



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 152 No. 017

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

Speaker: The Honourable Francis Scarpaleggia



CONTENTS

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

● (1005)
[English]

INFORMATION COMMISSIONER

The Speaker: It is my duty to lay upon the table, pursuant to subsection 40(1) of the Access to Information Act, the Information Commissioner's report for the fiscal year ended March 31, 2025.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(3)(h), this report is deemed to have been permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics.

* * *

[Translation]

COMMISSIONER OF LOBBYING

The Speaker: It is my duty to lay upon the table, pursuant to section 11 of the Lobbying Act, the report of the Commissioner of Lobbying for the fiscal year ended March 31, 2025.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(3)(h), this report is deemed to have been permanently referred to the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics.

* * *

VETERANS OMBUDSMAN

Sean Casey (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Veterans Affairs and Associate Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Pursuant to Standing Order 32(2), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the 2024-25 annual report of the Office of the Veterans Ombudsman.

* * *

[English]

INCOME TAX ACT

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP) moved for leave to introduce Bill C-211, An Act to amend the Income Tax Act and the Canada Pension Plan (deeming provision).

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am honoured to rise today to introduce an act to amend the Income Tax Act and the Canada pension plan, deeming provision. The goal of this bill is to make it easier for people with disabilities to obtain the benefits they are entitled to and to reduce the paperwork load on health care workers.

People with disabilities often need to complete separate applications to access the disability tax credit, disability benefits and the disability pension plan at the provincial and federal levels. This process can be onerous for applicants, caregivers and health care providers, as they are required to prove the same impairment again and again. This bill would streamline the process so that when someone has a disability recognized in their home province or territory, it is automatically recognized federally as well. Each disability tax credit form takes up to one hour to complete, and in 2022, over 400,000 disability tax credit forms were processed, which amounts to over one million lost patient visits.

I would like to thank my colleague, the former member for Victoria, Laurel Collins, for introducing this bill in the last Parliament. I would also like to thank the member for Winnipeg Centre for seconding this bill and for her ongoing advocacy for people with disabilities. Finally, I would like to thank all those fighting for disability justice and for a more inclusive Canada.

I hope all members will support this very important bill.

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

* * *

PETITIONS

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Cheryl Gallant (Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a petition signed by the health-conscious residents of my riding of Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke.

Business of Supply

The petitioners are calling out this government's hypocrisy after it recently and covertly signed on to the WHO's so-called Pandemic Agreement, just prior to the opening of the 45th Parliament. The Prime Minister had repeatedly promised on the campaign trail to defend Canada's sovereignty in the face of foreign threats, yet after the election, he went ahead and signed on to this legally binding treaty that will give unaccountable, unelected UN bureaucrats the power to override laws passed by our Parliament, which was duly elected by Canadians.

This treaty was never debated, nor was it voted upon in this chamber. The freedom-loving petitioners are calling for the government to immediately withdraw from the WHO's so-called Pandemic Agreement.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, in the petition I am tabling, the petitioners highlight that under common article 1 of the Geneva Convention, Canada is required to respect international humanitarian law, and that under article 59 of the fourth Geneva Convention, Israel is an occupying power that must allow and facilitate humanitarian aid by impartial organizations. They highlight that Canada's own Official Development Assistance Accountability Act requires that all Canadian foreign aid uphold human rights and international legal standards.

They highlight that, publicly and unequivocally, they reject the militarized aid model used in Palestine. They also highlight that they demand the full restoration of access for the UN agencies and established humanitarian NGOs, including UNRWA and the World Food Programme. They insist on safe and immediate entry for Canadian health care workers and other international humanitarian personnel to Palestine. They also ask that Canadian funding be withheld from any entity or model that does not comply with the principles of neutrality, impartiality, independence and humanity, and, finally, that all Canadian aid to Gaza is delivered through internationally recognized humanitarian channels.

* * *

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.

The Speaker: Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[Translation]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—SALE OF GAS-POWERED VEHICLES

Melissa Lantsman (Thornhill, CPC) moved:

That, given that the Liberal government is banning the sale of gaspowered vehicles that will force Canadians to buy electric vehicles, and this mandate will drive up the cost of vehicles by \$20,000, in order to allow Canadians the choice to purchase any vehicle that meets their needs at a price they can afford, the House calls on the Liberal government to immediately end their ban on gas-powered vehicles.

The Speaker: Today being the last allotted day for the supply period ending June 23, the House will proceed as usual to the consideration and passage of the appropriation bills. In view of recent practices, do hon. members agree that the bills be distributed now?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

• (1010)

[English]

Melissa Lantsman: Mr. Speaker, I am going to split my time.

I rise today in support of the Conservative motion in opposition to the government's authoritarian, misguided and altogether nonsensical ban on gas-powered vehicles. A ban on gas-powered vehicles sounds like some kind of conspiracy theory or something straight out of a science fiction novel, but it is real stuff. It is happening right now, and the Minister of Environment told us as much last week. She did not tell us that it was some aspiration or some kind of 100-year plan. She told us that it was a hard ban, a concrete requirement the government is going to bring in less than 10 years from now.

We know that members across the way like to think while wearing their radical thinking caps or their CN Tower-climbing jumpsuits, but let us take them off for one second and really consider what a policy like this does for Canadians and the Canadian economy. It would mean that we would need nearly 700,000 charging ports from coast to coast in less than a decade. We have 60,000 right now, and get this. In 2024, last year, the government managed to install fewer chargers than it did the year before. Apparently, the only thing moving slower than the construction of electric vehicle charging stations is the government email mandating them.

This ban would also mean that \$600 billion would have to be spent preparing infrastructure. That is over \$11,000 for every single car on the road at the moment. It would mean even lower car sales, lost jobs, higher auto prices and misery for consumers and workers alike. That is not according to me. That is according to the CEOs of some of the largest automakers in Canada.

Canadian economists and the non-partisan number crunchers say that this ban would cost us 38,000 jobs, if the sector remains operational at all. The boots on the ground, the people who make the cars, purchase the parts and navigate international trading relationships, say that a move like this would take us out of alignment with key trading partners like the U.S. in an integrated North American market, threatening our position in the supply chain and the global economy.

Let us not forget that the Liberals want to do all of this at a time when our auto sector is already menaced by tariffs south of the border, when we are already losing jobs left, right and centre, The Globe and Mail reporting more today, and when Canadians are still reeling from the worst inflation in four decades. Add an industrial carbon tax to this and we now have a recipe for uncompetitiveness, all while preaching the bravado of “elbows up”. Canadians cannot even think about putting food on the table or finding a place to live. Frankly, I think the last thing on their minds is putting a new Tesla in the driveway.

The government is going to come in with another job-killing mandate, another burden on consumers and the economy, all because it knows better than people do. I do not think the environment minister has taken any time to think about these mandates in a real way. I know that her accomplice, the heritage minister, who actually put these mandates in place, has not either. This is what we get when we govern by vibes instead of governing by logic and reason. Canadians have certainly gotten used to this from the Liberals, but even by established standards, this ban deserves some kind of award in creative governance.

If we take a deeper dive into the program and the inconsistencies and lack of oversight, we end up with just plain lunacy. I think Canadians watching this at home have no idea that it is happening. This is a plot twist that nobody saw coming, except for every single automaker in the industry.

The federal electric vehicle rebate program just ran out of money two months early, poof, gone, vanished, just like that, but the sales mandates are still in place. It is like telling Canadians that they have to eat nothing but steak for dinner every night while simultaneously taking away their grocery budget and calling it a climate plan.

Automakers, dealers and consumers were shockingly not thrilled to find out that the \$5,000 rebate evaporated overnight. Some poor souls even went to the dealership expecting that rebate and did not get it when they were in line to buy their electric cars. I am not a fan of the rebate to begin with, but nothing says stable investment climate like a last-minute pullback of a rebate that Canadians thought they were getting.

Let us not forget the nearly \$31 billion in subsidies that were handed out to foreign automakers and battery manufacturers, all of which are already going bust in a really big way. There are billions for multinational corporations and their executives, but heaven forbid a consumer gets \$5,000 to buy one of these things.

● (1015)

The new economic model the Liberals always think of is to subsidize the company that builds the product, then subsidize the consumer that buys it, and hope that nobody notices that the math does not add up. We cannot prop up both ends of the see-saw forever. Eventually, someone is going to want a product the government will not write a cheque for. Markets do not work on that basis, when Ottawa plays both the buyer and the seller in all of this.

In Ottawa's mind, the electric vehicle revolution is happening because they said so. Incentives are not their problem. Infrastructure is also somebody else's problem. Communication seems optional

Business of Supply

for them, but the mandates are very real, and they are sticking to them.

The result will be that automakers will face penalties for not selling enough electric vehicles, consumers will face higher prices and dealers will face unsellable inventory. They have told us as much. They have told the government as much. Ottawa will face absolutely no accountability for any of it.

What is more is that the liberty and freedom of choice that is guaranteed to every single Canadian vanishes with each passing decision. They are being replaced by a government that thinks it knows best about what someone should eat, what they should drink, how they should drink it, or what you should use to drink it, and yes, what kind of car they should drive. For those watching this at home, the government does not want them to drive their gas-powered cars anymore. It has decided to mandate that everybody drives an electric car. It is insanity.

The bureaucrats, the middle managers, the members of Parliament and the ministers of the government think they know better than Canadian consumers, and they want to make those decisions from Ottawa. They think they should be in control of every aspect of someone's life. We have seen this show before. We know how it ends. We can take our pick. It is a mandate, a carbon tax, some weird DEI quota or plastic straws. The Liberals believe they can control someone's life better than they can. They can make decisions better than Canadians can for themselves, and we get significantly worse outcomes. In fact, they backtrack on some of those outcomes. We get those outcomes at a greater cost. It sometimes takes seven times longer than it should, and it leaves everybody worse off.

Instead of a government that does a few important things really well, we get a government that does a zillion things badly. We still cannot get anybody's passport to come in the mail on time because the passport printer is broken and the mail people are on strike.

This is a government that wants to do everything for Canadians, to creep into their lives and to take control. The government wants to build an economy based on edicts, mandates and ideologies, and a healthy sprinkling of fairy dust, and none of this is actually going to happen.

Edicts, mandates, ideology and all of those things do not put food on the table. All of those things do not actually help people. All of those things do not provide the choice that someone should have as a Canadian. This might come as news to the government, but that is what it does.

Individual people living their lives as they see fit, participating in a free market, making decisions based on rational analysis and scarce resources is something the government knows nothing about.

Business of Supply

For instance, in my community, there are lots of people who drive electric vehicles because it makes sense. They drive short distances. We do not have erratic weather. We do not have really cold temperatures. With the right incentives, it makes sense based on what people choose. However, try telling somebody who lives in rural Alberta, who has to drive an hour or more just to run errands, and where it gets to -40°C, that they are going to be mandated to drive an electric vehicle by the government. It makes no sense and is not rational, which is exactly why we oppose this mandate.

All those on the opposite side of the aisle might be content to pursue the ideological war on the gas-powered car, but Conservatives on this side of the House will not stand for it. We will speak for every single person who wants to make their own decisions, who wants to make a rational economic decision. We will stand up for the auto workers and for those who build our sector. We will stand up for the decisions made that are common sense, by the auto sector, by the workers in the auto sector and by every single Canadian who wants to make a decision.

• (1020)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I must say there is a bit of irony here. For those who are not aware, the member who just spoke used to work for Doug Ford, and he is the Premier of Ontario. Whenever we saw those giant press conferences where Justin Trudeau was talking about the importance of the expansion of and the employment opportunities in the electric field in vehicle productions, who was beside him? It was Doug Ford, the Premier of Ontario.

Did Doug Ford have any influence on the member opposite, or was Doug Ford wrong in his investments? There were provincial investments also tied into it. Was Doug Ford wrong too?

Melissa Lantsman: Mr. Speaker, Doug Ford has had no influence on the member in the insane decision of mandating electric vehicles for people to drive. There is a \$31-billion government investment that is going to vanish in this country. Jobs will vanish in this country. Members should tell that to the 38,000 auto workers who will be out of a job and the 56,000 auto workers whose jobs are at risk today.

If he wants to make a joke about Doug Ford, that is his prerogative, but this is serious. It is about the people who work in this country and get to choose what they drive, how they live their lives, what straw to use and every decision regarding their lives. We are not going to take a lesson from the government on how to live our lives.

[Translation]

Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if the member is aware, but there is a very strong transport electrification hub in Quebec. An entire industry has developed there. There are a lot of people who are excited about working on the energy of the future and clean technologies.

Is my colleague trying to attack a strong industry in Quebec that generates thousands of jobs by declaring war on electric vehicles?

