



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 004

Monday, July 7, 2025

Chair: Peter Schiefke



Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities

Monday, July 7, 2025

• (1210)

[English]

The Chair (Peter Schiefke (Vaudreuil, Lib.)): I call this meeting to order.

Welcome to meeting number four of the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities.

Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format, and members are attending—

Mike Kelloway (Sydney—Glace Bay, Lib.): Excuse me, Mr. Chair.

I'm sorry to interrupt. I just wanted to make sure my hand was up to be on the speaking order, if that's possible.

The Chair: I have your hand up, Mr. Kelloway, and I have Mr. Albas's hand up as well.

Mike Kelloway: Thank you.

Philip Lawrence (Northumberland—Clarke, CPC): I have a point of order.

The Chair: Let me just get through this, guys.

Members are attending in person in the room and remotely using the Zoom application.

Pursuant to Standing Order 106(4), the committee is meeting to consider the request by members of the committee to undertake a study of the BC Ferries procurement. The request was distributed by the duty clerk on Wednesday, July 2, 2025.

Before we continue, I'd like to ask all in-person participants to consult the guidelines written on the cards on the table. These measures are in place to help prevent audio and feedback incidents and to protect the health and safety of all participants, including, of course, our interpreters. You will also notice a QR code on the card, which links to a short awareness video.

I'd like to take a moment to remind all members of the following points. Please wait until I recognize you by name before speaking. For those on Zoom, at the bottom of your screen, you can select the appropriate channel for interpretation, whether floor, English or French. For those in the room, you can use the earpiece and select the desired channel. As a reminder, all comments should be addressed through the chair.

For members in the room, if you wish to speak, please raise your hand. For members on Zoom, please use the “raise hand” function, which we've already done, apparently. The clerk and I will manage

the speaking order as best we can, and we appreciate your patience and understanding in this regard.

I have a point of order from Mr. Lawrence before I go to those with their hands up.

Mr. Lawrence has the floor.

Philip Lawrence: I'll make a quick clarification. Zoom does recognize left to right, and Mr. Albas is the first there.

Dan Albas (Okanagan Lake West—South Kelowna, CPC): Yes, I was going to put my hand up.

The Chair: I had Mr. Kelloway first with his hand up.

Dan Albas: He put his hand down.

Philip Lawrence: Zoom recognizes left to right. Mr. Albas was first, so by rule, you have to recognize him first.

The Chair: Okay, but it was the other way first.

Philip Lawrence: He put his hand down.

The Chair: How did that switch over?

Mike Kelloway: I didn't put my hand down.

An hon. member: Yes, you did.

Mike Kelloway: I didn't touch a thing. To be frank, I didn't touch a bloody thing on my computer.

Dan Albas: I'm in first here, so I would ask for the floor, please.

Mike Kelloway: I just want to note though, in all honesty, that I didn't touch anything on this computer.

Philip Lawrence: It's left to right.

Dan Albas: The motion for the consideration of the committee today is that pursuant to Standing Order 108—

The Chair: Hold on for a second, Mr. Albas. I'm conferring with the clerk. I'm trying to figure out why Mike Kelloway was in the top left and you were in the top right, both with your hands up, and then it switched over. That's all I'm asking.

Dan Albas: Now someone has switched off mine here. I would like to be able to continue, sir, because we did request.... Conservatives and the Bloc did request today's meeting, so I think it's incumbent upon the chair to allow us to go first.

The Chair: I can. I also want to do right by Mr. Kelloway.

Dan Albas: Okay, great. Thank you.

That pursuant to—

The Chair: Mr. Kelloway, you had your hand up first. Do you want to cede the floor to Mr. Albas?

Mike Kelloway: I had it up first, so I was planning to go first.

Dan Albas: I had the floor here, so it's....

Mr. Chair, I think you have to rule on this.

The Chair: Mr. Albas, I'm not trying to play games. He was first on the left. You were on the right. Both of you had your hands up. From my interpretation—

Dan Albas: Mr. Chair, he had his hand up before it began. Mine was clearly up when you began the meeting. He actually pulled his hand down. I have been patient here. It was the Conservatives who asked for this hearing, along with the Bloc. I think it's incumbent upon the committee to start with those who requested the meeting and then allow the committee to decide its business.

