this point, there seems to be some resistance, and unfortunately, that seems to be the case with Honda, for one, which has a plant in Canada. Obviously, it is sad to see this manufacturer back down when it would be in its best interest to look to the future, especially since it sells so many Honda Civics. I do not think any other car was as popular in Quebec when I was growing up.

● (1115)

Meanwhile, in Quebec, the electrification market is taking off. Everyone knows that Quebec has a robust market for electrification. Quebecers love electric cars. Honda would do well to take a greater interest in this market, since electrification is so popular in Quebec.

In point (c) of the motion, the Conservatives state that the government should use its “existing authority to reduce the amount of tax withheld on severance payments issued to workers at the GM CAMI facility in Ingersoll”.

That facility is probably based in Ontario and has experienced significant job losses. What does that mean, once again? It means that the Conservative motion is centred on Ontario's auto industry and on oil interests. It also shows a complete lack of sensitivity toward Quebec businesses in the manufacturing sector, particularly those that have also suffered job losses. Consider, for example, the folks at Paccar in Sainte-Thérèse, where 700 jobs were lost. Why did the Conservatives not include the workers at Paccar in their motion? It is probably because Quebec is the least of their concerns.

What we notice after reading the motion before the House is that it seeks to completely detract from what is coming. Electrification is being framed as some kind of trend that we need to back away from. We are being told that the world has changed and that we are in a different place now. Unfortunately, all too often, it is the Liberals taking that position. When we talk about people, we mean real people, not just the ones south of the border, in the Trump administration, a temporary United States government. When we look at the numbers worldwide, what do we see? We see that EVs currently account for 20% to 25% of the global market share. In China, the percentage is over 50%. In Norway, it is 88%. That reflects an increase in sales of nearly 20% last year, in 2025.

Electrification has a future; oil, not so much.

• (1120)

Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong, CPC): Madam Speaker, does the member consider it advisable to give taxpayer money to the United States for cars manufactured there?

Xavier Barsalou-Duval: Madam Speaker, I find the question rather interesting. We are not, in fact, giving money to the United States. We are giving money to taxpayers to help them buy vehicles that pollute less.

However, I want to ask my colleague a question. Why are the Conservatives defending the oil companies, fighting so hard for them, getting so worked up about them and thinking about them every morning when they get up, when 80% of those companies are controlled by Americans? Why do the Conservatives want us to continue subsidizing these oil companies and boosting their profits, which will continue to flow to American shareholders?

The Conservatives seem to have forgotten one side of the equation.

Tim Watchorn (Les Pays-d'en-Haut, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I must confess that my family also owns an EV. We bought our vehicle in 2022, in large part because of federal and provincial subsidies. I think that is a responsible choice.

What we see from the Conservatives is that they never think about climate change. I would like my colleague across the way to tell us about the importance of electrifying transportation as a way to deal with climate change.

Xavier Barsalou-Duval: Madam Speaker, I think my colleague raised a good point. I do not often agree with the Liberals, but I

Business of Supply

think that we can work together on some things, and electrification is one of them.

I would encourage his government to be even more ambitious, because abandoning the electric vehicle availability standards we had in the past is an unfortunate move. We know that when dealerships are forced to stock EVs, consumers have more choice and are more likely to buy these vehicles.

I think that is the direction that we need to go in. We know that EVs produce virtually no greenhouse gases, unlike conventional vehicles, which obviously cause more pollution because they burn gasoline. Conventional vehicles account for a substantial portion of our greenhouse gas emissions. I think the figure is approximately 40% in Quebec, and, in Canada, transportation accounts for about 20% because the country produces greenhouse gases in so many other industries. All of that is to say that conventional vehicles account for a significant portion of our greenhouse gas emissions, and we need to move toward the electrification of transportation if we want to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions and reach the much-discussed global commitment of net zero by 2050.

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Madam Speaker, I think it is clear today that the Bloc Québécois was in favour of subsidies for electric vehicles. In fact, it is clear that the government complied with the request that we have been making for quite some time. It finally listened to reason.

However, there is one area in which the government has not yet listened to reason. To me, the Conservatives and the Liberals are two peas in a pod. They are like two sides of the same coin. From what I understand, the latest budget extended carbon capture tax credits for the oil industry through to 2040, when they were supposed to end in 2035. This government is bumping up tax credits and subsidies for the oil and gas industry, then bragging about reinstating a measure that it should never have cancelled.

I would like to hear my colleague's comments on that.

Xavier Barsalou-Duval: Madam Speaker, the simple answer is that western Canada produces oil and has an oil-centred economy, even though the rest of the world is heading in a different direction. Ontario generally tows the same line, since it primarily manufactures gas-powered vehicles. Canada seems incapable of changing its ways.

Business of Supply

In Quebec, we produce electricity. That means we have every reason to transition away from oil for both economic and environmental reasons, since we already produce electricity. Right now, however, Alberta and the federal government seem unwilling to invest in a forward-looking and future-shaping economic shift. Instead, they want to keep things as they are for as long as possible. It is like wanting to hold on to coal trains forever. One day, this will simply no longer be possible. We need to start thinking about the future instead of always staying stuck in the past.

• (1125)

[English]

Arpan Khanna (Oxford, CPC): Madam Speaker, I would like to start off by sending my deepest condolences and prayers to everyone in Tumbler Ridge. What we saw and what we heard are heartbreaking stories. As a father, I mourn with them. As Canadians, we all stand with the community, and we are sending our prayers to the first responders, the victims and their families. May God bless them all during this challenging time. Canadians from all areas of our country are standing with them.

I will now shift to the issue at hand, which affects my riding quite a bit. Oxford County, usually known as the dairy capital of Canada, has a lot of farmers and a lot of agriculture. We also have a huge footprint when it comes to the auto sector. Members of the government have visited us recently as well. We were just celebrating a successful milestone in Woodstock at the Toyota plant, which started production of the new generation of RAV4s. I visited the plant and spoke to the workers who are producing the amazing RAV4s. Every 30 seconds, a new vehicle pops off the assembly line.

That is possible only because of the hard work, dedication and commitment of the people who make it happen. The workers in the auto industry are some of the best in the world. In my riding and in Windsor, Oshawa, Brampton and Quebec, there is a huge footprint of the amazing folks who are leading the way when it comes to manufacturing.

We are seeing an attack on the Canadian auto industry, and we are feeling it coming from within sometimes, in some of the policies coming from the current government. The government has been talking a very big game when it comes to the auto sector, with a lot of photo ops, a lot of fancy summits and a lot of talk.

However, the rhetoric is not matching the reality, and for my riding, this is having serious consequences, and not just with the job losses. I look at what the auto workers and the industry do for us. They are out in the community, and they are giving back to charities. They are usually the first ones to support events like Coldest Night of the Year, which is a national charity that focuses on people who are homeless. They give back when they can. They come together as one strong community. The industry and the workers are feeling betrayed by the government now.

Looking at the Prime Minister's record, let's look back at the last year. We have lost 5,000 jobs in the industry: direct jobs in Brampton, Ingersoll and Oshawa, and at Paccar in Quebec. There are also tens of thousands of indirect jobs, the spinoff jobs, that operate because of these manufacturing jobs.

Under the current government, under the Liberals' watch and under their failed leadership, auto production has been cut by half. In 2015, over two million cars were made in Canada; now it is a little over a million cars. We are now under attack when it comes to the auto industry. The government has had the opportunity to stand up for our workers, to show solidarity and to fight against the unjustified tariffs that are affecting our community, but it has not. The Liberals are not showing any leadership.

When the Liberals announced the new strategy, workers in my riding did not back it up. I have been getting calls and emails to my office. People are asking why the government is subsidizing, using their tax dollars to fund, American-made EVs. We should be bringing that money here to Canada, especially when Donald Trump is putting tariffs on Canadian-made autos. The Liberals talked about standing up to Donald Trump; we saw the campaign about elbows up. When it comes to issues like this, that is missing. Now the Liberals are repackaging their EV mandate with a different word and different packaging to make it look like it is new and exciting, but it is the same stuff that will have the same consequences on our economy.

• (1130)

The EV mandates were not supported by the manufacturers here in Canada. Brian Kingston and other leaders opposed them. They said that the Liberals did not know what they were talking about and that they had doubled down on their failed experiments. What did that do? It made us uncompetitive and brought instability to our industry, which in return meant job losses. That is why we proposed scrapping the EV mandates a long time ago. We have been calling for that for over a year.

We should be increasing demand for production in our country. We have the best, hardest-working workers. They want to get to work. They want to roll up their sleeves and build Canada. Instead of taking the GST off Canadian-made vehicles, which would incentivize our local economy because on a \$50,000 vehicle it would give Canadians a \$2,500 saving, the Liberals are going to ship the money down south.

Canadians do not want their tax dollars going into luxury vehicles they cannot afford, especially during an affordability crisis, when that money could be spent on boosting our local economy and making sure our workers get the jobs they need so they can put food on the table and would not have to line up at food banks as we have seen in the last bit under the current government. The government is completely out of touch.

Workers in Oxford County called me last week after the plant in Ingersoll laid them off. When they started getting their payouts and saw that more than half of their paycheque was being withheld in taxes, they were shocked. They had no words to explain what that would mean for their family. They do not know how they will pay their mortgage, rent and other bills, or how they will feed their family. They are making changes now for the summer, such as taking their kids out of their sports leagues.

All they wanted was for the government to do the right thing and stand with them, because that is what it claimed it would do. It talks a big game, saying it is with the workers, but when it comes to standing up for them in the House, it does not. Therefore we brought forward a proposal that would, under section 153 of the Income Tax Act, a federally governed system, provide some relief. When our economy is not doing well, I think relief should be there for workers, which would mean they could food on the table and would give them some breathing space and room for relief.

We told the minister we wanted to co-operate in good faith. We said we wanted to work together in collaboration around the table. The Liberals flatly rejected it. They called it “political malpractice”. I can tell members that it is political malpractice to not stand with the workers who dedicate so much to our country. The Liberals have turned their backs on them. They talk a big game and talk rhetoric, but the reality does not match their words.

Therefore we are calling on all sides to work with us in collaboration. Let us get to the table. Let us scrap the EV mandates; no matter how we brand them, they should be gone. We should look at scrapping the subsidies that are going to fund things down south, bring that money back home and put Canadian jobs and Canadian workers first. Let us take the GST off our Canadian-made vehicles. Let us give our workers the relief they need during these challenging times. That is what it means to be Canadian. It is time to stand up and support the auto industry.

Karim Bardeesy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I appreciate the time the member for Oxford and I had, together with his colleagues, the member for Kitchener South—Hespeler and the member for Cambridge, participating in the rollout of the new 2026 RAV4. I will note that it is a hybrid RAV4 that responded not only to consumer taste but also to the California emission standards, which require an increase in vehicle efficiency.

Does my colleague agree with me that the California emission standards helped contribute to the conditions that resulted in the RAV4 hybrid being manufactured at the world-leading plant in Cambridge and Woodstock?

• (1135)

Arpan Khanna: Madam Speaker, it was great to have the parliamentary secretary visit our riding. I welcome any member who wants to come take a look at some of the greatest things that get made. They should come to Oxford County; we will take them for a nice tour and show them all the great things that are happening in my riding. It is a beautiful place to be.

One thing that is very clear is that we were making hybrid vehicles before the government started putting all the regulations in. I have been in direct contact with Toyota quite regularly. The compa-

Business of Supply

ny tells me it will do what the market wants, what consumers want. That should be the way our auto sector works: Consumers should decide what kind of cars they want to drive.

If consumers want to drive gas-powered vehicles, they should be allowed to. In Oxford County, that is what a lot of folks want to drive. We have a lot of agriculture equipment, a lot of farming equipment; that is what is needed. If somebody wants to invest in a hybrid, it is their choice; they should be allowed to. If anyone wants to drive an electric vehicle, it should be their choice. We should let Canadians decide what vehicles they want to drive.

Sometimes they could try to use reports that lean towards their biases, but I believe and trust Canadians for their expertise. I can say that Toyota will keep on doing what it is doing, and it actually calls on the government to stand with it as well.

[*Translation*]

Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Madam Speaker, my colleague's argument is that the money should be invested elsewhere, especially at a time when people are struggling to make ends meet and the high cost of living is so high.

He is talking about the electric car industry, but what about the hundreds of billions of dollars that are going to oil companies, to American companies that make hundreds of billions of dollars in profits every year and that the government continues to finance at a time when what we really need are meaningful measures?

I represent an agricultural riding. Climate change is a nightmare for farmers. That is what is affecting the cost of living.

There is room for everyone to take their place in the sun. Let us continue to invest in the climate transition while ensuring that people who currently make a living from the fossil fuel industry can gradually transition to renewable energy, because that is the future of our planet.

[*English*]

Arpan Khanna: Madam Speaker, like my hon. colleague across the aisle, I represent an agriculture community. The farmers in my riding are telling me that input costs are being driven by the government. Whether by taxes on farm equipment or taxes on fertilizer, the Liberals are the ones driving up the costs, which are then, obviously, being sent to our consumers. I have said it before and I will say it again: When we tax the farmer who grows the food, when we tax the trucker who ships the food and when we tax the processor who processes the food, what that does is drive the cost of food up.

I am a big believer that the government should not be choosing winners and losers, and this is why our plan lets the market decide which direction it should be going in, not the Liberal government.

Business of Supply

Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am a member of the Conservative auto caucus. We have met with representatives from Toyota several times, and they specifically complained to us about the fact that the rebates and the programs the government has put in place picked and chose losers in terms of technology. Toyota was the world leader in hybrid technology but said that the government is completely ignoring its hybrid technology and wants to go to the plug-in electric only.

I am wondering if the hon. member has heard this as well.

Arpan Khanna: Madam Speaker, I have heard it loud and clear. That is why I stand with them every single day, and that is why our plan is the common-sense plan workers want right now, not the Liberals' failed photo ops.

• (1140)

Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Madam Speaker, “We are in the middle of a trade war” is what the Liberals say in response to questions Conservatives raise every time there are more layoffs in the auto sector, in the softwood lumber sector, in the steel and in the aluminum sector. They repeat it to justify their failure to get a deal with the Americans on these tariffs.

Let us be very clear about something right at the get-go: The United States started this trade war. It was President Trump who did it. He put unjustified and illegal tariffs on Canadian products. He has done that, which makes the Liberals' position on this legislation completely incomprehensible.

When Donald Trump is tariffing the Canadian economy, and in particular autos, he has said that he wants every single Canadian auto manufacturing job in the United States. That is his stated goal. To do that, he is putting enormous tariffs on Canadian autos. These tariffs are decimating Canada's auto industry. We have seen the closure of two production facilities. Thousands of Canadians who manufactured cars have lost their jobs. These were good, union jobs that allowed people to pay for their families, their mortgages and all of these things.

This is caused by the tariffs. One would think that in the middle of a trade war caused by the Americans, there is no way we would be giving subsidies for American electric vehicles, but we are. It is disgusting.

I spent Tuesday meeting with the Unifor Skilled Trades Council and skilled trades workers. Every single worker I talked to was outraged that the government would send one penny to the United States for an electric vehicle, which is what it is in fact doing with rebates.

Every single American electric vehicle should be ineligible for any kind of rebate. It is insulting that the Liberals are not doing that. They could do it with one stroke of a pen. The Prime Minister likes to do these fancy announcements with a pen. He pretended to get rid of the carbon tax by signing something. We all remember that a while ago. He could actually do it for this. With the stroke of a pen, the Liberals could make sure that American EVs are ineligible for one penny of Canadian tax dollars until the Americans take their illegal and unjustified tariffs off our auto sector, but they do not do it. They are kowtowing to Donald Trump with this policy, and I do not understand why they are doing it.

The Liberals ran the entire election on elbows up and saying that they could deal with Donald Trump and that they would stand up to Donald Trump, but here they are subsidizing Donald Trump's buy America plan. He wants every single auto in North America to be made in America.

I have looked auto workers in the face and told them about this policy, and they are outraged. The Liberals say that they have had conversations. I challenge any Liberal member to go and sit down with an employee from the shuttered Brampton plant and say to them, “We are sorry you lost your job, but by the way, we will be giving rebates for American-made EVs.” I can say right now that the meeting would not go well, because they are outraged. I am outraged too.

We should not send the Americans a single penny for a single EV until every single illegal, unjustified tariff is taken off Canada and what we produce. The fact that the Liberals will not do it is shameful.

Now, let us talk about something positive we could do for the Canadian auto sector, not the thing the Liberals are doing, which is to hurt it by giving those rebates for American EVs. I have also talked to auto workers about our policy, which is to take the HST off all Canadian-made vehicles, not picking and choosing as the Liberals have done. There is one Canadian EV that may get this subsidy, which is the Dodge Charger. It is a \$95,000 electric muscle car. There are not a lot of people buying them. In fact, in 2025, 600 people in Canada bought the Dodge Charger.

Rather than having a program that is going to primarily benefit the United States and other countries, why not have a program to support our auto workers?

• (1145)

This policy to take the HST off all Canadian-produced autos came from auto workers. I know because I met with them, I talked to them, and I asked, “What could we do to come up with a policy that would help each and every one of you to secure your jobs, to actually bring back some production jobs?” This is what they talked about, because over 95% of the vehicles produced in Canada are not EVs.

The 125,000 Canadians who work in the automotive sector in Canada rely on non-EV vehicle production. These niche subsidies that the Liberals are giving to help Donald Trump's buy America program are not helping the auto sector, not even remotely.

Business of Supply

This would actually incentivize Canadians to buy vehicles. If we look at taking the 13% HST off a vehicle in Ontario, on a \$50,000 vehicle we are looking at around \$7,000. We are in a cost of living crisis, and when a lot of Canadians go out shopping, they are looking at the cost of things very intently. If they could buy a Canadian car for \$7,000 less than an American car or a Japanese car or any other country's car, they will buy the Canadian vehicle.

That is why it is so incomprehensible that the Liberals will not adopt our policy. It is a policy the auto sector workers want. It is one that will be good for all auto production. It would not send a penny of Canadian tax dollars to Donald Trump and his buy American program, unlike their EV subsidy program, which I will again say is absolutely outrageous and unacceptable when we are in the middle of a trade war with the United States.

I want to talk a little about the strategy. The Liberal EV strategy is to produce a lot more EVs. That is what they say they are going to do. There might be a slight problem with that. Stellantis, in an announcement just this week, has said it is moving away from electric vehicles and moving away from the command economy to the demand economy, because demand is actually for non-EVs. That is Stellantis, one of the largest auto manufacturers in the entire world. They are saying it is actually not time to double down on EVs, because consumer demand is not there.

However, the Liberals are going to double down on it. They are doubling down on giving money to Donald Trump's America and doubling down on a strategy that the automakers are moving away from. It gets worse. Ford just announced today that they took a \$1.1-billion loss in the fourth quarter of 2025. They lose \$27,000 for every EV they make. They have also said they are going to reorient and move towards consumer demand, yet the Liberals are going in the opposite direction.

It does not make sense. We need to allow market conditions to determine the kinds of vehicles that people are going to buy, like the hybrid RAV4 that my colleague from Oxford talked about. Why is that not eligible for these subsidies? Why are the Liberals picking and choosing winners? This person is a winner; this vehicle is a winner. Elon Musk's Tesla is a winner, but Canadian manufactured vehicles are not.

There is a very simple thing that could happen in this Parliament. Number one, the government could change this legislation so that not a single penny of Canadian dollars will go to subsidize vehicles made in Donald Trump's America. It is very simple, and every single Canadian would support this.

Number two, the government could take the HST off Canadian-made vehicles to support the 125,000 men and women who work in the automotive supply chain in Canada, 95% of whom make non-electric vehicles. It would spur demand. It might actually bring back some jobs. I do not know why the government is not doing this. I do not know why the government would ever consider sending a penny of Canadian dollars to vehicles made in the United States when Donald Trump has declared a trade war on Canada. The Liberals should apologize to Canadians for that.

Karim Bardeesy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I welcomed the beginning of my colleague from Dufferin—Caledon's speech, where he did acknowl-

edge the trade war. Unfortunately, he spent the rest of his speech mostly talking about the policies that we think will spur investment in response to consumer choice.

I heard a number of critiques of different kinds of investments, including, if I understand correctly, the kinds of investments that would have been made by a previous government of a different colour during the financial crisis, investments that helped attract Japanese automakers, and other policy choices.

Within the motion and within the critiques of the investment attraction policies that we are putting forward on this side, what positive ideas does the member have to attract new investment into auto production in Canada?

• (1150)

Kyle Seeback: Madam Speaker, it is kind of unbelievable to me that the member would ask that question. I think I was very clear that we would take the HST off every vehicle made in Canada. That would spur the automakers in Canada to invest in Canada. They might decide they are going to invest in multivehicle platforms at their remaining factories here in Canada so they can produce more different models of Canadian vehicles that do not have HST, because they would be less expensive than those of their competitors.

There is one thing I have never gotten an answer to, despite asking many times in question period. I know the member will not answer it today and will not answer it in question period. Why are the Liberals giving rebates for American-made vehicles when Donald Trump has declared a trade war on Canada and is trying to ruin our auto sector? Why will the Liberals not answer that question?

[Translation]

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Madam Speaker, let us talk about questions that have never been answered. So far, no Conservative has answered a fairly simple question from the Bloc Québécois benches.

In the case of this motion, Conservative logic suggests that cars manufactured in the United States should not be subsidized because we are in a tariff and trade war with Donald Trump's United States. However, we never hear the Conservatives complain about the fact that the government is providing tax credits and direct and indirect subsidies for the oil and gas industry, which is largely owned by American shareholders. They do not have any problem with that.

I would like someone to explain that to me. I am open to discussion.

Business of Supply

Why is it acceptable to subsidize an industry that is primarily American-owned, namely the oil and gas industry, but not to offer a \$5,000 rebate on electric cars manufactured in the United States?

[*English*]

Kyle Seeback: Madam Speaker, that has a pretty simple answer. Number one is that those are things available in the tax code; they are not a direct rebate. Those are totally different things. They are tax advantages that every company that operates in Canada gets. Number two is that they are actually operating in Canada, creating Canadian jobs, paying Canadian taxes and creating Canadian wealth. Vehicles manufactured in the United States do none of those things, so I do not understand why the member is confused. It seems very obvious to me.

Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Madam Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleague a company called Edison Motors. It is a start-up company that is trying to build hybrid trucks here in Canada. The company faces challenges because it put a generator in the truck rather than an on-the-road engine, and generator engine emissions requirements and on-the-road engine emissions requirements are different. The government has failed to even talk to this company and give it approval to build these trucks.

This is just one example of the government totally failing to support our own Canadian industry. I am wondering if the member has an example from his neck of the woods of where the government does not support these new start-ups.

Kyle Seeback: Madam Speaker, the challenge is that the government likes to pick winners and losers across a whole host of things. The problem with that is that governments do very few things well, the current government even less than normal governments. When governments are trying to pick winners and losers in industry, they almost always pick the wrong things.

We could look at what happened with the battery plants. Stellantis just sold its interest in the battery plant for \$100. It is not actually producing car batteries anymore, for which the Liberals gave them all the money. It is now producing home batteries. Because it did not know which technology was going to lead in the EV sector, the government put all its eggs in one basket, and it made the wrong choice.

Governments should not pick winners and losers; they should create environments in which all companies want to invest and risk capital, and let the best company win with the best idea.

Chris Lewis (Essex, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is always an honour to stand in this place to represent the amazing folks of Essex. As always, I want to thank my Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, without whom this is not possible.

On behalf of the folks of Essex, yesterday was a really touching day here in the House, a moment of solidarity and thoughts and prayers for the Tumbler Ridge families, victims, survivors and the ones that probably hit me the most, the first responders and the thought of what they are waking up to today and tomorrow and the weeks, months and years ahead. As a first responder myself, I know it is a long journey, and I hope they know there is always somebody to talk to. There is always support. I am thinking of and praying for them.

I want to, first and foremost, thank my colleague from Dufferin—Caledon. He really did encapsulate so much of what my speech is about. I have had the opportunity to live right next to the busiest international border crossing in North America, which will be opened, the Gordie Howe International Bridge. For six and a half years, I have had the opportunity to be a co-chair of the Conservative auto caucus. I have met with dozens and dozens of manufacturers across the country, but specifically in the Windsor-Essex region. These manufacturers have invested enormous amounts of money to create jobs and to create a good, strong tax base for our region. The part that frustrates me the most, probably, is that these are the folks who invest the money and what they end up with is that the goalposts move.

A decade ago, Canada was building about 2.3 million vehicles per year. We are now at about 1.2 million per year. These folks put all the investment into their EVs. I am talking about the mould-makers and the tool shops, the ones that had to retool because the government, the Liberal government, told them that this will be the mandate. Now they have done all that investment, and what do they have? They are told that we are going to go back to fuel engines because the government realized that the consumer is not ready, that the vast majority of consumers are not ready to purchase these EVs. At the same time, it is going to move the goalposts again, so that even though they have made all the investments, the government has given them no support to cover those costs and is now going to talk about a new fuel standard.

I just got back, about a month ago, from a trip with the Canada-United States Inter-Parliamentary Group to Mexico. I met with some very influential people down in Mexico. It was a great trip. I also met with the senate of Mexico. I heard about how much further along they are in their talks with the United States, specifically on the automotive sector, than we are. The government, quite frankly, is nowhere near the finish line on that front.

What does that really mean? It means more Canadian jobs lost. Windsor-Essex specifically has 24,000 workers, indirectly and directly, supported by our auto industry. I am sure many of them wake up in the morning and wonder if the third shift at Stellantis is actually going to go down to a second shift again.

I have had an opportunity for so many years now to meet with Brian Kingston, David Adams and Huw Williams. They are from the Canadian Vehicle Manufacturers' Association and the global automotive manufacturers association. I have met with Canadian mould-makers. They have been telling me for six and a half years that industry does not drive demand, that consumers drive demand, so get rid of the EV mandates. We have been screaming from the top of the hills to the government to please get rid of the mandates. It finally listened and got rid of the EV mandates. What it did instead was to again move the goalposts. Everybody now gets to start from ground zero once again.

Business of Supply

• (1155)

Next week, I will be at the Toronto Auto Show, having round tables with industry leaders once again. I can only imagine what that conversation is going to look like. However, most of all, it is about the workers. It has only ever been about the workers. My father always said that we can have the greatest widget in the world, but we will not build one and we will not sell one without the people.

Windsor—Essex has some of the finest skilled trades workers in the world, the greatest tool and die makers and machinists in the world. The infrastructure is already there, but the government continues to tie the hands of these tier twos, tier threes and the OEMs, who are just trying to put forward good-paying jobs to allow food on the tables of Canadians across this country.

I have met with them on the shop floors. I can promise members that the workers in Windsor—Essex are not very excited when they wake up early in the morning to go to work and find out that, at the end of every week or biweekly off their paycheques, their money will be going to subsidize a job in the United States or in other foreign countries. I can only imagine how incredibly upset they must be. I can only imagine what the conversation on the shop floor is. Can members imagine waking up in the morning and going to work knowing that, at the end of the year, our taxpayer dollars, the ones that we literally worked so hard for and gave to the government, were going to another country, another company, so that they could literally eat your lunch? It is absolutely nonsensical, and it is, quite frankly, disgusting.

These workers have built our industry. They are the same ones, such as those in Unifor, who sponsor so many hockey teams, soccer teams and so many events. We see them everywhere. These are the ones who are truthfully community-minded, and they equally do not deserve to be slapped in the face. That is why Conservatives are always going to put Canadian workers and auto manufacturers first.

Conservatives are not about subsidizing other countries. What we are really about is making life more affordable for Canadians, which is why this bill will introduce the removal of HST on Canadian-built vehicles. What does that mean? It means about \$2,500 on a \$50,000 vehicle. By the way, the \$50,000 vehicles are somewhat out of reach, almost a luxury vehicle for Canadians today, because of the price of food and consumables. I am very proud that my colleagues and I have introduced this piece of legislation, which would make life more affordable.

To conclude, the government told industry, “Here’s the goalposts and here’s what you’re going to do”, and industry did that. Now the government is saying, “Oh, by the way, we know you made huge investments. We’re not going to give you any support for those investments, but we just changed the goalposts again.” It is no wonder that Canadian companies are leaving this country in droves when the government makes it so unaffordable to do business in Canada.

Conservatives are here to ensure that we are part of the solution, not part of the problem.

• (1200)

Dominique O'Rourke (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will start by saying that what we want to do is bring some clarity to this conversation, and not conflate and confuse things.

The member opposite voted against budget 2025, which had funding for a strategic response fund to support tariff-affected companies and industries, like the auto sector. The Conservatives voted against the productivity superdeduction that allows large manufacturers to write off capital investments in their first year, which helps the sector. He voted against trades training and supports for people who need to retrain.

I would like to know, sir, how you support that position when we are working hard to protect those jobs and workers?

• (1205)

The Deputy Speaker: I would remind members to speak through the Chair and not directly to other members.

The hon. member for Essex.

Chris Lewis: Mr. Speaker, how do we support it? What we do not do is send \$5,000 subsidies for electric vehicles to other countries, only to turn around and sell them back to Canadians who, quite frankly, cannot afford those vehicles.

I was pretty black and white in my speech. We have to stop moving the goalposts on Canadian companies and start making sure they have the appropriate backstops to keep Canadian auto workers moving and working.

[*Translation*]

Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères said earlier that the average price of an EV is \$63,000. That is expensive, and it is the average price. Let us not get carried away. The measure applies to vehicles that cost less than \$50,000. I do not know how much my colleague's vehicle cost, but it was likely close to the average price.

Why target one industry, the electric vehicle industry? EVs are very popular in Quebec since the Quebec economy is more focused on the energy transition. Why are the Conservatives not looking at the fact that, in recent years, the government has given hundreds of billions of dollars in subsidies to American companies that make billions of dollars in profit every year? I am talking about the oil industry—

The Deputy Speaker: I must interrupt the member to give the member for Essex a chance to answer his question.

[*English*]

Chris Lewis: Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague brings up some really good points in regard to all the subsidies for infrastructure that have been put in place. I believe they are around \$53 billion. At the Stellantis plant in Windsor, there are great jobs, but it was designed to build electric vehicle batteries for vehicles, and today, it is not building them for vehicles.

Business of Supply

The government needs to really understand that with all the money it is putting out, it has to get it back into Canadian hands. That is why going to start happening if we are manufacturing in Canada.

Burton Bailey (Red Deer, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister claimed that Canada would get things done in speeds not seen before, yet nothing is getting built. Nothing is getting done, and Canadians are losing their jobs.

Why does the Liberal government keep expecting Canadians to wait and take more hits while continuing to vote against Conservative policies that would make a real change?

Chris Lewis: Mr. Speaker, that is a fantastic question. At the end of the day, it is because Liberals do not get it. They are not on the shop floors. They are not seeing it for what it is. They are not suffering with the folks who are trying to figure out how they are going to pay their bills or put their kids into soccer this year. They do not understand. They are not in the middle of it.

However, they can rest assured that Conservatives will ensure that life gets better.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me start by offering my condolences and prayers to the residents of Tumbler Ridge, B.C., for the horrific things that have taken place over the last couple of days. I echo what the Prime Minister, the leader of the Conservative Party and others have expressed in regard to our love and prayers going to the community.

I want to expand on a bit more of a holistic approach to the automobile industry, which has been such a vital part of our manufacturing industry in Canada for many years. In fact, we can go back to Lester Pearson in 1965 and the signing of the auto pact agreement. This is an agreement I have talked about in the past when we were, I believe, the third party and possibly again once we were in government. It was a significant agreement at the time.

Much as Lester Pearson was a visionary looking at the automobile industry back in the sixties, we have a Prime Minister today who has developed a Canada-strong automobile strategy so that we will have a healthy automobile industry in Canada into the future.

Reflecting back to the past, it was not that long ago that I was pumping gas at a Turbo. Looking back to the seventies and the automobile industry back then, there was GM, Ford, Chrysler and American Motors. That was it, the big four in Canada. Those were perceived as the automobile industry.

We know American Motors was consumed by Chrysler, and Chrysler became Stellantis. What we have today are Honda, Toyota, Stellantis, GM and Ford. I think most Canadians would be very surprised about which cars are actually being manufactured in Canada today. Back in the seventies, people talked about not buying imports. Well, Toyota and Honda are actually producing far more cars here in Canada than the other manufacturers combined. It is not to take away anything from the other three, GM and Stellantis and Ford, but the automobile industry has changed over the years.

Today we have a motion from the Conservatives as if they actually know what to do. In reality, members can look at the time

when they were in government. They want to isolate the province of Ontario. One of the greatest hits to the industry was when the leader of the Conservative Party sat around in the Conservative caucus when the Ontario manufacturing industry was being decimated.

Listen to what the Conservatives talk about. They ask, how can we give an EV subsidy to American manufacturers? Seriously, do they not understand that we have an integrated automobile industry? Many of the parts used in those EVs across the border are actually manufactured here in Canada and are then brought to the United States and put into many of those electric vehicles. We have an integrated system. For the life of me, I believe the Conservatives just truly do not understand that.

● (1210)

The total number of cars manufactured in Canada today is just over one million; I think it is about 1.3 million or so. In looking at the consumption of vehicles, what Canadians are buying, we see that approximately 10% of Canadians are buying Canadian-made cars. However, there is a great deal of Canadian content in cars being purchased that come in from the United States. I am not going to defend Donald Trump, the United States or their political objectives on the automobile industry, far from that.

Whether it is the Prime Minister or any Liberal member of Parliament, we are very much concerned about the future of the industry, and the workers and their families. We need to see more empathy toward those families and the idea of generational workers into the future. If those workers have sons or daughters who they want to continue on in that industry, we better start thinking about the future and the direction that the industry as a whole is moving toward.

We are going to see substantial increases in the production, directly and indirectly, of EVs. The Conservatives are closing their eyes and ignoring it, as if we do not need to worry about it. Much like Lester Pearson recognized the issue back in 1965, how important it was that we have an auto pact agreement, which literally provided hundreds of thousands of good middle-class jobs and helped build the country we have today, we now have a Prime Minister who is saying we cannot just stand by and do nothing, especially when there is an American president who has been unpredictable. We do not know what the president is going to say tomorrow.

We have to look at ways to expand our economy that go beyond the Canada-U.S.A. border. That is what the Prime Minister, the ministers and members of the Liberal caucus believe we need to do. That is why we have a Prime Minister who has been travelling abroad, bringing literally billions of dollars of investment into Canada and looking at ways we can continue to export. There is no reason we cannot export more of our automobiles being produced in Canada beyond the United States. Today, well over 90% go into the United States.

After all, we should all take pride in the quality of the workforce in our automobile industry. The Dodge Charger was recognized in Detroit as the car of the year. I believe that is because of the employees and the company working as a team to produce that car of the year. The Toyota RAV4 is a vehicle that has been widely supported here in Canada and abroad. These vehicles, whether those two or any others being produced in Canada, are recognized for the quality of the product. The Prime Minister and this government have said we need to not only protect but also look at ways we can expand the automotive industry here in Canada. That is why the whole battery supply chain is so critically important.

Unlike the Conservatives, we do not have our heads in the sand. We realize that electric vehicles and hybrid vehicles will continue to be produced in the future, and we want to be in the game. The Conservatives say no, at a great cost.

● (1215)

We need to look at the reality of what is happening not only in Canada but around the world. We will see that Canada can, in fact, be a world leader. We need to be able to move forward. What if we followed the Conservatives? I can imagine the debates during the 1920s and so forth, with Conservatives saying, “You know what? Those wagon wheels create a lot of jobs. We want to keep the wagons flowing.” In technology, things change. Government needs to change. That is why the first question I asked the opposition on this issue was about the Conservative Party's strategy on the future of the automobile industry. Where is it? Nothing at all has been presented to Canadians.

I look at what the Conservatives say about EVs here in the chamber. They say the government is bad because it is providing a grant to encourage people to acquire an EV. Well, members know there are provincial governments across this land that have recognized the value of encouraging their citizens to purchase electric vehicles, and they also have provided financial incentives to do that. We know there are provincial governments that actually invest in the infrastructure to support EVs.