[English]

Melissa Lantsman: Mr. Speaker, nobody is denying that there are times when there is a choice to drive an electric car or denying the people making that choice. There is nothing wrong with that. What is wrong is the government mandating that everybody drive an electric car instead of a gas-powered car rather than giving them the choice. The decision has to make economic sense. It has to make sense for the driver and the Canadian economy. That is what we are saying here today.

Terry Dowdall (Simcoe—Grey, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Honda Canada was in my riding until this latest election and the redistribution. I dealt with it all the time. I thank my colleague for pointing out the importance of those jobs.

I remember when Stephen Harper, back when I was a mayor prior to my time here, introduced the gas tax. For a lot of municipalities, it was dedicated funding for roads and bridges. I know how important it was, especially for the rural areas at that time.

This is ridiculous. All the companies know it. All the manufacturers know it. Does the member believe this will go the same route as the carbon tax and that the Liberal government will try to sell it, but in the end, the reality is that it just makes absolutely no sense?

Melissa Lantsman: Mr. Speaker, from the beginning, it has made absolutely no sense for the government to want to tie itself to the EV mandate for the next nine years until it does some weird mental gymnastics and backs out of the very central piece of its policy.

It is the very fact that Canadians cannot choose. It does not make economic sense, particularly in that member's riding, for anybody to drive an EV. It takes a good couple of hours to get around his riding, and I suspect the charging infrastructure is not there and will not be there. The Liberals are married to a plan that does not work. I suspect, after they get bonked over the head with it over the next couple of years, there will be a reversal, just like there was with the carbon tax when Conservatives pushed them to drop it.

• (1025)

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, one thing I agree with my colleague on is that, when incentives are on the table, they should be honoured. That is certainly something we agree on.

I am going to talk a bit about Norway, where 88.9% of all new vehicle sales are EVs. It is a cold country and a lot of it is very rural. It is going to be at 100% by the end of this year.

Through you to my colleague, why do Conservatives constantly cite that it is impossible when other countries around the world are taking action on protecting the environment and on climate change?

Melissa Lantsman: Mr. Speaker, I am certainly not going to take lessons from that member and his party, which supported the previous government all the way through only to sit with seven people in opposition.

Here is the point: We cannot force people to do something against their economic interests. That is what we will stand for every day in the House.

Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when we think about the terrible policy initiatives put forward by the Liberal government over the last decade, this banning of gasoline vehicles ranks in the top five.

I will explain exactly why. In law, we would call this gross negligence because the Liberals know what they are doing is wrong, and that it is negligent, but they continue to do it anyway. If we could take them to court over this, they would absolutely lose on a charge of gross negligence.

I am going to point out and explain exactly why. When we look at where we are in Canada right now, we see we that about 8% to 10% of new vehicles being purchased are EVs. That is, of course, with the subsidies that have been in place. My colleague just explained that those subsidies have dried up, yet next year, in 2026, Canadians are expected to go to 20%, so increasing by more than double in one year. That is an enormous challenge right now, given that the average EV is about \$20,000 more than its comparable gas-powered vehicle.

We are at a time of an unprecedented cost of living crisis, where we have a million Ontarians regularly using the food bank, which is three times more than it was a decade ago. That is the economic record of the Liberal government. Now the government is going to say that Canadians have to spend \$20,000 more just to get a new vehicle. That is just for next year, but it gets worse.

By 2030, which is a mere five years away, it is going to be 60%. We are going to go from 8% to 10% this year to 60% by 2030, six times the previous amount. How is that even remotely possible? The government knows it is not possible, yet it is continuing to drive forward on this. This is because the Prime Minister is just as obsessed as Justin Trudeau was with this impossible agenda on reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Let us break down a couple of things. This is the epitome of ideology over fact and ideology over reality. First, it is going to cost, in an estimate from the Canadian Journal of Economics, 38,000 manufacturing jobs in the auto sector. That is a devastating blow that would happen as a result of a policy that the Liberals know is not possible but are driving ahead with anyway. It is as though they are saying, “Damn the torpedoes, we are going ahead”. The Liberals are ideologically obsessed with this, and the consequences to Canadians just do not matter. It does not even factor in it for them. Then it is to be 100% by 2035, a mere decade away.

The consequence of this for Canadians is that we are not going to be able to buy a gas-powered vehicle. When we go to 60% in a mere five years, if Canadians go to that dealership and say, “I am a farmer, and I want to replace my diesel pickup truck.” The dealer will say, “Sorry, we have sold all the diesel pickup trucks we are

allowed to sell this year.” That farmer will not be able to get one. Can members imagine that that will be the consequence?

Now, if there were a readily available charging network in Canada, people might say that this makes sense, but, one, there is not; two, the government has no plan to create a charging network; and three, who is going to pay for it?

There was a report put out by RBC called “The \$2 Trillion Transition: Canada’s Road to Net Zero”. The government is ideologically obsessed with net zero, no matter what the harmful consequences are to Canadians. I had the privilege of being the shadow minister for the environment at the time the report came out. I asked the deputy minister of environment at committee how much would it cost to build out the charging network in Canada, electric generation in Canada and increases to electric transmission in Canada to get to these zero-emission vehicle mandates. The answer was that they had no idea, that they had not calculated it. When we talk about gross negligence, that is the example.

The Liberals are driving forward with an ideologically driven mandate that is going to be harmful for Canadians. They do not know how they are going to get there, and they do not know how much it is going to cost. This is the direct definition of negligence, and they do not care. They are driving forward with it.

Let us think about how we get there. First of all, the government has set the charging network at a capacity that is higher per car usage than California or the EU. It has calculated the number of charging stations needed for a vehicle. The government has said that in Canada, a cold country, we need fewer chargers per vehicle than California does. This, in and of itself, is negligence.

● (1030)

Then, we look at where they are regarding the build-out of the charging network. Even with the Liberals’ modest goals, which would not create the charging network that Canadians need, they are at about 10% of their goals. Are they changing the mandates? No, they are not. This is gross negligence. It would have catastrophic consequences for Canadians who are would be forced to buy these vehicles and then have nowhere to charge them.

How can a government continue like this? How can members of the Liberal Party support this? Many of them have rural ridings where there will be no charging network, and their constituents, their voters, the people they are supposed to represent, would be forced to buy these vehicles.

This is not a zero-emissions vehicle mandate; it is a ban on gasoline vehicles. Let us call it what it is: a ban on buying a gasoline vehicle regardless of the consequences. If someone does not have a charging network that they can go to, that is too bad; they would still have to buy an electric vehicle. These are the consequences of the kinds of things the Liberals are talking about.

Business of Supply

Look at number one: We do not have the electric generating capacity to do this across the country. It takes 10 to 15 years to permit and develop new electricity generation, so somehow we have to massively increase our electricity demand for all the electric vehicles that would have to be charged, plus heat pumps, but there is no plan to actually increase the amount of electricity we generate. Again, this is gross negligence, or it is an absolute denial of reality.

Then we go the issue of the cost, which no one knows. I asked the deputy minister of the environment at committee how much it would cost, and he said, basically, that they have no idea and have not calculated that out to the end point.

Let us move to the issue of electricity transmission, and there are two aspects to that. There is transmission across the country, which would have to be massively increased. How much would that cost? They have no idea. Does the ministry of the environment have an idea? No, because I asked, and it does not know.

Then we get to local transmission. If everybody on my street in the town of Orangeville were to decide they were going to install an electric vehicle charger, because remember, in five years, 60% of the people on my street would have to have an electric vehicle, the local transmission cannot handle that capacity. Again, it does not just get downloaded from the federal government. That means there would have to be improvements made to Orangeville Hydro for local transmission. How much is that going to cost? Nobody knows. Do the Liberals know? No, they do not. Do they seem to care? No, they do not.

Therefore, the gasoline-powered vehicle bans that the Liberals are coming forward with are completely ideologically driven, with no plan. I have seen the Liberals come up with things for which they have a plan on the back of a napkin, but at least it is a plan. It is a terrible plan that they drew up in about 10 seconds, and that is often how they govern, but on this, there is absolutely no plan. There is no plan to build the electric generation capacity, no plan to build the electric transmission capacity and no plan to build the local electricity generation capacity. This is where we are.

What have some of the CEOs of the auto companies said about this? Bev Goodman, CEO of Ford Motor Company of Canada, called for the EV mandates to be repealed. Kristian Aquilina, president of General Motors, urged the Liberals to scrap the EV mandates, saying, "It's unrealistic to believe that the country is going to go from 5 or 6 per cent to 20 per cent by [2026], which starts now."

The auto manufacturers have said that the mandates are unrealistic and are impossible to achieve. The Liberals do not know the cost of the electricity generation or how they are going to get there. They do not know how they are going to get there on transmission or on local transmission. They have set the EV charging network standards way lower than in California and way lower than in the EU. There are more cars per charger for chargers that they have not built, yet the Liberals are refusing to cancel the gas vehicle bans. Why is that? It is because they are about ideology over reality.

The only people who are going to be hurt by this are Canadians who are already suffering from a cost of living crisis, an inflationary crisis and a housing crisis. They cannot afford it. Conservatives would cancel the mandates. Why will the Liberals not get onside?

• (1035)

Corey Hogan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have heard arguments like "simply no alternatives", "prohibitive costs" or "no reason to prohibit". Those were actually arguments against phasing out tetraethyl lead, leaded gasoline. We have also heard arguments about stealing freedom and about people's need to have the right to choose for themselves; those are arguments against seat belt laws that were used back in the day.

Yes, government should govern judiciously. Creating new rules should not be the instinct immediately, but I think we can agree that we have a role in setting the floor. My question for the member is this: What should that floor be? Does the member have a counter-proposal, short of doing nothing?

Kyle Seeback: Mr. Speaker, it is amazing. The member has the opportunity to respond to the real, valid criticisms that have been raised: we do not have the electric generating capacity, we do not have the transmission capacity, we do not have the local transmission capacity, we do not have the EV charging network in place and the CEOs of the companies are also saying they cannot reach the mandates. The member's answer is to say that there were some other issues that were dealt with a generation ago, so why can we not deal with this?

Deal with the facts. What is the cost of doing this? You have no idea. What is the cost of the transmission network? You have no idea. What is the cost of the charging network? You have no idea. Will you reach any of these things before the mandates come in? No. They have absolutely no clue what they are talking about. It is ideology over reality.

The Deputy Speaker: Before I go to questions and comments, this is just a reminder to members to speak through the Chair. The Chair has, in fact, no ideas about this debate.

The hon. member for Shefford has the floor.

[*Translation*]

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for my colleague.

First, once again, today's debate shows that Quebec clearly has a much greener and transition-centred vision to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Ultimately, that will save us billions of dollars in public health costs and investments in insurance and infrastructure that are affected by climate change events.

Now, in Canada, we have Electric Mobility Canada, an organization that, over time, has really increased its expertise and credibility. In fact, we see that it is not the electric vehicle availability standard that will destroy jobs in the Canadian auto sector, but, rather, the lack of technological development over time. At the moment, we do not produce electric vehicles in Canada.

Instead of investing in oil companies, would it not make more sense to direct those funds into helping manufacturers develop electric vehicles?

[English]

Kyle Seeback: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I will trust the estimates by the Canadian Journal of Economics over those of the company that the member cited with respect to economic loss. The fact of the matter is this. There is an old expression, “putting the cart before the horse”, and this is what is happening here. We do not have a plan for the electric generation. We do not have a plan for transmission of electricity. We do not have a plan for local electricity transmission. We do not have a plan for charging networks.

When we do not have any of that stuff, which is required for a mandate, how can we proceed with the mandates? That is the problem. There has been no thinking, no thought done by the government on how to implement the mandates. The only result of this would be increased suffering for Canadians, who are already suffering as a result of the economic policies of the Liberal government for the last 10 years.

Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join the debate. The member was actually out in Saskatchewan last summer, and we met with Evraz steelworkers, pipefitters, building trades workers and refinery workers. Not once did EV mandates come up in any of our conversations. He was able to see our province, with its vast, beautiful, long distances. There are not a lot of charging stations and availability to charge EV vehicles.

My one question is this: Who does the member think has asked for the EV mandate? I wonder whom the Liberals have talked to who has actually asked for the policy to come forward.

● (1040)

Kyle Seeback: Mr. Speaker, I wish they had talked to someone. I would say that we had a great trip out there. We met with the great unionized steelworkers and others who build this country from coast to coast. I do not think the Liberals talked to anyone, because when we look at the facts that I have pointed out repeatedly, we see that they do not have a plan. They need a plan for the fundamental aspects of making a zero-emission vehicle for Canadians to actually be able to drive and charge, and they have no plan for that. As I say, this is 100% Liberal ideology over reality.

Wade Grant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to rise today to speak about the issue, which is very important to the residents of Vancouver Quadra and to the residents of the Musqueam first nation, where I come from, at the mouth of the Fraser River near the Salish Sea, whose habitat is no doubt being affected by climate change.