If you'd like, I'll start: That pursuant to Standing Order 108—

The Chair: Mr. Kelloway, you have your hand up. Go ahead.

Mike Kelloway: With respect to Mr. Albas and everyone here, I didn't put my hand down. I don't know if there's a timeout function on this particular piece of software or if there's a glitch in the system, but I did not put my hand down. I didn't touch the computer, so it wasn't performed by me. I can say only that I didn't touch a bloody thing. My hand was up first—

Leslyn Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk, CPC): I have a point of order.

The Chair: I asked the clerk to give me a list of who had their hands up. He looked at me and said, “Mr. Kelloway has his hand up.” I said, “I know.” Then he said, “Mr. Albas has his hand up.” I said, “I know.” He started a list, which is why, when it switched over, I asked, “Well, how did this switch over?” He said, “I don't know”, but he has the list.

Dan Albas: Mr. Chair, I did start my—

Leslyn Lewis: I have a point of order.

The Chair: I took this out of my own.... I'm going to recognize Mr. Kelloway because the clerk is the one who took—

Leslyn Lewis: I have a point of order.

Philip Lawrence: I have a point of order.

The Chair: I'll turn it over to you for a point of order, but I'm going to recognize Mr. Kelloway because it was the clerk who took the list of those who were speaking.

Philip Lawrence: Before you decide that, I would appreciate it if you heard interventions from Dr. Lewis and me.

The Chair: I will allow Mr. Kelloway to speak, and then I will turn it over to you.

• (1215)

Philip Lawrence: I would challenge the chair.

The Chair: You can do that.

I want you to know, colleagues, with everything going on, that I basically asked the clerk to be the one to take note of who was the first to have their hand up—

Dan Albas: Mr. Chair, there's no debate.

The Chair: —in case I was reading my notes.

Dan Albas: There's no debate on this motion.

The Chair: I just want you to know that the clerk did that. I'm putting it out there for everyone.

A challenge of the chair is something that cannot be debated.

Dan Albas: I'd like a recorded vote.

The Chair: We'll go to a recorded vote.

(Ruling of the chair overturned: nays 5; yeas 4)

The Chair: Mr. Albas, I've switched the order. It's now you first, then Mr. Kelloway and then Mr. Lawrence, if he still wants to speak.

Dan Albas: Thank you, Chair, and thank you, committee members.

I move:

That, pursuant to Standing Order 108, the committee urgently undertake a study of the Canada Infrastructure Bank decision to provide \$1 billion in low-interest financing to BC Ferries for the purchase of new vessels from a Chinese state-owned shipyard;

The committee hold one meeting to receive testimony from the following witnesses for an hour each, separately, and that this meeting be convened as efficiently as possible within 30 days following the adoption of this motion:

1. The Minister of Housing and Infrastructure;
2. The Minister of Transport and Internal Trade;
3. The CEO of the Canada Infrastructure Bank;
4. The CEO of BC Ferries;

And immediately following the conclusion of witness testimony at the meeting, the Chair be instructed to recognize a member from an opposition party for the purposes of considering a motion containing recommendations related to this study, that not more than one hour be provided for debate on the motion, and that every question necessary to dispose of the motion be put before the meeting can be adjourned.

Mr. Chair, I have submitted this motion to the clerk in both official languages for circulation. I'm prepared now, if you see it in order, to start the debate on said motion. I do have my thoughts. Just let me know if I have the floor to continue at this time or if you want to take a moment to send it to all members.

Thank you.

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

I have confirmed that we have received it. The clerk is going to circulate it.

I see Mr. Kelloway's hand is up. Is that because you haven't received it, Mr. Kelloway?

• (1220)

Mike Kelloway: No, I was just going to ask...and my hand is up, as it was last time.

We're looking to, obviously, have it circulated, which you just said it is. We'd like to have just a few moments to take a look at it, if that would be okay with everyone.

The Chair: I'm going to suspend for about five minutes, just to make sure everybody gets a copy of it, and then we can review it.