The best I can tell is that there is only one political entity in the country, known across Canada, that says absolutely no to electric vehicles and the promotion of them, not to mention the infrastructure buildup here in Canada. It is the Conservative Party of Canada, the far-right Conservative Party of Canada. That is the only entity that does not have any real strategy to deal with our automobile industry.

The Conservatives want to give the impression that they care about the employees. They take these flash issues and try to build up anger toward the government when they themselves do not have a strategy that takes the industry into the future. The Government of Canada is very much on the front line, working with people and workers and consulting with families and companies, to ensure not only that we have a strategy but that it will be a strategy that is going to work and build upon the successes we have had in the past.

The Conservatives are completely blank, but just the far-right Conservatives here that I see. When I say that, some members ask why I would say “the far right”. They are extreme. We can take a look. There are Progressive Conservative premiers who will support the EV industry. Even the Alberta United Conservatives have

Business of Supply

supported, if not directly then indirectly, the expansion of EV chargers. The point is that whether they are Progressive Conservatives, New Democrats, Greens, the Bloc party or the Liberal Party, all the main parties that most Canadians would be aware of, they all recognize that things change and that we need to adapt and develop strategies around how we build into the future. The only other party is the Conservative Party.

● (1220)

There were interesting job numbers that were provided to me in regard to just how important the auto and battery plants are. Let us think in terms of the municipalities. We could talk about Windsor, Oakville, Oshawa, Ingersoll, Brampton, Alliston, Woodstock and Cambridge. These are all communities in the province of Ontario, but is not limited to Ontario when we talk about going forward into the future, and even today. I think of my home province of Manitoba, where Winnipeg has New Flyer, as well as the work that Red River College or the University of Manitoba are doing.

An hon. member: Are EVs manufactured in Manitoba?

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, there is EV manufacturing in Manitoba. The best buses in the world are being manufactured in my home city of Winnipeg, and they are EV buses. Imagine the shell shock on the other side. The silence is deafening when reality finally sinks in.

Even though we have emphasized a great deal about Ontario today, we are really talking about an industry that impacts everyone, every region of our country. That is why I stand up today looking at these communities, the broader community of the province of Ontario, specifically, for me today, and indicate that we care about what is taking place. Even as a Prairies member of Parliament, I am being sensitive to the jobs that are being impacted, as I know every Liberal member of Parliament is.

We have talked about Toyota in Woodstock, which is 2,500 jobs. That is where the RAV4 is produced. I think someone earlier said that every minute or every 30 seconds, a new car comes off the line. In Cambridge there are well over 5,000 jobs, close to 6,000. Let us take a look at what is happening in Alliston at Honda; again, there are thousands of jobs. Those two companies, as I indicated earlier, make up well over 50% of automobile manufacturing here in Canada. Let us take a look at the numbers. I would never have thought this in the eighties and nineties. They stepped up to the plate.

There is talk of a RAV4 hybrid being developed, and it could actually be done here in Canada, at least in some sort of limited way, possibly. I would recognize and ask Toyota. We should maybe make a resolution to support some of the industries that are so progressive. The RAV4 is a fantastic vehicle, and I hope to see a hybrid.

However, there is Stellantis, whether it is in Brampton or Windsor, with genuine concerns. There is General Motors in Ingersoll, Oshawa and St. Catharines. There is Ford. We are very much concerned. We want Ford to do better and to grow.

Business of Supply

When we talk about the supply chain, there is NextStar. Someone told me earlier today that NextStar has reached one million batteries being manufactured. Many of the initiatives we have taken as a government to support the automobile industry and add on the EV industry have actually been supported with public dollars by the Ontario government. Doug Ford, by the way, is a progressive Conservative.

At the end of the day, the government will work with Canadians, work with industry stakeholders, families and workers, to ensure that we have a strong and healthy automobile industry all Canadians can be proud of. That means there will be some changes, but we will persevere. What Lester Pearson did for the Auto Pact, the Prime Minister will do for the future of the Canadian automobile industry, and we will see prosperity continue.

• (1225)

Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am used to a lot in the member's diatribes, but I know that he accuses anyone who does not support government mandates on vehicle purchases of being far right. How far left does one have to be to think that government involvement and intervention is the only way industry can operate in Canada?

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, that would be a good question to ask Doug Ford, a Conservative who made many investments, recognizing, contrary to what the member just put on the record, that the government does have a role to play. I am not alone. Progressive Conservative provincial governments and NDP provincial governments also understand the reality that government can make a difference. We have seen that in Canada. We have a Prime Minister who understands that, which is one of the reasons we continue to work every day to protect the industries that are so valuable to our nation.

• (1230)

[*Translation*]

Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the program that the Conservatives are criticizing today provides for \$2.3 billion over five years. This sort of incentive worked very well in Quebec and helped boost EV sales there.

When I compare this amount allocated over five years to what the government is giving the oil industry, which is controlled by American companies that make billions of dollars in profit a year, it seems to me that this government is not very green and is not doing very much to fight climate change.

[*English*]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I am going to pick up on the point that the member who represents the province of Quebec talked about, which is the rebates, what they are and how it is important that we support the EV industry, its growth and its potential.

This is why we have brought forward through the automobile strategy a program that will sensitize Canadians to purchasing EV vehicles when the opportunity might be there for them to do so. Again, different levels of government have recognized that and have supported it, not only by the federal government's saying it is good but also by the provinces' adding more value to the program.

Tom Osborne (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the strategy includes incentives for Canadian automakers, and it also includes a focus on attracting other automakers to build cars in Canada.

While we heard the Conservative Party saying that this will provide incentives for luxury American cars, my understanding of the strategy is that it is capped at \$50,000 for imported EVs and that there is no cap for Canadian-manufactured EVs, but many of the parts for American-made EVs are made by Canadians in Canadian plants and factories. We need to support those workers in Canada as well. If we did not, I suspect that the Conservatives would criticize us if those shut down.

Can you speak to that?

The Deputy Speaker: I cannot speak to that, but I will invite the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader to speak to it.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, my colleague has made a very important observation. At the end of the day, when we look at the details of what is being proposed by the government, we see that he is 100% correct.

I would add to that by saying that roughly 35% of our EV purchases in Canada will come from the United States, but for many of those vehicles coming in from the United States, parts are being supplied by Canadian workers. Something overlooked by the Conservatives' rhetoric when they promote anger toward government policy is that they are criticizing jobs that Canadians have. I find that unfortunate because of our integrated system between Canada and the U.S.

Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to start by correcting a mis-characterization by the member, who suggested that somehow Conservatives are opposed to EVs. Many Conservative members actually own EVs, and that is fine. What Conservatives believe in is the freedom to choose what kind of vehicle they want to buy and not have the Liberal government force them to buy an EV through their tailpipe emissions standard they are putting in place.

The other thing Conservatives believe in is creating jobs for Canadians. Why does the member support sending subsidies to foreign countries that are producing vehicles, instead of making jobs here in Canada?

• (1235)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I would ask all members present who own an EV to please raise their hand. I do not see any on the Conservative side.

Having said that, let me suggest that it is the NDP and PC governments at the provincial levels and the Liberal federal government that have recognized that providing the rebates in some form or another is a good thing. The Conservatives gaslight people on the issue, and I believe that is a disservice. That is really what they are doing.

Remember that there is an integrated automobile industry between Canada and the U.S.A. Many of the parts manufactured here in Canada are sent to the U.S.A. to support EV production.

Hon. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would love to hear why, the member thinks, the Conservative Party has changed so much. I say that because the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada used to be at the forefront of environmental issues. It was Brian Mulroney who brought countries throughout the world together in Montreal to develop the Montreal Protocol to deal with the ozone layer. It was Brian Mulroney, a Progressive Conservative, who went to see George Bush Sr. to deal with acid rain and came up with protocols respecting how to deal with it.

Why, does the member think, have the Conservatives swung so far away from wanting to do anything with respect to protecting the environment?

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I remember former prime minister Joe Clark making the statement that he never left the Progressive Conservative Party but rather that the party left him. There are a lot of progressives, red Tories, or call them what we like: Conservatives with a conscience, Conservatives who believe in the environment and in having good, strong policy dealing with the environment. Those have all been pushed to the side.

We have witnessed the leader of the Conservative Party move and continue to move the Conservative Party of Canada farther and farther to the right.

Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to note that the Liberals keep bringing up the RAV4, and the member for Winnipeg North, for example, said that Toyota is developing hybrid technology. I have news for him: The RAV4 has been a hybrid since 2016, more than 10 years.

Toyota has complained to us that hybrid technology is not recognized by the government's rebates, emissions caps and all these kinds of things. It said it wants a technology-agnostic program. Why will the Liberals not provide that?

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, first, I recognize how important the RAV4 vehicle is, and I compliment the workforce at Toyota in Canada. Someone mentioned that it produces, I believe, one car every minute or less than a minute. I thought someone said 30 seconds.

Canada also produces the Dodge Charger, which is the number one car in North America. It was recognized as the car of the year by Detroit. We should be proud of those vehicles and the love and attention that go into making them.

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always an honour to rise in the House and speak for the decent and hard-working people of Windsor West. On their behalf, I would like to

Business of Supply

extend my heartfelt condolences to the good people of Tumbler Ridge as they go through the most challenging time of their lives.

Windsor is a border city. For us, when trade works, we work. When a trade war starts, Windsor is on the front lines of that war, but the choices being made here in Ottawa are having a serious impact at home.

It is important to explain what Windsor actually means to this country. Windsor is the automotive capital of Canada. The Windsor-Detroit corridor is the linchpin of our trading relationship, where roughly one-third of all Canada-U.S. trade crosses the border every single day, which amounts to over half a billion dollars every day.

Windsor anchors one of the most integrated supply chains in the world. Auto parts made in Canada cross back and forth to the U.S. several times before the final assembly of a vehicle. When tariffs are imposed and uncertainty grows, the impact is immediate. A delay in Windsor can idle a plant in Michigan. A slowdown in Michigan can shut down a supplier in Ontario. That is why getting our auto policy right is essential if we want to put Canadian workers first.

When I talk to workers back home, they are very clear about where our trouble started. They, too, blame it on the tariffs that President Trump imposed on us. Like us, the people of Windsor believe the tariffs are unjustified. They believe they were meant to target our manufacturing sector and our auto sector, and they hit Canadian auto workers directly. Just yesterday, even the United States Congress said those tariffs against Canada are unjustified.

However, more importantly, there is anxiety and frustration on our side of the border, because of how the government has responded to the trade war so far. Instead of securing protections for Canadian manufacturing and Canadian workers, the government announced billions of dollars in EV subsidies. On the surface, that sounds supportive, but when workers look closely, they see where most of that money is going. A significant portion is going to vehicles built in the United States, in Trump's America, and in other foreign jurisdictions. While Trump's tariffs are hurting Canadian workers, Canadian tax dollars are being used to support American production. The workers on the shop floor are shaking their heads at the complete lack of common sense in this policy.

That is not all. The workers in Windsor have a great memory. They remember being promised a trade deal by July 21, 2025. They remember being told that help was coming, but that deal never arrived. There was no agreement, no certainty and no protection. Many in Windsor are feeling disappointed. They are caught between unfair Trump tariffs on one side and domestic policies that fail to anchor production and secure good-paying jobs on the other. People understand that trade negotiations are complex, but they also understand when promises are not kept.

Business of Supply

This issue goes well beyond the big three automotive companies. Today, we are producing half the cars that we did in 2016, going from 2.3 million cars a year to 1.2 million cars a year. All of that decline took place under the Liberal-NDP rule.

In Windsor and across southwestern Ontario, parts manufacturers and tool and die shops are under real threat. These are smaller businesses, often family-run, that are highly-skilled and absolutely essential to the auto supply chain. However, when assembly lines slow down, the orders for these smaller companies disappear, and when uncertainty drags on, layoffs begin quietly. I can tell the House that this is happening on both sides of the border, unfortunately. I am hearing from tool and die shops that have already let workers go. Parts suppliers are cutting shifts. This is how economic damage spreads. It is out of sight from Ottawa, but deeply felt in cities like Windsor, London, Hamilton, Brampton, Oshawa and Quebec.

There is another concern that comes up over and over again, which is that capital investment is leaving Canada. Banks have published studies on this, by the way. Other Canadian companies besides Brookfield Asset Management are choosing to invest in Trump's America, not because Canadian workers lack skills and not because our plants lack capacity. I am being told by manufacturers that the rules south of the border are clearer, that the regulators there are helpful instead of hindering, that the costs feel lower and that the path to profitability feels more stable. Some of these folks have told me that the red tape on our side of the border is choking entrepreneurs. When will the government address this issue?

● (1240)

I have also had the opportunity to speak with a few workers, who have talked to me about the EV policy. They told me the production for the EV Dodge Charger model that was just referred to has been paused, yet it won awards at the Detroit Auto Show. As of January 2026, the Pacifica plug-in hybrid is also being phased out by Stellantis.

These workers are not debating climate goals; they are asking for clarity. They hear that the EV mandate is gone, but they are not happy about our tax dollars subsidizing cars made in Trump's America. When I mentioned our Conservative proposal for removing the GST on Canadian-made vehicles to support our manufacturing jobs, members can imagine their answer. They are all for it.

Before I go on, I want to briefly mention the Gordie Howe bridge, which has been under construction for eight years. It was completely approved in 2015, but the Liberal government did not put a shovel in the ground until 2018. The bridge is critical to both Windsor's and Canada's international trade.

We have heard about the comments made by the President and the subsequent conversations he had with the Prime Minister, but the people in Windsor have been waiting and seeing delay after delay. Now they are even more uncertain as to when this bridge will open or even when the toll rates will be announced. Incredibly enough, the Liberal government and its Crown corporation have not come up with toll rates after starting the project over eight years ago. It is absolutely incredible. For logistics companies, which plan months ahead while bidding on contracts, the lack of certainty and information on toll rates hurts their ability to compete.

This has to change. The government needs to provide firm timelines on when this bridge will open. People in Windsor and across southwestern Ontario need that information yesterday.

What do people in Windsor really need? The people in my city are reasonable, and they have reasonable expectations. They want their government to defend Canadian jobs, first and foremost, to stop sending our tax dollars to President Trump and to secure a trade deal that protects us and keeps investments in Canada. They are not asking for guarantees; they are asking for honesty and integrity.

This is the picture in Windsor. The unjustified tariffs by President Trump started the damage, the absence of an intelligent Canadian response by the Liberals allowed it to deepen, and workers, along with suppliers and small manufacturers, are paying the price.

Windsor is not the edge of the country, but one of its economic engines, and it is an important one, I might add. If we are serious about putting Canadians first and wanting workers in Windsor to believe their government believes in them, we must be serious about what happens to Windsor and its workers. They are relying on the House to come up with a proper solution so that they and their families have a viable future and their kids can enjoy all of the benefits this great nation has to offer.

● (1245)

Hon. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member can talk about where he sees the future of vehicles going. Right now, one in every five vehicles sold in the world is an electric vehicle. It is continuing to only increase and will continue to only increase, moving into the future.

I wonder if he accepts that fact and if he would share his thoughts on where he sees Canada's role in the electric vehicle manufacturing process.

Harb Gill: Mr. Speaker, that is a fantastic question. Here is the answer.

Last year, with respect to the Dodge Charger EV that my friends opposite referred to, only about 7,000 of them were made. A little over 500 were sold in Canada and 7,000 were sold in the U.S. It was a losing proposition for Stellantis, which stopped production on it and has not decided if it will restart production this year. The Pacifica plug-in hybrid version is also being suspended.

We are in North America. Our supply chains are integrated with North America. We have to do what is right here in our part of the world, not globally. They can do whatever they want in other parts of the world, but we should not be subsidizing other parts of the world with Canadian taxpayer dollars to say we support them and their—

The Deputy Speaker: Questions and comments, the hon. member for Lac-Saint-Jean.

[*Translation*]

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, today, we are asking ourselves one question: What does this motion have to offer Quebec?

As we see it, this motion has absolutely nothing good to offer Quebec. The more electric cars on Quebec's roads, the better for Quebec's economy.

Allow me to explain that to my colleague. When an electric car recharges, Hydro-Québec sells that electricity. Instead of using western oil, we use Quebec-generated electricity. Since Hydro-Québec is a publicly owned corporation, this is obviously better for Quebec's economy.

Does my colleague get the picture?

• (1250)

[*English*]

Harb Gill: Mr. Speaker, Ontario aluminum extrusion plants consume roughly 1.3 billion dollars' worth of aluminum from Quebec. Can Art, a company in Windsor, Ontario, has laid off 250 workers because the EV Ford truck is not being produced anymore. It started a plant worth \$60 million that is sitting idle because of the tariffs imposed by our friends to the south.

This is what we are doing to our own companies. We are not supporting them and we are not helping them. We are doing everything to stand in the way of their progress.

These are companies that add value to the resources coming from Quebec, yet here we are, debating what to do about electricity. It is a great question. We would support the electrification of the entire planet if I could help it, but what are we going to do about all of these plants that are consuming the products they make? We have not been helping them.

What is the government prepared to do to help aluminum extrusion plants in Ontario?

The Deputy Speaker: Questions and comments, the hon. member for Cloverdale—Langley City.

Before the member begins, I want to remind members that Standing Order 16(2) still applies. Members cannot cross between the Speaker and the member who is about to speak.

I invite the member to ask her question or make her comment.

Tamara Jansen (Cloverdale—Langley City, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after years of failed EV mandates, to the tune of \$52 billion in subsidies from Canadian taxpayers, the government now wants to spend another \$2.3 billion to boost the sales of cars that Canada

Business of Supply

does not build. The fact is that nearly all previous rebates went to vehicles manufactured outside Canada.

If the goal is to strengthen our auto sector, why is subsidy money going to support American factories instead of Canadian workers? How will this help the 5,000 families who have lost their jobs in the auto sector?

Harb Gill: Mr. Speaker, this is not going to help anybody except Mr. Trump and Trump's America. It is not going to help Canadians. It is not going to help the workers who have been laid off, and there are more than 5,000. There are other workers. I mentioned the Can Art extrusion company in Windsor, which laid off 250 people because it did not have work anymore.

There are multiple companies like that, which have lost employees or laid off people because they do not have the ability to keep them as a result of these mandates.

Hon. Pierre Poilievre (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I understand we are leading 4-0 in the big game today. We are truly team Canada, as we can see from the beautiful jersey right behind me.

Imagine if we could be team Canada when it comes to automotive purchases and production. Imagine the satisfaction someone would have if they drove their new car off the lot knowing that not only did they get a great price for a great automobile so they can do their full-time job as a chauffeur taking their kids to their hockey games, but that every penny from their purchase went to support Canadian workers, to put food on the tables of Canadian families, to buy Canadian steel, Canadian aluminum, Canadian plastic and Canadian-assembled automobiles.

That is the mission. That is how we make our country affordable, safe and strong. We must reindustrialize our country. We must unleash the production of steel, aluminum, plastic, minerals and other production for which we should have a massive natural advantage.

Then and only then, Canadian paycheques would grow. Then and only then, Canada would be affordable and autonomous. Then and only then, would we restore the industrial powerhouse that used to characterize the Canadian economy. We have a plan as Conservatives to bring about that industrial powerhouse and the affordable made-in-Canada vehicles I just described.

Business of Supply

It is a plan for quick permits, low-cost energy and low taxes, a plan to make this the biggest and most open economy anywhere in the world in which to produce, to make, to fix, to move, to dig and to deliver for Canadian consumers. We have the resources and the workforce that no other country can match, yet after 10 years of the Liberal government, we have had the worst economic growth in the G7, the worst productivity and the worst investment track record. Five hundred billion dollars of net investment has fled our country for the United States of America, as Liberal taxes and anti-development policies drive investors stampeding out of our country.

Automotive production under the Liberal government has fallen by half, from roughly 2.2 million cars a year to 1.2 million. All of that happened while the present-day Liberal finance minister was actually the industry minister. The new government looks an awful lot like the old government.

The Liberal Prime Minister promised that he would be different. Here we are, a year later, and what do we have? There have been grand speeches, announcements and signing ceremonies of unenforceable declarations. It is all an illusion. Look at the results.

He promised to negotiate a win with the U.S. by July 21. There is still no win, still no deal and still no jobs. He promised that we would have the strongest growth in the G7. Our economy is now shrinking, according to Bloomberg. He promised affordable food, but grocery prices are now rising faster in Canada than in any other G7 country. Real GDP in automotive manufacturing fell by 10% in November. He promised auto jobs. He has lost 5,000 of them. In fact, manufacturing is down 37,000 jobs since he took office promising to make Canada strong, and 5,000 of those jobs are in automotive production. We have seen 3,000 job losses in Brampton, where I had the the honour of standing in the rain with the great Unifor workers who were locked out of their facility; 1,200 at the GM CAMI plant; 500 at GM's plant in Oshawa; and 725 at Pac-car in Quebec.

We can blame President Trump's unfair tariffs, and we do, but the question is this: What are we doing about what we can control? As the Prime Minister said, and he is right on this point, no one can control what President Trump does or says. I agree with the Prime Minister. What we can control is what we do on this side of the border.

Here is what the Prime Minister's response is. He wants to take \$2.3 billion away from Canadian taxpayers, including Canadian auto workers, and spend it on a subsidy that goes exclusively to foreign-made, especially American-made, cars. While President Trump tariffs our automobile sector, the Liberal Prime Minister subsidizes the American auto sector.

• (1255)

Let us be very clear. Liberals are claiming that somehow the rebates will be used for Canadian automobiles. Here are the facts: In 2023, under the previous Liberal EV rebate program, which was pretty much the same as the one we have now, 99% of the subsidies went to foreign-made EVs: 31% went to the U.S., 25% to China, 19% to Japan, 16% to South Korea and 1% to Canada. Let us be clear: Only 1% of EVs purchased in Canada are made in Canada, and that is after \$52 billion of taxpayer subsidies for the EV supply chain. It does not seem to matter how much Liberal governments

throw away in handouts and subsidies; they cannot turn those dollars into enough production to satisfy even a tiny fraction of the Canadian marketplace.

Liberals say that is the present, but we should look to the future. That too is an illusion. Here is the reality: EV purchases are in free fall. Between December 2024 and November 2025, the market share of EVs in Canada plummeted almost by half, from 18% to 11%. Canadians are buying vastly fewer electric vehicles. In dollar terms, the sales have decreased in that period of time by 37%. That is absolute free fall. In fact, the reality is that if someone were trying to predict the future, and I do not believe that governments are able to do that, and simply based on the trajectory, it is clear that electric vehicles are not on track at this time to overtake the market. They are not even close.

Our Conservative approach would allow the free market to decide which vehicles get purchased. It lets consumers choose what they want to buy. We know that they will be biased in favour of the lowest price and the highest quality, and those vehicles happen to be, in many cases, Canadian-made internal combustion vehicles. That is the reality, and we have a plan to make sure that the maximum amount of content in those vehicles is made by our Canadian workers. We are going to reindustrialize Canada. We are going to make this into an industrial powerhouse, and we are going to make it possible for someone to buy a car and know it goes to Canadians.

It drives me crazy to think of the laid-off auto worker who is looking at their severance right now and sees 50% is gone in tax, knowing that their tax dollars will subsidize the very American-made vehicles that were made in the country that tariffed him out of a job. He does not have to live like that; we have a plan.

We will unleash Canadian production. We will take the GST off Canadian-made automobiles, saving people \$2,500 on a Canadian car. This would include, for example, the Chrysler Pacifica, the Chrysler Grand Caravan, the Dodge Charger, the Toyota RAV4, the Lexus NX, the Honda Civic, the CR-V, numerous Ford products, the Chevy Silverado and many more. We would get rid of the industrial carbon tax on Canadian steel, aluminum and plastic to make cars with Canadian steel. We would get rid of the capital gains tax on reinvestments in Canadian auto plants. We would end the new Liberal fuel tax so that we can move our parts around more quickly and economically, because low-cost energy is the key to reindustrializing our country.

These are solutions. They are positive ideas to make Canada an incredible industrial powerhouse, where patriotic Canadians can save money and save jobs at the same time and where team Canada not only wins out on the ice but wins at the auto dealership, wins on our streets and wins in our factories.

I say, “Canada first and Canada always.”

• (1300)

Karim Bardeesy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our auto strategy associates itself with the stronger emissions standards that are prevailing in California and in Europe, and it is part of a strategy that will decrease our dependence on internal combustion engines and increase our adoption of electrification. This strategy is good for the environment and good for the climate. Not in the motion but in the debate, we now hear that the Conservatives are opposed to California-style emissions standards. That, incidentally, is the position of the U.S. administration, which is now saying it does not want any emissions standards whatsoever.

My question to the Leader of the Opposition is this: Is he in support of California-style, European-style and Canadian emissions standards, or no emissions standards?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, we are in favour of Canada, and that means low-cost energy. I do not want high-priced European or Californian taxes on consumers and industry. That is how jobs get killed. That is how people are made poor.

Europe is rapidly running away from the radical net-zero agenda that the member just talked about. The Germans tried it and are having to reverse themselves completely because they are being shut down. In the United Kingdom, they realized that high-priced electricity, because of these same radical net-zero policies that the Prime Minister has embraced and written about, are impoverishing the working class and deindustrializing society.

We do not want any of these foreign policies he wants to impose. We want a Canadian policy to reindustrialize and make Canada affordable and autonomous.

• (1305)

[*Translation*]

Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I note that in the last point of the motion, point (c), the Leader of the Opposition is calling for a tax cut for GM factory workers who have lost their jobs. That is very generous of him, but how could someone who claims to advocate for Canada and work for everyone not think of the Paccar workers, who also lost their jobs? Why did he not include them in his motion? In Sainte-Thérèse, 700 people lost their jobs. That is my first question.

Here is my second question for the Leader of the Opposition. Alberta produces oil and Quebec produces electricity. Quebec is the leading market for EVs in Canada. Does he understand that his motion is an attack on the electrification of transportation, that Quebecers are fond of electricity, that they are fond of electric vehicles, and that, basically, he is attacking Quebec?

Business of Supply

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question, but not for his research, because he made a mistake.

We did not say that workers who lost their jobs would not have to pay the usual taxes. What we said was that the taxes should not be taken off at the beginning of the year, because then those workers will be forced to wait a year before getting a refund.

The problem with a one-time payment when a worker loses their job is that it puts them in a very high tax bracket. They lose half the money and have to wait 14 months to get a refund. Why not let the workers keep that money and pay the taxes on it later when they have a job? That is my first point.

My second point is that the member has lost touch with the regions of Quebec, where people like trucks that run on gas and diesel. We support Quebec consumers. We believe that they can decide for themselves, without subsidizing American vehicles.

[*English*]

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, workers in Windsor, Canada's automotive capital, are being hit by unjustified U.S. tariffs, while Liberal subsidies and Canadian tax dollars are paying for American-built cars. Investment is leaving Canada.

Can the Leader of the Opposition explain how a Canada-first Conservative plan for ending subsidies of foreign-made vehicles and cutting the GST on Canadian-built cars would protect Canadian jobs, Windsor jobs, and keep investment here in our country?

Hon. Pierre Poilievre: Mr. Speaker, first of all, nobody has done more to champion turning Canada into an industrial superpower than the member for Windsor West. Every day, in every way, he fights for our auto workers, and we owe him a debt of gratitude.

I am informed that since my speech began, team Canada has gone to 5-0. Apparently there is some momentum here, and I hope that the government will get out of the way and let that momentum turn into results. We are going to take the taxes off Canadian-made automobiles, so that they are affordable and our country is autonomous.

Hon. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I am only at the part about sharing my time, and they are already heckling me.

I will be sharing my time today with the member for Oakville West.

Business of Supply

I cannot help but wonder what is going on in the political party over there with its members being so hell-bent on disassociating themselves from the reality of the world we are in and the fact that our car industries are converting, changing and evolving.

I want to propose something to members. I want them to imagine for a second that EVs are already the norm. I want them to pretend for a second that gas vehicles do not exist and that there are only EVs.

I ask members to picture this: Every morning they wake up, their car has been plugged in and it has a full battery. When they drive around, there is no noise, no fumes and no rumbling traffic. The streets and the air are cleaner, and kids walking to school can breathe cleaner air as a result of this.

Members can think about it for a second. Everybody is driving EVs, and there is very little maintenance required. We are not getting oil changes, changing or adjusting timing belts, or dealing with transmission failures. We also have an energy source that is stable and affordable. This is the world we are living in, my imaginary world, for a second.

I now want members to imagine that I am going to pitch why we should transition from EVs to gas vehicles. This is my pitch: For starters, there would be no charging when we wake up in the morning. We might wake up and the car is empty, so we have to find a gas station somewhere to fill it up, where we are pulling a hose out of a gas tank and pumping flammable fuel into our vehicle.

Also, I want members to think about the maintenance involved. Instead of an EV, which has literally no maintenance, we suddenly have a vehicle that has hundreds of moving parts. There is an engine that, thousands of times a minute, is having little miniature explosions in it to drive the engine. This is my pitch to members.

In addition to that, every once in a while, every 5,000 kilometres or 10,000 kilometres, we are going to need to get an oil change. We are going to have to periodically get a new spark plug. We are going to need to have belts, pumps and filters changed. Everything is going to have to be changed. In addition to this, the vehicles are louder and make more noise on our streets. By the way, there is going to be this pipe at the back of the vehicle that spews out toxic gases for all of us to breathe in. This is my pitch to move away from EVs.

There is also the cost argument of the fuel. Rather than that stable, predictable cost of electricity, we are going to have to pay for our fuel based on global prices that are set by global influences. In addition to that, we are going to spend thousands of dollars in repairs and changes. The budgets are going to be completely unpredictable.

My point is that, if I were to stand here to try to pitch to members why we should move away from EVs to gas vehicles, it would be absolutely absurd, yet this is the place we find ourselves in. We find ourselves in a place where we have a political party that, for most measures, used to be fairly progressive as it related to the environment and embracing change and that seems to have only adopted one thing from that former party, and that is the word "Conservative".

All the Conservatives want to do is conserve and make sure that we cannot evolve or transition at all. There is something called the innovation curve, which is basically a bell curve that will tell us at what point in various different technologies we are currently at. At the beginning of the curve is the 0% to 2% range. People who buy into a new innovation at the bottom of that curve are called innovators. These are the people who have the resources to buy certain technologies because they enjoy it and they like the technologies. They are the innovators.

• (1310)

Next to them, in the 2% to 10% range, are the early adopters. These are the people who do not have quite the same resources the innovators have, but they are still very interested in the technology. They might be motivated from not only an economic perspective, but also a social perspective.

After that, on the innovation curve, we get to the early majority. This is when that new technology has penetrated the market between 10% and 40%. This is when things start to really kick off. The actual chasm point is about 7.5%, which is considered the tipping point. At that point, it is just a matter of going through the innovation curve.

After that, in the range of 40% to 70%, we have the late majority. The late majority are the people who reluctantly buy on, realizing, "Okay, yes, this is going to be more affordable, so I'm going to buy it." They do not really want the technology, but they do accept that the rest of the world is embracing it.

At the end of that, when we finally get to market penetration of 70% to 100%, there are what are called the laggards. These are the people who would still be using a rotary phone today if they could, but they have to use a touch-tone phone because the world evolved around them and there is no choice. The laggards are the Conservatives. These are the people who absolutely refuse to embrace the technological change.

Right now, one in five cars sold in the world is an electric vehicle. That means that, along the innovation curve, we are currently at 20%, which is well into the early majority. We are well past the tipping point, and we will not come back from this.

Do we want to be at the forefront of what is going on, or do we want to be laggards like the Conservatives? Do we want to just wait until we have absolutely no choice but to embrace the technology the rest of the world has already concluded is the only path forward?

My position on this is that we have the opportunity to be at that forefront. We have the opportunity to have some of that investment happening right in our country, so that we can be outputting that to the rest of the world, exporting it instead of just importing it.

Business of Supply

I know that the argument from the Conservatives is going to be that there are very few cars, and only one or two in Canada are EVs. They are going to come up with all these red herrings, like they always do, as though they are trying to somehow conserve, as in the name of their political party, this idea that it is impossible to evolve and it is impossible for things to change. We have the opportunity to be able to do this, to be at the forefront and participate in the change of vehicle that is inevitably coming.

We are well past the tipping point. This is not a matter of if; this is a matter of when. Electric vehicles are soon going to be the norm—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I hear the members laughing right now. Whether or not they want to get on board and drive one of those vehicles does not matter because at the end of the day, they will be in one. It may not be tomorrow. It may not be a year from now. It may not be five years from now, but I guarantee that eventually every Conservative will drive one.

I have been driving electric vehicles since 2011. I drive a Ford F-150 Lightning, and I park it here. I have put 112,000 kilometres on it, and I have never once brought it in for servicing. The electro-magnetic motors drive the vehicle. I do not have an engine. I do not have fuel. I do not have explosions happening to move the vehicle. This is all the stuff I talked about earlier, and this is the reality.

I really hope that we can get to a point when Conservatives can finally start to realize that the world around them is changing, and whether or not they want to participate in it is quite irrelevant because it is going to change. Our perspective is that we want to be at the forefront of that. We invite Conservatives to join us.

• (1315)

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I appreciated my hon. friend from Kingston and the Islands' call for Canada to be in the forefront.

We are too late to be in the forefront, but like the hon. member for Kingston and the Islands, I drive a plug-in, a hybrid. For those who talk about range anxiety and not having enough charging stations, this is a good step.

A hybrid is not as expensive as a full electric, and I can use the three-prong plug in friends' garages when I park while I am visiting. I rent, and the landlord agreed to let me plug it in there. It has an adapter. It is very versatile. I agree with the hon. member: I do not have servicing problems or battery issues either.

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, it is extremely rare that, when a government member speaks, the first question goes to the Green Party. That, I think, is a symbol of the Conservatives being afraid to ask me a question.

Nonetheless, I will address the member's point. She is absolutely correct about the transition. As a matter of fact, my wife did not want to go fully electric for the same reason of range anxiety. What did she do? She got a hybrid plug-in, and now she is at the point where she is ready to trade it in to get a full electric vehicle because she realizes that the range anxiety, by and large, is something that is

driven by the oil industry, which is trying to prevent people from buying EVs.

• (1320)

The Deputy Speaker: I would just remind all members that the Speaker, or chair occupant, still retains the right to recognize whomever they wish.

With that being said, we will continue with questions and comments. The hon. member for Dufferin—Caledon.

Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I know this member likes to raise his voice a lot, shout a lot and feign indignation at a whole bunch of things, but I have a serious question, which I have asked in question period over almost two weeks now, and I have not received anything that even resembles an answer. I suspect I will not get one now, but I will try again.

We are in the middle of a trade war with Donald Trump and the United States. He has said that he wants to take every single Canadian auto manufacturing job and bring it to the United States. To do that, he has put in punishing tariffs, which are accomplishing some of that. Why would the Liberals' strategy include one penny for American-made EVs when there are tariffs on our cars? The auto workers who I have talked to find that absolutely disgusting.

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, the member is being disingenuous when he starts off by criticizing me personally. The way I read it is that he does not have anything concrete to bring to this debate, but I will answer his question.

If the member listened to my speech and everything I said, he would have heard me make it very clear that we are in a transition. We are all going to be building only electric cars eventually. That is the reality, whether that member wants to pontificate about what is happening right now and try to conserve everything that exists in the auto industry, or whether he is willing to look towards the future.

In my opinion, the real question is, where is the future? I would encourage the member to start looking to where the future is. When we are at a place where one in five cars being sold is an EV, it is pretty clear to me where we are going to end up.

[*Translation*]

Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I rarely do this, but I really want to congratulate the member opposite on his speech. He is generally not my favourite member because I find his speeches overly partisan. However, today, I am truly impressed because he really dotted the i's and crossed the t's and told the truth about electric vehicles.

Since he is now such a straight talker, today, I would like to know if he is willing to admit or state that his government's decision to end the subsidies for zero-emission electric vehicles in 2025 was a disaster.

Is the fact that it has been reinstated today not proof of this?

*Business of Supply**[English]*

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I feel compelled to just accept that compliment and sit down. I do not think I have received one like that from the Bloc before. I genuinely appreciate it.

If the member is looking for an ally to always push the government to do more in terms of subsidies, he will find one in me. I will always encourage our government, or any government for that matter, even the provincial Conservative government, to do more for the EV industry, whether that is through subsidies or through different forms of incentives for people to buy EVs. Personally, that is certainly my position.