Business of Supply

I rise in the House today to respond to the motion before us, which calls on the government to abandon our commitment to the zero-emission vehicle supply chain, which is essential to the future of Canada's automotive sector.

The motion repeats discredited talking points about costs, and it tries to paint Canadians into a false corner between affordability and ambition. It tries to scare away Canadians from common-sense, data-driven climate policy. It references a price tag that has no basis in reality, a number that does not come from any independent policy source or the manufacturing sector. It seemingly is found originating only from a certain member who used to sit in the House, which is how I know that the motion is not put forth in good faith for all Canadians.

Let me be very clear from the outset: The regulation would not ban vehicles that use gasoline in 2035. In fact hybrid vehicles, of which there are many types, would count towards the targets, which is an important point to make clear right off the top. The motion is not based on facts.

The truth is that the electric vehicle availability standard is about ensuring that a variety of affordable electric vehicles would be available for Canadians to purchase. This would give them choices when it comes to driving cleaner, more affordable vehicles backed by a growing made-in-Canada supply chain. It is about expanding choice and creating jobs, something that members on the other side seem to have abandoned in their efforts to oppose any policy designed to fight climate change.

The reality is that Canadians sent a message during the last election, rejecting the type of rhetoric that the Conservatives are putting forward. Clearly that has not sunk in yet, because Conservatives continue to import American-style rhetoric opposing zero-emission vehicles. They continue to attack policies that fight climate change, instead of focusing on a united, unified Canadian approach to fighting American tariffs, the tariffs that are the real and present danger to Canada's automotive sector.

Let us set the record straight: The motion makes the claim that the government would be banning gas-powered vehicles, which is simply false. The electric vehicle availability standard would not ban vehicles from using gasoline; it would phase in targets for the availability of zero-emission vehicles with flexibilities that include plug-in hybrids. These are the kinds of actions on climate change that Canadians want. They want more options and want options made here in Canada, which is exactly what they asked for when they gave us the mandate to lead.

The Conservatives also claimed that prices for vehicles would rise, even though the Parliamentary Budget Officer himself found that the policy would actually lower the relative cost of ZEVs by 22% by 2035, compared to what they would cost if we did nothing at all. It would shift the burden away from the consumer and ensure that manufacturers are bringing affordable, zero-emission vehicles to the market, which would be a benefit to Canadian consumers, and it is backed by data, not by ideology and not by fear.

Business of Supply

Let us also remember that hybrid vehicles would count towards compliance, and for families looking for affordable, practical solutions, these vehicles are part of the bridge to a cleaner future. The regulation is designed to adjust over time, giving manufacturers and buyers the runway they need in order to succeed.

Light-duty EV sales continue to grow in Canada. We know that demand for ZEVs is rising. That is not a political talking point; that is just a market reality. EVs are getting better and better, with longer ranges, faster charging and lower costs. The question now is not whether people will drive ZEVs but whether those vehicles will be made in Canada or not.

While Conservatives campaign against the very technologies that are reshaping the global auto industry, Liberals are working to bring the production home. Since 2020, Canada has secured over \$34 billion in investment in the battery and automotive supply chain, and that is not where we are stopping. In our platform, we committed to moving forward with six major investment tax credits, including the clean-technology manufacturing ITC and the electric vehicle supply chain ITC. These are tools to attract investment, protect Canadian workers and ensure that our communities benefit from the jobs of the future.

● (1045)

We want Canada to build the cars of tomorrow, not just watch others do it. We do not want to force Canadians to buy electric vehicles. We want to be able to compete with major international companies that are already manufacturing the kinds of EVs Canadians want. We want to ensure that we are saving our manufacturing industry when the United States administration is trying to attack it. The single biggest threat to Canada's auto sector is American tariffs, not electric vehicles.

The Government of Canada is working closely with Canada's auto sector and provinces such as Ontario and my home province of British Columbia to ensure that our auto sector remains competitive. The truth is that this is not a path Canada is walking alone. More than 40% of the U.S. auto market, the European Union, the United Kingdom and China are all on the same path, but here is the difference: Canada's EV policy is much more flexible. We allow hybrid credits, and we offer credit banking. We are also working closely with the provinces and with industry.

In 2024, the International Energy Agency reported that the global sale of electric cars rose by over 25%, surpassing 17 million units and accounting for one-fifth of all car sales, in line with the IEA's projections for 2024.

The new federal government is particularly focused on protecting the jobs of auto workers and growing Canada's economy to be the strongest in the G7. This means supporting innovation. Investments in the electric vehicle supply chain are particularly important when it comes to making Canada the fastest-growing economy in the G7. This is a made-in-Canada approach that balances ambition with pragmatism.

I know that many Canadians are rightly concerned about the cost of living. That is why we have taken steps to support affordability through our broader ZEV strategy. We have committed to consumer incentives, which have already helped take the adoption of ZEVs

from 3% in 2019 to over 15% in 2024. During the last election, the Liberal Party committed to reintroducing a purchase incentive worth up to \$5,000 for zero-emission vehicles, which supports Canadian workers and strengthens our domestic supply chains. Coupled with provincial rebates, such as the rebates offered in my home province of B.C., EVs have become even more affordable for the average Canadian.

At the same time, we are helping Canadians power their vehicles where they live and work. Over 44,000 public chargers have already been built across Canada, with 33,900 more expected, thanks to compliance credits and clean fuel regulations. We have invested over \$1.1 billion through the Canada Infrastructure Bank and the ZEV infrastructure program to expand Canada's EV charging network. We are largely seeing charging infrastructure keep pace with the number of EVs being purchased in Canada, and we are closing the gap in the number of chargers that we will need in the years to come.

Let me be clear. The electric vehicle availability standard is only one part of our broader strategy. We are working across the entire ZEV value chain. That means critical minerals, battery manufacturing, vehicle assembly and recycling, driving private investments and protecting workers with smart industrial policy. It is not about one regulation; it is about a vision for Canada's economy.

We have an opportunity to become a world leader in a manufacturing sector that is rapidly growing. Every stage of creating ZEVs can be built right here at home by Canadians and for Canadians. Private sector partners and other levels of government also have important roles to play when achieving this goal. We are not banning vehicles that use gasoline. We are responding to the market. We are responding to Canadians.

Canada has recognized the importance of building a complete end-to-end EV battery supply chain. Transformative investments are creating well-paying jobs and bringing prosperity to communities throughout Canada. A commitment to sustainable investment in the EV battery supply chain in Canada is part of the transition to long-term sustainability for the planet. Let us not forget that EVs and ZEVs are not some small market products. It is no longer just Tesla or nothing. We have many more major auto sector companies that are not only building these vehicles but also investing in Canada to have this EV supply chain right here.

Canada is uniquely placed to be at the head of the pack. This is about climate leadership. This is about the future. This is about my children, my grandchildren, everybody's children, everybody's grandchildren. The regulations will contribute to Canada's climate change goals by preventing an estimated 362 megatonnes of greenhouse gas emissions.

● (1050)

That cumulative impact is real, measurable progress toward our international obligations. Transportation emissions have declined to levels not seen in decades, demonstrating that we can grow our economy while also fighting climate change. Canada has some of the most diverse and important natural habitats and wildlife in the world. It is our duty to conserve and protect it for today, for tomorrow and for seven generations ahead.

One might think the Conservative Party would be more interested in doing that, but let us be honest about what we are debating today. The Conservative Party is using fear and misinformation to try to score political points, but while they shout about choice, they offer no plan for emissions, no plan for jobs, no plan for trade, no plan to protect manufacturing and no plan to help Canadians afford the future. On the other hand, the government is working with auto manufacturers, with unions, with provinces like Ontario, B.C. and Quebec and with Canadians from coast to coast to build a modern, clean economy that works for everyone.

Canadians deserve better than this motion. Our children and our grandchildren deserve better than political theatre. They deserve a Parliament that looks to the future, not to the past. That is why I oppose this motion and stand for the Canada that builds the cars of tomorrow, supports the workers of today and ensures cleaner air and lower costs for future generations.

When I was elected by my constituents in Vancouver Quadra, I promised them I would fight for the future, for the climate, for our children and for what they believe in, and today I am happy to do that. My constituents are deeply passionate about protecting our environment, and I am honoured to be here to speak on their behalf as their representative in the House, the first-ever representative of the Musqueam first nation to represent Vancouver Quadra. I will continue to use my voice for my constituents and stand on the right side of history.

Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleague across the way on his maiden speech. There is a lot to unpack in it.

There are a lot of questions with regard to this legislation. Notwithstanding the government's plans for the 26 million or 27

Business of Supply

million vehicles on the roads as we speak, here is the question I have for my colleague across the way. When he was running to represent his constituents, did he tell them, with regard to the net-zero mandate, that their government would mandate that they could not purchase gas vehicles and had to purchase electric vehicles?

If Liberals are so proud of this, why did they not run on it in their platform?

Wade Grant: Mr. Speaker, I hearken back to when I was in grades 6 and 7. My grade 6 and 7 teacher, Valerie Jerome, sister of Harry Jerome, was the person who first introduced me to what is happening with our climate. Moving forward, I always said that I would take a strong stand.

I walked door to door, ensuring that I listened to my constituents, who said that the environment is the one key issue they want me to drive home. I will continue to do that. That is why I stand by this policy, and that is why I stand on this side: to fight climate change and to fight for my children and grandchildren.

● (1055)

[Translation]

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lis-tuguj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, last summer, the Conservatives called for a 100% surtax on electric vehicles manufactured in China, and a few months later, the Liberal government imposed that surtax.

Of course, we share the Conservatives' concern about the cost of electric vehicles. I would like to know the government's position on this. According to an Abacus poll released yesterday, 53% of Canadians would prefer for the import surtax that is being imposed on Chinese vehicles at the request of U.S. to be lower to make electric vehicles more affordable.

What is the Liberal government's position on this?

[English]

Wade Grant: Mr. Speaker, obviously, we want to make sure we make affordability a key component of this. That is why we are going to drive record investment into the EV industry and make sure we build them at home by Canadians and for Canadians, so we can ensure they become much more affordable more quickly.

Business of Supply

Hon. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. member for honouring the mandate that his constituents sent him to do. I want the member to talk about how during the campaign the Conservatives talked about anything but the tariffs imposed on the automotive sector. Maybe the member can talk about how on this side of the House we care about jobs in the southwestern Ontario corridor and every single area of the automotive sector that is affected. Conservatives talk about giving choice to Canadians and allowing Canadians to have consumer choice, but why are they not letting Canadians pick the EV sector as well?

Wade Grant: Mr. Speaker, as I walked door to door in Vancouver Quadra, a riding that is very clued into the environment, and as I went to my children's high school and talked to them, people told me that the number one thing that drives their anxiety for the future is climate change and what they are going to inherit. We want to ensure that we leave them with a planet where there is cleaner air and where they can go on the water to fish and do what they want. These are the things I committed to for my constituents.

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today's opposition motion is about affordability and accountability. Windsor auto workers and suppliers are worried, as these mandates are going to impact their jobs. What specific and time-bound commitments is the government going to make to safeguard legacy auto jobs in Windsor and ensure that no worker is left behind?

Wade Grant: Mr. Speaker, obviously we want to make sure that we work with the industries. That is what we are doing, working with industry and the workers to ensure we move forward with an educated approach to this. We will not leave any worker behind. We are going to work for the workers, and that is what we will continue to do on this side of the House.

Hon. Bardish Chagger (Waterloo, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I recognize there are a diversity of views and perspectives within this chamber. We know there is no bad seat in this chamber, and it is always an honour and privilege to represent the good people of the riding of Waterloo.

Something that the parliamentary secretary mentioned was in regard to the approach of the official opposition members and the fact that they are not recognizing the importance of growing our economy, growing opportunity. Electric vehicles are one of those opportunities. I come from southwestern Ontario. The automotive sector is a really important part of our economy and the jobs and the well-being of communities. What is interesting is that the official opposition chooses to attack electric vehicles rather than challenge the U.S. tariffs being imposed on Canada.

I would like to hear from the member why the Conservatives refuse to accept that climate change is real. Why is it that they always attack the government and Canadian jobs rather than actually looking at where the issues are?

Wade Grant: Mr. Speaker, the biggest threat to our economy right now is the American tariffs, not electric vehicles. We want to ensure that we grow our economy but also protect the environment for future generations. We need to do that with different approaches. There is not one panacea that is going to do that. We have to take different approaches, and this is just one, to ensure that my

children, my grandchildren and seven generations ahead will inherit an earth that is better than it is today.

● (1100)

[Translation]

Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am relieved to see that my Liberal colleague intends to vote against the Conservative motion, but I would still like to ask him about something else related to this motion.