Then, Mr. Albas, the floor will be yours to speak to the motion.

Does that work for everyone?

Okay. This meeting is suspended.

• (1220)

(Pause)

• (1235)

The Chair: I call this meeting back to order.

I will turn the floor over to Mr. Albas first. I have Monsieur Barsalou-Duval on the list, followed by Mr. Kelloway and then Dr. Lewis.

Mr. Albas, the floor is yours, sir.

Dan Albas: Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the committee.

I appreciate that this is not an easy time for any of us, but as I said at our first meeting, this is an issue that I think the transport committee needs to be seized with. Essentially, we have found a continuing story in which we find new insights as to what the government is doing—and it's not good.

Originally, when I pressed the Minister of Transport on this in the House of Commons, she actually said that she wrote a letter outlining her concerns that BC Ferries, which is owned by the good people of British Columbia, was purchasing ships. I won't go through the whole June 16, 2025, letter. Remember, this was only about three weeks ago. I'll read just the first paragraph and the last:

It is with great consternation and disappointment that I learned of BC Ferries' recent announcement that it has selected China Merchants Industry Weihai Shipyards...to build four new major vessels....

I am dismayed that BC Ferries would select a Chinese state-owned shipyard to build new ferries in the current geopolitical context, and I ask that you verify and confirm with utmost certainty that no federal funding will be diverted to support the acquisition of these new ferries.

Yet we find out, through the media, that the hapless new Minister of Housing and Infrastructure knew nothing of a \$1-billion loan agreement that had been signed by the Canada Infrastructure Bank, essentially financing, with taxpayer dollars, the outsourcing of Canadian jobs to the shipyard in China.

Imagine my shock as we learned that, during a time of unjustified steel and aluminum tariffs, when people are receiving pink slips for their jobs because of these American tariffs, their own government is actually using their tax dollars to subsidize jobs and economic activity outside of the country.

I think it's completely on us as a committee to demand answers from both the Minister of Transport and Internal Trade and the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, because they do not appear to be on the same page.

Any time we're talking about scarce public taxpayer dollars effectively incentivizing other corporations to do the same, to seek financing for a project.... I don't understand how this is even within the Canada Infrastructure Bank's mandate. That's why the CEO of the Infrastructure Bank, specifically, has been called in our motion.

Obviously, with BC Ferries, there are a lot of questions. I've spoken to many reporters in British Columbia who have a number of

different questions outlining the procurement and some of the details that come with this. Again, my focus is largely on getting answers so that people can know whether or not their government—remember, the government said, “Elbows up”, “Canada strong” and “we can build it together”—is, in fact, financing the outsourcing of Canadian jobs.

It doesn't seem that anyone, up until the Conservatives.... I should also thank my colleague from the Bloc for supporting this emergency meeting today so that we could bring this important issue forward.

The last thing I'll say, just simply, is that Conservatives are demanding answers for concerned Canadians, many of whom are facing job losses in their communities over unjustified steel and aluminum tariffs yet read in their newspapers that their own governments, both provincial and federal.... Particularly, as a federal member of Parliament, I find it outrageous that the Crown corporation known as the Canada Infrastructure Bank is actively financing the outsourcing of Canadian jobs. This is wrong.

We need to have some answers about the government's true position on this, because we have conflicting reports that have played out in the media. I really do hope that this committee can get behind this particular motion, and that we can have those ministers from the Canadian cabinet and the CEOs of these corporations come and answer our questions, as uncomfortable as they may be.

• (1240)

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

Go ahead, Mr. Kelloway.

Mike Kelloway: Thanks, Mr. Chair. I appreciate the time.

On the motion, a couple of things come to mind. I don't believe that we should conclude a study or make recommendations without careful consideration of that study. From my point of view, any report should have expert analysis done by the committee's analyst. We shouldn't guillotine or presuppose witness testimony by making recommendations right after it. We should hear from the witnesses first, so we shouldn't, basically, presuppose the outcomes of this study. For example, a member is more than welcome to make a motion to undertake a report, but that should be done by the analysts, following witness testimony.

From our perspective, we would look to strike that last paragraph of the Conservative motion. I put that out there for consideration.