Sima Acan (Oakville West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to participate in this debate today.

As we all know, times are changing, and in that uncertain world, the government is focused on what we can control. As part of Canada's new industrial strategy, we are transforming our economy with a diversification of trade partnerships as we work to catalyze growth with massive new levels of investment.

For over 100 years, Canada's automotive industry has underpinned advanced manufacturing, driven innovation and supported hundreds of thousands of well-paying jobs across the country, including in Oakville. It is as important as ever that we take action to maintain and improve Canada's automotive sector. In fact, we have a unique opportunity to do so.

That is why, on February 5, I was proud to join the Prime Minister as he launched a new strategy to transform Canada's automotive industry. Recognizing that the future of the automotive industry is electrified and connected, the government is prioritizing the development of the full value chain for next-generation vehicles. Within five years, EV sales are projected to reach nearly 40% of global car sales. It is important that Canada is among those at the forefront of that evolution.

While repealing the electric vehicle availability standard will allow manufacturers to use new technologies as they respond to consumer preferences to grow domestic demand for EVs, they must become more affordable for working Canadians. That is why the government will launch a five-year, \$2.3-billion EV affordability program that will offer purchase or lease incentives up to \$5,000 for battery electric and fuel cell EVs, and up to \$2,500 for plug-in hybrids with a final transaction value of up to \$50,000 on cars made by countries that Canada has free trade agreements with. To support the Canadian automotive industry, this \$50,000 cap will not apply to Canadian-made EVs and plug-in hybrids.

The government will also enhance, through the auto strategy, the national EV charging network, through investments of \$1.5 billion, including investments in my riding of Oakville West. These will, through the charging and hydrogen refuelling infrastructure initiative, make it convenient for drivers to charge their cars no matter where they are.

To accelerate investments in Canada's automotive manufacturing sector, the government will also allocate \$3 billion from the strategic response fund and up to \$100 million from the regional tariff response initiative to help the auto industry adapt, grow and diversify. We will also take advantage of the productivity superdeduction and

reduce corporate tax rates for zero-emission technology manufacturers to encourage investments in clean technologies and EVs as well as strengthen Canada's automotive remission framework to reward companies that build in Canada.

The government will also establish a comprehensive trade regime that strengthens the auto sector through new partnerships. For example, Canada recently deepened its strategic partnership with the Republic of Korea by signing a memorandum of understanding to strengthen Canadian-Korean industrial collaboration for future mobility. The recently announced new relationship with China aims to drive new Chinese joint venture investment in Canada and allow for a fixed volume of Chinese EV imports into the Canadian market. Although countertariffs on auto imports from the United States will be maintained, the government will continue to advance its auto strategy within an integrated North American automotive industry.

By making strategic investments and solidifying trade partnerships, Canada is positioning itself as a global leader in vehicle electrification, autonomous and self-driving technologies, and the battery supply chains that will power the future of mobility.

I would also like to mention the help we will provide to the auto workers who will build the vehicles amid short-term uncertainty. To protect Canadian auto workers and businesses from immediate pressures while helping bridge them to the future, the government will provide support to employees through a new work-sharing grant, preventing layoffs and supporting worker retention so that businesses can plan for the future. In addition, up to 66,000 workers across Canada, including affected auto workers, will receive employment assistance and re-skilling support as part of a \$570-million investment.

● (1325)

These strategic decisions and generational investments aim to build a strong Canadian auto sector, where Canadian workers build the cars of the future. Backed by a world-class workforce, globally recognized parts suppliers and leading-edge research and development, Canada's automotive sector is building the vehicles for today, and it will help build the vehicles of tomorrow.

Business of Supply

Philip Lawrence (Northumberland—Clarke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we have asked this question a number of times, and we have yet to receive a response. It is a serious question. Currently, 99% of the EVs that will receive the subsidy from the government are made elsewhere than in Canada. At what point will it get to 5% or 10%?

Sima Acan: Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the subsidy, the information given by the opposition is always inaccurate.

We are subsidizing Canadian consumers and protecting Canadian jobs in an integrated North American supply chain that supports hundreds of thousands of jobs in the Canadian market and the Canadian manufacturing sector. Our strategic strength is in Canadian manufacturing, securing investments in Canada and ensuring we remain competitive and leaders in this industry.

• (1330)

[Translation]

Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this government bought a pipeline that cost \$34 billion. Over the past 10 years, budget after budget, it has provided funding to oil companies, most of which are American-owned. Now, it is proposing a subsidy costing a paltry \$2.3 billion over five years.

Does my colleague think this is enough, given that Canada used to hold itself out as a champion in the fight against climate change?

[English]

Sima Acan: Mr. Speaker, as we are investing \$2.3 billion, we are also investing \$1.5 billion in charging infrastructure. Those stations also need power, for which we also announced measures in budget 2025, aiming to ensure that Canada has the clean and affordable energy needed to support our industries, including the auto sector. This was also included in the announcement made by the Prime Minister on February 5.

Dominique O'Rourke (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member for Oakville West is a colleague in our auto caucus. We visited Honda and Toyota together and were fortunate enough to be at the auto strategy announcement just last week. Members of the auto caucus are clearly in favour of electrification and see what the global trends are.

I am curious as to whether my colleague would talk about the importance of the investments in the charging infrastructure and what they mean for Canadian consumers.

Sima Acan: Mr. Speaker, the \$1.5-billion investment in infrastructure will allow consumers to charge their vehicles wherever they want. This is a very important investment. Also, as I mentioned in my response to the previous question, investing in that infrastructure will improve our electricity industry as well, because we will need more power. We are investing in those areas to support this infrastructure with clean energy.

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like the member to clearly explain how she can say that we are forcing Canadian workers to subsidize Trump-made cars, yet we have no clear strategy of our own to help our own workers.

What can she tell Windsor workers that she can do for them to protect their jobs and help our economy first, rather than helping

other countries, especially the U.S., when it has declared a trade war on us? Why are we subsidizing them?

Sima Acan: Mr. Speaker, it is so obvious that the other side of the aisle does not really understand what the subsidy is for. It subsidizes Canadian consumers in a huge industry in the supply chain, and it supports workers. There are workers in my riding of Oakville West, and they are powering our economy. When these times hit our economy, we have to be fast, fair and reliable. This is only one of the measures we are taking as a government.

I also want to mention that Unifor is supporting us, auto dealers are supporting us, auto manufacturers are supporting us, workers are supporting us, and I am curious as to why you are not supporting us.

The Deputy Speaker: Before we go back to debate, I will just remind members that they are speaking through the Chair, and when using “you”, they have to be careful with that.

[Translation]

The hon. member for Repentigny.

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, once again, our Conservative colleagues' attitude is not at all constructive, particularly when it comes to the fight against climate change. What people need to understand is that behind their motion lies a desire to do away with almost all of Canada's climate change policies, and they have been somewhat successful in accomplishing that so far.

Their motion covers up the fact that they are simply opposed to the electrification of transportation and electric vehicles. I think they would be better off having the courage to say it outright. For several months, even years, we have been seeing policy proposals that are essentially those of the oil and gas companies. People need to understand that oil and gas companies are strongly opposed to the electrification of transportation because, obviously, it will lead to a reduction in oil consumption in the country.

When it comes to the electrification of transportation in Canada, Quebec is ahead of all the other provinces. More electric vehicles have been sold in Quebec and more charging stations have been installed in Quebec, and there is a reason for that. It is because there is a significant financial advantage to transitioning to the electrification of transportation in Quebec.

Business of Supply

From an economic standpoint, Quebecers are still paying more than \$10 billion a year for oil. That is \$10 billion that is leaving the province and is therefore no longer in Quebecers' pockets.

That is in addition to the impact that burning oil and gas has on air quality. When we talk about air quality and the economic impact, obviously, we are talking about billions of dollars in health care costs, but we also need to talk about deaths, premature deaths, that are directly linked to poor air quality. We also need to talk about health conditions, hospitalizations and cardiovascular disease, especially among seniors and people who are at risk. We can solve some of these issues by electrifying transportation, but if we delay electrification, as the Conservatives want to do, we will lose out from an economic standpoint, from an environmental standpoint because of the fight against climate change, from a public health standpoint and from a consumer standpoint.

Consumers' pocketbooks are now captive to the oil and gas companies, the majority of which happen to be owned by U.S. investors. People are talking about Canadian nationalism and Canadian sovereignty, but it is important to keep in mind that over 50% of Canadian oil companies' shareholders are in the U.S. Nearly half of the gas imported to Quebec also comes from the U.S. We all stand to benefit if we take our money and invest it in the electrification of transportation. We also stand to benefit in terms of economic development and job retention.

Every litre of gas Quebecers replace with electrons means money for Hydro-Québec. That money stays in Quebec to be reinvested in our services, including health services, social services, schools, roads, infrastructure and public transit. This is a win-win situation.

Unfortunately, what we are seeing now is that continued pressure from the oil and gas companies, backed up by our Conservative colleagues, has forced the government into submission since it came to power. Ever since this new government took office, we have seen more backtracking on the fight against climate change than ever before. It got so bad that the former environment minister stepped down from his position as Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture because he disagreed with all the federal government's backtracking, including the increased funding for oil and gas companies in the latest budget, Bill C-5 allowing the suspension of certain laws, including some environmental laws, and the regulations to accelerate the construction of fossil fuel and pipeline infrastructure, including liquefied natural gas facilities.

● (1335)

Unfortunately, when we look at what is going on with the electrification of transportation, we realize that a whole year has gone to waste. Last year, the government suspended the EV purchase incentives, causing EV sales in Canada to drop by nearly 50% in one year. While the whole world is ramping up EV sales, Canada is going backwards. The United States is about the only country that has stagnated. Canada is about the only country that has gone backwards. That is shameful, and the government is directly responsible.

Now, the Liberals are coming back to us with some incentives, and the Conservatives are getting all fired up. They have never said a word about the roughly \$10 billion a year in subsidies granted to oil and gas companies. The Conservatives have never moved a mo-

tion to take that away. As they see it, giving money to oil and gas companies is fine, but helping people buy electric vehicles is not.

One of our major concerns is, of course, the affordability of vehicles. They are extremely expensive right now, especially electric vehicles. That is in part because there are currently barriers to entry and to competition from electric vehicles manufactured overseas in places like Europe that could come to Canada. There are plenty of models that would be much more affordable and much more economical for people, but the government is not allowing these vehicles into Canada, even though they are allowed into Mexico. The excuse is that European vehicles are not safe and do not meet Canadian standards. We do not have those vehicles here. What we need is access to affordable vehicles.

Yes, we need incentives in the short term, and we think they should be geared to household income. What I mean is that rich people are obviously not the ones who need financial help to buy electric vehicles. We should also limit the number of subsidies because it makes no sense to give away that much money.

That said, manufacturers should be forced to ramp up production of affordable EVs. Currently, the biggest lobby hindering electrification in Canada is made up of certain automakers that have fallen so far behind in Canada that they are struggling to compete with other vehicle manufacturers around the world, which is why these vehicles face barriers to entry to Canada. Opening the borders to allow vehicles in is a major issue, but we should not open them while burying our heads in the sand and acting as if there are no problems related to vehicle manufacturing in China, for example, where there have been documented reports of blatant forced child labour and human rights violations. We introduced a bill aimed at reversing the burden of proof so it is up to exporters to demonstrate beyond a shadow of a doubt that their products, including those from China, are not violating human rights and contributing to forced labour.

There are solutions. We need to implement them. The Bloc Québécois has proposed several. Obviously, we are concerned to see the government constantly backpedalling. Not only did the Liberals suspend the incentives for a year, but what they have announced now is that the mandate that would have forced manufacturers to produce and sell more EVs has been set aside, much to the satisfaction of Ontario and the automotive manufacturers. What people need to understand is that manufacturers will not do it unless they are forced.

Business of Supply

The government is proposing an alternative: Instead of requiring 100% of all vehicles sold to be electric by 2035, Canada will only require 75%. It is backtracking again. This will delay electrification, at a time when states like California are staying the course. Europe is also being more ambitious. In China, 60% of new vehicles sold are electric. Today, as we speak, Canada is at 9%. These policies need to be strengthened, fast, rather than diminished and weakened as the government is doing.

Obviously, we will oppose the Conservatives' motion. We clearly see their intentions: They are carrying out the oil and gas companies' agenda under the pretext of wanting to defend ordinary folks.

• (1340)

[English]

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Bloc has repeatedly said that taxpayer dollars should go into domestic manufacturing and not subsidize foreign competitors. The member has raised questions on climate change, which is important, but climate policy has to work in the real world economy, not an imaginary world.

Can the member explain how shutting down Canadian plants, laying off workers in Canada and importing EVs from Trump's America, or China, where the emissions standards are extremely lax, practically non-existent actually, is going to help workers in Quebec and Ontario?

• (1345)

[Translation]

Patrick Bonin: Mr. Speaker, as we speak, there are 130,000 jobs in Canada in what is known as the electromobility sector, which is everything related to electric mobility. Obviously, in Quebec, we manufacture batteries, we have exemplary electrification and we have charging stations, so jobs could increase to more than 300,000 by 2035.

If the automotive industry insists on clinging to a model from the last century, it will likely die off on its own. Electrifying transportation and producing more electric vehicles is not a fad. It is happening all over the world. Unfortunately, if the industry is facing threats and closures, it only has itself to blame for not investing in the future. That is why it is important to regulate the sector, because it clearly does not understand that the world is going in a different direction economically speaking.

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Party is gaslighting people on an issue to create anger. Let me give an example. I think of the community of Aurora, where Magna International employs 17,000-plus employees. That is a lot of people. They are not producing a car, but they are manufacturing parts that go to the United States. It seems that the Conservative Party does not care a damn about those jobs. The Conservatives do not talk about the importance of the integrated automobile industry between Canada and the U.S.

I wonder if my colleague from the Bloc could provide his thoughts on those jobs also mattering. When the Conservatives talk

about the program that is part of the automobile strategy, they should at least give some consideration to those employees.

[Translation]

Patrick Bonin: Mr. Speaker, obviously there are some parts required in the manufacturing of EVs that are made in the United States.

The question is, why are they not staying in Canada and why are they not being used to assemble EVs in Canada? Once again, the answer is because the government refuses to put real pressure on manufacturers. Billions of dollars are being handed out. We hope that their new strategy will yield results. However, the fact remains that they are backtracking on the targets for zero-emission vehicles, among other things, which only gives the industry more opportunity to drag its feet.

We have already lost jobs. Quebec has everything to gain from electrifying transportation. Unfortunately, the money is going to Ontario and with no accountability.

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, all day, the Liberals have been very proudly saying that they will be voting against this motion, as if they were pro-environment.

Can my colleague explain to our Liberal colleagues that their environmental track record is not just about voting against this motion? Their track record is much worse than one would think.

I would like my colleague to elaborate on that.

Patrick Bonin: Mr. Speaker, as we have seen in several respects, we need a comprehensive vision.

For example, the government is saying that it is going to invest in the electrification of transport, but it is backtracking on the goals it had a year ago. It has cut \$5 billion in funding for public transit and removed the oil and gas emissions cap. It is proposing a new pipeline that would carry a million barrels of oil per day, it is delaying the methane and clean energy regulations, it abandoned consumer carbon pricing, and it is now proposing to scale back industrial carbon pricing.

The government is backtracking in these areas and not taking any real action to make up for it and to bring Canada closer to its target. On the contrary, the federal government has abandoned the fight against climate change, and that is worrisome.

[English]

Connie Cody (Cambridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are here today to talk about Canada's auto industry. For my community, this discussion is about far more than numbers on a spreadsheet, statistics in a report or words delivered here in Parliament. It is about livelihoods, families and the future of a sector that has shaped who we are. In Cambridge and North Dumfries, the auto industry is a huge part of who we are. The paycheques earned in our auto sector help families put food on the table and keep a roof over their heads. The companies themselves give back in ways that matter by sponsoring our kids' sports teams and supporting the charities and food banks that so many people in our community now rely on.

Business of Supply

For more than 40 years, Toyota has proudly built vehicles in my hometown, creating thousands of good-paying manufacturing jobs and supporting tens of thousands more in parts supply, logistics, tooling and construction, as well as countless small businesses across our region. Thanks to those jobs, our community has grown and thrived, and our country has earned a reputation as a world-class auto producer and a place for innovators.

Canada is full of so many innovators the government could be supporting. Our very own University of Waterloo is leading groundbreaking research with a new battery that can charge faster and last longer. New innovation, new technology and new opportunities are all things to be proud of right here in Canada. It is critical that we support our local innovators and job creators.

Just a few weeks ago, I had the privilege of joining the workers at Toyota as they unveiled the sixth-generation RAV4 hybrid, which will be built in both Woodstock and Cambridge. I saw firsthand the pride in the eyes of the people who built these vehicles, the pride that comes with knowing that cars they had a hand in making are being driven on roads across North America. This is another remarkable Canadian success story, and is not unique to Cambridge. We will find the same pride in Ingersoll, Windsor, Oshawa, Oakville and auto communities across Ontario and across the country.

Recently, however, that pride has been overshadowed by fear and anxiety, because the truth is undeniable: Canada's auto sector is under serious threat. Since the Prime Minister took office, Canada has lost more than 5,000 jobs in the auto sector alone. Vehicle production has fallen off a cliff, from 2.3 million vehicles in 2016 to just 1.2 million last year, a nearly 50% collapse. Yes, these are the facts. There was a nearly 50% collapse under the current government. Our government has failed to get a deal in time with the United States, and workers are paying the price for trade instability and tariffs that have continued on long after the Prime Minister promised they would be gone.

What the government is doing in response to this crisis, and it is a crisis, is not supporting jobs here at home. Instead, it is subsidizing vehicles produced outside of Canada. Its new electric vehicle rebate, offering up to \$5,000 per purchase of an EV, might sound great in a press release, but when we look closely and allow the smoke and mirrors to disappear, a very different scenario begins to emerge, one of reality and not rhetoric.

Approximately 95% of the vehicles eligible for this rebate are not made in Canada; they are imported. The government will not be supporting the manufacturing of Hondas made in Alliston, Chevy trucks made in Oshawa or the RAV4s made in Cambridge. Instead, it is giving away taxpayer dollars to entice people to buy Volkswagens made in Tennessee, Fords built in Kentucky and, yes, even Teslas.

We are now at a time when our auto industry is fighting for its life. Tens of thousands of jobs are hanging in the balance. Families will wonder how they will buy the higher-priced groceries, keep a roof over their head or provide the same opportunities to their children that they grew up with. Right here in Canada, our own government is using Canadian tax dollars to encourage people to buy cars made in the very country we are locked in a trade war with. A real

auto strategy begins with a simple principle: Public money should support Canadian jobs first.

• (1350)

Let us be clear about all of this. It is not about opposing electric vehicles; it is about strengthening Canadian manufacturing capacity, instead of undermining it.

There is another serious issue with this EV rebate scheme that we need to talk about. It comes down to who benefits from this policy. Today, a new EV can cost nearly \$50,000. Most people in my community, after 10 years of skyrocketing housing costs, which doubled in price, youth and unemployment at double the national average and grocery bills surging, can barely afford a tank of gas, let alone a brand new vehicle. However, this policy asks everyone to give just a little bit more.

A single mom who works in a minimum wage service job and a senior who has to return to the workforce part time just to keep up are now obligated to subsidize the purchase of a \$50,000 electric vehicle, one they themselves may never be able to afford. It is asking laid-off parts workers and auto workers who have had their shifts cut to subsidize a policy that actively undermines their own economic security. That is not fairness; that is cruelty disguised as environmental policy.

When I went door to door during the last election, I made a promise to the people in my community. I promised to stand up for local jobs and the dream of Canada. That is why I am standing here in the House today, to defend our workers, our families and our community, all of whom rely on the auto industry. I am proud to serve on a Conservative team that is putting forward practical, straightforward solutions.

First, we believe that no Canadian taxpayer dollars should ever subsidize the purchase of a vehicle that is not made in Canada, built with Canadian labour, Canadian parts and Canadian ingenuity.

Second, we propose removing federal tax from all vehicles built here in Canada. Imagine the impact of this policy. This could save families more than \$2,000 on a Canadian-made vehicle. At the same time, it would boost demand for trucks and cars to be assembled in Woodstock, Cambridge and other communities across Canada. More demand means more production. More production means more jobs. More jobs is what makes a stronger community for everyone.

• (1355)

Third, we are calling on the government to treat laid-off workers fairly. They should not have to pay the price for the government's failures by providing tax relief on severance payments. This is something the government has the authority to do, and it should use that authority without hesitation. The government has left the workers at CAMI in Ingersoll out in the cold. The very least the government could do is ensure that those families, who are now wondering where their next meal is coming from, are treated with fairness and dignity during one of the most difficult times of their lives.

None of this should be controversial. Supporting Canadian workers should not be controversial. Keeping Canadian tax dollars here at home to support Canadian jobs should never be controversial. Standing up for communities built on manufacturing should not be controversial. The government has the opportunity to stand with us today to support the auto workers in my community and across the country, and to finally get to work doing what it promised to do so long ago.

We have everything we need to succeed right here in Canada. We have the resources. We have the supply chains. We have the manufacturing capability. Most importantly, we have the skilled, capable labour to make it all possible. What we need is a government that will finally step up here at home instead of selling out to Donald Trump and Elon Musk. We need a government that finally puts Canadian workers first, a government that strengthens, rather than sidelines, the manufacturing jobs we rely on.

We carry our future, Canada's future, in our hands by the decisions that are made in the House. However, it is up to the government as to how it will choose to vote on policies that can make this all happen, even if those policies are Conservative policies, policies to support cars built at Ingersoll, built in Woodstock or built in Cambridge, the place I am proud to call home. It starts with supporting this motion. It starts with taking a stand for fairness and for dignity. It starts with fighting for every single one of our Canadian manufacturing jobs.

Let us unite and fight to support Canada.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

• (1400)

[English]

MASS SHOOTING IN TUMBLER RIDGE

Jake Sawatzky (New Westminster—Burnaby—Maillardville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today B.C. is observing a day of mourning to honour the victims of the Tumbler Ridge mass shooting.

School should be a place where children learn about the world, a place where the biggest stress is a test they did not study enough for or when they are late for class and the bell is ringing, a place where they make friends and catch up with them every day at lunch. School should never be a place where children fear for their lives.

Every kid deserves a place where they can relax and grow. What happened in Tumbler Ridge is absolutely devastating. Innocent lives have been taken and many more injured. All of British

Statements by Members

Columbia, all of Canada and so many around the world are grieving.

We mourn with the families who have lost loved ones and with those who are recovering. No words can make this better, but they must know that they are not alone. Let us hold each other a little closer as we face this together.

* * *

INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE

Frank Caputo (Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Debbie Henderson, Flo Bellman and Paul Henderson are in Ottawa today. They did not ask to be here as advocates but have stepped up bravely to represent their family members, Bailey McCourt and Darian Hailey Henderson-Bellman, who were killed by intimate partners.

Debbie, Flo and Paul are just some of the voices fighting for justice after their loved ones were killed by intimate partners. This was not a role they asked for, but they and many others have taken on advocacy to fight the good fight. They have turned their grief into education. They are part of the cries for change, pleading for all sides to listen.

I say to them that they have been heard. It is now our duty, as legislators, not to fail them, Bailey, Darian or other victims. Debbie, Flo, Paul and all those who walk with them have worked tirelessly and we hold them in the highest esteem.

* * *

SERBIAN STATEHOOD DAY

Ned Kuruc (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I stand today to commemorate Serbian Statehood Day, also known as Sretenje. February 15 is a day that speaks of faith, humility and the encounter between the human and the divine. It is also the day in 1835 when Serbia adopted its first modern constitution, a symbol of liberty, dignity and the rule of law, values deeply shared with Canada.

Our two nations stood together in the darkest hours of the 20th century. One great example is Leslie Joy Whitehead, a young Canadian woman who volunteered to serve with the Serbian army during World War I. She marched through war-torn lands, endured capture as a prisoner of war and fought on the front lines, a testament to the courage, compassion and deep human bonds between our peoples.

Canada offered many Serbs a new home. Serbia offered Canada devoted citizens. Together, we have built 85 years of bilateral relations that are rooted in hard work, faith and freedom.

Statements by Members

[Translation]

TRAGIC EVENTS IN KITIGAN ZIBI

Tatiana Auguste (Terrebonne, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, early Wednesday morning, the Outaouais community of Kitigan Zibi Anishinabeg was struck by a heartbreaking tragedy. The lives of two children, a 10-year-old girl and a 12-year-old boy, were taken in a truly horrifying incident. These were two innocent people, rays of hope in their community, who wanted nothing more than to live.

This tragedy gives us pause. This ordeal has deeply shaken the indigenous community of Kitigan Zibi Anishinabeg and all of Canada.

I offer my deepest condolences to the families affected and to all members of the community who are experiencing unspeakable pain at this time. We stand with them. They are in our thoughts and prayers.

* * *

[English]

MASS SHOOTING IN TUMBLER RIDGE

Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to offer comfort to the families who lost their loved ones so tragically, so cruelly and so suddenly in Tumbler Ridge, B.C., but I am at a loss for words. They have all been said.

What can I say to ease the pain of a parent who will never again see or hug their child, watch them grow or share with them the ordinary joys and sorrows of daily life? As a mother, my heart breaks for those years lost forever. What can I say to heal the wounds of a community that once lived in trust and may now be guarded? What can I say to the families who keep vigil by the bedside of the injured, hoping and praying, or to the traumatized children for whom school was once a place to play, learn and feel safe?

Words have become trite. Thoughts and prayers are not enough.

We in the House can honour the lives lost in Tumbler Ridge. We can ensure that this tragedy will never happen again to other families, other children and other communities. We have the tools and the power to make that pledge. We must now find the courage.

* * *

● (1405)

JAMES FELTHAM

Carol Anstey (Long Range Mountains, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honour the life of James Feltham of Deer Lake, whom we knew as Jim. He passed away just a few days ago.

For 30 years Jim devoted himself to teaching at Elwood Regional High School, and for more than 50 years he was a pillar of the basketball community. He coached generations of young athletes, including me. He gave so much of himself to the sport that he loved.

Jim also salmon fished along the Humber River, close to our family property, and we anticipated the opening of the season and his arrival when he would put his boat in the water. We watched him spend hours out there. It was not just something he enjoyed but also a place where he seemed to find tremendous peace. He never

wanted help getting on and off the river, highlighting his quiet independence.

Jim's leadership, his love for his community, and his independent spirit left a lasting mark across our town. He meant something to so many of us. Today we remember him with gratitude and respect. My heartfelt condolences go to his family and to all who were fortunate enough to know him.

* * *

MASS SHOOTING IN TUMBLER RIDGE

Wade Chang (Burnaby Central, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, how do we ensure that fear will never defeat us as Canadians?

Families in Tumbler Ridge have faced every parent's worst nightmare. Innocent lives were taken, and many other people were injured. To the grieving families, we offer our deepest condolences. Their loss is felt across this country. To the people recovering and to the students and teachers carrying trauma, we stand beside them.

We thank the teachers who protected their students, the first responders who ran toward danger and the health care workers who worked tirelessly to save lives.

In Burnaby Central, we come from many cultures and speak different languages, but we stand as one in our promise: Our children should grow up free from violence.

Today we hold Tumbler Ridge in our hearts. We rise together. By choosing light over hatred, solidarity over division, and peace over violence, we deny fear its power. In every choice we make, we uphold Canada, a land of courage and a home of compassion.

* * *

LUNAR NEW YEAR

Vincent Ho (Richmond Hill South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, lunar new year has been celebrated on this land for as long as Canada has been a country.

When Chinese immigrants first arrived in British Columbia around the time of Confederation, they brought with them the traditions that were passed down for thousands of years: traditions of family, renewal, gratitude and hope. For over a century these celebrations have been part of Canada's history.

*Statements by Members***HOUSING**

Today lunar new year is celebrated by millions of Canadians with roots tracing back to Chinese, Korean and Vietnamese descent, and it is embraced by neighbours and friends of every background. The values celebrated at this time of year, such as respect for elders and the generations before us, responsibility to family, generosity and community spirit, are also Conservative values. We believe that strong families build strong communities and that strong communities build a strong country. It is people, not big government, who empower society and shape our future.

To all people across Canada celebrating in 2026, I wish health, prosperity and happiness in the year ahead as we welcome the year of the horse.

Happy lunar new year. *Gong hei fat choi*.

* * *

[*Translation*]

JOCELYN DÉMÉTRÉ

Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in life, there are people who inspire us with their courage, self-sacrifice, strength and dignity in the face of adversity. Since becoming the veterans affairs critic, I have come across some truly exceptional human beings. I have entered a world that is too often overlooked, one that is characterized by humanity, dedication and altruism.

One person in particular is always on my mind. He is one of those guardian angels who, each in their own way, have taken their combat experience and used it to help others. Serving others is their mission in life. I would like to introduce the House to retired captain Jocelyn Démetré, the founding president of Hero Lodge, a retreat in the Northwest Territories that he funds with revenue from his book, and a recipient of the Minister of Veterans Affairs Commendation.

I respectfully salute Jocelyn Démetré, a hero whose has made it his mission to serve every day.

* * *

● (1410)

[*English*]

MASS SHOOTING IN TUMBLER RIDGE

Gurbux Saini (Fleetwood—Port Kells, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are all heartbroken by the horrific attack at Tumbler Ridge Secondary School.

No parent should ever have to experience the loss of a child. I want to join members of the House in sharing my grief for the nine lives lost in Tumbler Ridge on Tuesday, and to pray for the quick recovery of the injured survivors. I also want to thank the first responders for their professionalism, which doubtlessly saved many lives.

As the people of Tumbler Ridge feel the weight of their heavy loss, I want them to know that the House and this nation stand with them.

Michael Guglielmin (Vaughan—Woodbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canada's housing market is sending alarming signals. New home sales in the GTA have fallen to their lowest point in 45 years, putting up to a hundred thousand jobs at risk. Across major markets, sales are down sharply, while builders report layoffs and are having growing concern about their ability to stay afloat.

At the same time, home ownership among Canadians 30 years old to 34 years old has fallen significantly over the past decade, and new housing supply is failing to keep pace with population growth. Nearly nine in 10 Canadians now express concerns about housing affordability, and many young people are considering leaving their communities because home ownership feels out of reach. Without action, an entire generation now risks being locked out of home ownership in their own communities.

Young Canadians deserve policies that increase housing supplies. When will the Liberals collaborate with us and remove barriers to construction so we can restore the dream of home ownership for young people in this country again?

* * *

MASS SHOOTING IN TUMBLER RIDGE

Zoe Royer (Port Moody—Coquitlam, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a British Columbian to express my deepest sympathy for the people of Tumbler Ridge. Innocent lives were lost in an unimaginable tragedy that has shaken a small and deeply connected community to its core.

To the families, friends, classmates, teachers and first responders, I say that they carry a heavy burden of grief that is almost impossible to bear. Nothing can replace the beautiful lives that were taken. They matter, and they will never be forgotten.

In this country, when tragedy strikes one community, it touches us all. Canadians do not turn away. We draw closer. We stand together. We support and love one another. That is who we are, and that is what it means to be Canadian.

* * *

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Fred Davies (Niagara South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, American protectionism is hammering our auto sector, yet the Liberal government has announced a \$2.3-billion EV subsidy for vehicles built in the United States. That is not leadership; it is economic capitulation.

Donald Trump has been clear: He wants every Canadian auto job moved south. Under the Liberals, 5,000 Canadian auto workers have already lost their jobs. Plants are idle, and families are hurting, yet the government is prepared to let Canadian tax dollars subsidize American factories during the economic fight of our life.

Oral Questions

In Niagara, a brand new EV plant was completed but never opened because the market never materialized. Another major EV battery facility is being built right now in a precariously murky market.

Conservatives believe in one simple, non-negotiable principle: Canadian dollars are for Canadian jobs, full stop. They are not to bankroll foreign factories, not to ship opportunity across the border and certainly not to export our paycheques, our plants or our prosperity.

* * *

TRAGIC EVENTS IN KITIGAN ZIBI

Sophie Chatel (Pontiac—Kitigan Zibi, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in this tragic week for our country, my heart is also with the people of Kitigan Zibi. The community is grieving the unimaginable loss of two of its children, a loss that every parent, every family and every member of this strong and deeply caring community feels today.

To the people of Kitigan Zibi, I want to say this: They are not alone. We stand with them. We are mourning with them.

• (1415)

[*Translation*]

I want to tell the victims' family and loved ones that our thoughts and prayers are with them as they start down this path of mourning, but also of healing. We walk with them.

Meegwetch.

* * *

[*English*]

MASS SHOOTING IN TUMBLER RIDGE

Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this past Tuesday, innocence was lost. Not expecting the unimaginable horrific events that would take place that day, parents packed lunches and sent their children to school. Precious lives were taken, and many other people were injured in an act of devastating, brutal and senseless violence.

Long after the political statements are made, the flags are raised and the cameras are gone, this day must forever be etched in our hearts and minds because the families in Tumbler Ridge are forever changed. They are now facing the unimaginable grief of silent classrooms, of empty seats around the dinner table, and of parents replaying the last goodbye and wishing they had held on to their child just a little bit longer or told them they loved them. The sorrow we feel is almost too heavy to bear.

On behalf of the families in my riding of Cariboo—Prince George, many of whom, like mine, have friends and relatives in Tumbler Ridge, I extend our deepest condolences. To the students whose sense of safety has forever been shaken and lives forever changed, we are here for them. To the teachers whose courage and selflessness saved lives, to the first responders who ran towards danger to protect others, and to the nurses and other health care workers who treated the wounded, I say that they are truly heroes and that we owe them a debt of gratitude forever.

It is on us as a nation to wrap the community of Tumbler Ridge in our collective arms, to lift it up, to hold it in our hearts and to never forget.

I say to my colleagues to hold their loved ones a little tighter today and never miss an opportunity to tell them they love them.

* * *

MASS SHOOTING IN TUMBLER RIDGE

Ron McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Tuesday's tragic events at Tumbler Ridge Secondary School have left a community devastated. My heart is with the families grieving unimaginable loss. I am wishing love and strength to the people who were injured and to the students, staff and residents who are now trying to process what happened. No community should have to experience this kind of violence.

I want to acknowledge the courage and professionalism of all first responders, educators and local officials who acted swiftly to protect others and to respond in a moment of crisis.

On behalf of Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, I extend our deepest condolences to everyone affected. We stand with the people of Tumbler Ridge, all British Columbians and indeed all Canadians at this heartbreaking time.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[*English*]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the official opposition, I would like to reiterate the messages of condolence and support from the House to the victims who are still fighting for their lives, for those whose lives were cut short and their families, and for the community still reeling from the senseless shooting in Tumbler Ridge, B.C.

• (1420)

Can the minister update the House as to the support being provided and share any news that would be appropriate as this investigation proceeds?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will answer my colleague's question by saying this:

[English]

The entire nation has obviously been grieving since the horrific events of Tuesday, and nowhere is that grief more deeply felt than in the community of Tumbler Ridge itself. The residents have come together to support each other in this time of indescribable pain, and, obviously, we want to assure them they are not alone.

The Minister of Public Safety is in Tumbler Ridge, working with colleagues, including the member of Parliament and provincial and municipal partners, to hear directly from the community, and coordinating with those levels of government. Service Canada officials are planning to be present very soon on the ground as well.

We expect that further updates will be provided from the RCMP as information becomes available and as its investigation progresses.

Finally, at the invitation of the mayor of Tumbler Ridge, the Prime Minister will be travelling to the community on Friday to attend a vigil in memory of the victims of this week's tragic shootings. He has invited the leaders of all parties to accompany him to the community.

This has been a dark week in the history of our country, and I know that by working together, we will all get through this. We continue to send our heartfelt best wishes and sympathies to the people of Tumbler Ridge.

* * *

HOUSING

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian dream of home ownership is fading for too many young Canadians. Despite lots of announcements, the actual results from the Liberal housing plan are downright depressing. Home ownership among 30- to 34-year-olds has fallen to 52%, and new home sales are down 45% in the GTA and 56% in Vancouver. In fact, the government's own housing agency is predicting that new home starts will fall, not increase, by more than 18% for the next three years.