Fewer electric vehicles are currently being sold than in the past. This is specifically due to the sabotage by his government, which, in a completely unexpected and unannounced manner, decided to cut subsidies for electric vehicles. People do not know whether the subsidy will come back or not. The government was reelected, but has yet to make any commitments regarding the return of these subsidies, which is creating a great deal of uncertainty in the market.

I would like to know when the government will put an end to this uncertainty so that sales will pick up again.

[English]

Wade Grant: Mr. Speaker, during the election, our platform stated that we were looking to reintroduce the \$5,000 incentive for those purchases. We look forward to electric vehicle sales continuing to rise in the near future.

Kerry Diotte (Edmonton Griesbach, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal member across the way talks about working with the auto sector and the industry. I met with some industry reps yesterday, and they hate these vehicle mandates. They have to be fully electric by 2026, and we are at 7.5% now.

What kind of draconian laws is the government prepared to bring in so it can meet those targets?

Wade Grant: Mr. Speaker, as I stated, we are looking forward to continuing to work with the auto sector and continuing to work with workers to ensure that we bring them along, so we can ensure that we protect those jobs, protect the future and protect our environment.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that the member talked a bit about how the Conservatives are trying to give this false impression that there will be no gas-powered vehicles 10 years from now and how it does a disservice to the public as a whole when we get Conservatives continually trying to give misinformation on what is fairly sound government policy.

Could the member provide his thoughts in regard to the negative side of the Conservative Party giving misinformation?

Wade Grant: Mr. Speaker, I hearken back to about a month ago, when I was on social media and I would see a number of my friends and family posting things that were clearly deepfakes. They had the same sort of negative rhetoric and were believing what the other side was saying. I had to call them to assure them that these things were not true.

Liberals are moving forward to ensure that we have a greener economy, but we are not outright banning gas-powered vehicles.

[*Translation*]

Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ) Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Repentigny.

To put it mildly, the honeymoon between the Conservatives and the Liberals was short-lived. The new couple, united by Bill C-5, is breaking up this morning over electric vehicles. It seems the Liberals may not be willing to buy into all kinds of nonsense when it comes to the energy transition and carbon pricing. Perhaps they are not prepared to go as far as the Conservatives.

I have participated in many Conservative opposition days, particularly with regard to the carbon tax. What are they repeating today with this motion? What are they repeating in this new Parliament? One thing is very clear to me: Today's motion, once again, shows that the Conservative Party is completely out of touch with Quebec's reality. Not only is the party out of touch, but the Conservative members from Quebec do not have the influence they need within their caucus to make progress on the issues facing the Quebec nation. We saw that this week.

As members know, we had an opposition day on the \$800 million that was stolen from Quebecers and reimbursed to the rest of Canadians for carbon tax payments they never made. What was my Conservative Party colleagues' reaction? They proposed an amendment to the effect that the \$800 million could be repaid, if Quebec agreed to end its carbon exchange. The Conservative Party wanted to tell the Government of Quebec how to take action on carbon pricing.

Let us recall the psychodrama that we experienced in the last Parliament when the Conservatives were shouting about how we were the "Liberal Bloc" and about how we were supporting the infamous carbon tax, a tax that did not apply to Quebec. Now, lo and behold, the Conservatives have seen the light and have understood that this much-talked-about carbon tax did not apply to Quebec.

Let us get back to the issue of electric vehicles. I think the key question here is, who has the most to gain from the electrification of transportation and who has the most to lose? The Conservative motion picks a side. It sides with Alberta and the oil and gas sector. The people who have something to lose in the electrification of transportation are in Alberta, the oil and gas sector. The people who have something to gain are in Quebec.

What about Quebec? For the past 30 years, there has been an energy transition. I will come back to the issue of setting up a battery industry. Hydro-Québec has developed a unique expertise that could help us become North America's battery producers. What else could be said about Quebec? Quebec sits atop vast reserves of critical minerals. It has clean electricity that is accessible to everyone at a very low cost. No one pays as competitive a price for electricity as we do in Quebec. It is a favourable geographic location that could allow us to become part of the battery industry. It is a vibrant industrial ecosystem with a low carbon footprint. Consider the forestry sector. The forest is a carbon sink that allows us to sequester carbon when we use wood. Consider Quebec aluminum, which is tied to the hydroelectric sector. It is thanks to Quebec's

Business of Supply

clean electricity that we can produce aluminum and that the Americans depend on us and our aluminum smelters. Quebec has all these significant advantages that are steering us toward a major transformation and the electrification of transportation, yet my Conservative colleagues from Quebec prefer to side with Alberta.

In many areas, the battery industry that is crucial to electric vehicles in Quebec is booming. Unlike what they are doing out west, Quebec does not invest in carbon capture or storage strategies. Quebec's investments are in this battery industry. The Quebec minister has repeatedly said that his government is in talks with about a hundred companies to develop such projects.

● (1105)

To illustrate the pertinence of my arguments, the two main projects that are likely to develop and create an economic boom in my region of Saguenay–Lac-Saint-Jean are related to the battery sector. I am talking about the phosphate industry, with First Phosphate and Arianne Phosphate. Those are two major projects.

Unfortunately, we never hear the member for Chicoutimi—Le Fjord talk about that. During the election campaign, he preferred to talk about GNL Québec, a project that was rejected by the Government of Quebec and that had no future for us. We never heard him say that it was possible to develop a phosphate sector. We have to put all our eggs in—

The Deputy Speaker: I must interrupt the hon. member for Jonquière. There seems to be a phone near the desk that is interfering with the interpreters' work. It would have to be moved.

The hon. member for Jonquière.

Mario Simard: Mr. Speaker, my apologies to the interpreters.

I was saying that, with today's motion, what the Conservatives are proposing is to hold Quebec back from its transition to a low-carbon economy and have our investments go to waste. It is simple: The Manichaeon view would be that the Conservatives want us in an oil and gas stranglehold. We saw that in the previous Parliament, and they are doing it again. The Conservatives constantly defend oil and gas tooth and nail. Quebec should remain dependent on oil and gas instead of developing its own clean electricity infrastructures. That would make absolutely no sense. That is what I do not understand.

Why should we electrify transportation? Oil sands development is the industry with the highest greenhouse gas emissions in Canada. Transportation is another major emitter. The electrification of transportation will reduce the consumption of fuel, along with our GHG emissions. If anyone does not believe that, they do not believe in climate change.

Business of Supply

Even worse, it is an essential economic driver in Quebec. I myself have an electric vehicle. Some people would have us believe that electric vehicles are nothing but trouble. That is nonsense. I live in the Saguenay, precisely 665 kilometres from Parliament. I can get here with my car. I have to stop for 20 minutes to charge it at a rapid charging station, then I can continue on my way. Typically, stopping for 20 minutes during a six-and-a-half-hour drive is not a luxury, so there is no reason, with today's new technologies, not to drive a electric vehicle. What the Conservatives want, however, is to keep people dependent on oil and gas.

I see this motion as an extension of what we have seen in the past. Former Conservative leader Pierre Poilievre is a master at coming up with populist ideas that make no sense. Today the Conservatives are attacking electric vehicles. They are using the slogan of Quebec's Conservative Party: "My car, my choice". It seems to be a matter of identity for the Conservatives.

I understand that we can have polarizing debates. Some people are pro-life, others are pro-choice. They are pro-gas, so they disagree with those who are pro-electricity. I do not understand how a serious party can introduce a motion like this.

However, what is most important is that today the Conservatives are trying to defend the oil and gas industry. They are on-side with the government on Bill C-5 to defend the oil and gas industry tooth and nail. Ultimately, the Conservative Party's rhetoric is similar to the Bloc Québécois's rhetoric: if it is good for Quebec, if it does not harm Quebec, we support it. In their case, if it is good for the oil and gas industry, if it does not harm the oil and gas sector, they support it. Otherwise, they oppose it. This motion is just one example of that.

• (1110)

Ginette Lavack (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indigenous Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as my colleague mentioned, everything about this motion seeks to divide people into winners and losers. I would ask the member to explain how the electrification of transportation could have a very positive impact in his riding.

Mario Simard: Mr. Speaker, a Quebecker who decides to plug their car into Hydro-Québec's electrical grid takes the money they would have given in the past to the large oil companies and their shareholders outside the country and gives it directly to Quebecers. This money can then be reinvested in our health care and education systems. I do not see why we would not take advantage of the exceptional opportunity we have of using an effective and inexpensive electrical grid. Why would we offer the money we invest in mobility to Alberta to contribute to a—

The Deputy Speaker: I must interrupt the hon. member.

The member for Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk has the floor for questions and comments.

Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's remarks and thank him for his speech.

Unfortunately, he has missed the point of our motion. Our motion is not intended to attack electric vehicles. On the contrary, it is intended to give people the option to choose the type of vehicle

they want to drive, based on their personal needs. The members says that the Conservative Party is disconnected from the reality of Quebecers, yet just a few weeks ago, Pierre-Olivier Zappa showed how he had "disconnected" from the interest he had in electric vehicles. Does the member disagree with Liberal MNA Monsef Derjaji, who said that it was utopian to say that this is a realistic objective, since it is becoming more and more unrealistic? Minister Benoit Charrette said that they have been saying from the start that they are not dogmatic and that they would reassess if it becomes apparent after several years that the market is not ready. That is exactly what our motion is doing.

Why does the member make a distinction between what he thinks and what Quebecers think?

• (1115)

Mario Simard: Mr. Speaker, I will not address Mr. Zappa's comments, which were grossly exaggerated. Once, when I had a gas-powered car, I spilled gas on my shoes. I did not go around saying that my car smelled of gas for four or five weeks. His remarks were exaggerated and do not represent the reality of electric vehicles. That being said, what really annoys me is to see elected members of Quebec's National Assembly stand up on an opposition day to defend an industry that does not benefit Quebec at all. The electrification of transportation would allow Quebec to successfully develop electrification. What the Conservatives want is to make life more difficult for Quebecers.

Patrick Weiler (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the two provinces where people buy the most electric vehicles are British Columbia and Quebec. What do these two provinces have in common that explains this phenomenon?

Mario Simard: Mr. Speaker, the answer is probably simple enough. It is because they offered incentives. It is because they built a network to serve EV owners.

The Conservatives' proposals do not align with that vision. What they want to do is not develop the EV sector. The last thing I heard the Conservatives say is that they want to maintain the plastic industry. They said that during the election campaign. They want to keep using plastic straws, and they want to get more gas-powered vehicles on the road. In my opinion, that is no way to deal with the climate crisis we are grappling with today.

[English]

Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity to sit with the hon. member on committee, and I know he is very passionate about everything environmental. I have a question because I know he is just as passionate about Quebec and Quebec sovereignty.

Why is the member comfortable with the government imposing a mandate on Quebecers? Let the market go where it will in Quebec, let Quebecers do what they want, but why is he comfortable with Canadians telling Quebecers what to do?

[Translation]

Mario Simard: Mr. Speaker, Quebec has already passed legislation on zero-emission vehicles. We did not wait for the federal government. When it comes to the energy transition, Quebec very rarely waits for the federal government.

What I find offensive, however, is the billions of Quebec dollars being funnelled to the oil and gas industry. We paid \$34 billion for a pipeline. Between 2024 and 2030—

The Deputy Speaker: Resuming debate.

The member for Repentigny.

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, what a fascinating debate this is. Unfortunately, I think we need to reframe it and recognize it for what it really is.

The oil and gas companies and carmakers both here in Canada and around the world are waging a campaign against any government action that would result in lower oil consumption. Let us be clear: Most of the arguments being put forward by my Conservative colleagues today are taken directly out of the oil industry's playbook. The oil industry is fighting to hang onto its market share in the face of a rapid global technological evolution and a rise in EV sales. Many of the remarks we are hearing today are a distortion of the truth. I think that if elected officials want to take part in a substantive debate and act responsibly, they should tell their constituents the truth and stop promoting what amounts to pro-oil propaganda.

Unfortunately, there are auto manufacturers in Canada that are not working for Canadians, on a number of levels. For example, they have put only a limited range of small, affordable vehicles on the market. This goes for both gas-powered and electric vehicles. Most of the EVs on the market, few of which are manufactured here, are large vehicles. They are extremely expensive, and the middle class cannot afford them. New vehicles are becoming more and more expensive in general.

One of the major problems we have in terms of vehicle availability is that the manufacturers are not putting them on the market of their own volition. What the Conservatives are proposing is to eliminate any obligation for manufacturers to market these vehicles. Following COVID-19, there was a shortage of vehicles, and many people had to wait nearly two years for an EV. Few models were available, and the most affordable ones were not being offered. Why did it take so long to get these vehicles here? Due to a shortage and problems with the supply of parts, among other things, manufacturers were forced to prioritize markets where there were rules requiring them to provide EVs. That means that places where there was no obligation to sell EVs came last. That is why there were delays and consumers had no options.