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

Are you putting forward an amendment to scrap the last paragraph?

Mike Kelloway: Yes, but I understand that Xavier also has time as well, so I don't want to jump the line there.

The Chair: If you're putting forward an amendment, though, the discussion then becomes about the amendment.

Mike Kelloway: I would put forward the amendment then.

The Chair: Okay.

Did everybody understand what Mr. Kelloway just put forward as an amendment?

Mike Kelloway: It's basically scrapping the last paragraph.

The Chair: Okay. What would the last...? It starts with "And immediately following the conclusion". Is that correct? Okay.

Do members all understand the amendment put forward by Mr. Kelloway?

We'll begin discussion. I'll create a new list on the amendment. I have Mr. Barsalou-Duval, followed by Mr. Albas.

[Translation]

Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

In terms of Mr. Kelloway's amendment, to some extent, I share his concerns. That's why I prepared another amendment that addresses those concerns, while letting the committee decide what it wants to do with the testimony provided at the meeting.

We must meet with these people in the committee. I'm thinking in particular of the officials from the Infrastructure Bank, which allocated the \$1 billion in question, and the officials from BC Ferries, which decided to award the contract to a Chinese company. I would also like to know how the two ministers responsible for this area will justify the decision to allocate \$1 billion of our public funds to this company. This money will go straight into the coffers of a Chinese state-owned company. It's quite astonishing. Under the circumstances, talk of "subsidizing jobs in China" seems entirely appropriate.

We've heard about this issue before. Up until now, we haven't wanted to get involved, since the issue concerned a corporate decision. No matter how dubious or deplorable the decision, this matter involved a British Columbia Crown corporation making its own choices. This was in no way a matter of federal jurisdiction. However, when Ottawa decides to invest money—\$1 billion isn't pocket change—I think that this raises questions. It's fair to ask the committee to hold a meeting so that witnesses can come and explain this decision.

I would also like to take this opportunity to talk about Quebec's significant needs when it comes to ferries, particularly in the Magdalen Islands. People are looking for a ferry to take over from the *Madeleine II*, which must soon be sent to dry dock. However, the federal government has allocated only \$10 million over three years to the people of the Magdalen Islands to find a new boat. This amount is clearly inadequate. The dry-docking of the boat has been postponed for two years, given the inability to find a boat that meets the criteria. I must remind you that this remains an essential need for the people who live there. Without a ferry, nothing and no one can get to the Magdalen Islands, including goods or cars.

I find it quite surprising that Ottawa would give British Columbia a cheque for \$1 billion so easily.

I'm happy that the people of British Columbia have ferries. However, Quebec needs them too. I would like the federal government to show as much enthusiasm for meeting eastern Quebec's needs as it does for meeting British Columbia's needs.

• (1245)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Barsalou-Duval.

Mr. Albas, you have the floor.

[English]

Dan Albas: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'd like to point out that, with Mr. Kelloway's amendment, effectively, he wants to push any timely recommendations as far back as possible to give the government as much clearance as possible so that they can either let this story die over the summer....

You know, as responsible parliamentarians, if we expect to have a government—a minority government, I'll just remind everyone—that will listen to Canadians and listen to their representatives, it's important for us to be able to make immediate recommendations that the government will see and hear, and to have those recommendations.... We may find through the process that there are important public policies, such as not financing with federal tax dollars, through the Canada Infrastructure Bank, steel, aluminum and shipbuilding jobs in another country, particularly China. This is an area that Chrystia Freeland, the Minister of Transport, has been very public about; she has huge concerns. Therefore, I think we need to be able to push those in power positions, positions of leadership, so that they immediately act on something.

With all due respect to the analysts, who do very good work, I do not need an analyst to give me a data-driven response for something that I know is wrong. Outsourcing Canadian jobs is always wrong. It's even worse when we have these unjustified steel and aluminum tariffs.

I hope Liberals will understand that. I hope they will not support this amendment.

Thank you.

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

I'll go back to Mr. Kelloway.

Mike Kelloway: I have just a couple of key points on what's been said here.