It is clear that more bureaucracy is not the answer. When will the government adopt the Conservative plan to kick-start homebuilding by removing the GST on all new homes and restore the dream of home ownership for young Canadians?

Jennifer McKelvie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the government cares deeply about affordability for young Canadians. That is why the Build Canada Homes act is before the House right now. Build Canada Homes is about strengthening Canada's future by creating a modern, resilient housing industry. We are building an industry that protects our economy, empowers our workers and gives Canadians, especially young Canadians, the affordable housing they need. The Build Canada Homes act is before the House. We hope the members opposite will support it.

Oral Questions

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Regina—Qu'Appelle, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government's own data shows that building bureaucracy does not actually get results.

The Liberals also have it backward with respect to the auto sector. Over the last 10 years of the Liberal government, the number of vehicles produced in Canada has fallen from 2.3 million cars to 1.2 million. Their plan is to force working Canadians to send their tax dollars to subsidize the purchase of EVs that most Canadians cannot afford, and the vast majority of those EVs sold in Canada are not made in Canada. That means some of the biggest winners of this subsidy program are American auto workers.

Instead of forcing Canadian workers to subsidize foreign-made vehicles, why do they not adopt the Conservative plan and remove the GST on all new vehicles in Canada?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like, first and foremost, to extend my heartfelt prayers to the victims and families in Tumbler Ridge. I know the government is there to support those affected.

I would like to remind my colleague that the money that is going to be supporting EV incentives is actually for Canadians at a time when we need to make sure that affordability is at the core of everything we do as a government. That is why Canadians need to be able to have access to more money to afford the right cars, including those made in Canada.

[Translation]

Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the number of cars manufactured in Canada dropped by half compared to 2016, and over 5,000 jobs have been lost. To add insult to injury, the Prime Minister implemented an auto strategy that subsidizes electric vehicles manufactured abroad.

On this side of the House, we have a better idea. Why not ease the burden on Canadian workers and citizens by eliminating these subsidies for foreign-made vehicles?

Is that a good idea, yes or no?

● (1425)

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what is a good idea is our auto strategy, which has been welcomed by the industry, unions and industry workers who want to make sure that they have a job today, tomorrow and 10 years from now.

The global auto industry is moving toward electrification. When modernization occurs, we need to be there. That is why we will support electrification.

Oral Questions

Why are the Conservatives ideologically against both affordability and electrification?

* * *

HOUSING

Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the minister said that the global market is doing well, but the Canadian market is completely collapsing.

It is no secret that Quebec City has always been a close-knit community, a place where it is possible to buy a home and safely raise a family. Now, however, the Liberals have increased immigration levels to the point where it has become impossible for young people to buy their first home, even in Quebec City. One thing is certain: None of this seems to bother the mayor of Quebec City, who gloated about this sad situation in the pages of *The Globe and Mail*.

Will the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship finally admit that the excessive immigration thresholds being forced on Quebec are preventing young Quebecers from buying a home and starting a family?

Caroline Desrochers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is ironic to hear the member talk about affordability day after day. The core mission of Build Canada Homes is to accelerate the construction of affordable housing across Canada.

We will do that by stimulating sectors that are going through tough times right now, sectors such as steel, wood and aluminum. We will protect and create jobs and, above all, we will provide Canadians with housing that fits their needs and their budgets. Our plan has the support of municipalities, developers and non-profit organizations.

The real question is this: Will the Conservatives do the right thing for their constituents and vote for the budget?

Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I do not think she understood the question. I urge her to read the piece by Étienne-Alexandre Beauregard, a young Quebec intellectual who warned that the war on cars, radical environmentalism and excessively high immigration levels are changing the unique nature of Quebec City.

Our young people can no longer afford to buy a home. Liberal elected officials from Quebec City, like the mayor, refuse to face the facts. The excessively high immigration levels that have been set over the past decade have caused house prices in Quebec City to skyrocket.

Will the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship finally admit that, by exceeding Quebec's capacity to welcome and integrate newcomers, the Liberal government has caused house prices to skyrocket, preventing our young people from owning a home?

Caroline Desrochers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, day in and day out, it is slogans. There is no solution, no plan, just filibustering.

Canadians in my colleague's riding expect better. They expect their MP to stand up to protect their interests.

On this side of the House, we have a plan. It is called budget 2025, which, by the way, is still stuck in committee. It is a plan to address today's threats and build tomorrow's economy. Above all, it is a plan to support families and workers during difficult times.

Once again, will you stand up, support us and put your ego aside?

The Speaker: Once again, I am standing.

The hon. member for Saint-Jean.

* * *

PENSIONS

Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, by the government's own estimates, the Cúram software is causing 85,000 retirees problems with their old age pensions.

The government has been aware of the problem since June, but it is still refusing to do anything about it. At the same time, the cost of Cúram has skyrocketed from the initial budget of \$1.75 billion to \$6.6 billion as of last June. These 85,000 seniors are victims of a software that cost almost \$5 billion more than it was supposed to, but according to the Liberals, there is nothing to see here and we should move on.

Our patience is wearing thin. Will the Prime Minister order a public inquiry into Cúram?

Hon. Stephanie McLean (Secretary of State (Seniors), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the OAS system transfer is complete and it came in under budget. More than seven million seniors are now receiving their benefits on time through a modern system. The total cost of Cúram will cover four separate projects. The amount that was planned and approved for the life of the project was \$6.6 billion.

Once again, I encourage the member opposite to give me the victims' names and we will assist them.

Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, by the government's own estimates, 85,000 pensioners are affected by problems with the Cúram software, and yet the ministers keep telling us just to give them the names if we know of people who are having problems. According to the government's own data, there are 85,000 people having problems. As if that were not enough, the cost of the software jumped from \$1.75 billion to \$6.6 billion, but the government keeps saying that, no, this is not a cost overrun, it simply includes contingency planning and inflation. Do the Liberals really think inflation is to blame? This warrants a public inquiry.

When will the Liberals call a public inquiry?

● (1430)

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I keep saying the same thing every day. The system was very old. We invested to modernize the system, and the vast majority of recipients were transferred without a problem. In some more complex cases, the department is working diligently to resolve the situation very quickly.

Oral Questions

I would gladly meet with the member if she would like to learn more.

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are seeing the world through rose-coloured glasses. The Cúram software was supposed to cost \$1.75 billion. We are now at \$6.6 billion. That is a cost overrun of nearly \$5 billion. However, according to the Liberals, that is not a cost overrun. No, those were just initial contracts with a below-cost starting value.

They seem to think we are stupid. Oh, that is not a cost overrun? Well, if we compare what it now costs to what it was supposed to cost, it is four times more expensive, damn it.

In addition, there are problems, particularly in Quebec—

The Speaker: Excuse me, but there are limits.

The hon. minister.

[*English*]

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have worked very well with the MP opposite, and I invite him to come and be briefed on the Cúram system. As we have been saying in the House, this is a very old system that needed modernization. In fact, one of the aspects of that modernization is that people can now apply for their benefits online, without personal assistance. That is going to relieve the load on the entire department.

Seven and a half million people have transitioned to this new system without problems. For those urgent cases that are stuck in the queue, we will make sure they get their benefits urgently. We can do that within 48 hours if the member will please send us the names.

* * *

HOUSING

Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the dream of home ownership is now a fantasy for more and more young Canadians, of whom 93% are saying that they are concerned about the state of housing. Nearly half of them believe they will have to leave their own communities because they cannot afford to live there. The government's own housing agency says homebuilding will drop over the next three years and prices will go up even more, but I have good news for the Liberals.

We have a solution. A Conservative government would remove the GST on new homes under \$1.3 million to make them more affordable. Why will the Liberals not do that?

Jennifer McKelvie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have good news for the Conservatives. There are two bills before the House that they can support, which would improve affordability for young Canadians. The first is the budget implementation act, which would bring in the first-time home ownership GST rebate. It would also bring in housing infrastructure that would bring down the cost of housing. On top of that, the Conservatives can support the Build Canada Homes act, which would catalyze modern methods of construction and create jobs for young Canadians.

Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the only things the Liberals are building are false hope and bureaucracy. Liberal house flippers and penthouse dwellers profit while young Canadians pay the price.

On this side of the House, we listen to the experts. The London Home Builders' Association told me this week that builders have to spend tens of thousands of dollars per home just on red tape and regulations. Every dollar spent on bureaucracy pushes homes further out of reach for young Canadians. Ontario lost 10,000 home-building jobs last year, because no one is able to build.

When will the Liberals reverse course, cut the red tape and scrap the GST on homes for families?

Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I know the member's community. I know his riding very well. Its residents expect better than his hurling insults. That is not a way to get things done in the House of Commons.

The member talks about the London Home Builders' Association. That is good. We met this week as well. They talked about, among other things, the housing accelerator fund, which in St. Thomas alone is leading to duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, mid-rise apartments and row houses. We are going to continue in that vein, working with municipalities, because we are going to get things done for Canadians and not play games.

Roman Baber (York Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, because of the Liberals, the dream of home ownership is fading for young Canadians. According to CMHC, new housing starts will drop every year for the next three years. Nearly half of Canadians say they have to move out of the community they grew up in, because they cannot afford a home. Instead of incentivizing new construction, the Liberals are building a fourth housing bureaucracy called Build Canada Homes. For what?

Why will the Liberals not adopt our Conservative plan, remove the GST on all new homes and get construction going in Canada?

Oral Questions

• (1435)

Jennifer McKelvie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is more good news. Build Canada Homes is delivering affordable housing for Canadians. In just 100 days, it has secured landmark agreements with provinces and cities, and advanced building on six federal lands. It is lining up thousands of affordable homes with shovels in the ground very soon. Over the past month alone, it has projects under way in Nova Scotia, Quebec and Ontario, and it is setting forth on delivering 7,500 new homes. This is how we catalyze a new homebuilding industry.

Keep the momentum going. Support the Build Canada Homes act.

Roman Baber (York Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the only thing the Liberals are building is a fourth housing agency, more desk jobs for Liberal insiders and more Liberal waste. CMHC is telling the Liberals that their housing plan is dead on arrival. New housing starts will fall every year for the next three years. Builders are laying off workers. BILD is warning that 100,000 construction jobs are now at risk.

Instead of building a fourth government agency, why will the Liberals not adopt our Conservative plan and remove the GST on all new construction so that young people can afford to buy a home?

Leslie Church (Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretaries of State for Labour, for Seniors, and for Children and Youth, and to the Minister of Jobs and Families (Persons with Disabilities), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I wish the Conservatives knew more about construction, but it seems what they know about is obstruction.

If these Conservatives cared about building homes for young Canadians, they would pass the two bills we have before the House right now. They would pass the budget implementation act and they would pass the Build Canada Homes act, because those are the tools that are getting shovels in the ground right across Canada for the next generation of young Canadians who need affordable homes.

Tako Van Popta (Langley Township—Fraser Heights, CPC): Mr. Speaker, under the Liberal government, the Canadian dream of home ownership is rapidly fading for young people. CMHC reports that housing construction is actually going to be down over the next three years by up to 18% compared to last year.

Why do the Liberals not just adopt the Conservative plan to eliminate GST on all new housing construction of up to \$1.3 million and help restore the dream of home ownership for young Canadians?

Hon. Wayne Long (Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my thoughts and prayers go out to the community of Tumbler Ridge.

The Conservative Party is not serious about housing. The leader called a middle-class house a “shack” and co-op housing “Soviet-style”. There are members on that side who mocked modular homes. To cap it all off, that leader told his members not to advocate for housing programs in their ridings, which would have helped their ridings. On this side of the House, we are serious about

building housing. Budget 2025 is going to deliver housing like we have not seen built in generations.

Tako Van Popta (Langley Township—Fraser Heights, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that answer is completely unacceptable. The Canadian Home Builders' Association says that, five years ago, new housing starts in the ownership market stood at 69%, the rest being in the rental market. Last year, that number dropped down to 49%.

Despite all the nice talk, clearly the Liberal plans are not helpful for prospective new buyers. Again, why do they not just adopt our plans and help restore the dream of home ownership once again for Canadians?

Yasir Naqvi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade and to the Secretary of State (International Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our big focus is to build as much housing as possible. We are going to build that housing through Build Canada Homes. We are going to build that housing on federal lands, just like in my community in Ottawa Centre where we are repurposing federal buildings. We are repurposing federal lands to build housing, and we will do that across the country.

Slogans are not going to be cut it, as we see from the opposition. Those members need to stop obstructing. They need to pass Bill C-20 so that we can start building housing across this land.

Vincent Ho (Richmond Hill South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian dream of home ownership is slipping away from young Canadians. The government's own housing agency says that housing starts will fall over the next three years, going down as much as 18% by 2028, while prices keep going up. After years of Liberal policies that drove up costs and slowed down construction, buyers cannot buy and builders cannot build. The only solution the Liberals can come up with is to build a fourth housing bureaucracy.

When will the government admit that Liberal rhetoric and bureaucracies do not build homes and finally scrap the GST on all new homes, incentivize building and restore the dream of home ownership?

• (1440)

Jennifer McKelvie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable the member opposite is not supportive of Build Canada Homes. I was just in his riding, where we announced a project. I spoke with the residents living in affordable housing there, and they talked about how important it was.

We know that with budget 2025, we are working to accelerate construction. We are cutting delays, increasing permitting capacity and working with local governments to get more homes built. While we are doing that, they are voting against expanding mortgage rate criteria for young Canadians, they are voting against the first-time savings account and they are voting against the GST credit for first-time homebuyers. Why?

* * *

[Translation]

CANADIAN IDENTITY AND CULTURE

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, next Tuesday, Quebec will once again put pressure on UNESCO to protect the diversity of cultural expressions in the from the hegemony of the web giants. Quebec will join forces with European countries to ensure that the 2005 UNESCO convention, which protects different cultures from globalization, also applies to the digital world. However, this is not a done deal. Since Quebec is not yet a country, Canada votes on its behalf. Last June, Canada did not vote in favour of adopting a binding protocol.

Will Canada change its position this time?

Hon. Marc Miller (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think it goes without saying that my predecessor saved the day at the last meeting.

For now, I do not have anything to reveal publicly, but we are more or less on the same wavelength as the member across the way.

Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Speaker, that is music to my ears.

Canada is voting on Quebec's behalf at UNESCO. Last June, it did not vote in favour of a binding protocol that would protect our cultural sovereignty from the web giants. Worse still, it later scrapped the digital services tax, which would have forced web giants to pay a modest levy that could have been used to support our culture and media.

Next week, Canada can take a step in the right direction by supporting the protocol in principle. Quebec's entire cultural industry and its government strongly support it.

Will the minister vote to protect our culture? “Yes” would be better than his previous response.

Hon. Marc Miller (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the member opposite were serious about supporting Canada's artists and creators, he would vote “yes”, as he usually does, but for our budget.

Oral Questions

PENSIONS

Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is the Phoenix fiasco all over again. As members will recall, that pay system deprived thousands of public servants of their salaries for months.

Now, with the Cúram software, the Liberals are creating a Phoenix for seniors, but on a larger scale, according to federal employees. The project was supposed to cost \$1.7 billion, but the cost has skyrocketed, currently coming in at \$6.6 billion. Some 93% of employees are giving it a failing grade.

Why do the Liberals insist on repeating the same IT mistakes, wasting billions and billions of dollars? Who is paying for these mistakes? In this case, it is our pensioners.

Hon. Stephanie McLean (Secretary of State (Seniors), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are modernizing a very old system. Doing nothing would have jeopardized payments for millions of seniors.

The outstanding cases are complex. They are being assessed, and retroactive payments are guaranteed.

Once again, I invite the member opposite to provide me with the names of those who are having problems, and we will assist them.

Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that response was frankly embarrassing.

The government talks a good game, but there are retirees who have been waiting nine months for their cheques. That is shameful. Worse still, an internal report criticized a departmental procedure that orders civil servants to hide the truth from the public. They are formally prohibited from mentioning the name of the Cúram software to explain these unacceptable delays.

Why is the minister so determined to cover up her incompetence rather than ensuring that our seniors receive their pensions on time? They need the money.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, obviously, seniors need their pensions, and we are working hard to provide pensions to some 7.4 million people in Canada.

The two ministers repeat this every day to reassure the public, but the opposition comes back with the same lines every day. If members of Parliament have information, they have already been invited to provide it, and we will help these people. People can also contact Service Canada.

The minister has also offered to brief the members opposite. I invite them to attend the briefing and learn more about the Cúram system.

Oral Questions

• (1445)

HOUSING

Gabriel Hardy (Montmorency—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in Montmorency—Charlevoix, and everywhere else in Quebec, families are spending more than 30% of their income on housing. The vacancy rate is very low, and housing insecurity continues to rise. Not knowing whether there is enough money to pay rent at the end of the month is a source of stress, anxiety and pressure that weighs on mental health, especially for young families.

After a decade of Liberal policies that have caused housing costs to skyrocket, how much longer will families in our country have to live in uncertainty before the government takes real action to increase the supply of housing and bring down prices?

Caroline Desrochers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, again, Canadians are not fools. Canadians know which party supports affordability, which party is there for them. On the Conservative side, there is no plan and no solution, just rhetoric.

On our side, we have signed agreements: one with Quebec, another with Nova Scotia, and we have announced one with Nunavut. More are in the works, specifically to accelerate the construction of affordable housing. That is the mission of Build Canada Homes. We will do it with Canadian materials and Canadian workers. We will be there for our industry. We will be there to build more housing.

Will the Conservatives really be there for their constituents?

Gabriel Hardy (Montmorency—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals really like patting themselves on the back and telling everyone how good they are. However, the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation is predicting a nearly 20% drop in housing starts by 2028. That means fewer homes, less supply and considerable pressure on prices.

Meanwhile, 93% of our young people say they are worried about the housing situation, and 86% of builders fear for the future of their businesses. The industry itself is calling this a lost decade for home ownership.

If the Liberals are going to take inspiration from our measures every week, why will they not take up our plan and remove the GST on homes for the general public in order to boost construction and help young people purchase a home?

Caroline Desrochers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we know that young Canadians are struggling right now because of the cost of living and the cost of rent.

The good news is that Build Canada Homes is already delivering results. We took action in the first 100 days. We have reached major agreements with provinces and municipalities, and there are projects that are currently under review. However, these projects will not move forward unless the opposition supports Bill C-15 on the budget and on Build Canada Homes.

We need their co-operation. If they truly want to be there for their constituents, they will stand up and vote with us.

Jacques Gourde (Lévis—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian dream of home ownership is fading for young Canadians. A Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation report says that housing starts in 2028 could fall by as much as 18% compared to last year. The Canadian Home Builders' Association says that current conditions will create a lost decade for home ownership in Canada.

When will the government adopt our plan to stimulate residential growth by eliminating the GST on all new homes so that our young people can hope to own their own home?

Caroline Desrochers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Build Canada Homes is a program that responds to what Canadians really need. Canadians need us to build housing that fits their needs and their budgets.

All the member opposite and his colleagues are saying today is that we need to abolish the tax on all homes. There is no tax anymore. I do not know how the Conservatives think they can govern when all they do is filibuster and say they are going to eliminate all taxes.

We on this side have a real plan, a plan that makes sense. It is called the 2025 budget. We hope they will approve it.

* * *

[English]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Jake Sawatzky (New Westminster—Burnaby—Maillardville, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there has been an outpouring of grief and support across this country following the Tumbler Ridge tragedy that occurred on Tuesday. The House has come together to honour the innocent lives lost.

Can the Secretary of State for Combatting Crime please reflect on the mass shooting in B.C.?

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the nation is heartbroken by this tragic shooting in Tumbler Ridge, British Columbia. Our hearts are with the families, friends and loved ones of all the victims, and with the little girl who is currently fighting for her life. May we all keep her in our prayers. We are forever grateful for the speed and courage of the RCMP and all first responders on that day. Their actions and bravery saved lives.

• (1450)

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Raquel Dancho (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC): Mr. Speaker, despite the Liberals signing on to \$52 billion to create an EV supply chain in Canada, the vast majority of EVs bought here are not made here. Now, despite the massive government subsidies, the auto companies are recording multi-billion dollar losses on EVs and abandoning or delaying EV projects.

The Liberals are now doubling down with their new \$2.3-billion EV subsidy, where Canadian workers will be forced to subsidize the purchase of foreign-made EVs, including EVs made in the United States. At a time like this, it is unconscionable.

Will the Liberals reverse course and stop Canadian tax dollars from funding American-made EVs?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, of course we believe in affordability. We believe that Canadians can have access to EV incentives, such as up to \$5,000 for a car that is up to \$50,000, as well as those for Canadian EVs, because obviously, we believe that the future of the industry is electrification. Recently, there were more EV sales in Europe than those of gas combustion cars. At the same time, we know that in the next five years, 40% of all the cars worldwide will be electric.

Our plan is to make sure that we bring our industry to the forefront of innovation and that good jobs are created here.

Raquel Dancho (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that the American tariffs have cost 5,000 jobs in Canada's auto sector and tens of thousands more jobs in the manufacturing sector across the board. Meanwhile, the Liberals created a \$2.3-billion, taxpayer-funded program that will subsidize the purchase of American-made EVs to the direct benefit of the American auto sector, when the Americans are trying to destroy our auto sector.

This is wrong, and the minister could easily rectify this. Will she do it?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of time for my colleague and a lot of respect for her, but she knows that our auto industry is obviously facing important challenges. It took months for the Conservatives to denounce the U.S. tariffs on autos.

We know that the entire sector is integrated within North America with Canada, the U.S. and Mexico. Now, when she is talking about EVs made in the U.S., she has to take into account, and Conservatives need to take into account, that Canadian auto parts are part of these EVs.

Is she going after the Canadian auto parts workers all across Ontario? That is my question.

Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday afternoon and Tuesday evening, I was in Toronto for the Unifor skilled trades conference. Those are the men and women who work in our auto plants to make sure the machinery and equip-

Oral Questions

ment work. When I told them that their tax dollars were going to go to subsidizing the purchase of American EVs, they were outraged and disgusted. They could not believe it was happening.

It is simple: Why would Canadian tax dollars be going to subsidize American EVs when Donald Trump is trying to kill our auto industry? Will the Liberals show they care about auto workers by cancelling the rebates for American EVs?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, finally my colleague met with the Unifor workers. It took him months to do that.

We have been in contact with Unifor since the get-go, even before U.S. tariffs were imposed. We have been in contact with them to make sure that we would be working together, as one team Canada, because it took months for the Conservatives to denounce the U.S. tariffs for our auto workers.

We are there with the industry. From the industry and businesses to auto workers and unions, everybody is in favour of the auto strategy, including Premier Ford. Why are the Conservatives not in favour?

Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have been meeting with auto workers for the past two years. It is how we came up with our policy to take the HST off of all Canadian autos. That was actually an idea of union workers. What is not their idea is to give their tax dollars to Donald Trump's America to build American vehicles.

These Liberals will not answer this question: Why are they giving these subsidies to EVs made in America when Donald Trump's stated goal is to destroy the Canadian auto industry? It is embarrassing. It is disgraceful. It is disgusting. They should look Canadian auto workers in the eye and apologize, but I know they will not.

• (1455)

Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have known my colleague for a long time. He does have passion, I will grant him that, but sometimes that passion leads him to act a bit too quickly. He forgot to talk to unions.

Oral Questions

Earlier this week, he and other Conservatives raised the situation of workers at CAMI in Ingersoll. They were talking about the withholding of severance. What he forgot to do was actually talk to Unifor. Local 88 in Ingersoll came out with a statement. I will review it for him; we can look at it together. It said that their “political posturing” is unacceptable and they should not take advantage of the working people of Ingersoll. That is a direct quote. It is unacceptable.

Tony Baldinelli (Niagara Falls—Niagara-on-the-Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government's new EV strategy fails to put Canadian workers and automakers first. How is allowing 49,000 Chinese-made EVs into Canada and subsidizing the purchase of American-made EVs going to help the workers who were laid off from GM in St. Catharines? They are worried about the future of their engine plant. GM has been in St. Catharines since 1929.

Will the Liberals support our motion to stop forcing Canadian workers to subsidize foreign-made vehicles and remove the GST on Canadian-made vehicles?

Leslie Church (Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretaries of State for Labour, for Seniors, and for Children and Youth, and to the Minister of Jobs and Families (Persons with Disabilities), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we stand with our auto workers, with unions and with the businesses that communities are built around, and they are standing with us. Auto workers, mayors, union leaders and premiers, including Premier Ford, called this a great auto strategy.

Let me read this to the House. The President of Unifor Local 200 in Windsor, who chairs Unifor's auto council, says that he is “ecstatic” over the measures put in place as part of Canada's auto strategy. He says, “We're putting a third shift on, and we want to make sure that third shift stays. That incentive is so important to our community. I was ecstatic to see [the government] put that in place”.

Tony Baldinelli (Niagara Falls—Niagara-on-the-Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that member is not talking to the Unifor members in St. Catharines, who had an EV battery engine plant, but GM moved it out because there were no sales.

The Government of Canada should not be subsidizing American-made EVs using Canadian taxpayers' money, especially when U.S. actions have already cost 5,000 Canadian auto worker jobs. Will the Liberals simply join us, finally put Canadians first and support our Conservative motion to remove the GST on Canadian-made vehicles?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I know my colleague is fighting hard to change the narrative, but the auto strategy has already been out for a week and everybody is in favour of it, including, of course, Unifor workers who are working at GM in St. Catharines and Premier Ford, who we all know is a very strong Conservative, as well as the industry, auto parts workers, everyone. Why is that? It is because, fundamentally, it is a good plan.

We know that the industry is going towards electrification. Capital is following that innovation. We will not hold our workers back. We will protect them.

Connie Cody (Cambridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after months of pressure from Conservatives, the government is finally slamming

the brakes on its ideological electric vehicle mandate, but the new EV rebate scheme will not protect Canadian auto workers. It is just going to subsidize Tesla and send taxpayer money straight across the border.

The government has gone from saying “elbows up” to selling out. It is driving other countries' economies forward while leaving Canadian workers in the dust. The Liberal government's policies are eroding our domestic vehicle manufacturing sector and the livelihoods of Canadian workers. When will the Liberals finally get behind the wheel for Canada instead of selling out to Donald Trump and Elon Musk?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what the Conservatives need to understand right now is that the industry needs predictability and clarity. At a time when there is a revision of the USMCA, we were able to provide that. By providing that, we are now having conversations with German automakers, Korean automakers and Chinese automakers that want to invest in Canada and create good jobs.

Why are the Conservatives fundamentally against what the market is saying, which is that this is a good plan and Canada is a great destination to invest?

Chris Lewis (Essex, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Essex-Windsor auto sector is not just assembly lines; it is mould-makers, tool shops, parts suppliers and automation firms.

The Liberals promised to protect jobs, yet they are handing out money to America EV companies, importing Chinese EVs and costing thousands of families their livelihoods. EV policy was meant to protect workers.

Will the Liberals stop forcing Canadian workers to subsidize foreign-made vehicles and remove the GST on new Canadian-made vehicles?

● (1500)

Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the industry minister and the Prime Minister, along with every minister and this entire caucus, are devoted to ensuring the well-being and future of the Canadian auto sector and its workers.

I invite Conservatives to support the government in continuing to ensure that measures are put in place to ensure the future well-being of that sector.

Ned Kuruc (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadian taxpayers should not be subsidizing American EVs when the U.S. trade conflict has already cost 5,000 Canadian auto manufacturing jobs, 37,000 since the Prime Minister took office. He needs to stop this insult to Hamilton auto workers and work with us to put Canadian auto jobs first.

This is a time when the Canadian auto sector is looking for unity and action in standing up to Donald Trump. Will the Liberals join us and support our motion to remove the GST on new Canadian-made vehicles?

Hon. Mélanie Joly (Minister of Industry and Minister responsible for Canada Economic Development for Quebec Regions, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, of course, if the Conservatives knew a lot about the auto strategy, they would know that we are already supporting the Canadian-made auto sector and Canadian-made vehicles. That will be for the Dodge Charger and the Pacifica. We are convinced that there will be more because we will have more investment in the sector.

The Conservatives have all been asking the same question. I guess their leader gave them a sheet to read. Fundamentally, what they need to remember is that Canadians are in favour of this because the entire sector is in favour of this.

* * *

[Translation]

PUBLIC SAFETY

Hon. Greg Fergus (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, a tidal wave of sorrow has swept over our country this week, including Kitigan Zibi, as the member for Pontiac—Kitigan Zibi so eloquently described earlier today. Two young lives have been extinguished far too soon, leaving their loved ones and their entire community to grieve.

Can the Secretary of State for Nature share her thoughts and reflections on the tragic incident that has taken place in Quebec?

Hon. Nathalie Provost (Secretary of State (Nature), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with a heart already heavy from the tragic events in Tumbler Ridge, I rise in the House today to offer my sincerest condolences to the family members and loved ones of the two young Anishinabe victims from Kitigan Zibi.

I do not have the words to explain such a tragedy, coming on the heels of an already sombre week. How anyone can weaponize children as a means to cause harm is incomprehensible.

My heart goes out to the community of Kitigan Zibi, to all those who will be called upon to support this family, to my colleague and fellow member and to everyone involved in providing assistance to this family and their loved ones, including first responders and health care workers.

What happened defies comprehension. I want to join with my colleagues in offering our thoughts to all of these people.

I hope they stay strong.

Oral Questions

[English]

Sukhman Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, British Columbia is facing a public safety crisis. Extortion is now at record highs and my community members are living in constant fear. Abbotsford police have been clear. They are calling on elected officials to act urgently and work across party lines to confront these ongoing threats. Canadians' safety matters now.

Will the Liberals act today and vote for our Conservative plan, supported by the NDP Premier of B.C., to ensure that those convicted of serious crimes cannot exploit our refugee system in order to stay in Canada?

Hon. Randeep Sarai (Secretary of State (International Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the premier of the province, the mayor of Abbotsford and the police chief of Abbotsford have all said to please go across party lines to get Bill C-2, Bill C-12 and Bill C-14 passed.

I used to think that maybe it is obstruction that Conservatives are doing, but I really think they do not even read the bills. If they read the bills, they would know that it would be very impactful to pass them, legislate them and get the tools to the police, who need them right away.

● (1505)

Brad Redekopp (Saskatoon West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, apparently the minister was not around on Tuesday. Extortion is real, and newcomers to Canada are the ones who suffer.

Here is an example of an extortion letter from Abbotsford:

WARNING...we are Indian gang members, we want our share from your business like protection money...

We are asking only 2 million...in cash...we have links all over do not ignore us, it will effect you really bad... we gave you 1 month to decide....

Threats like this one are followed by arson, shootings and murder. If caught, they claim refugee status. Will the government support our motion to stop people who are charged with serious crimes from claiming refugee status in order to avoid justice?

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, extortion is real and we are taking it very seriously. That is why, back in June, we tabled lawful access measures in Bill C-2. Those measures would make it possible for police to quickly investigate these types of crimes, as well as child predator crimes. It is important for us to give law enforcement the tools it needs to keep up with criminals.

The motion that has been brought forward by the Conservatives is basically moot. With Bill C-12, all of the asylum cases they are referring to would not be allowed.

Oral Questions

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, contrary to their claims today, everything is not fine, and the Liberals' status quo is putting lives in danger. The Liberals, if what they are saying today is true, should have no problem supporting our motion that would stop non-citizen extortionists who shoot up homes in Surrey and in Brampton from filing bogus refugee claims or getting lenient sentences to dodge removal.

Why are the Liberals so determined to keep allowing non-citizen extortionists to break the law and stay here?

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the same measures that I refer to on asylum in Bill C-12, which is currently in the Senate, were originally presented in the House in Bill C-2 back in June. Had the Conservatives not obstructed at that time and co-operated with us, those asylum cases that the member is referring to would not be allowed.

However, there is good news. Once Bill C-12 passes in the Senate, the claims that have been made will be cancelled.

* * *

HOUSING

Julie Dzerowicz (Davenport, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is great news. We have already seen Build Canada Homes move quickly from promise to progress, delivering real results for Canadians. A great example is Dunn House phase two, located in Toronto's Parkdale community, which will provide supportive housing for at-risk seniors.

Can the Minister of Jobs and Families, on behalf of the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, update the House on how this project reflects the government's approach to accelerating affordable housing across the country?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Jobs and Families and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Northern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member for Davenport is a tireless advocate for seniors and housing across Canada.

Our government is working to ensure seniors can age in place with dignity and the supports they need. Indeed, Dunn House provides rent-geared-to-income units for at-risk seniors in Toronto, which helps them live safely and independently. The Conservatives are asking how many. Over the past month alone, we have created 7,500 new homes in Nova Scotia, Quebec and Ontario. Why are they standing in the way of—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: The hon. member for Foothills has the floor.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadian farmers are worried that an announcement by Beijing today means there is no deal to reduce tariffs on canola.

On January 16, the Prime Minister said that he was engaged in a “new strategic partnership” with the People's Republic of China. He stated, “By March 1...Canada expects that China will [reduce] tariffs on Canadian canola seed to a combined rate of approximate-

ly 15%.” Today Reuters said that Beijing has delayed a decision on canola tariffs until March 9. No decision means no deal.

Why did the Prime Minister mislead Canadian farmers about having a deal to reduce canola tariffs for Canadian farmers?

Hon. Heath MacDonald (Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am certainly glad that the opposition is now starting to talk about canola. It has been how long since we returned from China? I never heard a word about canola. The Leader of the Opposition has canola in his new riding.

We are working hard. We will continue to work hard. The lines of communication are open with China, and we will continue to work with China and with every trading partner. I met with the canola farmers last week in Ottawa, and we had a really good meeting. We will continue to work with China and the contacts we have there.

* * *

● (1510)

MENTAL HEALTH AND ADDICTIONS

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, Canada is in a mental health crisis and young people are being hit hardest, yet counselling, therapy and treatment still depend on workplace benefits or the ability to pay in a two-tier system. The PBO confirmed that bringing mental health care under the Canada Health Act and achieving parity with physical health care through Bill C-201 would cost just 1.5% of total public health spending.

Will the minister act now and bring mental health care under the Canada Health Act, yes or no?

[Translation]

Hon. Marjorie Michel (Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague knows very well that I care deeply about the mental health of Canadians.

Health services, including mental health, since it is part of health, are under provincial jurisdiction. I am working closely with my provincial partners to ensure that they provide the best services to Canadians.

[English]

DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, we know foreign interference is a threat to Canadian democracy. It was confirmed by the Hogue commission, and we have taken steps, at the federal level for federal elections, to deal with the threat of foreign interference.

Is there anything being done and what is being done now to consider the threat of foreign interference to provincial referenda that could break up this country, when we know people in the White House are encouraging separatism? What are we doing to prepare?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Minister of Transport and Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, foreign interference in our democracy at any level is unacceptable. The government has obviously carefully taken note of the—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: We need to hear this.

The hon. government House leader, from the top.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Mr. Speaker, foreign interference at any level and transnational repression at any level of our democracy are absolutely unacceptable. We have taken careful note of the recommendations of the Hogue commission, and I and my colleagues will be responding more fully in due course.

As the member pointed out, we have taken steps to protect Canada from our adversaries and to provide more information to the public about these threats. We will stand firm against attempts to undermine our democracy, and we will take very firm steps to prevent people from undermining our unity as well.

* * *

[Translation]

POINTS OF ORDER

ORAL QUESTIONS

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I believe I used unparliamentary language and I ask you to use your discretion to withdraw it, please.

The Speaker: That is much appreciated. It is an honourable gesture.

I thank the hon. member.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—SERIOUS CRIMES AND REFUGEE CLAIMS

The House resumed from February 10 consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: It being 3:13 p.m., pursuant to order made on Wednesday, February 11, the House will now proceed to the taking

Business of Supply

of the deferred recorded division on the motion of the member for Calgary Nose Hill relating to the Business of Supply.

Call in the members.

And the bells having rung:

The Speaker: The question is as follows. May I dispense?

Some hon. members: No.