It is completely illogical to think that if we allow EV manufacturers to operate as a free market, there will be more EVs. The past very clearly shows that this is not how things work. We need to regulate manufacturers and make them responsible for offering more and more vehicles, as well as smaller electric vehicles, which is a problem right now.

Business of Supply

As for the propaganda we are hearing today, we have heard both the oil companies and the Conservatives say that people will not be allowed to choose what vehicle to buy. They are suggesting that, starting in 2035, gas-powered cars could be seized. They are saying that the government could seize a gas-powered vehicle owned by an individual. That is just not true. We are talking about new vehicles. By 2035, new gas-powered vehicles will no longer be sold. That is 10 years from now, and the technology is already in place today to replace gas-powered vehicles with electric vehicles. The gains are significant.

Obviously, we will talk a little later about the fight against climate change, the fact that the transportation sector is a problem and the fact that electric vehicles are part of the solution, but not the only one. However, it is wishful thinking to imagine that Canada could achieve its objectives by eliminating regulations, measures and programs when the country is already not on track to meet its greenhouse gas reduction targets. More specifically, it is proof of the Conservatives' total unwillingness to fight climate change and to hold this government accountable for what the World Health Organization says is the single greatest threat facing humanity.

• (1120)

The single greatest health threat facing humanity is climate change. This is not fiction, it is reality. We are right in the middle of experiencing the impacts of climate change, particularly wildfires. To prevent the situation from getting even worse, we need to respect science and reduce emissions in the transportation sector and other sectors. Most credible climate scientists agree on a target of net zero by 2050. We need to cut back considerably. We need to try to stop consuming oil and gas now, or at least in the next 25 years. The deadline is coming up fast. Science is telling us to cut global emissions by half, or almost half, by 2030. We are behind schedule.

Business of Supply

Regarding the transportation sector, unfortunately, we cannot force everyone to take the bus. We need to provide more funding for alternatives to solo car rides, including public transportation, car sharing, carpooling and active transportation. We also need to tackle the vehicle fleet. We need to renew the fleet with more fuel-efficient vehicles, such as light-duty vehicles, which are part of the problem. One solution that would be promising in many ways for Quebec and all of Canada is transportation electrification. This would help the fight against climate change by significantly reducing emissions. According to a life cycle assessment by Hydro-Québec, EVs produce almost 65% fewer GHGs over the first 150,000 kilometres. Compared with a gas-powered vehicle, an EV powered with Quebec's renewable electricity produces almost 80% fewer GHGs over 300,000 kilometres. From a climate action perspective, there is no doubt that this is an avenue we need to look to.

As far as health is concerned, unfortunately, the Conservatives do not have much to say about current issues. There are national statistics on mortality rates due to poor air quality. We are talking about 2,000 premature deaths. We must add to that what we call comorbidity, in other words, people with cardiovascular problems, people who end up having days off work, people who end up hospitalized or having to go to the emergency room. These air quality impacts amount to billions of dollars. Fighting climate change also means making sure that we reduce our dependence on oil and improve air quality by reducing emissions related to the combustion of oil. As I was saying, more than 2,000 people die prematurely every year in Montreal alone, according to the statistics. When people switch from a gas-powered vehicle to an electric one, emissions drop to zero because there is no combustion. As I have shown, we must keep in mind that fighting climate change also means reducing health costs which everyone has to pay, both financially and in human terms. Everyone has a grandmother or a grandfather, who is often the first to be affected by poor air quality. The same is true for young children as they develop. Unfortunately, the Conservatives and car manufacturers are not proposing accountability.

In economic terms, we are talking about more than \$10-billion worth of imported oil every year for Quebec alone. We have everything to gain from a societal point of view by turning the corner and freeing ourselves from fossil fuels in Quebec, which has joined the Beyond Oil and Gas Alliance. The Government of Quebec has very clearly said that we must reduce our dependence on oil. It has said no to new oil and gas exploration and development, and yes to solutions that move us away from oil and gas. From an economic and societal point of view, we are talking about more than \$10 billion in imports. The biggest deficit in Quebec's trade balance comes from importing oil. We are choosing this large deficit instead of, among other things, powering up Hydro-Québec and keeping our money at home through renewable energy. That is the kind of societal project we need. We do not need more oil and gas, as the Conservatives are proposing.

● (1125)

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Quebec is switching to electric vehicles because there is a well-developed network of charging stations on our roads. I would like the member to tell us how the standard of availability of electric vehicles will contribute to the growth

of a Canada-wide network, and perhaps convince the rest of the country to follow Quebec's lead.

I would also like the member to tell us how many charging stations he thinks need to be added to the existing network.

Patrick Bonin: Mr. Speaker, having standards in place means an increasing number of electric vehicles and higher demand for them. It then becomes more attractive to develop a system that more and more people are using.

Quebec is indeed an example when it comes to the number of charging stations available. The current system allows builders who do not meet their electric vehicle sales quota to invest in installing charging stations instead and thereby contribute to expanding the essential charging station system that we need.

As for the number of charging stations that are needed, I do not have that figure right now, but I would be happy to come back with a response later. By all accounts, Quebec is ahead of several other provinces on this and we think that the federal government—

● (1130)

The Deputy Speaker: I must interrupt the hon. member because his time to respond is up.

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

Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Repentigny for his speech and congratulate him on his election.

The member mentioned the environmental footprint of cars, which is entirely legitimate, but let us remember that this debate is about the obligation to sell only electric cars in Canada starting in 2035.

I drive an electric car myself. Electric cars produce zero emissions. However, producing an electric car requires a lot of minerals. Could the member explain the environmental footprint of manufacturing a car, whether electric or conventional?

Patrick Bonin: Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to provide my colleague with some of the studies that have been done on this subject, including by Hydro-Québec, an organization that we are very proud of.

Four out of five factors used in the full life-cycle analysis of vehicles show that electric vehicles are much better. This is true not only in terms of greenhouse gas emissions when compared to gas-powered vehicles, but also in terms of the natural resources used. Gas-powered vehicles burn and therefore use much greater quantities of natural resources than do electric vehicles, whose lithium batteries are 99% recyclable. As for cobalt, I will tell my colleague that cobalt is used in gas-powered vehicles at the oil refining stage and that not all electric vehicles contain cobalt.

Nevertheless, the entire life cycle certainly needs to be improved, including the mineral extraction stage. We completely agree with that. All of this must also be reduced as much as possible at the source, of course.

The Deputy Speaker: I would like to remind hon. members that there are two Standing Orders involved in getting recognized by the Chair. First, a member must be in their seat.

The hon. member for Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères.

Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my colleague from Repentigny on his speech.

We know that the transportation electrification strategy is essential for reaching greenhouse gas reduction targets and that the Liberal government suddenly stopped funding electric vehicles.

What does my colleague think about the fact that we are still waiting and that the government has stopped helping to electrify transportation?

Patrick Bonin: Mr. Speaker, like many others, we think the way the program was cancelled is completely unacceptable. There was no predictability for the industry. The government acted very quickly when it could have sent a warning about where the program was headed rather than cancelling it overnight. Today, only the Government of Quebec funds the purchase of electric vehicles, which are very beneficial. We would like the federal government to get back to doing that.

That obviously requires a budget. One of the reasons we asked for a budget is that programs like this cannot be rolled out. We hope that the program will be improved to help individuals, including the less fortunate, buy an electric vehicle. That is why we are calling for an upgrade to the action plan that targets society as a whole to improve sustainable mobility in the country.

* * *

[English]

PRIVILEGE

ALLEGED MISLEADING MINISTER TESTIMONY IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to respond to a question of privilege raised by the member for Lakeland on Friday, June 13, respecting statements made in the committee of the whole on Wednesday evening.

Privilege

The member alleged that the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources misled the House respecting statements he made in response to her question about the process and context of Bill C-5. My colleague across the way is unfortunately engaging in a game of gotcha politics. Members of this House know well that the cut and thrust of questions and answers in the committee of the whole can be designed to trip up another member. This can and does happen, but to impute a motive that the minister deliberately misled the House is not in question. He did not.

The time for answers in the committee of the whole is to be proportional to the time to ask the question. As members can appreciate, this results in very short questions that are not designed to receive informed and contextualized answers. That is what the minister was attempting to do in providing the member with an answer to her question, to provide her with the context and process that will be used in the project identification.

The process envisioned in identifying projects of national interest will involve consultations and engagements with a diverse group of Canadians, including, first and foremost, indigenous partners, premiers, businesses, environmental groups and investors. This is not a process where politicians make decisions in a vacuum. Rather, this process will include real and robust engagement with the groups I just mentioned.

I will, for the sake of clarity and to avoid any confusion that the minister's remarks may have caused, reassure members that the minister in no way sought to deliberately mislead the House or my colleague across the way.

We apologize for any confusion that may have arisen from this debate. I will say that the minister's attempt to clarify and provide some context on how the process to identify projects of national interest will proceed, in my view, is important for all Canadians. The groups and individuals who will have a stake in these projects need to be meaningfully engaged, heard and respected, and the process will inform our approach.

In closing, I note that the exchange that is the subject of the member's concern occurred on Wednesday evening. The member waited until Friday to raise this concern with you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly do not want to impute motives as to why the matter was not raised at the earliest opportunity, Thursday, June 12, when the House had over six hours of debate on the Conservative opposition day motion. Be that as it may, the fact remains that the matter was certainly not raised at the first opportunity, and it was not a matter that would have taken such an experienced member one and a half sitting days to raise.

● (1135)

The Deputy Speaker: I thank the parliamentary secretary for those additions and contributions to that debate.

Resuming debate, the member for Huron—Bruce.

*Business of Supply***BUSINESS OF SUPPLY**

OPPOSITION MOTION—SALE OF GAS-POWERED VEHICLES

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Ben Lobb (Huron—Bruce, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise today. It is my first opportunity to rise in the House since the last election. I would like to thank the voters in Huron—Bruce for their support through the years. I certainly appreciate it. It is humbling; I will say that. I would also like to thank my family and extended family for their great support through the years. I would also like to thank all the fantastic volunteers. For anybody in the House of Commons or anybody who ran in an election in a big rural riding, I say it is quite a challenge. We have volunteers in every community and every town, and they really help out, putting up signs and door knocking. It really is a big effort. I thank all of them.

I am going to share my time with the member of Parliament for Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke, a great colleague of mine. Her speech will be up after mine and will likely be 10 or 20 times better than mine, but we will hear everybody's speech.

With the EV mandate that is being brought forward, I do not think it is important to debate what a person likes better. If we like an electric vehicle, if we like an electric truck or if we like a diesel truck or a gas truck, that is our preference. Probably, we would all agree that the issue comes down to how, by 2035, whether we still desire to purchase a gas or diesel vehicle that suits our lifestyle needs, whether we live in a rural or remote area or whether we use it for business, that is something I do not think we need to be penalized for, in terms of \$20,000 a vehicle. I think most people would agree with that.

The idea of and the evolution of electric vehicles is on display every time we get in our car and drive up and down a road. Where we never used to see one, we see one at every grocery store. Whatever area we are doing our shopping in, we will see one. We will see charging stations. It has evolved very well over the last 15 to 20 years and likely will only continue to grow. I do not think that this is the debate anybody is really having in here. It is just about how we are going to put the hammer down by 2035 and penalize those whom it probably is not going to work for. When we are doing that, we are saying it is for everybody. I do not think Canadians are saying that.

To take the most simplistic example, I used to have a gas-fired chainsaw and a gas-fired grass trimmer. My neighbour sells Makita battery-operated chainsaws, drills, lawnmowers and so on. One day, he said to me that I am just a weekend warrior, no offence, and he asked me why I did not get into one of these, because then I would not have to worry about it not starting when I wanted it to, etc., etc. I said I did not know. He let me borrow his. The next day, I went over and said I would buy one, and so I started off with the battery-operated grass trimmer, and it is fantastic.

The point is that this is a market-driven demand. I saw a better option that worked for me. For someone who is in the forestry business, an 18-volt or whatever-volt battery that is going in our chainsaw is not going to work for that person, but for a weekend warrior like me, who needs to cut some branches or a little tree that needs to be taken care of, it works great. If we take that approach, it

would be a much more logical and sensible approach that Canadians would agree with.

It does not matter if we are 25 years old or if we are getting close to 50 years old or if we are 80 years old, we can make those decisions that work best for us. Nobody wants to go out to their shed and pull it out. If we are only using it once a month in the summer-time, we want the thing to work. If it is battery operated, it is going to work.

There are two other considerations here. I am from Ontario, and the consideration I would have is the actual electrical grid. I checked this morning, just before I was up to speak, and the demand for Ontario was about 17,500 megawatts and it is only going to continue to go up today, likely to 20,000 megawatts or somewhere around there. The supply and demand in Ontario's grid is pretty tight when we get into June and July and air conditioning season, etc. The 2035 mandate is really going to be tight for Ontario.