For me, the amendment is put forward because it's the responsible thing to do in terms of the analysis of witness testimony and not presupposing those recommendations. It's not who's more Canadian or who's more focused. We all want to work. We want to see work completed by Canadians. We want work done by Canadians, but we also don't want to presuppose anything that may not be beneficial to the country writ large or this example.

I just wanted to put that in there. From a process perspective, it's to get the best recommendations. It's to go through the right process to get them and to do this strategically. It's not to avoid anything. It's not to remove anything. There is no grand conspiracy here. We want to get to the heart of the matter, but we want to do it the right way and with the right process. I think that's what all parliamentarians share.

I just wanted to put that on the record. Thank you.

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

I have nobody left on the speakers list for the amendment proposed by Mr. Kelloway. Therefore, we will go to a vote.

Dan Albas: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

The Chair: Yes. We will have a recorded vote.

(Amendment negated: nays 5; yeas 4)

The Chair: That brings us back to the discussion on the motion put forward by Mr. Albas.

Next on the list I have Mr. Barsalou-Duval, followed by Dr. Lewis.

• (1250)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Barsalou-Duval, you have the floor.

Xavier Barsalou-Duval: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

It's my turn to move an amendment to the motion tabled by my Conservative colleagues. I move:

That the motion be amended by replacing the words "And immediately following the conclusion of witness testimony at the meeting, the Chair be instructed to recognize a member from an opposition party for the purposes of considering a motion containing recommendations related to this study, that not more than one hour be provided for debate on the motion, and that every question necessary to dispose of the motion be put before the meeting can be adjourned" with the words "And immediately following the conclusion of the testimony, that the committee devote one hour of business to determining the action it intends to take on this meeting, and that the questions raised be put to the vote before the meeting is adjourned".

May I explain the amendment?

The Chair: Yes, please.

Xavier Barsalou-Duval: The previous amendment would have led indirectly to a report from the committee, whereas my amendment gives members the chance to discuss what they would like to do after hearing the testimony. We can't assume that we'll have any recommendations to make or any report to submit to the House. This doesn't mean that we won't have any either.

The wording of the current motion also assumes that the study would be mostly completed after one meeting, whereas our amend-

ment would give us the option of holding further meetings if we deem it necessary, either this fall or at another time. This gives the committee more flexibility to decide what it wants to do after hearing the testimony, while providing the same options as the Conservative motion to make recommendations and report back to the House.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Barsalou-Duval.

[*English*]

I'll now turn the floor over to Dr. Lewis.

Leslyn Lewis: Thank you.

The Liberal infrastructure bank gave out their largest investment to date, \$1 billion of taxpayer-funded loans, not to build Canadian ships to power our Canadian economy but to build up the Chinese economy and Chinese workers and power their economy. A number of questions come to mind for Canadians. First, Canadians want to know why the taxpayer-funded Liberal bank has not ensured that its loans are not being used to fund industries in foreign nations. The other question that arises is this: How did the Minister of Infrastructure and the Liberal government allow this to happen?

This is not what Canadians expected when the Liberal government said that the bank would catalyze investments and that they would leverage private sector dollars. The Trudeau, now Carney-backed, Canada Infrastructure Bank is funded with \$35 billion of taxpayer money. Those taxpayer funds are being used to ship jobs essentially overseas and are selling out the Canadian shipbuilding industry, all at the expense of Canadian workers.

This motion is about a very serious matter to Canadians and to our Canadian economy. The Liberal government and the Canada Infrastructure Bank are actually complicit in offshoring Canadian jobs. This is a very serious issue. This is especially outrageous at a time when our steelworkers and industry are under attack from unjustified U.S. tariffs. The CIB is complicit in undermining Canadian competitiveness. It must be held to account for how it has allowed this to happen.

There is actually no excuse for the fact that the Minister of Transport, who has been in cabinet for at least 10 years, omitted the fact that this \$1-billion financing is from the Canada Infrastructure Bank. Her strongly worded letter to her provincial counterpart actually made it sound as if her government had nothing to do with financing the Chinese ships. How could this government feign outrage at the investment yet not know that they were bankrolling it at a subsidized rate and sending Canadian jobs abroad? How many Canadians get a loan from the government at a 1.8% interest rate? Canadians would love this treatment from their government that we are handing out to foreign nations.