[Chair read text of motion to House]

• (1525)

[Translation]

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

(Division No. 67)

YEAS

Members

Abouttaif	Aitchison
Albas	Allison
Anderson	Anstey
Arnold	Au
Baber	Bailey
Baldinelli	Barlow
Barrett	Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt)
Berthold	Bexte
Bezan	Block
Bonk	Borrelli
Bragdon	Brassard
Brock	Calkins
Caputo	Chambers
Chong	Cobena
Cody	Cooper
Dalton	Dancho
Davidson	Davies (Niagara South)
Dawson	Deltell
DeRidder	Diotte
Doherty	Dowdall
Duncan	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)	Falk (Provencher)
Gallant	Généreux
Genius	Gill (Calgary Skyview)
Gill (Windsor West)	Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Groleau	Guglielmin
Gunn	Hardy
Ho	Hoback
Holman	Jackson
Jansen	Jivani
Kelly	Khanna
Kirkland	Kmiec
Konanz	Kram
Kramp-Neuman	Kronis
Kuruc	Kusie
Lake	Lawrence
Lawton	Lefebvre
Leslie	Lewis (Essex)
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)	Lloyd
Lobb	Mahal
Majumdar	Malette (Kapuskasing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)
Mantle	Martel
Mazier	McCauley
McLean (Calgary Centre)	Melillo
Menegakis	Moore
Morin	Motz

Business of Supply

Nater
Paul-Hus
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Richards
Ross
Ruff
Schmale
Shipley
Steinley
Strahl
Stubbs
Tochor
Van Popta
Viersen
Wagantall
Waugh
Zimmer— 131

Patzer
Poilievre
Reid
Reynolds
Rood
Rowe
Scheer
Seeback
Small
Stevenson
Strauss
Thomas
Tolmie
Vien
Vis
Warkentin
Williamson

Kelloway
Klassen
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)
Larouche
Lauzon
Lavoie
Leitão
Lightbound
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
McKelvie
McKnight
McPherson
Mendès
Miedema
Mingarelli
Myles
Nathan
Noormohamed
Ntumba
O'Rourke
Perron
Plamondon
Provost
Rana
Romanado
Sahota
Sarai
Savard-Tremblay
Schieffe
Sheehan
Simard
Solomon
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Thériault
Turnbull
Vandenbeld
Watchorn
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 191

Khalid
Koutrakis
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Lapointe (Sudbury)
Lattanzio
Lavack
LeBlanc
Lemire
Long
Ma
MacDonald (Cardigan)
Malette (Bay of Quinte)
May
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLean (Esquimalt—Saaneich—Sooke)
Ménard
Michel
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Nguyen
Normandin
Olszewski
Osborne
Petipas Taylor
Powlowski
Ramsay
Rochefort
Royer
Saini
Sari
Sawatzky
Sgro
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sodhi
Sousa
St-Pierre
Tesser Derksen
Thompson
Valdez
Villeneuve
Weiler
Yip
Zerucelli

NAYS

Members

Acan
Ali
Auguste
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Belanger (Desnethé—Mississippi—Churchill Riv-
er)
Bittle
Blanchette-Joncas
Bonin
Brière
Carney
Casey
Champagne
Chang
Chatel
Chenette
Church
Connors
Coteau
Dandurand
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
d'Entremont
Deschênes-Thériault
Dhaliwal
Diab
Duguid
Earle
El-Khoury
Eyolfson
Fanjoy
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Fry
Gaheer
Garon
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gould
Greaves
Guilbeault
Hajdu
Harrison
Hirtle
Hogan
Hussen
Idlout
Johns
Joseph

Al Soud
Alty
Bains
Bardeesy
Battiste
Beech
Bendayan
Blanchet
Blois
Boulerice
Brunelle-Duceppe
Carr
Chagger
Champoux
Chartrand
Chen
Chi
Clark
Cormier
Dabrusin
Danko
DeBellefeuille
Deschênes
Desrochers
Dhillon
Duclos
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fancy
Fergus
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fuhr
Gainey
Gasparro
Gazan
Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassi-
nan)
Grant
Guay
Gull-Masty
Hanley
Hepfner
Hodgson
Housefather
Iacono
Jaczek
Joly
Kayabaga

Mendès
Miedema
Mingarelli
Myles
Nathan
Noormohamed
Ntumba
O'Rourke
Perron
Plamondon
Provost
Rana
Romanado
Sahota
Sarai
Savard-Tremblay
Schieffe
Sheehan
Simard
Solomon
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Thériault
Turnbull
Vandenbeld
Watchorn
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 191

PAIRED

Members

Anand
Gill (Brampton West)
Kibble
McKenzie
Muys
Roberts
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Anandasangaree
Gill (Calgary McKnight)
McGuinty
Morrison
Oliphant
Robertson
van Koeverden— 14

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

NATIONAL STRATEGY ON HOUSING FOR YOUNG CANADIANS ACT

The House resumed from February 5 consideration of the motion that Bill C-227, An Act to establish a national strategy on housing for young Canadians, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: Pursuant to order made on Wednesday, February 11, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded motion on the motion at second reading stage of Bill C-227 under Private Members' Business.

• (1535)

[Translation]

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

(Division No. 68)

YEAS

Members

Acan	Al Soud
Ali	Alty
Auguste	Bains
Baker	Bardeesy
Battiste	Beech
Belanger (Desnethé—Missinipi—Churchill River)	Bendayan
Bittle	Blois
Boulerice	Brière
Carney	Carr
Casey	Chagger
Champagne	Chang
Chartrand	Chatel
Chen	Chenette
Chi	Church
Clark	Connors
Cormier	Coteau
Dabrusin	Dandurand
Danko	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
d'Entremont	Deschênes-Thériault
Desrochers	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Earle
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Eyolfson
Fancy	Fanjoy
Fergus	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fragiskatos	Fraser
Fry	Fuhr
Gaheer	Gainey
Gasparro	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gould
Grant	Greaves
Guay	Guilbeault
Gull-Masty	Hajdu
Hanley	Harrison
Hepfner	Hirtle
Hodgson	Hogan
Housefather	Hussen
Iacono	Idlout
Jaczek	Johns
Joly	Joseph

Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Lapointe (Sudbury)
Lauzon
Lavoie
Leitão
Long
Ma
MacDonald (Cardigan)
Malette (Bay of Quinte)
May
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)
Ménard
Michel
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Nguyen
Ntumba
O'Rourke
Petitpas Taylor
Provost
Rana
Romanado
Sahota
Sarai
Sawatzky
Sgro
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Solomon
St-Pierre
Tesser Derksen
Turnbull
Vandenbeld
Watchorn
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi — 169

Private Members' Business

Kelloway
Klassen
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)
Lattanzio
Lavack
LeBlanc
Lightbound
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
McKelvie
McKnight
McPherson
Mendès
Miedema
Mingarelli
Myles
Nathan
Noormohamed
Olszewski
Osborne
Powlowski
Ramsay
Rocheffort
Royer
Saini
Sari
Schieffe
Sheehan
Sodhi
Sousa
Sudds
Thompson
Valdez
Villeneuve
Weiler
Yip
Zerucelli

NAYS

Members

Abouttaif
Albas
Anderson
Arnold
Baber
Baldinelli
Barrett
Beaulieu
Berthold
Bezan
Blanchette-Joncas
Bonin
Borrelli
Brassard
Brunelle-Duceppe
Caputo
Champoux
Cobena
Cooper
Dancho
Davies (Niagara South)
DeBellefeuille
DeRidder
Diotte
Dowdall
Epp
Aitchison
Allison
Anstey
Au
Bailey
Barlow
Barsalou-Duval
Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt)
Bexte
Blanchet
Block
Bonk
Bragdon
Brock
Calkins
Chambers
Chong
Cody
Dalton
Davidson
Dawson
Deltell
Deschênes
Doherty
Duncan
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)

Private Members' Business

Falk (Provencher)	Fortin
Gallant	Garon
Gaudreau	Généreux
Genius	Gill (Calgary Skyview)
Gill (Windsor West)	Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)	Gladu
Godin	Goodridge
Gourde	Groleau
Guglielmin	Gunn
Hardy	Ho
Hoback	Holman
Jackson	Jansen
Jivani	Kelly
Khanna	Kirkland
Kmiec	Konanz
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kronis	Kuruc
Kusie	Lake
Larouche	Lawrence
Lawton	Lefebvre
Lemire	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd	Lobb
Mahal	Majumdar
Malette (Kapusasing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)	Mantle
Martel	Mazier
McCauley	McLean (Calgary Centre)
Melillo	Menegakis
Moore	Morin
Motz	Nater
Normandin	Patzer
Paul-Hus	Perron
Plamondon	Poilievre
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Reynolds
Richards	Rood
Ross	Rowe
Ruff	Savard-Tremblay
Scheer	Schmale
Seeback	Shipley
Simard	Small
Steinley	Ste-Marie
Stevenson	Strahl
Stubbs	Thériault
Thomas	Tochor
Tolmie	Van Popta
Vien	Viersen
Vis	Wagantall
Warkentin	Waugh
Williamson	Zimmer— 152

PAIRED

Members

Anand	Anandasangaree
Gill (Brampton West)	Gill (Calgary McKnight)
Kibble	McGuinty
McKenzie	Morrison
Muys	Oliphant
Roberts	Robertson
Sidhu (Brampton East)	van Koeverden— 14

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[English]

Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities.

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

UKRAINIAN HERITAGE MONTH ACT

The House resumed from February 6 consideration of the motion that Bill S-210, An Act respecting Ukrainian Heritage Month, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

The Speaker: Pursuant to the order made on Wednesday, February 11, the House will now proceed to the taking of the deferred recorded division on the motion at second reading stage of Bill S-210 under Private Members' Business.

● (1550)

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

(Division No. 69)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaif	Acan
Aitchison	Al Soud
Albas	Ali
Allison	Alty
Anderson	Anstey
Arnold	Au
Auguste	Baber
Bailey	Bains
Baker	Baldinelli
Bardeesy	Barlow
Barrett	Barsalou-Duval
Battiste	Beaulieu
Beech	Belanger (Desnethé—Mississippi—Churchill River)
Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt)	Bendayan
Berthold	Bexte
Bezan	Bittle
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Block	Blois
Bonin	Bonk
Borrelli	Boulerice
Bragdon	Brassard
Brière	Brock
Brunelle-Duceppe	Calkins
Caputo	Carney
Carr	Casey
Chagger	Chambers
Champagne	Champoux
Chang	Chartrand
Chatel	Chen
Chenette	Chi
Chong	Church
Clark	Cobena
Cody	Connors
Cooper	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Dalton	Dancho
Dandurand	Danko
Davidson	Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Davies (Niagara South)	Dawson
DeBellefeuille	Deltell
d'Entremont	DeRidder
Deschênes	Deschênes-Thériault
Desrochers	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Diotte	Doherty
Dowdall	Duclos
Duguid	Duncan
Dzerowicz	Earle
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Epp	Erskine-Smith
Eyolfson	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)

Falk (Provencher)
 Fanjoy
 Fisher
 Fortier
 Fragiskatos
 Fry
 Gaheer
 Gallant
 Gasparro
 Gazan
 Genuis
 Gill (Calgary Skyview)
 Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)
 Gladu
 Goodridge
 Gourde
 Greaves
 Guay
 Guilbeault
 Hajdu
 Hardy
 Hepfner
 Ho
 Hodgson
 Holman
 Hussen
 Idlout
 Jaczek
 Johns
 Joseph
 Kelloway
 Khalid
 Kirkland
 Kmiec
 Koutrakis
 Kramp-Neuman
 Kuruc
 Kwan
 Lalonde
 Lamoureux
 Lapointe (Sudbury)
 Lattanzio
 Lavack
 Lawrence
 LeBlanc
 Leitão
 Leslie
 Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
 Lloyd
 Long
 Ma
 MacDonald (Cardigan)
 Mahal
 Malette (Bay of Quinte)
 Maloney
 May
 McCauley
 McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
 McLean (Calgary Centre)
 McPherson
 Ménard
 Menegakis
 Miedema
 Mingarelli
 Morin
 Motz
 Naqvi
 Nathan
 Noormohamed
 Ntumba
 O'Rourke

Fancy
 Fergus
 Fonseca
 Fortin
 Fraser
 Fuhr
 Gainey
 Garon
 Gaudreau
 Généreux
 Gerretsen
 Gill (Windsor West)
 Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)
 Godin
 Gould
 Grant
 Groleau
 Guglielmin
 Gull-Masty
 Hanley
 Harrison
 Hirtle
 Hoback
 Hogan
 Housefather
 Iacono
 Jackson
 Jansen
 Joly
 Kayabaga
 Kelly
 Khanna
 Klassen
 Konanz
 Kram
 Kronis
 Kusie
 Lake
 Lambropoulos
 Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)
 Larouche
 Lauzon
 Lavoie
 Lawton
 Lefebvre
 Lemire
 Lewis (Essex)
 Lightbound
 Lobb
 Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
 MacDonald (Malpeque)
 MacKinnon (Gatineau)
 Majumdar
 Malette (Kapusking—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)
 Martel
 Mazier
 McKelvie
 McKnight
 McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)
 Melillo
 Mendès
 Michel
 Miller
 Moore
 Morrissey
 Myles
 Nater
 Nguyen
 Normandin
 Olszewski
 Osborne

Business of the House

Patzer
 Perron
 Plamondon
 Powlowski
 Ramsay
 Redekopp
 Rempel Garner
 Richards
 Romanado
 Ross
 Royer
 Sahota
 Sarai
 Savard-Tremblay
 Scheer
 Schmale
 Sgro
 Shipley
 Simard
 Sodhi
 Sousa
 Ste-Marie
 St-Pierre
 Stubbs
 Tesser Derksen
 Thomas
 Tochor
 Turnbull
 Van Popta
 Vien
 Villeneuve
 Wagantall
 Watchorn
 Weiler
 Williamson
 Zahid
 Zimmer

Paul-Hus
 Petitpas Taylor
 Poilievre
 Provost
 Rana
 Reid
 Reynolds
 Rochefort
 Rood
 Rowe
 Ruff
 Saini
 Sari
 Sawatzky
 Schiefke
 Seeback
 Sheehan
 Sidhu (Brampton South)
 Small
 Solomon
 Steinley
 Stevenson
 Strahl
 Sudds
 Thériault
 Thompson
 Tolmie
 Valdez
 Vandenbeld
 Viersen
 Vis
 Warkentin
 Waugh
 Wilkinson
 Yip
 Zerucelli
 Zuberi— 318

NAYS

Nil

PAIRED

Members

Anand
 Gill (Brampton West)
 Kibble
 McKenzie
 Muys
 Roberts
 Sidhu (Brampton East)

Anandasangaree
 Gill (Calgary McKnight)
 McGuinty
 Morrison
 Oliphant
 Robertson
 van Koeeverden— 14

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, the bill stands referred to the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage.

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

The Speaker: I wish to inform the House that because of the deferred recorded divisions, the time provided for Government Orders will be extended by 36 minutes.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Rob Moore (Fundy Royal, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to wish all members a good constituency week as they travel back to their riding.

I would like to ask the government deputy House leader what the plan is when we return to Ottawa from our constituency break.

Business of Supply

Hon. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I too want to extend well wishes as everyone returns to their riding. I hope this will be an opportunity to reconnect and to answer questions that many of our constituents have.

I also want to extend my heartfelt feelings, thoughts and prayers to the grieving families in both communities: Tumbler Ridge and Kitigan Zibi Anishinabeg. As a parent myself, I understand how tough this time is. I wish the members of Parliament who represent those areas resolve and wisdom as they navigate the days to come.

Tomorrow we will proceed with report stage and third reading of Bill C-14, the bail and sentencing reform act.

When we return from the constituency week, we will consider Bill C-20, the Build Canada Homes act, at second reading on Monday, as well as on Wednesday if needed.

[*Translation*]

I also wish to inform the House that Tuesday, February 24 shall be an allotted day.

auto strategy will directly influence the livelihoods of hundreds of thousands of people in our ridings and thousands of workers in our region. There is no other place where this transformation is more visible than St. Thomas. This community, in London West's backyard, has long been connected to Canada's manufacturing story. It now stands at the forefront of the electric vehicle economy.

The investments that have been made there represent more than just new facilities. They represent renewed confidence in our region of southwestern Ontario, in our workforce, in our industrial capacity and in Canada's ability to compete in the industries of the future. For the people of St. Thomas, and of London and the entire region, this transition is about good jobs, economic revitalization and the next chapter of a proud manufacturing legacy.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[*English*]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—AUTOMOTIVE STRATEGY

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Hon. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Bourassa.

Before I begin my remarks, I would like to once again acknowledge the horrific mass shooting that occurred in Tumbler Ridge, British Columbia. My thoughts are with the families who have lost loved ones, with those who are injured and with the entire community that is now facing unimaginable grief. Canadians stand united in mourning, and we remain deeply grateful to the first responders who acted with courage and professionalism in the face of this tragedy.

I also want to recognize, as I said earlier, the families in Kitigan Zibi Anishinabeg. Two communities right now are experiencing the loss of children. As I said, I am a mom. I cannot imagine what these parents are facing right now. On behalf of London West families, I take the liberty of extending my heartfelt prayers to both communities and pray for them as they navigate the very hard days that are ahead of them.

Last week, the government released its auto strategy, a plan designed to help Canada's automotive sector navigate the profound changes reshaping the global economy. These changes are already being felt in communities across the country, particularly in southwestern Ontario, where the auto sector is not just an industry but the economic backbone of our region. In southwestern Ontario, the automotive sector represents jobs, families and the stability of local businesses and communities.

From the assembly plants to parts manufacturers, from tool and die shops to advanced technology firms, the success of Canada's

Canada's auto strategy rests on five pillars. Today, I am going to focus on two pillars through the lens of southwestern Ontario's automotive sector. The first pillar is the government's commitment to reducing emissions from light-duty vehicles as part of Canada's broader objective of achieving net-zero emissions by 2050.

Climate action is often framed as an environmental necessity. It is that, but it is also an economic imperative, particularly in regions like mine. The global automotive industry is undergoing a historic transformation. Electrification is no longer optional now. It is a must. It is the direction of travel for markets, for investments and for long-term competitiveness. We have to be at the table.

For southwestern Ontario, this transition also represents both opportunity and risk: opportunity because Canada has the talent, the industrial base and the skilled workforce needed to lead the next generation of vehicle manufacturing; and risk because transitions of this magnitude create uncertainty for workers, suppliers and communities that have built their economic identity around traditional automotive production. We owe it to our children and future generations to do the heavy lifting of putting in place transformative policies that will enable Canada to lead in the low-carbon economy of tomorrow. That is why we will continue to fight climate change and why we will also be creating the strongest economy in the G7.

Business of Supply

Transportation accounts for a quarter of Canada's greenhouse gas emissions. There is no credible pathway to net zero that does not involve fundamental changes in how we design, build and power vehicles. At the same time, we have to recognize the realities of the automotive production cycle. Vehicles built today will remain on the road for well over a decade. Manufacturing decisions made today will shape employment patterns for years to come. This is precisely why regulatory certainty matters most to our workers.

Canada's strengthened greenhouse gas emissions standards for light-duty vehicles provide a clear, predictable framework for manufacturers. For southwestern Ontario, predictability is the foundation upon which companies can make investment decisions. They can retool if they need to. They can retool their facilities and secure long-term employment.

● (1555)

When automakers and suppliers know the rules of the game, they take the time to invest with confidence. They can predict and plan for their workers' benefit as well. The community benefits, and the entire region's economy benefits as well.

Our region's auto workers are among the most skilled and productive in the world and have repeatedly demonstrated their ability to adapt to technological change, whether through automation, advanced manufacturing or electrification. What they require from policy-makers and legislators in this House and others is clarity, stability and a long-term vision. That is what we are giving them in this moment through the automotive strategy that the Prime Minister announced last week.

The second pillar I want to highlight is supporting consumers in the transition to electric vehicles by making EVs more affordable and accessible. Affordability is not just a consumer issue. It is also an industrial strategy. When Canadians can afford electric vehicles, the domestic demand strengthens, and when domestic demand strengthens, Canadian manufacturing becomes more viable. The previous incentives for zero-emission vehicles program played a critical role in stimulating early adoption. It helped normalize electrical vehicles within the Canadian market and supported hundreds of thousands of purchases. However, we know that affordability remains one of the most significant barriers to broader adoption. The new electric vehicle affordability program will address these challenges head-on.

For southwestern Ontario, this program carries particular significance. By prioritizing vehicles produced in Canada or within trusted partners, the program links consumer incentives with domestic industrial growth. Most importantly, by removing the transaction value cap for Canadian EVs, the strategy sends a powerful signal to the entire region. It tells manufacturers that Canada is serious about building demand for vehicles produced by Canadian workers, and it tells our workers that their jobs are central to Canada's climate and industrial policies.

Small and medium-sized enterprises are the backbone of the automotive supply chain. These companies manufacture components, provide specialized services and drive innovation. For these firms, the EV transition requires significant capital investment, technological upgrading and workforce adaptation. These are policies that stimulate EV demand. They do not only benefit large automakers;

they also benefit the small mom-and-pop shops. The ripple effect throughout the supply chain sustains thousands of smaller businesses that depend on a healthy, growing automotive sector.

Beyond affordability, infrastructure remains a critical factor. Range confidence is especially important in regions like mine, where many residents rely on personal vehicles for commuting, intercity travel and economic activities, so we have to invest in charging infrastructure. These investments we are making in charging infrastructures are therefore investments in consumer confidence, but they are also investments in regional economic integration. A robust charging network along major corridors such as Highway 401 strengthens the practical viability of EV ownership for workers, families and many businesses in the region. Canada's national charging infrastructure strategy and the Canada Infrastructure Bank's dedicated funding envelope are essential to these components of this effort. Accelerating infrastructure deployment will also help ensure that the EV transition is perceived not as a constraint but as a practical, accessible choice.

We must acknowledge the broader geopolitical context we are in. Uncertainty in the United States, shifting trade dynamics and evolving industrial policies have created challenges for the North American supply chains.

I will close by returning to the fundamental questions before us. What kind of future do we want to envision for our children? What kind of future do we want to envision for Canadians across southwestern Ontario and in other communities where the automotive sector is the backbone of the economy? I think it would be a mistake if we did not make the right decisions, the right policies to bring us forward into the future, and it held us back. I look forward to taking questions from the House.

● (1600)

Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, over the last 10 years, we have seen the economy in our country flounder, and the auto industry in particular is under significant threat right now.

I wonder if the hon. member would at least acknowledge that the auto industry was in pretty significant decline under the Liberals' watch before Donald Trump started with his tariffs.

Business of Supply

Hon. Arielle Kayabaga: Mr. Speaker, I find my hon. colleague's question a bit tone-deaf, given that many people in the sector have asked us to put partisanship aside and to address the real issue. We are talking about a sector that is facing unprecedented challenges due to many issues, including tariffs that are unjustified, and people are asking policy-makers across the board to put partisanship aside and to make the right decisions that will ensure our families can put food on the table.

I put it back to the member. What is he doing, instead of obstructing, to make sure that Canadian workers actually have the supports that they need?

• (1605)

[*Translation*]

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lestiguj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my party is in favour of electric vehicle subsidies. However, we are disappointed that the federal government has scrapped the idea of an electric vehicle availability standard that would have required all vehicles sold in Canada as of 2035 to be electric. Such a regulatory tool would have been key to achieving transportation electrification.

Can my colleague explain why they scrapped this measure in favour of an emissions standard that will not be as effective in promoting the transition to electric vehicles?

Hon. Arielle Kayabaga: Mr. Speaker, I am listening. I would be willing to have a lengthier discussion with him. I do not have any more information at this time, but I really urge him to support it.

Where I come from, this sector is affected, so I can speak for my constituents and people in this sector who are affected. We have to keep working together to do everything we can to support the people who find themselves in this very difficult situation.

[*English*]

Tom Osborne (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Canadian parts that are made for the EVs in the United States are vitally important to the Canadian economy. Those jobs are vitally important to the Canadian economy. Unlike what the questions put forward by the opposition imply, that we are supporting American vehicles, we are supporting Canadian jobs and Canadian automakers with what is in the strategy, and we are focused on bringing other automakers to Canada. With a world that is moving further and further toward EVs, attracting companies to come to Canada to build these vehicles will also be important.

I would ask the member if she can speak to how we are protecting Canadian jobs, with the parts that are made in Canada.

Hon. Arielle Kayabaga: Mr. Speaker, I can actually share with the House that I support the auto sector in my region. I drive a Toyota RAV4 hybrid, and that is made right in my backyard in south-western Ontario. I think those are the different ways that we can continue to show our support. As the Prime Minister said, Canada is a nation that builds cars, and it will continue to be. We are not going to stop.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of the Environment, Climate Change and Nature, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the House that Tuesday, February 24, shall be an allotted day.

* * *

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—AUTOMOTIVE STRATEGY

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, to my previous point, the Liberals want to be the heroes of the story that they created. They have failed to support the auto industry for the last 10 years, and now they say that we are trying to defend the horse and buggy. The horse and buggy are still not banned from our roads. Are they planning to ban the horse and buggy as well?

Hon. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, that is interesting. I think the Conservatives nitpick what they want to talk about. I talked about St. Thomas and the investments we made in St. Thomas even prior to today. I invite the member opposite to actually chat with one of his colleagues, Mayor Preston, who has said that he “hasn’t stopped smiling” since we made these investments in his community.

The Deputy Speaker: It is my duty pursuant to Standing Order 38 to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Similkameen—South Okanagan—West Kootenay, Carbon Pricing; the hon. member for York—Durham, Automotive Industry; the hon. member for Richmond Centre—Marpole, Indigenous Affairs.

• (1610)

[*Translation*]

Abdelhaq Sari (Bourassa, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, before I begin my remarks, I would simply like to say that, as a member of Parliament, as the member for Bourassa, and above all as a father, I am deeply affected by the events that occurred in Tumbler Ridge on Tuesday evening. I would like to express my sincere solidarity. I would also like to express my deepest sympathies to the victims, their loved ones, their families and the community of British Columbia. During this difficult time, all of us here are united by compassion, respect and the desire to support one another.

I rise today to speak to a matter of strategic importance to our economy and to hundreds of thousands of families. It concerns the future of the Canadian auto industry. This industry supports more than 500,000 jobs in Canada and is one of the pillars of our manufacturing base.

[*English*]

It has shaped our prosperity for more than a century and continues to structure entire communities.

Business of Supply

[Translation]

The facts are clear. Unfortunately, this sector is undergoing major changes. Since 2016, auto manufacturing in Canada has decreased from about 2.3 million vehicles to about 1.2 million vehicles in 2025. Moreover, over 5,000 jobs have unfortunately been lost in this industry over the last few years. We must respond to this reality seriously and with determination.

Today, more than 90% of vehicles assembled in Canada and close to 60% of auto parts are exported to the United States. This dependence makes our industry powerful, but it also makes it vulnerable.

[English]

Our automotive strategy is based on clear principles: Produce more in Canada, innovate in Canada and protect Canadian jobs.

[Translation]

That is why the automotive strategy is based on a simple principle: Produce more here in Canada, innovate here in Canada and protect our workers.

That is why we are mobilizing major investments, including \$3 billion from the strategic response fund and up to \$100 million from the regional tariff response initiative to help the auto industry adapt, modernize and diversify.

We are also supporting the energy transition with clear, achievable and quantitative targets. We want to achieve a goal of 75% EV sales by 2035 and 90% EV sales by 2040. To support domestic demand, we are implementing a \$2.3-billion, five-year program to make EVs more affordable through incentives of up to \$5,000 for EVs and \$2,500 for plug-in hybrids. We are also investing \$1.5 billion to develop the national EV charging network in order to remove a significant barrier restricting EV adoption.

These measures have a clear objective: to produce the vehicles of tomorrow here in Canada. Earlier, I was talking about limitations mainly having to do with travelling very long distances. I myself have an electric vehicle. This is one of the things our government wants to work on to achieve these clear objectives. The goal is to produce the vehicles of tomorrow right here in Canada, but also to be able to actually use them in our country, which is extremely big.

At the heart of this strategy are people. There are workers. We are investing \$570 million to support employment, training and re-training. This could reach up to 66,000 workers across the country. We have already approved more than 1,350 work-sharing agreements, which have prevented more than 18,500 layoffs. Enhanced employment insurance measures will allow more than 190,000 workers to receive extended support, including up to 20 additional weeks for long-tenured workers. These measures are not theoretical. They protect real jobs. They are being applied in real factories and in the very real communities that each and every one of us here represents.

Now let us talk about the transition to electric vehicles. This is not just an environmental issue. It is also a transition to a new economic trajectory. Electric vehicles cost up to 50% less to maintain and up to 10 times less to power than gas vehicles. Adopting EVs

creates jobs, attracts investment and strengthens our global competitiveness.

• (1615)

[English]

Canada has major strengths in its critical minerals, expertise in artificial intelligence, clean energy and a skilled workforce.

[Translation]

We also have access to 51 countries and more than 1.5 billion consumers through our trade agreements. The challenge is clear: If we want to remain an automotive nation, we must invest. Our strategy aims to strengthen domestic production, attract investment and protect workers while positioning Canada as a global leader in the transportation of tomorrow.

I will conclude with this. The true economic strength of a country like ours is measured not only by its exports, but also by its ability to create quality jobs right here in our country and to prepare for the future of our workers, our families, our regions and our communities.

That is what we are doing. We are building a modern industry, strengthening our industrial sovereignty and preparing the Canadian economy, and we are doing it with workers.

Philip Lawrence (Northumberland—Clarke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, discussion is a good thing.

[English]

However, my question is one I have posed to a number of Liberal members. We know 99% of the cars that will be subsidized as a result of this program will be built outside of Canada.

When will it grow to at least 2%, if not 5% or 10%?

[Translation]

Abdelhaq Sari: Mr. Speaker, my colleague's question is very relevant, but his analysis is, to put it simply, flawed, if not false.

In fact, as I said earlier, our goal is to have jobs right here in Canada, in our communities, and to be able to export. Our goal is not just to export our products, but also to keep and preserve our jobs.

Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I did pick up on a desire to make greenhouse gases less and less noticeable.

Business of Supply

I actually met with the President of the Treasury Board this morning, and we talked about regulatory sandboxes, among other things. I am very concerned. I am very concerned because, on this opposition day, it is clear that economic pressure from the fossil fuel lobby has resulted in an opposition motion aimed at tearing down what is being built.

Is my colleague aware that, if there is pressure in the interest of economic prosperity, the new measures in the budget will make it possible to change course and potentially not meet the targets?

Abdelhaq Sari: Mr. Speaker, my colleague wants to know whether I am aware of climate and environmental issues and whether our government is also aware them. The answer is obviously yes.

Now, to answer the part of the question where my colleague talked about, or rather made inferences about economic ambitions, the answer is once again yes. However, our economic ambitions and development also come with a certain responsibility. This is a responsible development that will protect workers and aim to truly electrify transportation. Quebec will also benefit from it, since everyone in Quebec who charges their car will be using electricity from Hydro-Québec, a Crown corporation. We are both economically ambitious and very environmentally responsible.

• (1620)

Pauline Rochefort (Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State (Rural Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate my colleague's comments, and I am very impressed by the fact that Quebec is a leader in Canada when it comes to embracing EVs.

I was wondering whether my colleague could tell me about charging stations.

What role do they play in reaching these target numbers?

Abdelhaq Sari: Mr. Speaker, that is an excellent question. I would say that charging stations play a role in many ways.

First, everyone knows that Quebec covers a very large area, so for EV users, the more charging stations there are, the better. Second, it is important to note that Quebec has exceptional expertise in designing, developing and installing these charging stations. Once again, Quebec is not only a leader in manufacturing cars and batteries, but also in developing these stations, and other workers will benefit from this.

In closing, the more charging stations there are, the more people will be encouraged to buy EVs and the more they will enjoy driving them. As a result, the number of vehicles running solely on gasoline will decrease, which will obviously help us meet our targets.

[English]

Tamara Jansen (Cloverdale—Langley City, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we spent \$52 billion trying to force an EV transition. Production targets are failing, 5,000 workers have been laid off, and now the government wants another \$2.3 billion in subsidies, even though most of its past rebates went to foreign-built vehicles.

Is this about helping Canadian workers or saving face after a failed policy experiment?

[Translation]

Abdelhaq Sari: Mr. Speaker, my answer will be very short and very simple. Had members listened carefully without trying to obstruct anything, they would know that the plan I outlined is based on investment in manufacturing, innovation and workforce support, support for workers. The primary goal is to revive our auto sector in a very sustainable way.

[English]

Michael Guglielmin (Vaughan—Woodbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise on behalf of the great people in the great riding of Vaughan—Woodbridge.

This is my first opportunity to rise in the House of Commons following the tragic and devastating news coming out of Tumbler Ridge, British Columbia. Like many people in the House, I have to say that as a father it is hard to even imagine the pain and the suffering that these families are going through. As we all know, there are no words we could say that would truly offer comfort. However, I would like to say the people of Vaughan—Woodbridge are thinking of these families. Our love is with them. We stand with them, and our prayers will be with them.

It is an honour to rise today to speak about the auto industry. Canada has been building automobiles for over a century. From Windsor to Oshawa, from Brampton to Sainte-Thérèse, there are generations of skilled workers who have worked in the auto industry. We have tradespeople, engineers and plant workers. These people have been the heartbeat of Canada's great automotive sector, one of the greatest automotive sectors in the history of the world. Our automotive industry really does represent the best of Canadian innovation and manufacturing prowess. It is home to some 600,000 indirect and direct jobs, and it has a GDP of \$16 billion.

Before coming to Parliament, I spent my career in the steel industry, in the steel service centre business, which is nestled right in the automotive supply chain. I have had the opportunity to work with many great people, those who work on the factory floors and those in the offices that support these workers. These people represent the best of what it means to be Canadian. These people do not work for fortune or for fame. They strap on their boots every single day to go to work to ensure that their children have a better life than they did. They work to ensure our country is better off than it was before. These are the very people who represent the ideals of Canadian identity.

It is unfortunate that we often think just about the numbers and the statistics, the GDP and the job numbers. The numbers represent these people, and they truly represent what it means to be Canadian: that work, that discipline, that ethic.

Business of Supply

Unfortunately, our auto industry and the industry associated with it has been in decline for many years. I witnessed this first-hand in my time working in this industry. I remember when I first started in the steel business, I was at a conference and someone asked a major auto parts supply manufacturer why their company no longer invested in Canada. The response was that other countries roll out the red carpet, but Canada seems to want to roll out the red tape.

It is no surprise that over the past 10 years we have witnessed a sharp decline in the number of automobiles manufactured in our country. It is an almost 50% decline, from 2.3 million vehicles to roughly 1.2 million vehicles. Some of this obviously has to do with the natural process of globalization, but most of it has been the result of some major structural issues facing our economy. These issues have led to a negative business environment so astounding it is actually approaching the point of miracle. We now have some 320,000 different federal regulations, with over 105,000 regulations on the manufacturing sector alone.

At the Standing Committee on Industry and Technology, we heard over and over again from people in the automotive sector when we had our emergency study that some of the major barriers to the prosperity of the industry are the regulatory environment and some of the tax framework issues that are preventing capital from being spent on capital projects in this country and driving capital outflows to places like the U.S. and Mexico. This is where we start to see the divergence between capital outflow and FDI into Canada.

All of this was long before the unjustified tariffs that have been put in place by U.S. President Trump. These tariffs, as I have said many times in the House during debates on the auto sector and at committee, are certainly the catalyst in the industry, but they do not explain the decades' worth of decline in this sector.

• (1625)

It is very understandable why Canadians find tariffs not only intellectually reprehensible but morally repugnant, because many of us, if not all of us, looked at the U.S. not only as an economic partner but as a cultural partnership. Many of us have family connections in the United States. It is almost as if a family member has stabbed us in the back. The ties between the U.S. and Canada run deep.

We have also heard the U.S. President take aim at our auto sector, saying that he wants to relocate the Canadian auto industry back to the United States. That attack does not just threaten jobs and GDP; it is an attack on what it means to be Canadian. It is an attack on the hard-working person who straps on their boots every day.

These attacks, although vicious, have provided us with an opportunity, because as a mature country, Canada must begin to think for itself. It is no secret that for decades at this point, we have outsourced our economy and security to the United States. While we cannot control what it does, we can certainly fix what we do here at home.