● (1140)

Now, I am sure all politicians will say that we can meet the challenge, we can do it, but if we actually ask the people who have to build the electrical plants, they may be a little skeptical, especially considering all the red tape involved in a new build, regardless of what source of energy it will be. The grid has to be a big part of this; it has to be a big consideration in this.

The IESO put out a report in 2024 that basically outlined the two biggest drivers in demand growth for electricity in Ontario until 2050. There is R1, which we are talking about today, the electrical car mandate. The other is something that has come up as an election promise, and I am sure the government will try and follow through on it: all the data centres that are going to be required for AI. If we look at these two drivers for electricity to 2025, we are going to be really up against it.

The numbers are, roughly, that about 200,000 electric vehicles will use about 5,000 megawatts on average. As the fleet continues to grow, we can see that if we are adding 20,000, 30,000 or 40,000 EVs every year to a province, that is going to really chew into the electrical supply. What we need to do collectively here is to say that we know people like electric vehicles, and we want to be able to provide car manufacturers the ability to make these vehicles, but we also cannot handcuff everyday people in Ontario with not having enough electricity.

Business of Supply

We saw what happened in California a couple of years ago with Gavin Newsom. He actually had to tell people there were certain days and certain hours when they could not charge their car. Well, if a person is retired and not having to do everything all the time, that is one thing, but for a parent with kids, running them to hockey, baseball, soccer and music, and going back and forth to work, the possibility of having charging restrictions may not work as well. I am not trying to throw fear into the discussion here, but that is just the reality of what happened, and it was probably because of poor planning of the electrical grid and some other conditions.

Something I think we need to consider is the complete cycle of this. That is a reality of the mandate as we get to 2035, and it will be a challenge. If we look at the IESO report, it anticipates that there could be new builds for some forms of electricity by 2035, but every day that goes by, we are further along.

The other point I really want to talk about is the complete life cycle. Years ago, I worked in the automotive parts manufacturing business. The other point is the recycling of these batteries, which is a reality. If we are adding hundreds of thousands of vehicles with electric batteries in them every year, they cannot just get thrown into the junkyard. There has to be the ability for the entire industry, and the governments that promote these vehicles, to recycle these vehicles safely, environmentally and ethically.

We know the recyclers will take all the nickel and cobalt they can get out of it, because that is the lucrative part of the recycling, but there are the plastics, the copper and aluminum; all of those should be ethically taken out as well. There was a company, Li-Cycle, a recycler in the U.S., mainly, that recently filed for chapter 15 bankruptcy protection, and a company does not file for that if it is making hordes of money recycling these batteries. It could not get its costs down quick enough to make a go of it.

If we have a complete cycle, it makes sense. If governments are going to promote this and we are going to do it, we have to have a complete cycle in the sector. We have to find a way to recycle these vehicles when they come to the end of their life. If we are going to claim an electric vehicle is environmentally friendly because it does not emit, which I can agree with, then we have to be able to recycle the entire car.

• (1145)

Dominique O'Rourke (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would first congratulate the member for Huron—Bruce on his re-election.

I love to hear Conservatives talk about how we get to yes, including recycling not just of electric vehicles but, hopefully, of all vehicles.

I want to recognize that new hybrid models would still be available for sale after 2035, and the purchase of used gas-powered vehicles is not prohibited, so we are working towards a target. The member's concern seems to be not really with electric vehicles, but rather with the conditions.

My question for the member is this: Will he support the one Canadian economy bill, which will support significant investment in clean and green energy? Would he support further investments into EV chargers to address that range anxiety?

Ben Lobb: Mr. Speaker, on the problem that the hon. member talks about, she will see if she just goes outside of Guelph a bit that there are an awful lot of people who make their living with a pickup truck. Whether they are a contractor or whatever they do, they have a pickup truck.

The way it is today, take, for example, a Ford electric truck. It is great if someone is just tooting down the road with nothing to pull behind them, but as soon as they put a trailer on it with a bit of a load, the battery does not last. It is not a critique of Ford; that is just the way it is. People need a combustion engine to get the job done. It is not to say that down the road it would not happen, but the Liberals are handcuffing Ford, GM, Dodge, all of them. Make it a goal, but the way it is, the proposal is too rigid right now.

[Translation]

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Mr. Speaker, since this morning, much of the discussion has focused on the economic aspect of the issue. I am keeping a close eye on this issue, particularly with regard to the automotive industry. The riding of Shefford, including the city of Granby, is known for its many car dealerships. This industry is very strong in Shefford, so I keep abreast of the situation and meet with dealerships on a regular basis.

I found an email that the Automotive Industries Association of Canada sent me recently. I was checking to see what issues there are with zero-emission vehicles, electric vehicles. However, the email mentioned the right to repair cars, but also, and more importantly, the impact of tariffs on the automotive industry.

Does my colleague agree that, when it comes to the economy, there are many other issues that should be addressed well before this one?

• (1150)

[English]

Ben Lobb: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. member to talk to car dealership managers right now and ask how sales of EVs are going once the government rebates and grants are falling off. We can look at the data for the first six months of the year, and we know sales are down because the grants are down.

The other thing I will say is to take a look at the combustion engine and its evolution over the last 30 years, specifically around pickup trucks that had V8 engines. Regarding fuel mileage, way back in the day, Ford pickups would get about eight miles to the gallon. Maybe 20 years ago, it would have been 13 or 14 miles to the gallon, and now, if they are cruising down the road, it is close to 30 miles to the gallon. That is a huge innovation.

Business of Supply

There are other things, like EGR valves that are bolted onto the exhaust manifold. Those help to recycle emissions. We have catalytic converters. What comes out of the tailpipe of a truck from 30 years ago does not reflect anything that happens on a new truck today.

Scot Davidson (New Tecumseth—Gwillimbury, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I like the way my colleague speaks in reality. The reality is, we know the government has forgotten about rural Canadians. The member talks about power. The Liberals have trouble doing math. In my riding, I have a lot of people still on 60-amp service; in old cottage country, it is 100-amp service.

The government put out heat pumps. The reality is that we have people who cannot even get a heat pump going, let alone an electric charger that takes 30 amps. They have got an oven taking 30 amps, a dryer, 20 amps.

I wonder if the member could comment a little further on our power problems.

Ben Lobb: Mr. Speaker, it is all part of the consideration. I know the hon. member is a big fan of snowmobiles and chainsaws and all of these things. We can think back to snowmobiles 30 years ago when there was not one snowmobile in the country that was four-stroke. They all were two-stroke, and they used mixed fuel, and we could smell them five kilometres away. Most of them now are four-stroke, and people do not have to mix the fuel. Even in recreation vehicles, there is innovation.

Cheryl Gallant (Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise on behalf of the hard-driving Canadians of Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke.

The Liberal plan to ban the internal combustion engine is an act of pure economic vandalism. When this Soviet-style car sales mandate is combined with Trump's auto tariffs, it would mean the death of domestic car manufacturing. This is government-assisted suicide for the Canadian automobile industry.

If this horrific Liberal policy is allowed to proceed, the damage it would unleash would spread out far beyond the auto industry. This regressive policy would hurt lower-income Canadians, students and refugees. This idiotic policy discriminates against rural Canadians and remote first nations. This proudly socialist policy would push up electricity prices while paving over paradise to put up a solar farm.

Over the last 10 years of Liberal rule, we have seen some overtly communist or Marxist policies. For example, there is the Liberal plan to search the homes of 2.3 million Canadians for firearms that look scary to people who know nothing about hunting. There is the plan to ban plastic food packaging so Canadians will eat less fresh food, fruits and vegetables, while being forced to eat food packed with preservatives.

This car ban struts around wearing a Che Guevara shirt. It was one thing when we had a prime minister who made dumb statements like that the budget will balance itself or that he does not think about monetary policy. Despite replacing the drama teacher with an economist, we still have a government committed to this economic lunacy.

Just so Canadians understand, the Liberals are proposing to impose massive fines on carmakers that do not sell enough electric vehicles, or EVs. Obviously, carmakers cannot go around forcing people to buy their electric vehicles, especially if they do not currently manufacture electric vehicles. How will carmakers ensure they sell enough EVs? They will do it by drastically raising the prices of internal combustion vehicles. When prices go up, demand goes down.

Unfortunately, carmakers that do not currently produce any zero-emission vehicles will have to leave the Canadian market entirely or pay a \$20,000 tax for every non-EV car they sell. The result will be much higher prices, less competition and fewer choices for consumers. The only winners with this policy are the all-electric carmakers, such as Tesla and BYD. That might be great for the United States and China, but it leaves Canada more reliant on two countries that do not always have our best interests at heart.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer recently reported that the price of EVs would have to come down by 30% for the mandate to work. Since that is not likely to happen with 100% tariffs on Chinese EVs, the only choice would be to increase the price of internal combustion vehicles by 30%. This is effectively a \$20,000 car tax. This would price millions of Canadians out of the new car market. Those millions of Canadians would then turn to the used car market. The price of used cars would go up. Canadians who could just afford a new car would be forced to buy used. Canadians who could just afford to buy a used car would be forced to take on more debt or go without a vehicle entirely.

That may be an option if someone can afford to rent or own a home in a major city with public transit. Those living outside of major cities, such as the 108,000 people living in my riding, would have no options. That means they could not work. Maybe the government plans to give those vacant jobs to laid-off auto workers.

By hiking prices on new vehicles, demand goes down, which means production must go down. Fewer cars being sold means fewer people working in the industry. That means fewer auto plant workers, fewer car part workers and fewer car salesmen. Those laid off would cut back on spending, leading to fewer jobs in service industries. Those who could still manage to afford a vehicle would have less money to spend after paying the higher prices.

None of this is a surprise to government. All of this is spelled out in the regulations: Zero-emission vehicles, or ZEVs, “are expected to generally cost more than non-ZEVs, and this vehicle price increase could lead to a reduction in the quantity of vehicles purchased.”

• (1155)

By their own estimate, this policy would cost Canadians an extra \$54 billion. Leaving Canadians poorer than before really is the hallmark of the Liberal government. Lower-income Canadians will not be able to afford a car, but they will still be forced to pay taxes to subsidize an EV BMW for Canadians who can well afford it.

This policy clearly discriminates against rural and remote Canadians. Pricing millions of Canadians out of the car-buying market, the government will have a devastating impact on rural communities. Without access to affordable transportation to get to work or to medical appointments, these Canadians will be forced to leave their homes and move to the cities.

Even rural Canadians fortunate enough to afford an EV may find themselves trapped when the temperatures drop. Despite claims repeated by Liberal ministers, Canada is not Norway. I had the opportunity to travel to northern Norway to observe the Canadian Armed Forces participate in NATO exercises. Norway's capital, Oslo, sits just a few degrees below the Arctic Circle. It is a winter Olympics superpower, but it is also a coastal country with a milder climate than Canada's. Ottawa, in January, is 10°C colder than Oslo.

Canada is also 26 times bigger. Once we start driving north up the Trans-Canada Highway, things get a lot colder. In -25°C, the range of an electric vehicle drops by half. This might not matter much in a big city when the commute to work and back is 40 kilometres, but in rural communities in Canada, the closest hospital can easily be beyond the range of an electric car.

We have not even touched the reliability of the electric grid in rural and remote parts of Canada. We have seen during ice storms that cities regain power much faster than remote areas. Going without electricity for three weeks is unimaginable for people who live in major cities; living in rural Canada, it is just a reality.

Whether it is an ice storm, a solar storm or a cyber-attack, for rural Canadians forced to buy electric vehicles, the result is the same: Once the EV battery depletes, they are trapped. They cannot drive to the grocery store. The EV ambulances cannot get to them if they are sick or hurt. The EV fire trucks cannot put out fires. Without electricity, people will die.

This Liberal policy clearly discriminates against those of us who live in rural and remote communities. The tired, old Liberals love to deny the reality they reveal in their regulations. They will look us straight in the face and tell us they are making life more affordable. We can literally quote their own regulations back to them and they still will not believe themselves.

This policy will make cars unaffordable for millions, but the plan does not stop there. Ontario's electricity power operator found that to meet the net-zero goal using only renewables would require an area 400 times the size of Toronto. How many trees must die to make the Liberals' green dream a reality?

Business of Supply

The Liberal government recently committed to reclaiming 30% of Canada's developed lands. This is a government at war with itself. Has the proud socialist minister finally abandoned his opposition to nuclear power? When the minister declared an end to road building, was it a preview of a carless Canada?

Forcing an early adoption of EVs before we have the electric infrastructure ready will mean higher energy prices. It is not just about building more EV chargers. Every local transformer in every community in Canada will need to be replaced. Electro-Federation Canada estimates the cost at \$350 billion, and costs will be passed along to consumers. Energy poverty will increase.