This \$1-billion funding to China is Liberal incompetence at best and deliberately misleading to Canadians at worst. This is exactly why Canadians have long opposed the Liberal failed infrastructure bank. Where is the transparency? Why are they funding projects that are taking jobs from Canadians and giving them to countries with much lower labour standards, much lower environmental standards and much lower ethical standards?

The bank has also struggled to attract private sector investment, barely 1:1, even though it promised a 6:1 ratio. The bank has not only failed to attract any private sector investments; they have gained taxpayer dollars and have channelled them away from Canadians to a Chinese state-funded shipyard.

The Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities several years ago also determined that this infrastructure bank was not fixable. They made one—only one—recommendation in their report, and that was to abolish the bank. Once again, we see why Canadians, Conservatives and opposition members were correct in the assessment to abolish the bank. This is yet another example of why Conservatives do not have any confidence in this bank.

• (1255)

The bank's decisions are suspect and were made behind closed doors, the ramifications of which are that the decisions come at a pivotal time to Canada and strike a very hard blow to the Canadian employment sector and workers. The CEO and the Minister of Infrastructure must answer for this. Liberal ministers have often denied having responsibility for the bank's investments or spending, saying that it is arm's-length, but that is no excuse when the stakes are so high. Canadians need answers about how their hard-earned tax dollars are being spent.

The CIB characterized this investment as supporting essential “service upgrades” and “green infrastructure”, but it does not reflect the original promise of public-private partnership, a model that was supposed to—

Will Greaves (Victoria, Lib.): Mr. Chair, on a point of order, the member doesn't seem to be speaking to the amendment that's been tabled. We're jumping ahead and, seemingly, speaking to the substance of the agreement that's been struck in British Columbia. Could we perhaps focus on the amendment as tabled?

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Greaves.

I'll just ask the member to make a link or reference to the amendment, which was proposed by Mr. Barsalou-Duval, in the remainder of her remarks.

Leslyn Lewis: The amendment is to have additional time for the hour. I'm substantiating why Mr. Barsalou-Duval's amendment is in line and why we will need that extra time. This is what I'm speaking to. Thank you.

The CIB characterized the investment as supporting essential service upgrades, but it does not reflect the original promise of a public-private partnership model, where private investors share financial risks—this is a taxpayer-subsidized loan to another nation—nor do we have any evidence to suggest that building these ferries in China, which largely fuels its economy with coal, will provide any net benefit to the environment. In fact, the additional hour, which Mr. Barsalou-Duval spoke of, is important because the investment

will likely cancel out any emissions reductions they hope to achieve because of how poor the environmental standards are in China.

Lastly, the CIB just celebrated its 100th investment to build a strong, more resilient Canada. This celebration came out the same week they announced this \$1-billion deal with BC Ferries to purchase new Chinese Communist state-made vessels. The question remains, what other investments are being touted as Canadian investments when they are actually being outsourced to foreign nations and are not benefiting the Canadian economy and job market?

• (1300)

The Chair: Thank you very much, Dr. Lewis.

Next, I'll go to Mr. Greaves, followed by Mr. Lawrence.

Will Greaves: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

First of all, let me say that I support this committee in undertaking a study into this decision and into the shipbuilding agreement that's been struck by BC Ferries, but I think it is disappointing to see our colleagues opposite making very familiar political points and using as a whipping post what is, in fact, a critical piece of infrastructure in our province of British Columbia. While, perhaps, some of the colleagues—particularly those, I note, who are from the province of Ontario—may be less familiar with the critical role that BC Ferries plays in supporting B.C.'s coastal communities, this is a service that is, very unfortunately, being played politics with currently and being made to feel the brunt of long-standing concerns and talking points that our Conservative colleagues have made before.