Earlier this month, the government unveiled its new auto strategy, within which it finally repealed the EV mandate, which we welcome and have been arguing for. Of course, that target was always unrealistic. We heard that time and again from industry leaders and

experts. It is nice that it has listened to the Conservatives and removed this policy.

That said, I am worried it is trying to back-door it through an excessive regulatory framework and I certainly have questions around it. For instance, 80% to 90% of the vehicles we manufacture are exported, and 90% to 92% of those exports are directly targeted at the U.S. What will the costs associated with these regulatory measures be? How will that hamper or bolster competitiveness? Are the Americans adopting this standard, because as we know, we have a lot of cross-border interactions in the supply chain. Certainly, we cannot have one without the other.

The centrepiece for the government's auto strategy is this new five-year, \$2.3-billion EV affordability program, offering \$5,000 in rebates for vehicles under \$50,000 for which Canada has a free trade agreement. The difficulty for me on this is that the vast majority of EVs sold in Canada are not actually built in Canada. We currently assemble one fully electric vehicle that qualifies under the new rules, the Dodge Charger EV in Windsor. Meanwhile, the long list of eligible vehicles for this initiative are from foreign countries.

This is where I question if this strategy was actually fully thought-out, because Canadian taxpayers will be subsidizing electric vehicles that are made in the United States while the U.S. is threatening our auto industry and displacing our workers. At the same time, the American President has said he wants to attack one of the industries that really represents the identity of what it means to be Canadian. We have already lost 5,000 jobs in this sector. What I cannot understand is why we are rewarding the Americans for this. It makes no sense. My colleague, the shadow minister for industry, asked the Minister of Industry this exact question at committee and she had no answer.

We know that less than 5% of the vehicles built in Canada will qualify for this program. That means the majority of the \$2.3 billion will flow to foreign manufacturers. What kind of message does this send to workers? What kind of message does this send to the auto workers in Brampton who are supposed to build the Jeep Compass? How do we explain this to the 1,200 former employees in Ingersoll who are now seeing more than half of their lump-sum severance taken away in tax? Under section 153 of the Income Tax Act, the minister has the regulatory authority to reduce withholding rates so that workers can access more of this money.

We hope the government will support us in our approach to build here, so we can—

• (1630)

The Deputy Speaker: Questions and comments, the hon. Minister of the Environment and Climate Change.

Business of Supply

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of the Environment, Climate Change and Nature, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite asked what message we are sending to auto workers, because we know we have the best auto workers in the country. That message is hope, and we delivered that message with the auto strategy. I believe we were in his riding, at Martinrea International in Woodbridge, when we made the announcement, because it is about auto parts as well. For vehicles assembled in the United States, because we are so integrated, auto parts go back and forth. A vehicle may have parts made in the member's very own riding that will come to be assembled in the United States.

Is the member discounting the value of supporting all of our workers who make those auto parts, which are some of the best auto parts made by the best auto workers the world?

Michael Guglielmin: Mr. Speaker, it is great news that a small portion of the EVs that are actually sold have parts that are manufactured in Canada. However, does the member know what would further increase the parts made in Canada? It is if the Liberal government would take our plan and remove the GST from new car purchases. That would signal to the industry and to consumers that we are serious about getting the industry moving. It would increase sales, and even more parts would be manufactured at facilities like the great manufacturer of auto parts in my riding. Hopefully, the Liberals will collaborate with us and remove the taxes on vehicles.

[Translation]

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to understand what our Conservative colleagues are trying to accomplish.

The government backed down on consumer carbon pricing. It introduced Bill C-5 to suspend environmental laws and build pipelines. It added more money for oil and gas subsidies in the last budget. There was a pipeline project for a million barrels a day and an additional 300,000 barrels a day for Trans Mountain. The greenhouse gas emissions cap for the oil and gas sector was scrapped. Now the Conservatives are attacking transportation electrification.

Does my colleague realize that the government has done almost everything the oil industry wanted? What are his ideas for reducing greenhouse gas emissions in the transportation sector? Does he think climate change does not exist?

• (1635)

[English]

Michael Guglielmin: Mr. Speaker, it is very important that we support our oil and gas sector in this country. We know that because our country is currently under threat from an American trade war, and our number one resource and number one driver of the economy is our natural resources.

We have among the strictest environmental regulations in the entire world, and we make some of the cleanest products here in Canada. This is something we should be proud of. This is something we should stand up for and promote. We should be focused not only on exporting oil and gas to the world but on building cars here in Canada, protecting auto jobs here in Canada and creating the business environment and regulatory environment for businesses to manufacture products and export them to the world.

Vincent Ho (Richmond Hill South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals announced last week, as part of their so-called auto strategy, that they are providing \$2.3 billion of taxpayer money in rebates for Canadians to purchase EVs. The problem is that this rebate is available for foreign-made EVs, and a vast majority of EVs purchased in Canada are produced elsewhere. Effectively, this taxpayer-funded Liberal rebate will now subsidize American EV producers, including those that chose to relocate to the U.S. from Canada because of American tariffs. This is a slap in the face for Canadian auto workers who are facing layoffs, and it is an insult to call this an auto strategy.

Should Canadians be outraged that the Liberals are sending billions of Canadian taxpayer dollars to the U.S. auto sector, while tens of thousands of Canadian auto workers are being laid off because the Liberal Prime Minister failed to get a deal with the U.S.?

Michael Guglielmin: Mr. Speaker, as I said in my speech, I find it very perplexing that at a time when we are under an unprecedented attack on our auto industry from the American President through tariffing one of our key sectors, the plan for our auto strategy encompasses within it this idea that we are going to subsidize vehicles that are mostly made in the United States. It absolutely makes no sense. What does that say to the hard-working men and women in our auto sector who have been laid off and face increasing uncertainty. We have 5,000 jobs that have been lost and many more are on the chopping block. When will the Liberals take our plan to get the GST off all cars?

[Translation]

G rard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenrahk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to take part in this debate to clearly demonstrate that we need to take positive action to help the Canadian industry, which is currently in a critical situation. Unfortunately, this is nothing new. It is important to take the right approach, but we know that the government has adopted an approach that, in our opinion, is not the right one for the Canadian auto industry.

I would remind members that, over the past 10 years, auto production in Canada has decreased by nearly half. In 2016, when the Liberals came to power, 2.3 million cars were being made in Canada. After 10 years of the Liberals being at the helm, there are now 1.2 million cars being made here. Since the Liberals came to power, the Canadian auto industry's output has decreased by about half. Things have not improved since the new Prime Minister took office. The auto industry has lost 5,000 jobs. That is not something to celebrate. It is very serious. Businesses have literally shut down. At Paccar on Montreal's north shore, 725 people did not get their contracts renewed. They lost their jobs.

Business of Supply

Of course, that has had a major impact on the very powerful sector in Ontario, but also across Canada. We know that hundreds of companies in Quebec work hand in hand with the automotive industry and are directly affected by the problems the industry has been facing for more than 10 years, particularly the decline in automotive production in Canada.

Now the government has introduced a strategy to supposedly help the industry. The approach developed by the government involves subsidies: \$2.3 billion in subsidies to buy EVs, most, if not the vast majority, of which are not manufactured in Canada. We believe that this is the wrong approach.

First, a subsidy is money that is taken from workers' pockets. I am tempted to say that the money is taken from taxes, particularly the GST, but I cannot say that. For those listening to us right now, every penny they pay in GST is used solely to pay the interest on the debt. Incidentally, that debt has doubled since the Liberals formed government, and it is accompanied by a deficit of about \$80 billion, the likes of which we have never seen. That is since the current Prime Minister took office.

Subsidies do not fall from the sky. The money is collected from workers and distributed by the government, which chooses the winners and losers. This is not the right approach, especially since it can have serious adverse effects. I would like to point out that the idea of subsidies has been widely criticized. Auto expert Antoine Joubert wrote that there have indeed been government subsidies, but that they have had an adverse effect. According to Mr. Joubert, these are "fake rebates", because in three months' time, we will see that the real cost of the car has not changed. He said that the problem is the message the public is getting, the implication that buyers will receive a \$5,000 gift, when that money is going directly into the pockets of the automaker, not the citizens or the buyers. "Please don't try to convince us that taxpayers are getting their money back", Antoine Joubert wrote.

Yesterday, Philippe Léger wrote in the newspaper *Le Journal de Montréal* that these subsidies are essentially meant for certain classes of Canadians who do not need such assistance. In addition, he said, it is well known that, with demand rising, manufacturers will be incentivized to raise their prices. In short, it is a bad idea masquerading as a good idea, but it is not the right approach to help the industry.

First, let us discuss the government's funny business regarding the subsidy. The government proudly said that it was going to help people buy EVs. It said that the subsidies would be targeted and that they would help the industry. As we all saw, it did not necessarily help consumers, and it turned into quite a boondoggle for the industry. As soon as the government decides to pick winners and losers, well, that distorts the market, which causes unfortunate effects.

Members may recall that, last year, when January started, buyers were entitled to a \$5,000 subsidy. All of a sudden, on January 13, with no warning and with no mitigation measures, poof, the \$5,000 subsidy was cut, just like that. People who were planning to buy a car, who had done their math and had gone to their dealership were suddenly told that the subsidy no longer existed. That is what I call the Liberals' half-baked way of doing things.

• (1640)

Later, on June 12, the government confirmed that the subsidies would be reinstated. The subsidies were suddenly cut on January 13, and then on June 12, two experienced ministers from this government advised people to wait, saying that it would happen, that they should not be discouraged and that the subsidies would be reinstated. We asked when this would happen and the Liberals told us that they would look into it, that it would happen. Nothing happened in June, July, August, September, October or November.

People who wanted to buy a car and who were told on June 12 to wait for the subsidies to be reinstated waited six months for nothing. Then, the budget was tabled on November 4. Everyone expected the subsidies to return. What happened? Nothing. As a result, all those who were waiting for the subsidy were left out in the cold.

Then what happened? Last week, the government changed its mind and brought back the subsidy. It is hardly surprising that EV sales are struggling. I know that those people over there are making it up as they go, meddling in things that are none of their business and picking winners and losers. They convince the supposed winners that subsidies are finally coming back, but then they do not come back, and then they finally do. That totally distorts the market, which is exactly what happened.

Going back to Antoine Joubert, he wrote that it was a surreal solution that ended up destabilizing the industry by creating a highly artificial market. This was another of the government's blunders, although it could care less about the impact on the industry or on dealers.

People do not need subsidies to choose electric cars. I am the living proof of that, or maybe I should say the driving proof. Two and a half years ago, I assessed the situation, assessed my needs and decided that an electric vehicle would work for me. Electric cars may not work for everyone, but they fit my needs. I bought a used electric car. There was no subsidy. However, it cost half the price of a new vehicle.

Incidentally, when an electric car works well, it works really well. Problems are rare once it has been properly broken in. There are some very good deals to be had right now when it comes to used electric vehicles.

As I said, I bought a used electric car, without subsidies, without obligations, and it was my personal choice. I decided it was the right thing to do. I have driven 120,000 kilometres in that car and have not had any problems. It is possible to go electric without subsidies. When the government gets involved, there are more problems.

Business of Supply

That is why we are suggesting an approach that directly helps car buyers, workers and the industry. How would it work? Removing the GST on new cars manufactured here in Canada would kill three birds with one stone. Eliminating the GST on new Canadian vehicles would help buyers, workers and the industry. It is a win-win situation. What is more, it does not cost taxpayers anything. We are not going to take \$2.3 billion out of workers' pockets to choose the winners. Anyone who wants to buy a car will be encouraged to buy a Canadian car to help the industry and also to help us as Canadians.

I would like to move this favourable amendment:

That the motion be amended by adding the following:

“, the GM facility in Oshawa, the Stellantis facility in Brampton, the Paccar facility in Sainte-Thérèse, and all other severance packages for Canadian workers in the auto sector.”

• (1645)

The Deputy Speaker: The amendment is in order.

Questions and comments. The hon. member for Beauport—Limoilou.

Steeve Lavoie (Beauport—Limoilou, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech. I greatly admire him and he knows it. I have an observation to make. Some people might associate the words “unreliable”, “troublesome” or “lack of infrastructure” with EVs today. However, that is actually how the gas-powered car was described in the early 20th century. It was said to be unreliable. It was said that there was no infrastructure and that it would never replace horses. Still, people believed in it, and look where that led us. EVs are now at the same stage of development. They need infrastructure and investment to succeed to the same extent that the gas-powered car did. I want to know whether my colleague is looking to the future or to the past.

Gérard Deltell: Mr. Speaker, electric cars are undoubtedly part of the future of the automotive world. I am living proof of that. However, the government does not need to subsidize EV purchases, since people are able to buy them without subsidies. I am a living example of this. My car has 120,000 kilometres on it, and I have been driving it for two and a half years. As the member is well aware, I live in Quebec City. I drive 450 kilometres each way every week and it works fine. I just have to stop for a while, about 15 minutes. At 61, I have to stop for a little while anyway because I cannot drive for five hours straight.

We do not need subsidies. The government is taking \$2.3 billion of taxpayers' money and choosing the winners and losers. That is the wrong approach. We should be getting rid of the GST. We should be leaving more money in people's pockets to help them. Get rid of the GST on the purchase of Canadian cars—

• (1650)

The Deputy Speaker: I will have to stop the hon. member there to allow for some more questions and comments.

The hon. member for Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lestiguj.

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lestiguj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by taking a moment to recognize scouting week, which runs from February 16 to 22 this

year. The scouting movement is an educational path for young people that is based on volunteerism and is open to all, as conceived by its founder, Baden-Powell. Scouting is the largest youth movement in the world, and the francophone scouting movement brings together more than 10,000 young people across the country, supported by more than 3,700 dedicated volunteers. I was a cub scout myself as a kid growing up in the Gaspé region. I remember the inclusive and constructive values that were promoted, including community involvement, teamwork and learning. I have fond memories of camping in the forest in the dead of winter. I am happy to know that Baden-Powell's work continues to this day, and I am pleased to highlight the scouting movement today. Congratulations to the scouts of Quebec and to the volunteers, and, as the motto says, “be prepared”.

Now, I would like to ask my colleague a question. Why move this amendment at this stage of the debate on the motion?

Gérard Deltell: Mr. Speaker, as a scout, I am also always prepared. Fifty years ago, I was a founding cub of the 112th Château-d'Eau scout group and my father was the first Bagheera. I am very proud of that.

I must admit that the beginning of the member's intervention surprised me a little, but it is very important. Our proposal is twofold. First, the government must remove the GST, but it must also use its existing authority to reduce the amount of tax withheld on severance payments issued to workers at various companies that are directly affected, including the Paccar plant in Sainte-Thérèse, as the member from Quebec is well aware.

[English]

Tamara Jansen (Cloverdale—Langley City, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals finally removed the EV sales mandate, which was a common-sense thing we had been begging them to do, but then they imposed a tailpipe emissions standard so strict that only electric vehicles would realistically qualify. As such, the mandate disappeared in the press release, but it reappeared in the regulations. Does my colleague think that Canadians appreciate these kinds of games?

Gérard Deltell: Mr. Speaker, obviously it is wrong to have the mandate. If we oblige people to buy something, we will force problems with the industry. I am living proof that we can run electric cars without subsidies and without obligation, because I picked up a used car. When one buys a used car, it is half the price, and it is a good occasion right now to pick one up for half the price, with no obligation and no subsidies. That is the way to address it correctly.

Shannon Miedema (Halifax, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Guelph.

Business of Supply

It is my pleasure to participate in this debate today. As we all know, times are changing. We are in uncertain times in an uncertain world, but our government is focused on what we can control. As part of Canada's new industrial strategy, we are transforming our economy from one that is reliant on a single trade partner to one that is diversified with many partnerships and is more resilient to global shocks. Canada is building a more independent and resilient economy, and we are working to catalyze massive new levels of investment.

In that context, I would like to thank the member opposite for raising the government's new auto strategy. For over 100 years, Canada's automotive industry has been a cornerstone of our economy, underpinning advanced manufacturing, driving innovation and supporting hundreds of thousands of well-paying jobs across the country. However, given the current uncertain trade environment, as well as advancing technology and evolving consumer demand, it is as important as ever that we take action to maintain and improve Canada's auto sector. In fact, it is a unique opportunity for us to do so.

That is why, on February 5, the Prime Minister launched a new strategy to transform Canada's auto industry. Recognizing that the future of the automotive industry is electrified and connected, the government is prioritizing the development of the full value chain of next-generation vehicles. Within five years, electric vehicle sales are projected to reach nearly 40% of global car sales.

It is important that Canada be among those at the forefront of that evolution. Our government will introduce stronger greenhouse gas emissions standards that will put Canada on a path to achieve a goal of 75% EV sales by 2035 and 90% EV sales by 2040. This will also help to reduce Canada's carbon footprint and improve our global leadership in clean energy.

At the same time, repealing the electric vehicle availability standard will allow manufacturers to use new technologies to respond to consumer preferences while driving EV adoption, but to grow domestic demand for EVs, they must become more affordable for working Canadians. That is why the government will launch a five-year EV affordability program to lower the cost of electric vehicles for Canadians and create a strong domestic market. The \$2.3-billion program will offer purchase or lease incentives of up to \$5,000 for battery electric and fuel cell EVs, and up to \$2,500 for plug-in hybrids with a final transaction value of up to \$50,000 on cars made by countries that Canada has free trade agreements with.

The Canadian Climate Institute and others have shown with research based on the past that EV incentives have driven the adoption of EVs across this country from the very first one. To support the Canadian automotive industry, the \$50,000 cap will not apply to Canadian-made EVs and plug-in hybrids.

Through the auto strategy, the government will also enhance the national EV charging network with investments of \$1.5 billion through the charging and hydrogen refuelling infrastructure initiative. We are making it easier and more convenient for drivers to charge their car no matter where they are. EV adoption will become more convenient for local consumers in my riding of Halifax and across this country as more stations are available in parking lots and mixed-use residential buildings. Those stations will need pow-

er, so measures announced in budget 2025 aim to ensure that Canada has the clean and affordable energy needed to develop, manufacture and drive the cars of the future.

Underpinning these advances are needed strategic investments, so to accelerate investment in Canada's auto manufacturing sector, the government will allocate \$3 billion from the strategic response fund and up to \$100 million from the regional tariff response initiative to help the auto industry adapt, grow and diversify to new markets. We will also take advantage of the productivity superdeduction and reduced corporate tax rates for zero-emission technology manufacturers to encourage investment in clean technologies and EVs, as well as strengthen Canada's automotive remission framework to reward companies that produce and invest in Canada.

The government will also establish a comprehensive trade regime that strengthens the competitiveness of the auto sector through new partnerships. For example, Canada recently deepened its strategic partnership with the Republic of Korea by signing a memorandum of understanding to strengthen Canada-Korea industrial collaboration for future mobility. As a port city, Halifax is especially well positioned to support the increased demand for shipping and distribution.

● (1655)

The recently announced partnership with China aims to drive new Chinese joint venture investments in Canada and allow for a fixed volume of Chinese EV imports into the Canadian market. Although countertariffs on auto imports from the United States will be maintained to ensure a level playing field for Canadian automotive manufacturers in the domestic market, the government will continue to advance this auto strategy within an integrated North American automotive industry.

Canada's auto sector is built on nation-to-nation collaboration. The North American auto industry succeeds when our integrated supply chains are strong and when we compete together globally. Canada and the U.S. have built this integrated industry together over decades, and we are stronger together. By making strategic investments and solidifying trade partnerships, Canada is positioning itself as a global leader in vehicle electrification, autonomous and self-driving technologies and the battery supply chains that will power the future of mobility.

Business of Supply

I would also like to mention the help we will provide to the auto workers who will build the vehicles amid short-term uncertainty. To protect Canadian auto workers and businesses from immediate pressures while helping bridge them to the future, the government will provide support to employees through a new work-sharing grant, preventing layoffs and supporting worker retention so businesses can plan for the future. In addition, up to 66,000 workers across Canada, including displaced auto workers, will receive employment assistance and re-skilling supports as part of a \$750-million investment.

The actions the government is taking will shape the Canadian auto industry for decades to come. These strategic decisions and generational investments aim to build a strong Canadian automotive sector where Canadian workers build the cars of the future. Backed by a world-class workforce, globally recognized part suppliers and leading-edge research and development, Canada's automotive sector is building the vehicles of today, and it will help build the vehicles of tomorrow. By protecting the industry and incentivizing automakers to build here, we can transform Canada's workers and businesses to compete and win in this new global environment.

Our government is focused on working with all our partners here and abroad to find innovative solutions for modernizing our auto industry. We can lead and capitalize on the opportunities we have to pivot and adapt in the face of challenge. Our new auto strategy is economically sound and environmentally sound, and I am very excited to roll it out.

• (1700)

Dave Epp (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in her intervention, my colleague stated some projections, and if I caught them, she said that the projected global EV sales would go to 40% globally and the plan was to have them go to 90% by 2040.

What happened to projections? We had an EV mandate that I am sure also came along with projections. Obviously, that failed. They did not come about. Where is the confidence that these projections are anywhere close to something that is going to happen? Under the previous EV mandate, the domestic auto manufacturers had to ship money south to Tesla until the EV mandate was rolled back. Now we are shipping money south in a different form.

Where is the confidence in the new projections?

Shannon Miedema: Mr. Speaker, the electric vehicle availability standard that we were debating at the environment committee was never actually live. It was still being debated. It was not going to start until 2035, so none of that has actually happened. The global trends have been fairly consistent. What has happened right now between Canada and the United States we could not really predict. The member is right, but we are where we are now.

Our government is focusing on what we can control right now. There are a lot of studies on the importance of things like rebates and other pieces that are required to drive a transformation in an industry. I am really excited about this auto strategy and what it is going to do for Canada.

Michael Guglielmin: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

As acting opposition whip, I approve of the amendment proposed earlier to the motion.

The Deputy Speaker: It is noted.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Abitibi—Témiscamingue.

[Translation]

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, since we are in a debate about cars, I will ask a question about mechanics. Then, since we are discussing subsidies for electric vehicles, I will ask a question about money.

I would like to know if the member for Halifax thinks that the fact that the Conservative Party receives a lot of money from donors who are heavily involved in the oil and gas industry could have anything to do with its choice to use its opposition day to remove subsidies for electric vehicles, which would obviously have a strong, lasting effect on the automotive industry of tomorrow.

[English]

Shannon Miedema: Mr. Speaker, I will not comment on the Conservative Party's priorities around oil and gas, but I will say what I said before: The research shows that incentives for electric vehicles are really important in the early adoption phase. The idea of this five-year plan with the rebates is that by the time we hit those five years, the cost of electric vehicles should have continued to decrease and will hopefully be near cost parity with ICE, internal combustion engine, vehicles. That is part of the strategy we are trying to put in place today.

[Translation]

Angelo Iacono (Alfred-Pellan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since more than 500,000 Canadians depend directly on the auto industry and our workers are facing unjustified tariffs from the United States as well as global changes that happen quickly, can my colleague explain how the government's auto strategy protects Canadian workers, attracts investment and strengthens our industry's resilience in the face of tariffs and global changes?

Business of Supply

• (1705)

[English]

Shannon Miedema: Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we are addressing, not only with the auto industry strategy but also with all the major work of the government right now: reducing our reliance on the United States and diversifying our trade partnerships across the globe. That is why we are really excited about the progress that has been made with the signing of all the new trade agreements internationally with the Prime Minister. We are really excited about the conversations we are having with Korea on the auto sector here. It sounds like there is a real appetite for investing in Canada and having a lot of these vehicles built by Canadians in Canada.

Dominique O'Rourke (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I would like to join others in expressing my condolences on the profound tragedies at Tumbler Ridge and Kitigan Zibi. Having lost people close to me, I know it is really challenging, when one's world has been shattered, to feel like the rest of the world is moving along. I just want those communities to know that we grieve with them, and they are in our hearts even though we are continuing the work of this place.

I am very proud to represent the riding of Guelph, where we see leadership in the auto sector every single day, in parts manufacturing. Guelph is home to Linamar, Denso, Polycon, CPK and many others. Many people in Guelph work at Toyota in Cambridge, and that plant has received more quality awards than any other plant on the planet.

In our region, we know auto manufacturing. That is why I chair the auto caucus. I understand in my bones how important the sector, with 500,000 jobs, is to Canada and to our communities. In Guelph alone, there are 12,000 jobs in the auto sector.

I care about the auto workers and the health of the sector. This government cares. That is why we announced a comprehensive auto strategy last week. Through that strategy, we will accelerate investment in Canada's auto manufacturing sector, with \$3 billion from the strategic response fund and up to \$100 million from the regional tariff response initiative to help the auto industry adapt, grow and diversify to new markets.

I have been promoting this in my riding, and I hope all members of the House are reaching out to potentially tariff-affected businesses and letting them know what supports exist, even if they voted against those supports in budget 2025.

The auto strategy will harness the productivity superdeduction and reduced corporate tax rates for zero-emissions technology manufacturers, to encourage investment in clean technology and EVs. The productivity superdeduction is another measure to enable all manufacturers to invest in capital or business that can be written off in the first year, and was also opposed in the budget by members opposite.

The auto strategy will rationalize emissions reduction policies to focus on outcomes. This means that stronger greenhouse gas emission standards put Canada on a path to achieve a goal of 75% of EV sales by 2035 and 90% of EV sales by 2040 to reduce our carbon footprint and secure Canada's global leadership in clean energy.

I am really thrilled to be speaking at the same time as my hon. colleague, the member for Halifax. I attended the environment caucus presentations from Electric Mobility Canada, and environment caucus members joined in auto caucus meetings. We really understand that there is an exciting intersection of auto and electrification that is positive, and that is where the world is going.

The more stringent emissions standards will allow manufacturers to use a range of technologies to meet the standards and respond to consumer preferences in the near term while driving adoption over time. This is what the manufacturers have been asking for as they innovate in their technology and as they move towards their goals of net zero.

Earlier today, some members in this House talked about automakers as laggards, but I want to applaud the industry's leadership in regard to electrification. Toyota is committed to becoming carbon-neutral across the vehicle life cycle, in its manufacturing and in its vehicles, by 2050. Consumers are with them. Toyota Canada's Q3 results show electrified vehicles representing 49.4% of overall sales. The demand and the expertise are there. Honda also has a net-zero initiative for 2050.

This trend is global. Electric car sales exceeded \$17 billion globally in 2024, reaching a sales share of more than 20%. Electric car sales in 2025 were expected to exceed \$20 billion worldwide and to represent more than one-quarter of cars sold across the globe.

In Canada, we do not have the 2025 data yet, but in 2024, EVs were responsible for 60% of the net increase in total vehicle registrations. They accounted for one in seven new vehicles sold that year, but depending on the region and the model, that number was as high as one in three or one in four new vehicles sold in 2024. There is consumer demand. What happened?

• (1710)

When the incentives were paused, that demand dropped off as consumers waited to see if they would come back. Therefore, we are going to strengthen domestic demand by making EVs more affordable and the infrastructure more reliable for Canadians. That is why we have launched a five-year EV affordability program, to lower the cost of EVs for Canadians and to create a stronger domestic consumer market. The plan was always to support EV adoption over 10 years. We are resuming that plan because, frankly, it worked.

Business of Supply

This is a piece that has been missing as well. We are going to offer individuals and business owners purchase or lease incentives of up to \$5,000 for battery-electric and fuel-cell EVs and up to \$2,500 for plug-in hybrids with a final transaction value of up to \$50,000 on cars made by countries that Canada has a free trade agreement with. To support the Canadian automotive industry, this \$50,000 cap, as we know, will not apply to Canadian-made EVs and plug-in hybrids.

Let us be very clear. The rebates for the purchase of an electric vehicle or a plug-in hybrid go into the pockets of individual Canadians or companies that purchase them. That is where those incentives go. Even if the vehicle comes from the U.S., it is subject to countertariffs, and it contains parts from Canada made by Canadian workers, which means it is part of our Canadian auto sector. Let us not allow the Conservatives to confuse people on this point. The Government of Canada, the Prime Minister, the Minister of Industry and cabinet members have listened to Canadians. Canadians are embracing the EV rebates.

Canadians also want to address the issue of range anxiety. They want a better national EV charging network, so we are investing, as my colleague said, \$1.5 billion to support the charging infrastructure.

We are establishing a comprehensive trade regime that strengthens the competitiveness of the auto sector by strengthening the remissions framework to reward companies that produce and invest in Canada, which we should all be able to agree on. We are attracting new investment to Canada, which should also be an easy point of agreement, and we are maintaining our countertariffs on auto imports from the United States to ensure a level playing field for Canadian automotive manufacturers in the domestic market.

Finally, the automotive strategy protects Canadian auto workers and businesses from immediate pressures while helping them bridge to the future, if required, through support and re-skilling. As that happens, other players are coming into the market, like EV battery plants in St. Thomas and Windsor. This strategy has been supported by the Canadian Vehicle Manufacturers' Association. It welcomes the government's automotive strategy, stating:

Funding to support renewed purchase incentives and a robust charging infrastructure strategy will help continue to drive EV adoption, and CVMA members are well-positioned to support the shift to electrification through diverse product offerings.

The Global Automakers of Canada stated:

We are pleased that the government has provided greater clarity on issues such as the Electric Vehicle Accessibility Standard, the reinstatement of EV incentives, and a commitment to aggressively build out the charging infrastructure.

The members of the Ontario Auto Mayors caucus are thrilled, and the next one is my favourite. The Canadian Auto Dealer president and CEO stated:

The expanded and adjusted support measures aimed at maintaining Canada's vital automotive manufacturing sector are essential as we enter the critical phase of the CUSMA renegotiation with the U.S. Dealers across Canada particularly applaud the government for ending the EV mandate and choosing a better path forward for EV adoption that is more in line with diverse technology, charging infrastructure and overall consumer demand.

Even Unifor representatives are saying that they are ecstatic and believe this is very helpful for the sector.

The Conservative motion before the House today is not a strategy. It is not sound policy. It is not even accurate. We need clarity, not confusion. EV incentives go to Canadian households and Canadian businesses. We have an integrated auto manufacturing sector. All vehicles assembled in North America have parts from Canada. The strategic response fund is helpful.

I do not support this opposition motion, because there is no substance. I support Canada's auto sector strategy. I support solutions that work. I stand with the sector and with our auto workers.

• (1715)

Vincent Ho (Richmond Hill South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I find the Liberal member's speech kind of rich.

Last week, the Liberals announced their so-called auto strategy. It had a \$2.3-billion fund for some rebates for EVs that are purchased in Canada. While that sounds great, the problem is that most EVs purchased in Canada are made elsewhere, including in the United States, where many factories are relocating. Effectively, this rebate is now subsidizing U.S. and other auto manufacturers.

Why are the Liberals subsidizing foreign auto manufacturers to the tune of \$2.3 billion when tens of thousands of auto workers are being laid off here in Canada? Will the Liberals support Canadian auto workers?

Dominique O'Rourke: Mr. Speaker, we will absolutely support Canadian auto workers. Let us be very clear. We also have the Canadian Automobile Dealers Association. I do not believe the Conservatives, for this motion, have consulted with any of the large associations. A lot of Canadians will buy a Kia. A lot of Canadians will buy electric vehicles from a lot of places. Why the focus on the North American auto market? Why are they now talking down some of our partners, where the parts are being sold and the collaborations are taking place? We have an integrated North American auto market. We are going to fight for that integrated auto market. We are going to fight for auto workers.

[*Translation*]

Marie-Hélène Gaudreau (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am reflecting on my colleague's question from a few minutes ago about the motion. How could the Conservatives have left some things out of the motion? Why were they forced to amend it after we listed the Quebec businesses that were not included?

Dominique O'Rourke: Mr. Speaker, I apologize but I do not understand the question. I did not move the amendment and I have not read it. If you would like to ask me a question relating to my speech or the plan, I would be happy to answer.

The Deputy Speaker: I would remind the member that when addressing another member, she must do so through the Chair and avoid using “you.”

The hon. member for Alfred-Pellan.

Angelo Iacono (Alfred-Pellan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, with the global auto industry rapidly shifting toward electrification and clean technologies, can my colleague explain how the government's automotive strategy—including incentives for Canadian production, tax measures to attract investment, the development of the battery and critical minerals supply chain, and support for EVs adoption and charging infrastructure—is going to strengthen Canada's competitiveness, secure well-paying jobs and position our country as a global leader in the automotive industry of tomorrow?

Dominique O'Rourke: Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Alfred-Pellan answered his own question. Yes, we must look at the automotive strategy and budget as a comprehensive plan to attract investment. We need to look at not only the automotive sector, but also Canada's manufacturing sector as a whole. We need to look at the entire supply chain, from critical minerals to auto parts, from assembly to distribution and charging stations. This will build confidence in the sector and ensure we have the best workers in the world, equipped to do the job.

[English]

Dave Epp (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite went to great lengths to proclaim that the subsidy will flow to the consumers or the buyers of EVs.

Is it her contention that the sellers of EVs sold in Canada will not incorporate that subsidy into their selling price?

• (1720)

Dominique O'Rourke: Mr. Speaker, the mechanism for the EV rebate will be similar to what it was a few years ago. If someone goes to a dealership and purchases a vehicle, depending on the manufacturer's suggested retail price and if it fits the conditions, they will get that rebate. It goes into their pocket. We are seeing movement of all types through the auto sector. For a party that loves consumer choice, the EV rebate gives them that consumer choice.

Ellis Ross (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is tough to get back to House business given the events that happened in Tumbler Ridge on Tuesday. Canada is still trying to recover. We send our thoughts and prayers to the community, the people and the families of Tumbler Ridge. They are going to have a long journey of healing. My family is quite upset about this.

Today, we are talking about electric vehicles and the rebate initiative from the federal government. Listening to the speeches, I keep hearing the conversation go back to how we are supporting Canadian auto worker, that the world is moving towards electric vehicles and how Canada intends to join that trend, but American EV automakers are actually writing off their losses, and the same thing is happening in China. Its domestic sales are collapsing. Canada is

Business of Supply

actually throwing a lifeline to America for EVs made in the United States with a rebate. There is only one car that could possibly qualify for the rebate that we are talking about; the rest of it is going to help an industry that is dying in the United States.

The agreement the government signed with China is going to help an industry that is dying in China. It is an over-produced, over-subsidized vehicle. However, it does not end there. Tesla has revenues coming from carbon credits. Since 2017, without selling anything, it has raised over \$10 billion in carbon credits from auto manufacturers that do not produce electric vehicles, including those in Canada. We will be sending \$2.3 billion of rebates to help a failing industry in the United States, and our auto manufacturers, or what is left of them in Canada, that do not produce electric vehicles will have to buy carbon credits from an American company. How is this building Canada strong?

We hear all these talking points, but everything is actually geared toward the United States and helping its economy, helping it with its jobs and helping it re-establish its manufacturing sector. Canada not only is helping it with this rebate, but we also previously gave Stellantis hundreds of millions of dollars to produce jobs and vehicles in Canada. What did Stellantis do? It said, “Thank you very much,” left Canada and went to the United States. It is going to build a plant down there. Everything is geared toward the United States.

There are the promises made by the Prime Minister. He promised that we are going to be the strongest performing country in the G7. No, we have a failing grade on that. He promised that we are going to be an energy superpower. No, we are not. He wanted to be judged by the price of groceries at the grocery store. No.

One of the most significant promises he made was to President Trump, and it was that he was going to invest \$1 trillion Canadian into the United States economy. I think we are well on the road to seeing that promise fulfilled, even if it is in instalments, like a \$2.3-billion rebate going to the electric vehicle manufacturers in the United States.

By the way, when the Prime Minister came back to Canada, he clarified that it would not be taxpayer dollars, but that it might be private investment dollars. Well, this tax rebate is coming from the government; it is coming from taxpayers. It is \$2.3 billion, and that is on top of the \$52 billion that the government committed to creating an electric vehicle supply chain in Canada for a vehicle that is produced in the United States.

• (1725)

Now we are looking at 49,000 electric vehicles coming from China. We are helping lagging economies, but doing nothing to help our own economy and our own people, whether we are talking about jobs or affordability.