Thanks to the leadership of Pierre Poilievre, Canadians have been liberated from the carbon tax. Thanks to the Liberal Party, all those gains will be lost due to higher electricity prices. Canadians will pay more for electricity, and they will pay more for cars.

Rural Canadians who cannot afford cars will be forced to move to the cities. Our domestic auto industry will disappear. Canadians will be forced to pay higher taxes to subsidize battery makers and \$60,000 cars. This policy will leave all Canadians worse off.

• (1200)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, there was no fearmongering and misinformation in that speech. It is interesting how among the Conservatives, no one, except possibly Pierre Poilievre, does it better than the member opposite. All one needs to do is just listen to or read her speech.

I can assure the member that gas-driven vehicles are not going to disappear in the next 10 years. A question before noted hybrid. I can reference to the Ford F-150 truck, which is gas-driven and has an electric component to it, so it is the best of both worlds in that sense.

I am wondering if the member could provide some sort of explanation as to why Pierre Poilievre and members of her caucus spread misinformation continuously in an attempt to put fear in the minds of Canadians.

Business of Supply

Cheryl Gallant: Madam Speaker, even hybrid electric cars would not qualify, and if there are still internal combustion vehicles on the roads or owned by people, they would not be able to get fuel because the new fuel standards are eliminating the gasoline that would fuel ICE cars, those with internal combustion engines. Even if we cannot afford an EV and all we have is gas power, the gas will not be available.

[Translation]

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to remind the House that the automotive industry is very important to the Shefford region. There are many dealerships in Granby. I would like to give a shout-out to Annie Chagnon of Chagnon Honda, who was named person of the year at the Haute-Yamaska chamber of commerce and industry's recent 2025 Desjardins distinction gala. I would like to commend Annie for her community involvement. I met with her on Zoom during the election. She told me about the challenges facing the industry. I made a commitment to her keep the lines of communication open and meet with other people in the industry to continue to discuss their concerns. What they talked to me about most was the impact of the tariffs on their industry.

The question I have for my colleague is this. Other than going after zero-emission vehicles, what does she have to offer people in the auto industry?

• (1205)

[English]

Cheryl Gallant: Madam Speaker, with respect to EVs and internal combustion engines, the tariffs that have been imposed on us and the tariffs imposed by the government are making new cars unaffordable altogether, so anything left of auto parts manufacturing in Canada is going to be driven out of the country. There are even fewer EV manufacturers, so Canadians are not going to have anything to drive in the next 10 years.

Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC): Madam Speaker, Liberal members have several times today indicated that they are not banning gasoline vehicles. While that may be partially true, what they are banning is the production of new gasoline vehicles in 2035, and they are introducing a strictly 100% electric vehicle mandate. I am wondering whether my colleague could provide a little more clarification on that.

Cheryl Gallant: Madam Speaker, what car salespeople have to do is reach the mandates that are required by government, and if they do not reach the sales limits required on electric vehicles, they will have to pay a \$20,000 fine on every gas-powered vehicle as opposed to electric vehicle.

All that being said, at least where I live, there may be a few electric vehicles in the lots, but nobody wants them because they cannot use them where they live. The cold makes them unusable, and then there is the time it takes to charge them, if they can even charge them at their homes. As mentioned before, many homes do not have the amperage needed to charge these cars. Even the military base would not be able to accommodate people who are living on base, because they certainly do not have the infrastructure for what they need, let alone for EVs.

Hon. Judy A. Sgro (Humber River—Black Creek, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is great to see you looking so fabulous today, and in the chair and back to work the way I know you want to be.

I will be sharing my time with the great member for West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country.

I am really pleased to speak to the issue of EV cars, why they are so important and why we as a government continue to encourage that kind of investment.

We are gathered in the chamber at a pivotal moment, not just for our government but for the future of all Canadians everywhere. Beyond these walls, families, workers and business owners are thinking about what comes next. It is a very challenging time for our country, but also a very exciting time to look at a different way of doing business than how we were doing it and running the government previously. People are reflecting on the kinds of jobs they have and might have in the future and the economy and environment they want their children and grandchildren to inherit. It is a huge responsibility we have in our hands in the upcoming years as we move forward.

The shift toward electric and zero-emission vehicles is not about limiting choice, because as a government, we very much want to encourage more people to get an electric car and experience it. It is about creating new opportunities for Canadians and keeping our country competitive in a rapidly changing world. More than that, it is about living up to values that have always defined our national character: responsibility, ambition, a drive to build something better for the next generation and protecting our environment.

In a time of uncertainty when Canada is facing the impact of unjustified tariffs from the United States, it is important that we seize every opportunity to expand our industries, including the EV industry, and welcome the thousands of jobs that come with it from end to end, from mining critical minerals for EV batteries, which is very important and a great opportunity for Ontario, in particular, when it comes to the Ring of Fire and exploring the mining industry; to becoming a critical mineral supplier of choice for the world's EV manufacturers, which should make us stop and think about what it will do for our economy; to putting together the necessary infrastructure for Canadian vehicles to remain charged; to welcoming new automotive manufacturing opportunities. We cannot afford to turn these jobs away during a time when our economy, our sovereignty and our prosperity are in jeopardy.

During times of great change, it is easy to feel uncertain. That is understandable for everyone. Every great leap Canada has ever taken demanded leadership, vision and honest conversation, and I believe we are hearing that every single day from the new Prime Minister. In the case of our transportation sector, we know that vehicles are more than just machines. They are the backbone of many Canadians' daily lives. Whether it is work, school, family, opportunities or travel, so much depends on reliable mobility, and it is our job to ensure that mobility remains accessible, affordable and sustainable now and into the future.

Over the last several years, the global auto industry has been moving in one clear direction. People want cleaner vehicles because they care about what their families breathe and about the world their children will inherit. Across the globe, we see that countries and companies alike are racing to innovate, breaking ground on new factories and inventing new technologies designed to meet these demands.

Canada has the expertise. We have the workers, we have the minerals, we have the manufacturing capacity and now we have the vision to be an energy superpower for the 21st century. Since 2020, over \$34 billion has flowed to Canada through major investments in the batteries and automotive supply chain, and that is just the beginning.

• (1210)

These investments are not distant promises. Factories are going up, equipment is coming in, and on top of that, developing new mines and new processing plants for a national EV supply chain will contribute upward of \$16 billion to our annual GDP and create up to 40,000 well-paying jobs over the next decade for our children and our grandchildren. That is real economic growth with a real impact on real people's lives.

To realize these benefits, Canada has been building. We know that making the decision to switch to electric vehicles is a big step for most families. That is why we have invested in practical support. Canadians will benefit from a network of tens of thousands of electric vehicle chargers, funded by the zero-emission vehicle infrastructure program, and with the Canada Infrastructure Bank's deploying another 5,000 EV chargers, we are making sure charging is available for rural, remote and urban communities, ensuring range anxiety soon becomes a thing of the past.

Over the past weekend, I was at a local shopping mall. There were half a dozen chargers there, and every one of them was filled with someone filling up their car, which happens very quickly. They would move out and someone else would move in.

The electric vehicle availability standard that the Conservatives are opposing will actually incentivize the construction of thousands of new charging stations. We believe, on this side of the House, that Canadians deserve real, reliable information about their options. With every new charging station, every new awareness program and every new vehicle on the road, Canadians are moving forward, not backward.

Canadians across every province and territory are choosing electric. In 2024, approximately one in six vehicles sold produces zero emissions, and costs, contrary to some fears, are coming down. As

Business of Supply

manufacturing ramps up and technology improves, EVs are becoming more accessible, with over 80 models now available in various showrooms. For many, the switch is making life easier and more affordable by reducing fuel costs and maintenance costs. Cleaner vehicles also mean healthier air, something every Canadian wants regardless of where they live or how they vote.

The transition is also about more than private vehicles. Businesses are investing in greener fleets, municipalities are running zero-emission buses, and entrepreneurs from coast to coast are using Canadian know-how to manufacture parts and innovate new systems for the world. This is true Canadian leadership that we are hearing about every day: Canadian leadership at its best, building prosperity and protecting our environment at the same time. I would welcome my colleagues remaining in the House to become more supportive of this particular initiative, as it will be very helpful for our planet as we move forward.

Let us not forget why the work matters for our planet and our health. On-road transportation accounts for nearly a fifth of Canada's greenhouse gas emissions. By embracing new technology, we are fulfilling our responsibility to reduce our footprint, which is a responsibility for each and every one of us.

We are also meeting the clear demand from global markets. Our trading partners across Europe, Asia and North America are raising their standards and seeking cleaner vehicles. To keep selling Canadian-built cars and trucks, we must meet these expectations. We must stay competitive, or we will risk falling behind and losing economic ground, which is not at all what we want to see.

When we talk about the electrification of transportation, we cannot overlook the foundation that makes it possible. With Canada's wealth of critical minerals, from lithium to nickel, and cobalt to graphite, we are one of the only countries in the world with all of the ingredients required to produce advanced EV batteries from the ground up. That is an amazing and exciting opportunity for all of us.

Developing Canada's critical minerals is not just a matter of resource extraction; it is also about creating a strategic, national supply chain, generating high-quality, future-proof jobs and reinforcing Canadian economic sovereignty in an era of global uncertainty. Every new mine and processing facility means paycheques in resource communities, and know-how that stays right here at home.

Business of Supply

• (1215)

Globally, demand for critical minerals is skyrocketing. As the world commits to cleaner vehicles and low-carbon energy, countries are racing to secure stable, responsible sources of these essential minerals. This is a generational chance for Canada to lead, to supply not only our auto sector and EV battery plants—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member for Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong has the floor.

Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong, CPC): Madam Speaker, the member opposite's speech gave a lot of details about the progress that is being made on electric vehicles. I am not opposed if somebody chooses to have one, but I can clearly see that people are not choosing them. We are at 7.5% uptake on them, even with government incentives in place.

It is also worrisome to me that after investing \$55 billion to get some of the battery plants and supply chains going, many of which have gone bust or moved to the States, now the Liberals are thinking of mandating a \$20,000-per-car penalty if people do not meet the quota. Does the member think it is a good idea to do that to the auto manufacturers in these difficult times, when clearly they would pass those costs on to the consumer?

Hon. Judy A. Sgro: Madam Speaker, it is nice to see my colleague back. I find the whole industry very exciting. Within our own family, we have a brand new, great big van that seats seven people, so when we take long trips, we have a great vehicle to do that. However, the vehicle used most in our family is a small electric vehicle. We have had it about seven years, and it has been maintenance-free for seven years. There is absolutely no cost to running this little car, and it is the cleanest thing around. It is very enjoyable to drive. We do not realize just how noisy traditional vehicles are until we get into an EV vehicle and there is perfect peace and quiet. It is amazing, so I think it is exciting times going forward.

• (1220)

[Translation]

Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to see that my Liberal colleague intends to vote against the Conservative motion. I would have been very concerned if she had decided to vote with the Conservatives.

While she seems to be saying that we need to transition to electric vehicles, which is a great, her government is introducing more and more pro-oil industry policies. I am thinking in particular of Bill C-5, the fact that they buy pipelines and the fact that they support carbon storage.

Will my colleague commit to trying to get her government to stop constantly working in favour of the oil companies? We cannot have it both ways. We need to choose a direction and follow it. We cannot keep moving in opposite directions.

[English]

Hon. Judy A. Sgro: Madam Speaker, I want to assure my colleague that all members of the House, I believe, have the right intentions to make sure we are protecting our environment and moving forward in a positive, safe way. This is a great opportunity for

Canada for jobs, for production and for us to move forward, but as we move forward, we need to do so while being sensitive to the environment we deal with every day. I believe that by working together, all members of the House, and putting our best out there, we can be successful and can protect our environment and our economy at the same time.

[Translation]

Hon. Greg Fergus (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Humber River—Black Creek, not only for her very interesting speech, but also for her perspective. In her long career here in Parliament, I imagine she has seen trends evolve.

Could she tell the House about the current trend toward electric vehicles? Can she tell us about the opportunity Canada has to become a leader not only in electric car production, but also in parts manufacturing? We have an opportunity to become a world leader in the production of electric vehicles and related products.

[English]

Hon. Judy A. Sgro: Madam Speaker, yes, I have been here quite a few years, and at many different times I have seen new ideas and things try to move forward that do not necessarily succeed without political leadership.

I continue to call upon all of us as parliamentarians at a very challenging time in front of us. We can either crumple up and say that we cannot do anything about this and that we are just going to give up, or we can turn around and have the kind of leadership our current Prime Minister is showing, along with my colleagues, to move forward into the EV sector and to encourage people to look at and try out these new vehicles. I am sure that once people have actually been in one, they will not want to go back to the standard vehicle of before.