In this instance, they're also, seemingly, prejudging the outcome of the witness testimony, which we look forward to hearing in our next meeting. It really is premature for many of the conclusions the members opposite are drawing to be raised in this fashion rather than waiting, in good faith, for the expert testimony and for the leadership of BC Ferries and the ministers in question to actually have an opportunity to speak to this committee and to the concerns that have been raised, and to explain very clearly for us why it is that Canadian shipyards are currently at capacity. Based on the national shipbuilding strategy, they were unable to offer cost-competitive bids to provide these ferries.

I look forward to my Conservative colleagues' defending why they think it is that the electrification of British Columbia's ferry fleet and the expansion of this vital service for coastal communities is something for which the Conservatives would seemingly endorse spending billions of dollars more and waiting decades longer to receive those replacement ferries.

We need to hear this witness testimony and have the opportunity to reflect on the questions that have been raised, but I encourage my colleagues to stop using BC Ferries and B.C. coastal communities as punching bags and making points we have heard before, which, frankly, do not serve Canadians or the public taxpayer properly in this instance. Let's let the evidence be raised and the witnesses speak, and then let's pass our conclusions about how to proceed and what the federal government can or should perhaps do in future situations of this kind. We support this study but, please, let's have a little less foghorn from the members opposite.

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

Next, we'll go to Mr. Lawrence.

[Translation]

Philip Lawrence: Thank you.

Given the geopolitical context, I found it quite odd that no Quebec shipbuilder was contracted to build these vessels.

How could the federal Liberals give a \$1 billion loan to the British Columbia government and exclude Quebec shipbuilders?

[English]

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

I have no speakers left, so I'll turn it over to the clerk to go to a recorded vote on the amendment put forward by Monsieur Barsalou-Duval.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 9; nays 0)

The Chair: Now we will go back to the motion as amended by Monsieur Barsalou-Duval.

Mr. Albas, I see your hand is up. The floor is once again yours.

• (1305)

Dan Albas: Thank you again, Mr. Chair.

Part of the motion charges you, as the committee chair, to find the most efficient way possible of bringing in these ministers and these CEOs, but again, it does give some specificity that we expect the ministers to appear separately, for one hour. We want to focus in with specific questions for each one so that we can consider their responses.

I wish you the best in that, Mr. Chair. I'm sure the Liberal members who have spoken, saying that they also want answers, would support my call to you to try to make this happen as soon as possible.

Thank you.

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

I see no other members who wish to speak....

[Translation]

Mr. Barsalou-Duval, you have the floor.

Xavier Barsalou-Duval: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I assume that we'll be voting on the motion, so I'll take this opportunity to make another comment.

It's surprising to see the federal government allocate \$1 billion in public funding to a project that will be carried out in China. Not that long ago, ministers from this government were touring the country promising that major infrastructure projects would be built with Canadian steel. These ferries will be built with steel at a time when American tariffs are affecting our industry. My constituency has a steel mill with thousands of workers. I'm sure that they would like to secure contracts and public funding, rather than see these things sent to countries such as China.

As elected representatives, I think that we should all reflect on these matters and show sensitivity when it comes to future decisions. After all, people are at risk of losing their jobs. They're concerned about the situation and they want to see their elected officials handle it responsibly.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Barsalou-Duval.

[English]

Is that a legacy hand, Mr. Albas?

Dan Albas: This will be quick, Mr. Chair.

I want to thank my colleague from the Bloc for making that reference. I actually was at Seaspans the other day, talking about their capabilities and capacity. One thing they mentioned to me was that they use Algoma Steel as much as possible. When we talk about shipbuilding here in Canada, I just want to reiterate that there is a supply chain, and that gets used. These are really real consequences.

I do hope that all members can vote in favour of this motion and that we can get those ministers in as soon as possible, because I'd like to hear from them on this. Thank you.

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

Seeing no other members who wish to speak, we'll go to a vote on the motion as amended.

(Motion as amended agreed to: yeas 9; nays 0 [See Minutes of Proceedings])

The Chair: Thank you very much, colleagues.

With no other business, before I adjourn, I want to give a shout-out to Austin and Logan, two interns here on the Hill who are joining us for this meeting and learning a little more about our democracy. It's always great to have the next generation here to learn how it all works.

With that, this meeting is adjourned.

Have a great summer, everyone. We'll see you in the next 30 days.

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>