Business of Supply

I will say one thing, and I talked about this a lot in the B.C. legislature, but the electric vehicle mandate was unfair and unreasonable. Putting financial pressure on people to buy an electric vehicle, especially in ridings like mine, in Skeena—Bulkley Valley, where it is not practical for those who work in forestry or on farms. Perhaps I should say they used to work in forestry, because the industry is basically shutting down left, right and centre in B.C. An EV is not practical. Therefore, to put financial pressure on people who are already struggling with affordability, making sure they get punished if they buy a gas or diesel vehicle, is unfair.

What has replaced this electric vehicle mandate? A tailpipe emissions mandate, which is going to accomplish the same thing as the EV mandate. It is going to put pressure on Canadians, especially those who cannot even think about purchasing an electric vehicle. This is not fair. Government should not be putting more hurdles and obstacles in front of Canadians, who cannot afford a home, cannot afford groceries and cannot afford to pay their utilities.

This is not what the Prime Minister promised, especially when I do not think the Canadian public understands where we are going with respect to investments. This is not just investing the \$2.3 billion in rebates, which will go to the auto manufacturers in the United States. According to Natural Resources Canada, we will need around 450,000 public EV chargers, along with nearly 12 million in homes, by 2035 to accommodate the projected new EV car sales.

We talked a lot about this in B.C. The infrastructure we need in B.C., especially in the rural areas, is just not there. We are talking about a supply of electricity that B.C. does not have in the first place. Then there is the transmission line, which comes right into our neighbourhoods and into our homes, but it is just not there. It is going to cost billions more to provide the infrastructure for the EV mandates. Who is going to pay for that in the end? It will not be the government; it will be the consumers and the taxpayers.

In fact, right now, I am getting complaints at my office about the new hydroelectricity bills that people got in the last couple of days. They are asking what is causing the jump, but I do not know. I know that the hydroelectricity cost for the dams in B.C. was a deferred cost. Just like with the unmanageable budget the Liberal government has put in place, at some point somebody is going to have to pay that bill. If they do not, there will be consequences to our sovereignty. There are many examples of what happens if a country cannot pay its bills.

I know that to some people here, the idea of being fiscally responsible is a joke, but under the Indian Act, it was hammered into us, as chiefs in council, that we were not allowed to go into debt or have deficits, under punishment from the federal government. Those rules are still there today.

We can talk all we want about this brand new world of driving an electric vehicle—

• (1730)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Questions and comments, the hon. member for Alfred-Pellan.

[Translation]

Angelo Iacono (Alfred-Pellan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I can see that my colleague is blaming our government for the fact that EVs in Canada are a complete failure.

I am curious to know how my colleague can claim to stand up for auto workers while rejecting a strategy that incentivizes production in Canada, protects jobs during the transition and reduces our dependence on a single export market. Canada is going to become a country that will concentrate significantly on EVs.

Why does my colleague say that this is a failure?

[English]

Ellis Ross: Mr. Speaker, I said that because the Liberal record already shows what failure looks like. The Liberals gave hundreds of millions of dollars to Stellantis to build a manufacturing plant here. They claimed they were going to get it back. They claimed there was a promise of jobs. What did Stellantis do? It took the money and ran down to the United States to build jobs and cars in the United States.

What is so different here? How will this rebate actually produce jobs and improve the economy in Canada? It is all going to benefit the United States.

[Translation]

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lis-tuguj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois believes that EVs are the future.

There are currently no EV assembly plants in Quebec. However, subsidies for purchasing EVs are effective because they fast-track the electrification of transportation and make EVs more affordable.

What does the Conservative Party have against more affordable EVs?

[English]

Ellis Ross: Mr. Speaker, I have nothing against affordable electric vehicles. I have nothing against affordable gas and diesel vehicles. I have nothing against them.

My opposition has to do with how the rebate is essentially going to fix a dying economy in the United States, Ford and General Motors, while at the same time it will benefit Tesla, an American company that will benefit from more carbon credits.

Kurt Holman (London—Fanshawe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, this is the first time I am standing in the House of Commons since the tragic event that happened on Tuesday, February 10. On behalf of the people of London—Fanshawe, our thoughts and prayers go to the community of Tumbler Ridge, British Columbia.

Business of Supply

I would also like to ask a question of my colleague, the member for Skeena—Bulkley Valley. Despite the Liberal government's commitment of \$52 billion to an EV supply chain, most vehicles made and sold in Canada remain gas powered, so that policy would reward countries that already dominate EV production.

Could my colleague please expand on this concern, which could affect many Canadians?

Ellis Ross: Mr. Speaker, what I want to talk about, and what I try to talk about, is a made-in-Canada approach for Canadians. We have asked questions of the Canadian government about funding initiatives in Skeena—Bulkley Valley that would produce jobs and revenues for Canadians. We are talking about Telkwa Coal, which needs infrastructure. Terrace's industrial lands need infrastructure help. We are talking about the Stewart port, which needs infrastructure dollars. We have had no answers.

We have the answers for a made-in-Canada approach. We do not need an approach that helps a dying electric vehicle industry in the United States. That is what this rebate is going to do. It is going to rescue the electric vehicle industry in the United States.

• (1735)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member does not seem to recognize the integrated automobile industry between Canada and the United States. Many of the parts come from Canada or will be manufactured in Canada. They will go to the United States to be put into electric vehicles, and then, yes, some of them will come back to Canada.

Does he recognize the integration of the automobile industry in Canada?

Ellis Ross: Mr. Speaker, I do recognize that integration, but it is not only in the auto industry. We are intricately connected in all sorts of trade. That is why the CUSMA negotiations are so important, but the diversification we are talking about does not mean we should spend 2.3 billion of Canadian tax dollars to help a dying industry in the United States.

Why are we not investing that into the industry in Canada to bring back the jobs that were lost just this past year under the Liberal government?

Adam Chambers (Simcoe North, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to rise on behalf of the people of Simcoe North, and it is always an honour to rise in the chamber to speak about issues that matter to Canadians.

Before we get into the opposition day motion, the supply day motion, it is important to discuss, with respect to electric vehicles, how we came to be here today.

For years, the Liberal government was chasing an electric vehicle mandate such that, by 2035, 100% of the vehicles sold in this country needed to be electric. For years, the Liberals were wedded to this ideological view that the government should force people to drive certain kinds of vehicles. That was against all the advice from industry. Officials at Environment and Climate Change Canada even raised the prospect that the electric vehicle mandate would drive up the prices of used cars, in turn hurting low-income Canadi-

ans, and would harm individuals in rural and northern communities because of a lack of access to infrastructure.

Since the EV mandate was proposed, Conservatives constantly and consistently demanded that the EV mandate be abolished. I suppose one might say or think that Conservatives should now be very happy because that EV mandate has been abolished. I suppose one might think that we should be applauding the government for listening to Conservatives, for listening to the hundreds of thousands of Canadians who do not want to be told what kind of vehicle to drive. The challenge the government has is that it has now replaced the electric vehicle mandate with an electric vehicle rebate scheme, which it is now reintroducing, that will subsidize the purchase by Canadians of electric vehicles that are not produced in Canada.

In this moment, we do not just have massive deficits. We have deficits double the size of what even former prime minister Justin Trudeau projected. In a time when we have these massive deficits, the government is bringing forward an unfunded program. It needs to borrow additional money to fund this new rebate scheme, where Canadian tax dollars will be going outside of the country to purchase vehicles not built in Canada.

There is another way. It includes the Conservative proposal to take the GST off Canadian-assembled vehicles to reward production that stays in Canada. The automotive sector is on its knees. It is 50% smaller today than it was when the Liberals first took office in 2015. We have seen automotive production continue to be sucked south of the border. President Donald Trump has made it his explicit objective to take Canadian auto sector jobs because, in his words, Americans “don't need” Canadian-made automobiles; they want American-made automobiles.

Of the \$2.3 billion set aside for this rebate program, the lion's share of that amount will go to Canadians to purchase vehicles not assembled in Canada. Even worse, a large amount, millions of dollars if not hundreds of millions of dollars, will go to American automakers that are assembling vehicles in the United States and sending them to Canada. It is bewildering. It is stupefying. It makes no sense why we would take Canadian tax dollars and send them out of the country. It makes even less sense that we would take those tax dollars and send them to American companies. Why would we reward President Trump for his behaviour?

Business of Supply

● (1740)

This is all too common a pattern of behaviour for the government. It introduces bad laws and bad regulation against reasonable advice, only to turn around and reverse itself and then expect that it will be applauded, that it deserves a medal. However, we do not have to think very hard about those examples. It took the Liberals years to realize they made a mistake with the carbon tax. In fact, they went on for years saying that the carbon tax put more money in Canadians' pockets. Then, when they cancelled the carbon tax, they said they were doing it to make life more affordable. No one can make this up.

They also seem to believe that the way forward is to assemble vehicles in Canada for export to markets other than the United States. That is just pure fantasy. There is no planet where it makes sense to build cars in Canada to send to Europe, China or to other countries, other than the United States. This is also evidenced by them linking the tailpipe emissions standards and aligning them with Europe. Those regulations make no sense. We should be aligning on a continental fuel-efficient standard so that vehicles can be assembled in Mexico, the United States or Canada to be sold in those markets. It is just not realistic.

Not only will we be diverging on our standards but safety standards for vehicles in Europe are incredibly different from those in Canada and the United States. That means that vehicles need to be assembled in a different way. It is just not a practical solution. We absolutely need to maintain an integrated market in North America for vehicles. We need to make a deal with the United States that would see a de-escalation of this trade war, especially as it relates to automobiles being produced in Canada. These jobs are not just a job for one individual. These jobs support families. These jobs support communities. These jobs are supported by thousands of other jobs throughout the rest of the supply chain in the conventional vehicle market.

I know the government likes to claim that there are electric vehicle parts produced in Canada for the integrated EV market in the U.S. and that some of the parts in these vehicles will be made in Canada and eventually shipped back in a finished vehicle, but it absolutely pales in comparison to the thousands of parts in the conventional internal combustion engine vehicles that are currently made today and that need to go to the U.S. It is absolutely imperative that we do not decouple and believe there is some fantasyland where Canadians are going to start making vehicles for shipping elsewhere around the world. China is already building plants in eastern Europe. Car manufacturers are building plants in Europe to service that market to reduce transportation costs. We need to be realistic that the most likely scenario to save our auto sector is to ensure market access for Canadian autos, and we should be rewarding Canadians for purchasing Canadian-made products.

In my last 30 seconds, Mr. Speaker, I want to wish you a happy Valentine's Day. I would like to wish my wife a happy Valentine's Day, as well as my two children, my friends at sunny ways and my close friends, including Tom Barlow.

● (1745)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The Chair takes no position on any such matters, but happy Valentine's Day and happy Family Day too.

[Translation]

Angelo Iacono (Alfred-Pellan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my Conservative colleague claims to defend Canadians' choice to drive whatever car they want, so why is he against a strategy that makes EVs more affordable, protects Canadian jobs and gives consumers the freedom to pick their own car?

[English]

Adam Chambers: Mr. Speaker, there is no evidence to suggest that the rebate will protect Canadian jobs, because that rebate is going to go primarily to automakers who do not produce vehicles in Canada. What is even worse is that the rebate is actually higher in the upfront years, the next one or two years, and tapers off. By the time Canadian automakers might actually be producing electric vehicles, that rebate is going to be even less. As such, there is no evidence to suggest that this rebate will protect Canadian jobs. We should take the GST off Canadian-made vehicles. That is a direct way to support Canadian auto workers and their families.

[Translation]

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lestiguj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his speech and his joyful words. I have a question for him.

Why are the Conservatives getting all worked up about EV subsidies, saying that this encourages foreign auto manufacturers, but they are perfectly fine with giving about \$10 billion in subsidies every year to the oil industry, 60% of which is owned by Americans?

[English]

Adam Chambers: Mr. Speaker, I think that was the member's first question of me, and I am pleased to serve in this chamber with him.

I am not sure I would agree with the premise that there is \$10 billion in subsidies to the oil and gas sector. I do believe that in a resource-constrained and fiscally constrained environment, we need to question every single dollar that is spent, and why we would subsidize the purchase of vehicles that are not made in Canada. With respect to the oil and gas sector, we need to make sure that we have more pipelines in this country to get our resources to market, and we need to work with the provinces to make that happen. That would produce more jobs for Canadians here at home.

Tony Baldinelli (Niagara Falls—Niagara-on-the-Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my colleague talked about the regulatory harmony that existed between Canada and the United States, which led to the growth of the North American auto sector. With this shift in the EV mandate, the government has moved over to a rebate system.

With the regulatory environmental standards that the Liberals are now putting in place, would the member not agree that this will do most harm to the Canadian auto sector and not help it?

Adam Chambers: Mr. Speaker, we have an integrated auto market in North America. Part of that means we need to make sure our regulatory environment is harmonized. If we are going to decouple the regulations and align our tailpipe emissions with the European Union, we will not be able to send our vehicles into the U.S.

I have a newsflash for the government: It will not be economical for us to ship vehicles from Canada to Europe when there is overcapacity of supply there and additional manufacturing being built to supply that market to reduce transportation costs. China is already building plants in eastern Europe. We will not be able to do it. The most likely destination for our vehicles is the United States. Of what we produce, 80% is exported, and 90% of that number goes to the United States. That is the most likely purchaser for our vehicles.

• (1750)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): It being 5:51 p.m., it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the business of supply.

The question is on the amendment.

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

Pat Kelly: Mr. Speaker, I request a recorded division.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Pursuant to Standing Order 45, the division stands deferred until Monday, February 23, at the expiry of the time provided for Oral Questions.

* * *

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing the House that the Senate has passed the following bill: Bill C-19, an act to amend the Income Tax Act.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

[English]

NATIONAL FRAMEWORK ON SPORTS BETTING ADVERTISING ACT

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Waterloo, Lib.) moved that Bill S-211, An Act respecting a national framework on sports betting advertising, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Private Members' Business

She said: Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to second reading of Bill S-211, an act respecting a national framework on sports betting advertising.

I would like to begin by thanking Senator Marty Deacon for her dedication in crafting the bill, alongside her colleagues in the Senate, who unanimously voted to send the bill forward to us in the House. Senator Deacon is a Canadian who has coached and led teams from the grassroots to the Olympics, the Commonwealth Games and the Pan American Games. She, like many members of the House, has witnessed first-hand what the power of sport and the opportunity of sport can be.

Sports betting is legal in Canada, yet constituents in Waterloo, as well as constituents across multiple provinces and territories, have shared concerns regarding the abundance of advertisements, which now often overshadow the sport itself.

I have witnessed the joy of young people being given very basic equipment and facilities that allow them to learn and lead through sport. This is what sport should be. However, we are hearing directly from Canadians that the lines are being blurred. This is a problem we all bear some responsibility for. I include myself in this, as I voted in the 43rd Parliament for Bill C-218, an act to amend the Criminal Code regarding sports betting.

Members will recall that, in 2021, Parliament passed Bill C-218, which amended the Criminal Code by removing the long-standing prohibition on betting on the outcomes of “a race...or fight, or on a single sport event or athletic contest.” It removed one line from the Criminal Code that referred to single sports betting. This, in effect, permitted provinces to allow for single sports betting in their own jurisdiction.

It is interesting that the ads we see that permeate every phone and television screen across the country are all from Ontario, the one province, for now, where private companies are allowed to operate and advertise. To date, every other province or territory allows for single sports betting only through its own lottery corporation, yet I and my colleagues have heard from our constituents from coast to coast to coast that they are growing tired of and increasingly concerned by seeing advertisements pushing sports betting. Sending the bill to committee for a thorough and thoughtful study would go a long way in trying to make this right.

Private Members' Business

I would like to thank my friend and colleague, the hon. member for Etobicoke—Lakeshore, for seconding the bill. I also appreciate that Bill S-211 has been joint-seconded by many colleagues spanning three political parties and seven provinces and one territory. I and many colleagues are eager to respond to the growing concerns of constituents and to determine the correct framework forward.

I will just give a reminder that less than five years ago, to gamble meant leaving one's home and going, most likely, to a casino. I will elaborate on this a little bit later.

Many other countries, such as the U.K., Australia and Germany, have implemented similar policies to some degree. Italy has banned ads outright. Admittedly, for all these jurisdictions it remains a work in progress, but the takeaway is that other jurisdictions are at least doing something about it. Why are they? It is because they legalized sports betting well before we did, and they are reckoning with the outcomes. We have the benefit of foresight here. We can see where this is heading, and we cannot stand by and let our country and its citizens steer straight toward that iceberg by doing nothing.

Gambling is not a benign form of entertainment for everyone. For a significant number of Canadians, gambling is addictive, with consequences that extend well beyond the individual to families, workplaces and communities. Problem gambling is associated with financial distress, mental health challenges, relationship breakdowns, and, in severe cases, self-harm.

Sports betting is a unique and distinct form of gambling. Its abuse is deeply intertwined with users' love of sports: an activity that is rooted in community, identity and shared passion but that masks the true nature of the harm.

Sports bettors often develop a perceived personal connection to the athletes and teams they wager on. This familiarity can create a false sense of expertise and control, leading individuals to believe they can outsmart the game and heightening their risk of larger financial losses and addiction at higher rates.

Sports betting is widely perceived as socially acceptable, even celebratory. It is framed as a way for fans to connect over their shared love of sports, making its abuse more persuasive than in traditional forms of gambling. As a result, the social acceptance, encouragement and normalization of sports betting significantly downplay its serious risks and set it apart from how other forms of traditional gambling are understood.

• (1755)

The digital era has expanded access to sports gambling-related harm in an unprecedented manner. Whereas individuals once had to physically travel to a casino or other betting venue, today this access follows users around, with virtual betting sites existing in the user's pocket. The sort of addiction we have with our phones and social media, which we have all been guilty of at one time or another, applies directly to gambling habits as well.

An article that was shared with me, from the American Institute for Boys and Men, states:

Beyond easier access, much of the increase in online gambling is due to the fact that gambling companies have engineered their games to be ever more difficult to

resist. They feature the same behavioral nudges and dopamine delivery mechanisms as social media platforms. These are not your grandparents' slot machines.

Every part of a gambling app is designed to be fun, easy to use and hard to quit. After a cursory age-verification process...bettors can deposit money as easily as buying anything else online. The apps have their own version of the endless scroll, with a constantly updating menu of things to bet on.

..."Imagine being a gambling addict and always having a slot machine in your pocket except you also need that slot machine to stay in touch with friends [and] family, to get jobs and contact co-workers, for banking, for navigation."

The list goes on.

Online expansion of sports gambling promotion has made access to abuse easier, while the consequences feel less severe.

Public safety is a top priority for the Government of Canada. The health and safety of Canadians is, at minimum, a shared responsibility. Canada has long recognized that addictive products require a different regulatory approach. Tobacco, alcohol, cannabis and vaping products are all legal but are not treated as ordinary consumer goods. Their advertising is restricted, and their promotion and regulation are grounded in a public framework that prioritizes harm reduction, particularly for young, vulnerable people. These harms have all been treated with a national coordinated approach that has been shown to be effective.

June 29, 2026, will mark the fifth anniversary of legalizing sports betting in Canada. Enough time has now passed since the expansion for its impacts to become increasingly visible. A recent report released this past November by the Canadian Centre on Substance Use and Addiction found that 9.1% of Canadians are classified as experiencing problem gambling. The people most affected by problem gambling harms were those who engaged primarily in online gambling, specifically young men aged 18 to 29.

The mental health harms associated with problem gambling are profound. People experiencing problem gambling were four times more likely to report anxiety and depression, four times more likely to have thought about suicide, and seven times more likely to have made a suicide plan in the past year. These findings make clear that gambling-related harm is not limited to financial loss but also constitutes a serious and growing public concern.

It is vital to recognize that national gambling statistics include only people above the age of 18. This is because research is limited to individuals who are legally permitted to gamble. Therefore, current national data does not reflect minors engaging in online sports betting, but we know that these youth exist, through the abundant sharing of stories and lived experiences that I and many colleagues are encountering.

Through consultations with the Canadian Society of Addiction Medicine, my team met with clinicians and pediatricians who work directly with impacted youth. These frontline professionals reported a growing number of children and adolescents presenting with harms related to online sports gambling. These clinicians reported treating children as young as 13 years old for severe problem gambling related to online betting.

In these cases, the consequences extended beyond the individual child, placing significant emotional and financial strain on families and creating serious disruptions within the home. Pediatrician and youth mental health advocate Dr. Shawn Kelly shared that his own seven-year-old child asked about sports betting terminology after being exposed to gambling advertisements during a televised sports event in their own home. As a result, sports programming is no longer permitted in their household.

These are only a few of the accounts heard from constituents spanning the country that make clear that youth exposure to online gambling is not hypothetical; it is already producing real and harmful impacts, underscoring the urgent need for stronger protections regarding persuasive media advertisements.

• (1800)

When gambling-related harms occur, families are often left to carry the burden. Parents and siblings must cope with the emotional strain, financial stress and breakdowns in trust that can follow a loved one's gambling addiction.

What is especially painful for many families is the way this issue has begun to intrude on one of the few remaining shared family activities, which is watching sports together. For too many households, sports have shifted from a source of connection and joy to a source of anxiety and blatant annoyance.

The volume of betting advertisements has been so abrasive during sports games that in 2024, on average, betting ads occupied up to 21% of advertisements during broadcast games in Canada. Its proliferation across all marketing forums is overshadowing the purpose of the game itself, which is to build community around cheering a team on.

On that note, I must say, in the Olympics, go team Canada.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Bardish Chagger: That is right.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the intent in 2021, when Parliament legalized single-game sports betting in Canada. This was achieved with the objective of bringing gambling activity out of the illegal market and into safe, regulated frameworks. The legislation granted provinces and territories authority to regulate their own sports betting markets to promote responsible gambling practices, but since its legalization, provincial and territorial approaches have been fragmented, creating gaps across Canada.

While most provinces have stuck to a public, regulated model with government oversight of the industry, Ontario, for example, has opened its market and allows private gambling companies to operate and advertise in the province. What begins as persuasive

Private Members' Business

advertisements through the province can quickly and easily turn into engagements in illegal, unproductive or offshore activity.

It should bother every jurisdiction that has not loosened its market that its own populations are being encouraged to place bets with companies that legally they cannot bet with. If they have held back on privatizing because of a more cautious approach, then why should their populations be bombarded with ads from one province that has decided to open the floodgates? This is at least one thing a national framework would undoubtedly address.

As it is, protections for gambling ads nationally will only be at the level of the lowest common denominator. The Internet, or even traditional cable, cares little for provincial or territorial boundaries, and all Canadians deserve the same degree of protections from gambling promotion and its associated harms.

Problem gambling is federally recognized as a public health concern and warrants the same seriousness of treatment as other harms in Canada. Like tobacco, alcohol, cannabis and vaping, gambling risks are not distributed evenly across the population. Aggressive marketing can exacerbate harm among the most vulnerable to addiction. When betting odds, celebrity endorsements and winning inducements are broadcast repeatedly during sporting events or on social media platforms watched by millions of Canadians, including an abundance of children, we are no longer talking about neutral information; we are talking about normalization and encouragement of risky behaviour that is more easily accessible than ever before.

Even in Ontario, where celebrities and athletes were recently banned from promotions, there are some workarounds. These individuals can appear in what purport to be public service ads put out by companies that encourage a person to "bet within your limits". This is almost worse, because it still affiliates an athlete with a brand, but it also tells people that as long as they know their limits, gambling is a safe and healthy practice.

Bill S-211 recognizes this reality. Bill S-211 acknowledges a legitimate public concern in protecting Canadians who are most vulnerable to the proliferation of advertisement in recent years. It calls for a unified approach across Canada to close the gaps in advertising abuse to protect youth and those most vulnerable to persuasive marketing and addiction.

I hope all members will recognize the merits of having committee study this bill and that all members will engage in this discussion so that we can do our best to keep Canadians safe.

Private Members' Business

While I am on my feet, I know this week has been tough, especially because we have lost young Canadians. We owe it to these young people to make sure their future is bright and frameworks are in place that work for them. I want the communities that have been impacted to know that the people of Waterloo are with them in our thoughts and prayers, and we will continue to stand by them.

• (1805)

Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, one of the things I have learned in researching this bill is that a lot of these gambling sites will even offer money in order to get people to come back to the app. If someone has not used their app for a while, it will say, “Here is \$10 to go gambling.”

I am wondering if this bill will address that as well.

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Mr. Speaker, I will be very honest. What we are bringing forward with this Senate public bill that is now in the House is that we need to talk about this issue. We need to make sure the framework works, and that is a concern that I have also heard. What has concerned me even more is that the first time somebody is gambling online, they are being given an amount of money, so it is not going to cost them anything, but the online site will pay for it. It just reminds me of how drugs went through communities as well, so if this framework needs to address that, it is important. We need to look at jurisdiction. The committee would be able to bring in the experts to make sure that we get it right.

[*Translation*]

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, it is never easy to take up a bill from the Senate in the House, especially when there are imperfections.

I would like to note my colleague's desire to start a public debate about an issue that affects people's health and that has significant financial implications. Obviously, this encroaches on the provincial jurisdictions and that of Quebec. I would like her to tell us about that.

Her research led her to Quebec's sports betting model. I would appreciate if she could tell the House more about that.

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased with the question and the opportunity to have this discussion.

I think some provinces have a model that works very well, but others have some issues. I think we need to look at whether this falls within the jurisdiction of the provinces and territories or whether it falls within the federal government's jurisdiction and whether it has a responsibility.

That is why I think we need to send this bill to committee, where we can hear from witnesses and experts and have a discussion to ensure that the federal government is doing the work it needs to do while respecting the jurisdiction of the provinces and territories.

• (1810)

[*English*]

Lisa Hepfner (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I met with the Canadian Gaming Association or the advertisers in question here late last year. Their position is that the provinces already have enough regulation and that there are enough controls already

to protect Canadians. What is her response to this position from the industry?

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Mr. Speaker, acknowledging that there is a diversity of opinions, there are a lot of organizations that have been contacting me and Senator Marty Deacon. As well, I know the member chairs the heritage committee.

We just legalized sports betting in Canada five years ago. We are starting to see some of the concerns and impacts coming from it. My concern is that the federal government did legalize sports betting in Canada, and we have a responsibility for the health and safety of Canadians, just like the provinces and the territories do. I commend the regulations, but we are recognizing that there are different models and that certain provinces have, I would say, imposed onto the space of other provinces. Usually, when it comes to inter-provincial matters, the federal government needs to play a role, so I would just like to have the conversation.

Ellis Ross (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that was an excellent description of this bill. It is not really talking about jurisdictions or provinces per se, but I want the member to talk about jurisdiction in terms of international borders, especially the United States. Some of the platforms the member talked about actually originate in the United States and are being advertised on YouTube, Facebook and Twitter.

Has the government actually considered that, or is it going to wait for the bill to go to committee?

Hon. Bardish Chagger: Mr. Speaker, a bill could only be amended or broadened at committee, so that is where the work would be done. What I am presenting through this bill is the value and importance of having a discussion around a potential framework. I did refer to unprotected and offshore sites, so that is where the federal government probably does have some responsibilities.

We know that the intention was to give provinces and territories jurisdiction, but we are recognizing that people are getting advertising across the country, and it might be starting from one place and not in their own backyard. We ask whether that is a responsibility of the federal government, and if it is, let us do something about it. Let us make sure we have a response before more harms are caused.

[Translation]

ROYAL ASSENT

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): I have the honour to inform the House that a communication has been received as follows:

February 12, 2026

Mr. Speaker,

I have the honour to inform you that the Right Honourable Mary May Simon, Governor General of Canada, signified royal assent by written declaration to the bill listed in the Schedule to this letter on the 12th day of February, 2026, at 5:07 p.m.

Yours sincerely,

Ken MacKillop

Secretary to the Governor General

The schedule indicates the bill assented to was Bill C-19, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act.

* * *

[English]

COMMITTEE TRAVEL

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions among the parties, and if you seek it, I believe you will find unanimous consent for the following motion. I move:

1. That, in relation to its study of Canada and the forthcoming CUSMA review, six members of the Standing Committee on International Trade be authorized to travel to Washington, D.C., United States of America; and Detroit metropolitan area, Michigan, United States of America, in the winter/spring of 2026, during an adjournment period, and that the necessary staff accompany the committee.

2. That, in relation to its study of Canada's Arctic strategy, six members of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development be authorized to travel to Washington, D.C., United States of America, in the winter/spring of 2026, during an adjournment period, and that the necessary staff accompany the committee.

3. That, in relation to its study of North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD) modernization, six members of the Standing Committee on National Defence be authorized to travel to Yellowknife, Northwest Territories; Inuvik, Northwest Territories; and Tuktoyaktuk, Northwest Territories, in the summer of 2026, during an adjournment period, and that the necessary staff accompany the committee.

• (1815)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): All those opposed to the hon. member's moving the motion will please say nay. It is agreed.

The House has heard the terms of the motion. All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

(Motion agreed to)

* * *

NATIONAL FRAMEWORK ON SPORTS BETTING ADVERTISING ACT

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill S-211, An Act respecting a national framework on sports betting advertising, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak to Bill S-211, an act respecting a national

Private Members' Business

framework on sports betting advertising. I want to thank the member for Waterloo for bringing this forward.

When the average Canadian sits down to enjoy a sports broadcast, they are inundated with a barrage of endless advertisements for sports betting sites and online casinos. For example, in Ontario, a viewer can literally not go a minute without being exposed to three gambling references during a sports broadcast.

In 2024, the CBC's *Marketplace* did a report with the University of Bristol. They found that over multiple NHL and NBA games, on average, 20% to 21% of the viewing time was spent being exposed to gambling advertisements. That is a massive volume of advertising.

While online gambling is legal, we know there is the potential, as with many other addictive activities, to destroy relationships, livelihoods and families. That is why I believe it is important that sports betting advertising be treated similarly to alcohol, tobacco and cannabis advertising.

We have seen the impact of the increase in sports betting advertising in Ontario. Ontario's growth in active player accounts on gambling sites has exploded over the last five years. In just two years, it went from 490,000 accounts at the beginning of 2023 to over 1.3 million by the end of 2024. The advertisements in question are clearly working to build a player market. That is obvious because of the massive increase in exposure to these online gambling practices.

The Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse and Addiction recommends that players not spend more than 1% of their pre-tax household income. In Ontario, that is about \$89 a month. However, the average player in Ontario spends \$283, three times the recommended amount that experts consider to be safe.

What harms are these players now being exposed to? The studies conducted by this organization, to build the guidelines around this, said that an individual who spends more than 1% of their household income is 4.3 times more likely to experience financial harm, 4.7 times more likely to experience relational harm, 3.9 times more likely to experience emotional harm and 4.4 times more likely to experience health problems related to their gambling than a low-stakes or non-gambler. These are significant risks, and the harm is relentless and unregulated.

The exposure to online gaming advertisements has caused a 265% increase in those exposed to these harms. These harms are not limited to the individual gambler either. The data on relational harm shows that high gambling causes risk to children, spouses, parents, co-workers, employers and people in a 360° relation to the gambler.

Many sports betting sites also use questionable tactics to keep gamblers coming back, like offering them free money or free credit. One Canadian man who started sports betting when he turned 18 said, "Imagine someone going for sobriety being given a free drink.... It should be illegal to give money to gamblers."

Private Members' Business

I want to highlight a particular segment of the population that seems most at risk of experiencing the harms of online gambling and sports betting. The American Institute for Boys and Men has found that the negative financial impacts of sports betting are more pronounced for young men, especially in low-income areas.

A recent Maclean's investigation on the harms of the explosion of online gambling references Dr. Nigel Turner, a scientist at the Toronto Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, where he specializes in gambling research. Dr. Turner has analyzed calls to the Ontario problem gambling helpline, and he found that when iGaming Ontario launched in 2022, calls to that helpline jumped by 30%, and they have risen every year. He notes that the demographics of callers have changed to include younger and younger people, especially young men.

On Tuesday, my colleague from York—Durham was reflecting on becoming a new father and emphasized that “Strong and healthy families are built on strong, committed and masculine fathers.” He also said, “Our kids need strong fathers and families, our communities need strong fathers and families, and our country needs strong fathers and families. I will be a champion for that.”

This is a great focus and an inspiration for young men. However, many young men are now finding themselves trapped in the addiction of gambling, of sports betting. This is destroying their relationships, families and communities. Research has shown that hazardous gambling is correlated with increased rates of anxiety and depression. Young men who engage in it are more likely to slide into a full-blown gambling addiction, and boys who frequently gamble miss classes, perform worse in school, drink more alcohol and participate in other risky behaviours at higher rates, often to cope with gambling-related stresses. These anti-social patterns compound, and the gambling sucks up their time and mental energy, which might otherwise go to developing relationships, hobbies and personal growth.

● (1820)

Dr. Turner warns us that we are also seeing an increase in sports betting advertising that includes celebrities. He says that this is telling young men, a population vulnerable to gambling, that it is a great thing to do and shows them someone they admire. Canada is better when we champion young men, calling on them to be builders and contributors, and to take responsibility. That is why I think this bill is a good step, and I am happy to support it.

Bill S-211 would require the minister of Canadian heritage to develop a national framework on sports betting advertising. It would also mandate the CRTC to review the regulations and policies to assess their adequacy and effectiveness in reducing the incidences of harm resulting from the proliferation of sports betting advertising. The CRTC already regulates advertisements to children, as well as alcohol ads, tobacco ads and marijuana ads, but I would suggest that sports betting ads be part of this as well. Bill S-211 would align gambling policy with how we treat these other activities.

In preparing for this speech, I had a chance to read the Cardus memo on the former bill, Bill S-269, as well as the report on the harms of single sport betting in Ontario. Cardus supports Bill S-211 and had recommendations to further strengthen the bill. For example, Cardus recommends to “Strengthen subsection 3(2)(a) with a

view to a complete ban on sports betting advertising, instead of simply restricting its usage.” This would have a great impact on those who are vulnerable to gambling addiction, particularly on minors and boys. Alternatively, they suggest at minimum moving toward a ban on “advertising for sports betting during sports broadcasts” or requiring “the national framework to identify measures to ban advertising for in-game bets.”

Operators would remain legal and regulated, but they would no longer be permitted to aggressively market an addictive product to the general public during sports events. I would also note that the Canadian Medical Association calls for sports betting ads to be restricted during sports broadcasts. The family physician Shannon Charlebois, who is a medical editor at the Canadian Medical Association Journal, stated:

I have seen people's lives fall apart at all ages, from all walks of life, whether it's an accountant with a career behind him, or a kid who's just looking to maximize his college fund who then had lost it all within a matter of a few weeks.

She notes that, while online sports betting sites say they are only for people who are 19 and older, youth are being inundated with these advertisements that equate enjoying sports with betting.

As well, Cardus recommends adding to subsection 3(2)(b) a requirement that the measures include ways that Crown corporations could contribute financially to solving the problem of gambling addiction, to ensure that they put money into prevention and treatment, with the contributions being linked to their marketing expenses.

Research shows that there is a clear causal relationship between advertisement and increased gambling activities, so if gambling companies are going to engage and be responsible partners in advertising, they should also be part of the solution. We need to put young men, families and Canadians ahead of corporate profits.

Finally, Cardus recommends adding “a new clause under subsection 3(2) to identify measures to improve the efficacy of gambling prevention messaging.” It talked a bit about the “Know your limits, play within it” piece and how it was not necessarily effective. I think that would be a helpful suggestion. I also recommend that the committee, when it is studying this bill, talk to Dr. Nigel Turner from the University of Toronto.

For those reasons and more, I will be supporting the bill, and I urge all members to support it. With my final words, I would like to say that this is exactly the way legislation has to work in this country. We legalized sports betting a number of years back. Now we are reassessing whether that is working. I look forward to that conversation.

Private Members' Business

• (1825)

[*Translation*]

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by expressing my support, as many other members have done, for the communities affected by the events of this week, specifically Tumbler Ridge and Kitigan Zibi.

Bill S-211 provides for the development of a national framework to regulate sports betting advertising by establishing national standards. No one will be surprised to hear me say once again that Canada is jumping headfirst into areas of jurisdiction that belong exclusively to Quebec and to the other Canadian provinces. As with many other national strategies, we in the Bloc Québécois are not at all happy about them.

I would like to remind the House of one thing: The Bloc Québécois recognizes that sports betting advertising and its effects on vulnerable groups are harmful. We also recognize that pathological gambling is a public problem that requires public authorities to address the issue in a consistent manner and to invest the necessary funds, because people are suffering because of it.

As I mentioned, each province is responsible for taking action and implementing measures to restrict sports betting advertising, as well as lottery and gaming advertising. We recognize that, for many young people and minors, sports betting advertising, which is primarily online and can feature spokespersons like athletes and celebrities who are worshipped by young people, is a problem that needs to be addressed.

However, again, it is not the federal government's responsibility. I would remind the House of the federal-provincial agreement on gaming signed in 1985. Amendments to the Criminal Code changed gaming in Canada by consolidating power in the provinces. As a result, the federal government ceded all jurisdiction over gaming to the provinces. Quebec and the provinces are the ones operating, administering and regulating legalized gambling.

It should be noted that in 2021, this Parliament passed the Safe and Regulated Sports Betting Act, which amended the Criminal Code to make it lawful for the government of a province, or a person or entity licensed by the lieutenant governor in council of that province, to conduct and manage a lottery scheme in the province that involves betting on a race, other than a horse-race, or fight, or on a single sport event or athletic contest. I think it is clear that regulating sports betting is the responsibility of the provinces.

The way sports betting, racing, and gaming are managed today is different because each province has chosen to adapt its regulations to its own context and interpretations, and that is perfectly fine. Quebec and each of the provinces and territories have different ways of seeing things and different vulnerabilities. Any regulatory or legislative changes that aim to achieve this are welcome, because they give provinces the power to act as they see fit and the agility to act quickly.

That is what happened on the ground. The Ontario government, for example, opted for an open market. It created iGaming Ontario to regulate online gaming and issue operating licences to private companies. Quebec, on the other hand, went a different way. Through its *Mise-o-jeu* program, Loto-Québec decided to take

charge of online sports betting itself. This is a societal choice that is up to each province. Do I agree with the Ontario model? The answer is no, not especially. However, I respect that government's choice.

Quebec decided to retain control of legalized gambling through its *Mise-o-jeu* program. In 2016, acting within its public protection jurisdiction, Quebec passed a law banning unlicensed online gaming sites by requiring Internet service providers to implement systems for blocking access to them. The Superior Court struck down that Quebec law because, in its view, it infringed on an area of exclusive federal jurisdiction, namely telecommunications, as well as on the Canadian Criminal Code.

• (1830)

What does the bill we are debating do? It does not attempt to regulate the Criminal Code of Canada or federal broadcasting legislation. However, that is where the problem lies, as illustrated by the court's ruling. That is why Quebec cannot ban unapproved online gambling sites from operating within its territory. That is why there has been an increase in the number of platforms and ads. We are not opposed to studying a bill that would address this issue, but we have reservations about the desire to establish a national framework to regulate advertising. In our view, this is another perfect example of Ottawa encroaching on a jurisdiction that is not its own.

The Act respecting the Régie des alcools, des courses et des jeux, which created Quebec's gaming board, contains a very interesting provision: section 23. Subsection 6 states that the board is responsible for “monitoring advertising and educational programs relating to alcoholic beverages and to activities governed by the Act respecting racing and the Act respecting lotteries and amusement machines”.

Quebec's regulations are very clear on sports betting and advertising. According to the law, a gaming and gambling company must not promote activities to minors under any circumstances. Its advertisements must portray games of chance and gambling in a responsible manner without encouraging excessive gambling. In fact, there are a lot of ads during sporting events, and that is fine. Advertising for games of chance and gambling also must not be misleading or inaccurate. For example, advertisements that promise easy winnings and give the impression that the player is certain to win are prohibited. Another very important rule is the ban on this type of advertising in traditional media during programs that are likely to be watched by minors or an impressionable young audience.

Private Members' Business

Quebec already regulates online gambling advertising. What the federal government wants to do here is tell us what to do and how to do it, once again, as though we were incapable of doing so and as though every province did not have that ability. I just demonstrated that we do. I presume the concern expressed by some members stems first and foremost from their concerns about their own provinces. This bill comes to us from the Senate, but I would advise the member sponsoring the bill to go to Ontario and advocate for a change in the rules in her province. Just because we do not have a uniform approach does not mean that a loophole exists. Not all problems can be approached in the same way in Alberta, Ontario, Quebec and, I would even say, at the local level. The approaches have to be different. That is why we are talking about decentralization. That is why remote regions are asking for the tools they need to develop economically. A one-size-fits-all approach never works.

Since we are talking about sports betting, I will use sports examples to illustrate my point. Each Canadian team in the NHL has opted for a different development model. The Maple Leafs have chosen to overpay their four best players. The Oilers have decided to invest a little bit everywhere, except in a goalie. The Jets invested heavily in a goalie, but less elsewhere. The Canucks and Flames decided to rebuild. The Montreal Canadiens decided to rebuild around young players: Caufield, Suzuki, Hutson, Demidov. Each team chose a model that suits them. Each team will try to win the Stanley Cup. A team using any of the three models could make the playoffs and try to win the Stanley Cup, except perhaps the Maple Leafs. I am still a realist, after all.

Because they each have their own way of doing things, Montreal and Edmonton could make it to the Stanley Cup final and achieve the same result. At this point, it is all a matter of chance. Some of them may have other goals for the time being because they have not reached the same place yet. That is what Quebec is asking for: Let us manage our affairs as we see fit in order to achieve the goals we want to achieve.

Even if Bill S-211 was truly intended to address public health issues, changes would have to be made to restrict the provinces from issuing private contractor licences, for example. That could reduce competition from online sports betting sites, which are all fighting for a vulnerable clientele. Where are the amendments to the excise tax, for example? Where are the funds earmarked for health and social services to help Quebec and the other provinces offer better services to those affected?

No, all that this bill proposes to do is introduce a national framework. We know how much it costs to manage a national framework program. Take the child care system, for example: It cost \$50 million just to send a cheque to Quebec. How much will taxpayers spend on drafting a Canada-wide strategy? How much more will they spend to cover the different stakeholders' travel and accommodation expenses? This bill is another example of Ottawa spending money so that it can interfere in provincial jurisdictions. In closing, I nevertheless wish to underscore the importance of this evening's discussion.

• (1835)

[English]

Lisa Hefner (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am truly honoured to have the opportunity to speak in favour of Bill S-211 today, an act respecting a national framework on sports betting, for many of the reasons we have heard already this evening.

I am not someone who spends a lot of time watching professional sports, I will admit, but they are often on my TV when I am home with my family, and even I have noticed that sports betting ads are ubiquitous. It has become a topic of conversation in our house that people are not just watching sports anymore; they are participating with their money. They can bet on the next play of the football game they are watching or how many points a professional baseball player might make. Every few minutes, there is an ad encouraging Canadians to gamble, because watching sports seems to no longer be enough of an experience in itself.

Our sports, sports figures and teams are part of our national identity. Sports have long brought Canadians together, and now Canadians have to navigate endless gambling advertisements in order to watch a game or a competition. For many people, this presents a risky temptation.

Back in the early 2000s, when I was a journalist, I got to know a prominent Hamilton man who lost his career due to a gambling addiction. We spoke at length about this, and he introduced me to some of the men he had met at Gamblers Anonymous. All of them were people who had important careers until they lost everything due to their gambling addictions, including a lawyer who was supposed to be appointed to the Superior Court bench the same day that police were raiding his offices to find evidence that he had stolen money from clients to fuel his gambling addiction.

We did a whole long TV series about this, and these people told me how difficult it was to resist when they were routinely bombarded by advertising that compelled them to keep spending money at casinos and other gambling venues. Remember, this was back in the early 2000s. It was before the tsunami of social media and the avalanche of betting sites we have available online today.

Today the world is different. We know this. It is not just adults in the prime of their careers who are falling into destitution and despair due to addictive behaviours. Elderly people, vulnerable people and people susceptible to mental and physical harms are all being bombarded with the same sports advertising. Today children are glued to their devices. They are watching sports and, inevitably, are fed a constant stream of sports betting advertising. Gambling has become normalized as a part of sports. This is what our children are learning as they grow up.

Private Members' Business

I chair the permanent Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage. We recently completed a study on the impacts of social media on young people, and we heard that many online applications used by children encourage addictive behaviour. The gamification of everything means that our kids are becoming addicted to their favourite vice earlier and earlier in life. They are learning how to become addicts.

We heard this testimony from several witnesses. For example, Maude Bonenfant, the Canada Research Chair in Gaming, Technologies and Society and a professor at the Université du Québec à Montréal, told us that platforms use games of chance and money. They use gambling as a strategy to keep users engaged as long as possible, and the line between video games and gambling is becoming increasingly blurred, so video games are becoming more like gambling. There is more betting within video games, and the algorithms are increasingly sophisticated, with the aim of keeping kids immersed in online content through gambling.

Michael Cooper from Mental Health Research Canada told us that one addictive behaviour can be a catalyst for another addictive behaviour. For example, people who spend more than six hours online are more than twice as likely to be at high risk for alcohol and cannabis abuse and a host of other addictions. The same is true for gambling. This normalizing of gambling in everyday life can mean, according to Cooper, that our ability to regulate ourselves in the face of temptation is broken.

Today, we are inundated with enticements to gamble, particularly in sports. Bill S-211 is a first step in preserving the integrity of the sports culture in Canada, but it is also about preserving the mental health of Canadians.

Our colleague from Waterloo and other members have spoken about the former Bill C-218, the Safe and Regulated Sports Betting Act. This was something Parliament brought and became law in 2021, because before that, all we had was black-market bookies with ties to criminal organizations.

● (1840)

The bill was an attempt to put the industry under the purview of the provinces so that it had greater oversight. However, today, only Ontario in Canada authorizes third party gambling operators, as we have heard several times tonight, and sports betting operators have taken full advantage. They have purchased oodles of ad space on regional and national broadcasts, particularly on sports channels during sporting events. Some estimates say that we are subjected to three gambling ads every minute while we are watching sports on TV. We now see sports betting ads even when we are watching live. They appear on athletes' jerseys and on the boards around the ice rinks.

In Canada today, we have more than 19 million active online gamblers. This is one of our fastest-growing industries. Canada rates eighth in the world for the most money spent on gambling, about \$4 billion every year.

Also, as I impressed upon this chamber earlier, children, teens and vulnerable people are also watching these games. They are talking about the experience the next day with their friends and their community. Do we really want them to think of gambling as a

normal part of taking in a sporting activity, or even that a person has not really experienced a game if they have not put some money down on an outcome or player? We need to deeply consider whether we want important, healthy Canadian cultural institutions to be intertwined with the often harmful habit of gambling.

Research shows that the more we are exposed to gambling ads, the more positive our attitude becomes toward gambling, intentions to gamble become greater and gambling activities increase. The Canadian Centre on Substance Use and Addiction found that almost one in four young people who bet online reported harms due to gambling behaviour, and that online sports betting is associated with double the risk of gambling harms compared to other forms of gambling. Also, sports betting advertising is four times more appealing to children than adults.

I learned a lot about the significant impacts that problem gamblers face when I did that news series 25 years ago: impacts on their own health, on their mental health and on their well-being, and equal impacts on their family and their loved ones. Problem gamblers are four times more likely to have anxiety and depression, and seven times as likely to have planned suicide in the past 12 months. Excessive advertising can exacerbate all of these issues, as I heard from problem gamblers, and that was a quarter century ago, long before the onslaught of the advertising we face today. Researchers say that there is a possibility of a connection between the extent of exposure to advertising and the intensity of the gambling addiction.

Bill S-211 asks the federal government to establish a national framework, regulate sports betting advertising, provide tools for the prevention and diagnosis of gambling and support those who are impacted by a harmful gambling addiction.

Canadians agree that something should be done. In 2024, a poll by Maru Group found that most Canadians have a negative attitude toward gambling ads: 75% say that we need to protect children and youth from gambling ads, 66% say that those commercials should not be allowed during live broadcasts and 59% believe in a national ban on this type of advertising. When we pair gambling with the broadcast of a game, we normalize sports betting as an integral part of the sport experience. It is not.

I will leave members with words from Bruce Kidd, a retired professor of sports policy. He wrote an article in *The Globe and Mail* on February 7, in which he established that about four million Canadians, the population of about Alberta, are at risk of a gambling addiction. He said:

Think about multiples of the number of people who watch a Blue Jays game in Rogers Stadium. And then think about their families. If we fail to pass Bill S-211, those will be the numbers of...people we'll have abandoned to the careless greed of the advertisers who think they're doing their part by saying over and over again—and disingenuously, of course—"Please gamble responsibly."

Adjournment Proceedings

● (1845)

Philip Lawrence (Northumberland—Clarke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have to say this debate has been excellent. I have learned many things. I will start off with the joy of sports, and the member for Waterloo talked about this a bit.

I was never much of an athlete, much to the disappointment of my father who was an athlete, but the one thing I could do was watch sports. One of the greatest joys I have is either watching my daughter compete in her competitive dance or watching my son compete at hockey. He is a goaltender and is at a tournament tomorrow, so I would ask everyone to please wish him good luck. There is nothing that I enjoy doing more than watching them compete and have a great time.

What I also love to do is sit around the house, when we get that break from time to time, and watch sports with them. Seeing them enjoy watching team Canada's hockey team compete, which won five to nothing, brings joy around. My chosen NFL team is the Buffalo Bills and there is nothing better than sitting around with friends and family and crying together as they lose yet again in the divisional round. There is a purity to people competing, giving everything they can, working so very hard to get to that great moment and coming together as a team. Anyone who has worked as a team, which is what we are in the House of Commons, knows the thrill of coming together, putting someone else's interests above ours and competing to get the best possible product, or bill, and winning the game. There is a purity and a greatness to that.

I must say that the gambling around this has tainted it. Some of the other speakers also talked about this earlier with respect to the particularly vulnerable groups in this: young men and boys. If we go to a high school, we would see that nearly every teenage boy, and every teenage girl for that matter, has a phone. If we looked at what was on their phones, I can guarantee members that over 80% or 90% of them have a gambling app. That is scary because it is leading them down a path. Not everyone will go down the path where it will have a big impact on their life, but some will. What is the number of individuals who go down that path and have that challenge? What are we willing to accept in society? Is it okay if one in 10, one in 100, or one in 1,000 give up their life to a horrible gambling addiction that sucks in friends and family members as they try to support these people? What is that number?

One of the things I do when I look at legislation or at laws as we try to make the best decisions in this House, which I believe all 343 members attempt to do, is that I look at it as if we were driving to that perfect society where we all live in prosperity and abundance, where we are kind and gentle with each other and where we only have good days, and I ask if this law would get us closer to that. I am not naive. I know we will certainly not get there in my lifetime, and probably not even after that, but as a House, as legislators, we should be striving toward that goal. When I see this legislation, I say, yes, this is another step toward it, because it starts to rein in and regulate the amount of advertising.

There are a couple of issues I have with this legislation, and I hope they will be fleshed out at committee. Of course, we will be supporting it to go to committee, and we hope it will get fleshed out. The overall driving principle of this legislation to expose our

children to less gambling advertising is going in a positive direction. I really do not think anyone can say no to that.

In fact, I am told that there are industries out there right now that are self-regulating and self-imposing those regulations with respect to the amount of advertising. To those folks I would say that is a great job and may they keep it up. The less government we have the better. In this case, I think there is a need for some intervention, unless of course the industry can get together and control its own house, which would be great.

● (1850)

I have been there, like the member, sitting and watching sports, and I do probably watch too much sports. It is just amazing; we will see, in one show, three or four different advertisements for online sports betting. We will then see them on the boards of the skating rink. We will see them in the back of the basketball stadium. We will see them in the baseball stadium, in the back. They are just absolutely everywhere. They are invasive.

Just as the government has stepped in and regulated advertisements on things like alcohol and nicotine and smoking, I think it makes sense to have a process here.

The Bloc Québécois actually raised a terrific point, in that a lot of this is provincial jurisdiction. When we look at national frameworks, the idea is good. I have no doubt about that, but I am hoping that some work can be done in committee, so that we do not just have a bureaucrat-led, one-size-fits-all solution, so that we bring in partners, so that we have agreement from the provinces, so that we have agreement from the premiers from coast to coast and so that we have agreement from industry, quite frankly.

Whether one works for a multinational or whether one works for Parliament or whether one works for a premier, the reality is that we all have children and we all want the best for those children. We need to find a solution where we have everyone working together to make sure that children are protected, as there has clearly been an excess of advertising of online betting.

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

[English]

CARBON PRICING

Helena Konanz (Similkameen—South Okanagan—West Kootenay, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the government members' defence of the industrial carbon tax. They say farmers do not pay it. They say it only applies to large emitters. They say it has almost no impact on households.

Adjournment Proceedings

Let us walk through this in plain terms. When a farmer in my riding buys a new combine or replaces their tractor, that equipment is built with Canadian steel produced under a carbon price that is rising to \$170 per tonne. When they purchase replacement parts, install an irrigation system, upgrade an industrial dryer or build a machine shed, those materials are made from steel and aluminum produced under the same industrial carbon cost. The government may not send the bill directly to the farmer, but the farmer receives it anyway.

Statistics Canada has confirmed that realized net farm income dropped by \$3.3 billion in 2024, which is a 26% decline. At the same time, operating costs climbed to \$78.5 billion and farm debt rose to 14%. Farmers are not looking for lectures about climate policy; they are trying to cover their costs and plan for the next season.

Professor Sylvain Charlebois from Dalhousie University has been clear, saying, “The industrial carbon tax...continues to erode competitiveness in the agri-foods sector.” He has pointed to the growing cost gap with producers in the United States. That gap matters when Canadian farmers are competing directly with American producers who are not operating under a \$170 per tonne carbon trajectory.

When Canadians say food costs are too high, they were asking for policies that bring costs down. Instead, they received a temporary one-off rebate. I do not oppose this rebate, but it does not change the cost structure for farm equipment; it sends money back after the price has already gone up. If the policy increases costs at the production level and then we offer rebates to offset those higher costs, that is an admission that the burden exists.

Canadians do not want a cycle of higher costs followed by temporary relief; they want structural change to make things cost less. The government speaks out about being pro-Canada and strengthening domestic supply chains. It speaks about building more here at home, but if something is produced in Canada to be used in Canada, such as steel and aluminum, it carries this industrial carbon cost. This is the same when the government wants to use Canadian-made steel and aluminum in a Canadian-made car, a Canadian-made ship or a Canadian-made bridge. Everything the government wants to build more of in Canada is increased by the industrial carbon tax, while other markets are unaffected.

The incentive for suppliers to build or fabricate elsewhere becomes higher. For example, the Liberals chose to build B.C. ferries in China instead of Canadian shipyards, which means using non-Canadian steel and no support for Canadian shipyard jobs. We cannot ignore that reality.

The question is straight forward: If the industrial carbon tax increases the cost of producing the very goods we say we want to build in Canada, is that policy helping affordability or is it making the problem worse?

• (1855)

Wade Grant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I just want to make sure we make it clear that the member is presenting a picture of the industrial carbon pricing system that simply does not reflect how it works or to whom it applies. There is no carbon tax on food,

and farmers are not subject to the industrial carbon price. That is a fact. Independent modelling backs this up.

An analysis from the Canadian Climate Institute and Navius Research shows that the economic effect on industrial carbon pricing on consumption will be extremely small, less than one-tenth of one per cent by 2030. Industrial carbon pricing has essentially no impact on the agricultural sector. The same analysis projects that the cumulative GDP impact on the agricultural sector would be 0.08% by 2030. Farmers do not directly pay the industrial carbon tax, and there are almost no costs passed to consumers.

The system in question applies only to large industrial emitters: the steel, cement, oil and gas, mining and other heavy industries. It was designed so the biggest polluters, not smaller operations like Canadian farmers, are the ones carrying the costs. The intent is straightforward: Cut emissions from major industrial facilities while protecting competitiveness and keeping jobs here in Canada.

Under the federal system, industries have several compliance options. They can make their operations more efficient, including by adopting new technologies; they can generate or buy credits from cleaner performers; or they can pay the carbon price. This is not a one-size-fits-all levy; it is a flexible framework that rewards innovation, drives investment and minimizes cost impacts across the economy.

When Canadians see higher grocery bills, the main drivers are global: disrupted shipping routes, climate-related crop impacts, and the cascading effects of Russia's illegal invasion of Ukraine on fertilizer and energy markets. These are the same pressures facing consumers in Europe, in the United States and around the world.

Our government has taken concrete steps to support producers, and it continues targeted support through the Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act. We continue to work with farmers and not against them. The idea that scrapping the industrial carbon pricing would suddenly make fruit from the Okanagan cheaper is simply not rooted in evidence. Eliminating climate policy will not reverse climate-related crop losses. It will not stabilize global supply chains, and it will not protect Canadian industries from carbon border measures being implemented by our trading partners.

Climate action and economic strength go hand in hand. We will continue to deliver on both. That is what this side of the House promises.

Adjournment Proceedings

● (1900)

Helena Konanz: Mr. Speaker, no member of the House is arguing against reducing emissions. The question is whether driving the industrial carbon tax to \$170 per tonne, while our competitors in the United States do not face the same burden, is helping the environment or simply pushing production elsewhere. If steel production moves south, emissions do not disappear; jobs disappear, investment disappears and Canadian competitiveness disappears. Meanwhile the farmer still pays more for his equipment, and the manufacturer makes fewer products.

This is not a debate about caring for the environment; it is a debate about whether the policy is making life more affordable. The government has still not answered that.

Wade Grant: Mr. Speaker, I will repeat this because it matters: Farmers do not pay the industrial carbon price, and groceries are not subject to the carbon price. Industrial carbon pricing focuses only on major emitters and gives them practical options to reduce pollution at the lowest possible cost, while it also drives investment in clean technology in Canada.

If the opposition succeeded in dismantling these tools, it would not lower food prices. It would increase pollution, reduce investor certainty and place Canadian industries at a competitive disadvantage as other countries move toward cleaner production.

Our government will stay focused on affordability, economic resilience and a cleaner future for Canadian workers and families.

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Jacob Mantle (York—Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government proudly announced recently that it was removing its failed EV mandate and replacing it with a shiny new emissions standard, but, as Shakespeare warned us:

Look like the innocent flower,
But be the serpent under't.

The surface appears to have changed. The explicit sales quota is gone, but beneath it seem to lurk the same coercive rules.

The old mandate aimed for 100% zero-emissions vehicles by 2035. The new emissions standard, by the government's own proposal in its press release, will result in 75% EV adoption by 2035 and 90% EV adoption by 2040. Therefore, automakers will still endure the same intense pressures, credits, penalties and subsidies to sell mostly electric vehicles.

If this is not really just the old mandate, if it is not just the snake in disguise, can the government please explain to me what the difference is?

Karim Bardeesy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the intervention from my colleague from York—Durham.

On this day of all days, to receive this question is really quite something. This is the day on which the administration to the south, the U.S. administration, has rejected a decades-long bipartisan consensus. The very serpent that the hon. member refers to is the existence of California-level emissions standards that have become increasingly stringent over time and helped us get the kinds of vehicles that we are manufacturing here in Canada, whether they be in-

ternal combustion engine vehicles or hybrid vehicles or electric vehicles.

There has been a long-time consensus among Liberals and Conservatives and Progressive Conservatives in Canada and a long-time consensus between Democrats and Republicans. Today, the U.S. administration is making a very clear decision to break away from that and to say in their challenging of the endangerment finding that they want no emissions standards whatsoever, and the Conservatives are embracing that extreme far right position. This is a position that comes out of the project 2025 playbook. It comes out of a complete rejection of any progress in this sector, the kind of progress that gave us the vehicles that we have today.

In our auto strategy, yes, we are proud of the investments in electrification. We are proud of those rebates. We are proud of the supply chain that we hope can continue to grow out of the investments we are making in electrification. We know that the investments in sustainability and electrification are the very investments that attract new investment, new greenfield auto plant investment that we have had over the decades here and of which we hope more will come. We know it is all based on a set of skills that are the best in the world. The workers and the team members at the different auto companies and parts suppliers are the best workers in the world, which is why more investment is being attracted here.

This was a major piece of news today. Not only is the Conservative opposition opposed to the EV rebates, which we knew it would be, but it rejects any tailpipe emissions standards whatsoever. The Conservatives are associating themselves with an extreme far right position that is the current policy of the U.S. administration rather than embracing the bipartisan consensus that has stood us well for decades, has increased stringency and has resulted in the cleaner vehicles that people want. It is really quite something, and I look forward to an explanation.

● (1905)

Jacob Mantle: Mr. Speaker, the member doth protest, but he does not answer my question. I have another one, about the new EV industrial strategy, as it is called.

I am not one for subsidizing companies, but if they are going to subsidize companies, as the Liberals are proposing, with a new subsidy for the purchase of American-made electric vehicles, should it not at least be available to all Canadians on an equal footing? Right now, we know, and studies will show this and the government can confirm, that for the most part, working-class people buy used vehicles and cannot afford or choose not to buy new or lease new EV vehicles, which are on the higher end.

In other words, what the Liberals are proposing is regressive. What steps will they take to ensure that the subsidy that they are going to offer will be available to all Canadians?

Karim Bardeesy: Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member knows, this new EV rebate is positioned a bit differently from the older one. It is capped at vehicles retailing at \$50,000 or less. Sometimes I hear from the other side that we are denying consumer choice in some way. In fact, our policy is to attract investment of all types while looking at the electric vehicle future that we are pointing to.

The auto strategy is about vehicle production generally, and we think that the marketplace is well served. We are very well served by our auto dealers in this country, which provide a wide variety of options to consumers, and this auto strategy is very consistent with that.

INDIGENOUS AFFAIRS

Chak Au (Richmond Centre—Marpole, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Cowichan decision is not a small local dispute. It is a Canada-wide concern. It raises fundamental questions of property ownership. The court found that aboriginal title may exist over lands currently held in fee simple by private owners. That finding carries significant implications for Canada's land title system, a clear system built on certainty.

For generations, when the Crown granted fee simple interests, those grants were understood to provide certainty of ownership. One of the doctrines historically relied upon to support that certainty was the extinguishment argument, the position that historical Crown grants were treated in law as having settled questions of aboriginal title in those lands. This has long formed part of the legal architecture underpinning property ownership in Canada.

However, during the Cowichan litigation, the federal Liberal government made a deliberate decision not to advance that argument at trial. That was not a procedural failure; it was a directive to the federal counsel. The extinguishment argument, central to fee simple certainty, was not defended.

Since that ruling, uncertainty has spread beyond one region. Land title questions are surfacing elsewhere in British Columbia, including most recently in relation to land claims in the Kingcome Inlet area. When foundational legal principles appear unsettled, the ripple effects extend far beyond the original case, yet the federal government has provided no clear public explanation of its directive, no detailed legal justification and no clear statement of principle. Filing an appeal does not explain what doctrine the government now stands behind. If this reflects a policy shift, Canadians deserve transparency. If a new framework is being adopted, it should be clearly communicated.

Adjournment Proceedings

The government's decisions have consequences. In Richmond Centre—Marpole, families are concerned about the security of their homes, which are often their life savings. Lenders are raising questions. Developers are pausing projects. Large and small businesses are reassessing long-term plans. On October 23, 2025, the City of Richmond wrote to the Attorney General urging restoration of the extinguishment argument on appeal and seeking clarification. There has been no response. City council subsequently passed a motion calling for federal action. There has been no meaningful engagement.

More than 500 residents attended a public session seeking answers while provincial officials stepped in to provide reassurance. Property law cannot operate in governmental ambiguity. Certainty underpins mortgages, development, taxation and long-term investment across this country, and the federal government carries the ultimate responsibility for securing property ownership in Canada.

Will the Liberal government explain why it directed its lawyers not to advance the extinguishment argument, what legal principles it now intends to defend and what immediate steps it will take to restore certainty and confidence for Richmond residents and Canadians across this country?

● (1910)

Jaime Battiste (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for raising this important topic and giving me the opportunity to speak to the issue. It is an important topic, and it is valuable to be having this discussion today in the House.

However, as we have this conversation, it is also important to note that this matter is before the courts, and so it is incumbent upon all members to be judicious and responsible when discussing this case so as not to impact the legal process.

Our government understands that the trial judge's decision in the Cowichan case has created uncertainty for potentially impacted landowners in the area over which title was found to exist.

Since September, we have been clear: Canada disagrees with the B.C. Supreme Court ruling and appealed it on September 8. British Columbia, the City of Richmond, the Musqueam Indian Band and the Tsawwassen First Nation have also appealed. We are reviewing potential legal arguments and all options are on the table.

Adjournment Proceedings

This decision's potentially significant implications, including on private fee simple property rights, require greater legal certainty, and our government is committed to attaining that clarity through the proper legal process.

To be clear, we are absolutely committed to maintaining legal clarity and stability for private landownership. That is why we defended the validity of fee simple title granted by the Crown at trial, and we will continue to do so now as we go through the appeals process.

We absolutely understand the frustration of some potentially impacted private property owners in Richmond over the fact that they did not receive official notice of the proceedings prior to the decision being released.

Canada brought an application in 2017 seeking an order requiring the plaintiffs to notify the private landowners in this case. At that time, the court declined our request to have plaintiffs give formal notice to the private landowners.

Just a couple of weeks ago, Canada filed its consent with the court regarding the application by Montrose Industries and Ecowaste Industries to be added to the litigation and have a limited reopening of the trial. This would allow the company to provide its perspective on how the declaration of aboriginal title impacts its legal and financial interests, evidence that was not before the court during the trial. We are now awaiting the decision from the court regarding the application.

However, through it all, I want the House to know we absolutely respect the constitutional recognition of aboriginal rights and title, and we maintain a firm commitment to advancing reconciliation. We will continue to work collaboratively with all parties to uphold the principles of reconciliation, transparency and legal responsibility throughout this process.

Chak Au: Mr. Speaker, first, I believe the residents of Richmond do not buy the argument that since the case is before the courts, we

cannot make comments. The B.C. government and the Richmond city council have made comments, so it is not right for the federal government to be silent on this issue.

Secondly, to say that the government has appealed is not enough. It filed an appeal at the very last minute and without a clear direction about what it is going to use as the grounds for the appeal.

Once again, will the Liberal government retract its directive to its counsel and use extinguishment as the grounds for appeal in this case?

• (1915)

Jaime Battiste: Mr. Speaker, we are absolutely committed to maintaining the legal clarity and stability of private fee simple landownership. The decision's potentially significant implications, including on private fee simple property rights, require greater legal certainty and clarity, which we are asking the courts to do.

In our country, the Supreme Court of Canada makes rulings. As politicians, and as a government, we respect that. However, our government is committed to attaining that clarity through the proper legal process, not a political process.

To further support potentially impacted private property owners, B.C. has also taken the lead on moving forward with the provincial loan guarantee program, given that landownership and title fall within provincial jurisdiction.

We are absolutely committed to maintaining the legal clarity and stability of private fee simple landownership, and we will continue to work with all parties to find a solution.

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

(The House adjourned at 7:17 p.m.)

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Mass Shooting in Tumbler Ridge	
Sawatzky	5739
Intimate Partner Violence	
Caputo	5739
Serbian Statehood Day	
Kuruc	5739
Tragic Events in Kitigan Zibi	
Auguste	5740
Mass Shooting in Tumbler Ridge	
Fry	5740
James Feltham	
Anstey	5740
Mass Shooting in Tumbler Ridge	
Chang	5740
Lunar New Year	
Ho	5740
Jocelyn D��m��tr��	
Gaudreau	5741
Mass Shooting in Tumbler Ridge	
Saini	5741
Housing	
Guglielmin	5741
Mass Shooting in Tumbler Ridge	
Royer	5741
Automotive Industry	
Davies (Niagara South)	5741
Tragic Events in Kitigan Zibi	
Chatel	5742
Mass Shooting in Tumbler Ridge	
Doherty	5742
Mass Shooting in Tumbler Ridge	
MacKinnon	5742

ORAL QUESTIONS

Public Safety	
Scheer	5742
MacKinnon	5742
Housing	
Scheer	5743
McKelvie	5743
Automotive Industry	
Scheer	5743
Joly	5743
Paul-Hus	5743
Joly	5743

Housing	
Paul-Hus	5744
Desrochers	5744
Paul-Hus	5744
Desrochers	5744
Pensions	
Normandin	5744
McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)	5744
Normandin	5744
Hajdu	5744
Lemire	5745
Hajdu	5745
Housing	
Lawton	5745
McKelvie	5745
Lawton	5745
Fragiskatos	5745
Baber	5745
McKelvie	5746
Baber	5746
Church	5746
Van Popta	5746
Long	5746
Van Popta	5746
Naqvi	5746
Ho	5746
McKelvie	5747
Canadian Identity and Culture	
Champoux	5747
Miller	5747
Champoux	5747
Miller	5747
Pensions	
Vien	5747
McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)	5747
Vien	5747
MacKinnon	5747
Housing	
Hardy	5748
Desrochers	5748
Hardy	5748
Desrochers	5748
Gourde	5748
Desrochers	5748
Public Safety	
Sawatzky	5748
Sahota	5748
Automotive Industry	
Dancho	5749
Joly	5749
Dancho	5749
Joly	5749
Seeback	5749
Joly	5749

Seeback	5749
Fragiskatos	5749
Baldinelli	5750
Church	5750
Baldinelli	5750
Joly	5750
Cody	5750
Joly	5750
Lewis (Essex)	5750
Fragiskatos	5750
Kuruc	5751
Joly	5751
Public Safety	
Fergus	5751
Provost	5751
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)	5751
Sarai	5751
Redekopp	5751
Sahota	5751
Rempel Garner	5752
Sahota	5752
Housing	
Dzerowicz	5752
Hajdu	5752
International Trade	
Barlow	5752
MacDonald (Malpeque)	5752
Mental Health and Addictions	
Johns	5752
Michel	5752
Democratic Institutions	
May	5753
MacKinnon	5753
Points of Order	
Oral Questions	
Lemire	5753

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Business of Supply

Opposition Motion—Serious Crimes and Refugee Claims

Motion	5753
Motion negatived	5754

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

National Strategy on Housing for Young Canadians Act

Bill C-227. Second reading	5755
Motion agreed to	5756
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee) ..	5756

Ukrainian Heritage Month Act

Bill S-210. Second reading	5756
Motion agreed to	5757
(Bill read the second time and referred to a committee) ..	5757

Business of the House

Moore	5757
Kayabaga	5758

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Business of Supply

Opposition Motion—Automotive Strategy

Motion	5758
Kayabaga	5758
Viersen	5759
Deschênes	5760
Osborne	5760

Business of the House

Dabrusin	5760
----------------	------

Business of Supply

Opposition Motion—Automotive Strategy

Motion	5760
Viersen	5760
Kayabaga	5760
Sari	5760
Lawrence	5761
Gaudreau	5761
Rocheffort	5762
Jansen	5762
Guglielmin	5762
Dabrusin	5764
Bonin	5764
Ho	5764
Deltell	5764
Amendment	5766
Lavoie	5766
Deschênes	5766
Jansen	5766
Miedema	5766
Epp	5768
Lemire	5768
Iacono	5768
O'Rourke	5769
Ho	5770
Gaudreau	5770
Iacono	5771
Epp	5771
Ross	5771
Iacono	5772
Deschênes	5772
Holman	5772
Lamoureux	5773
Chambers	5773
Iacono	5774
Deschênes	5774

Baldinelli	5775
Division on amendment deferred	5775
Message from the Senate	
The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater)	5775

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

National Framework on Sports Betting Advertising Act	
Chagger	5775
Bill S-211. Second reading	5775
Viersen	5778
Lemire	5778
Hepfner	5778
Ross	5778

Royal Assent	
The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater)	5779

Committee Travel	
Lamoureux	5779
Motion	5779

(Motion agreed to)	5779
National Framework on Sports Betting Advertising Act	
Bill S-211. Second reading	5779
Viersen	5779
Lemire	5781
Hepfner	5782
Lawrence	5784

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

Carbon Pricing	
Konanz	5784
Grant	5785

Automotive Industry	
Mantle	5786
Bardeesy	5786

Indigenous Affairs	
Au	5787
Battiste	5787

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>