Patrick Weiler (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise to speak in opposition to the opposition day motion today, which, at the heart of it, is simply disinformation: disinformation about climate policy and disinformation about an affordability policy that, quite frankly, gives me flashbacks to the last government, where it seemed that week after week, the Conservatives would have a similar type of motion that they would bring forward.

Here the Conservatives are making the claim that Canada has a plan to completely ban gas-powered cars and that this would somehow drive up the cost of vehicles by \$20,000. That is simply untrue. It is about a regulation that will progressively increase the number of light-duty cars that dealerships sell, which are zero-emissions vehicles in Canada: to 20% in 2026, 30% in 2030 and then up to 100% in 2035. What they fail to mention is that there are exemptions built in that allow for the purchase of plug-in hybrid vehicles for those parts of our country where electric vehicles are not as well suited.

Business of Supply

Why do we have the regulation in the first place? Contrary to what Conservatives say, it is actually about choice. It is about having the choice to find an electric vehicle if someone wants one. It is no mistake that the provinces that have the highest adoption rate of electric vehicles are the ones that have had a standard for the purchase of electric vehicles, including Quebec and British Columbia, where sales were over 30% and 22%, respectively, last year. With those types of regulations, car dealerships will actually show the models on the floor to meet the demand that is there. If the standard is not there, they are going to prefer to have things on their lot like gas-powered cars, particularly SUVs, where we know the margins are much higher for them.

However, we also hear opponents of electric vehicles suggest that they are somehow a luxury product, but the facts again show otherwise. Over the lifetime of ownership of an electric vehicle, they will actually be much cheaper, because a Canadian driver today will save thousands of dollars each year at the pump. While gas prices will fluctuate, sometimes very wildly due to global instability, which is entirely outside of Canada's control, EV drivers are charging at a fraction of the cost.

To put it into context, at today's prices, the average Canadian driving 20,000 kilometres per year spends about \$2,800 on gas. The same distance in an EV costs about \$500 in electricity, so that is a saving of over \$2,000 every year. That is before we even talk about maintenance. Anyone who owns a gas-powered car knows the cost of oil changes, engine repairs, exhaust systems and transmission issues, none of which actually apply to electric vehicles. Studies show that electric vehicles cost 40% less to maintain and repair than their gas-powered counterparts.

When we combine the fuel and maintenance savings, a typical Canadian family can expect to save about \$20,000 over the lifetime of their vehicle. The PBO just released a report that confirmed that over the first three years of ownership, the higher initial purchase price of an electric vehicle, even without any incentives, will be made up on the operational savings.

I can speak to this very personally as someone who was able to purchase an electric vehicle just under two years ago. It is a very nice feeling knowing that I do not have to worry about what the prices at the pump are going to be, whether this is the time that the summer gasoline blend comes in, or whether whatever type of conflict is happening in the Middle East could jack up the prices. I know I can charge my vehicle in the comfort of my home rather than having to plan for those types of stops. I can do just about any round trip in my 13,000-square-kilometre riding in one charge on my car.

The other reason that it is important to move forward with this is that we are living in a climate crisis. Just in one community in my riding alone, the district of Squamish, has had three wildfires so far this year, and we are only in mid-June. We know that transportation accounts for about a quarter of Canada's emissions, so if we are serious about reducing our emissions in Canada and protecting our communities, then transportation, particularly light-duty vehicles, has to be part of the equation.

• (1225)

We know that electric vehicles emit about 80% less over the lifetime of the car than gas-powered alternatives do, even when we account for such things as battery manufacturing and Canada's current electrical grid. As our grid gets cleaner and we find more sustainable ways of mining and processing minerals and manufacturing vehicles, those emissions reductions are going to grow even more significantly.

We also know that less pollution means healthier communities. It also means fewer respiratory illnesses, fewer hospital visits and a better quality of life for our kids and grandkids, so this is also about public health. None of those benefits actually matters if Canadians cannot access electric vehicles in the first place. That is why the government introduced these regulations, to ensure that manufacturers actually bring EVs to the Canadian market. For too long, Canada was a dumping ground for gas vehicles while EVs were shipped elsewhere. Canadian consumers were left with long wait times.

I can speak personally. I waited over a year and a half to be able to purchase an electric vehicle. There are limited options, and we have inflated prices. Therefore, our regulations simply ensure that automakers prioritize Canada when deciding where to sell their electric vehicles so that Canadians are not left at the back of the line.

I want to be very clear. These regulations do not ban gas-powered cars; they simply create a level playing field in which Canadians can choose from a wide range of affordable, high-quality electric vehicles and hybrid vehicles, many of which are now being built right here in Canada.

That gets me to my next point. This transition is not only good for consumers and the environment, but it is good for our economy. Canada is increasingly becoming a global leader in electric vehicle manufacturing, battery production and clean technology. We are seeing historic investments in plants, battery factories and the mining of critical minerals. This is something for which there are opportunities from coast to coast to coast to create thousands of well-paying jobs in our country.

However, we do have challenges to seeing higher adoption of electric vehicles. With the depletion of the federal incentive for electric vehicles, and with its elimination in my home province of British Columbia as well, we are seeing a slowing of that demand. Therefore, it is really important that this gap be addressed so that we are able to continue to encourage people to adopt electric vehicles. Our government has made the commitment, as we reform the industrial carbon price, to ensure that big polluters in Canada are going to pay for incentives for individual Canadians to make those greener choices.

Business of Supply

The other challenge we have is that, in Canada, we do not have a lot of the affordable models other countries have access to. We made the decision to bring in a 100% tariff on Chinese-made electric vehicles for understandable reasons, but we can also look to what other jurisdictions have done, such as the European Union, which has a smaller tariff geared more toward the specific impact of some of its unfair subsidies, as well as to protecting the nascent market it has there. There are a lot of affordable electric vehicles that are manufactured in some of our value-aligned countries but are not available right now in Canada. I think of places like Europe, Japan and South Korea. One thing we could do is find a way of harmonizing our vehicle certification standards so that vehicles approved for use there are available in Canada as well. This would have the impact of ensuring that we see a lot more of those EVs on the lower-cost end, which is where we are seeing some of the biggest challenges with adoption.

We have seen what happens when supply is limited: higher prices, long delays and frustration for families trying to do the right thing. The government believes Canadians deserve better. By leaning into this transition, we are securing Canada's place in the clean economy of the future while making sure that Canadians and communities benefit.

Opponents of these measures often talk about freedom of choice, but what choice do Canadians have if the vehicles they want are not available? Not all Canadians have the ability to buy EVs, because they are not available in all provinces. The ZEV availability standard is what is needed to make sure Canadians are able to have that choice. We see that the demand is there in metro Vancouver, where almost 70% of residents want an electric vehicle to be their next choice of vehicle. In my riding, the district of Squamish has the highest adoption rate of any metropolitan area in the country. The district of West Vancouver may have the highest adoption of any municipality. We see that the demand is there, but we need to make sure the supply is there. That is what these regulations are all about.

• (1230)

Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong, CPC): Madam Speaker, I live in a rural part of Ontario where we have difficulty getting money to fix the roads all the time. The gas tax has been a good mechanism to make that happen. What is the government's solution as we transition to electric vehicles and those gas tax transfers decline, eventually going to zero, to keep the roads in repair?

Patrick Weiler: Madam Speaker, that is a really important question that we need to consider as we see lower revenues that go to fund some of those things.

There are ways that we can think of things. Perhaps, with public charging stations, there may be some of that tax that could go to fund some of those same things. Some jurisdictions have put a small tax on the registration for electric vehicles. I am thinking of Alberta. There are a lot of ways that can be done.

This is an overwhelmingly positive thing for our communities that we need to find ways of supporting rather than putting up roadblocks. We do need to find ways of ensuring that the infrastructure is going to be well supported and maintained for the long term.

[Translation]

Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Madam Speaker, it is clear today that the Conservatives are on a crusade against electric vehicles. Looking back a few years, during the pandemic and even more recently, people could be waiting a year or two, maybe even three, to get the vehicle they wanted to buy.

Does my colleague agree that if we go back to saying that there is no need to force dealerships to sell electric vehicles, we risk ending up in the same situation where customers are sold what dealers want to sell, not what consumers want to buy, and that we will once again delay the necessary energy transition?

• (1235)

Patrick Weiler: Madam Speaker, I am one of those people who waited for an electric vehicle during the pandemic, so I am very familiar with this situation. We need measures like this so that the vehicles people want to buy are actually available for purchase. Continuing to improve how these vehicles are produced in Canada is one way to accelerate the transition. What is clear is that people want these vehicles, and we must do everything we can to make them available.

Hon. Greg Fergus (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to congratulate my colleague on the quality of his French. There is a strong trend around the world right now. Will the future lead to electric vehicles or not? If we know that the trend is going in that direction, would it not be better for the Canadian economy to have policies in place that can support this transition?

Patrick Weiler: Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for giving me another opportunity to speak French in the House. We do know that this is the direction that the world is heading in. There are already countries such as China where it is cheaper to produce electric vehicles than gas-powered ones. When everyone adds to the number of vehicles produced, prices will be even lower. Technology will also improve. We have to be ready for that. We want to see these vehicles made in Canada.

[English]

Fred Davies (Niagara South, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am happy to rise today to second the motion by the hon. member for Thornhill. I will be splitting my time with the member for Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound.

I come from the private sector, and we tend to look at the markets to determine what our customers want. We do not tell them what they need; that is the best way to go out of business. Here, the Liberal government tends to take a different route.

At a press conference in 1986, U.S. President Ronald Reagan said, “the nine most terrifying words in the English language are: I’m from the Government, and I’m here to help.” That is like this legislation. To me, it is pretty terrifying. To wit, I was around this place when the Liberals introduced the national energy program. It was government interference at its very best. We all know what happened to the national energy program when government decided what was best for the consumer and the market, when it dictated how the private sector would produce its goods and ship its product. The evidence suggests it will not work. When we look at this legislation, we see that it is the new carbon tax. It would result in a similar reaction that we have seen across the country over the past several years with the carbon tax.

As industry tries to cope with the mandate that would be imposed on it, I wonder what the government will do when the sector fails to reach the KPIs that are established in the legislation. Again, I am inclined to look at things like this from a business perspective. I know that the private sector and the public sector are two different things, but there needs to be a business case here. We know what the current government looks at when evaluating business cases such as LNG: It says there is no business case while the world is starving for our liquefied natural gas.

Is the market there? It is not, according to the statistics. The government cannot mandate what the private sector does with its production. It cannot mandate investment capital. It cannot, unless it is free, which the government has pretty much done over the last several years with the amount of money that it has put into subsidies for the EV market. However, the market has shifted.

Plants are being halted, and one major plant has gone bankrupt internationally. In my riding, Linamar built a state-of-the-art, 300,000-square-foot gigafactory in Welland. It is a beautiful building. It was going to employ 200 people. The federal government in Ottawa committed \$170 million to this plant. Described as a highly integrated casting, machining and coating operation with the first-of-its-kind gigatonnage high-pressure-die-casting capabilities by an auto supplier in North America or Europe, this plant is beautiful, but it never opened. It is now listed for sale on Realtor.ca.

Where do we go from here? Is the infrastructure available in the country? It is not even close.

A member opposite asked a question earlier about whether the Conservatives would support investment in the infrastructure. Does that just mean more tax dollars? I think perhaps that is what she meant: Were the Conservatives supporting the government’s paying the bill for infrastructure after paying the bill to build these plants just to see them shut down?

The punitive measures in the legislation are also interesting. To enforce the mandate, the program would put on a harsh penalty structure that implements a \$20,000 tax per vehicle on any auto manufacturer that is unable to meet the quota. Put another way, if a company is supposed to sell 1,000 vehicles in 2026 and 200 of those must be EVs, but it ends up selling only 150 EVs, the company is therefore 50 EVs short of its quota and subject to fines.

Kristian Aquilina, president of General Motors Canada, urged the Liberals to scrap the EV mandate and said, “It’s unrealistic to

Business of Supply

believe that the country is going to go from 5 or 6 per cent to 20 per cent by model year '26, which starts now.”

● (1240)

Brian Kingston, president and CEO of the Canadian Vehicle Manufacturers' Association said, “The federal EV mandate needs to be repealed before serious damage is done to the auto industry at the worst possible time.”

A study in the Canadian Journal of Economics estimates that the mandate will eliminate 38,000 jobs in the auto sector and cost upward of \$138 billion, assuming that the sector never shuts down as a result of this policy.

Let us talk about tariffs. This is the worst possible time to be imposing a new business model on a private sector industry. My colleague for Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke was correct when she said that this could devastate the auto sector.

I want to repeat this. This is the new carbon tax. If the government forces this on the economy, be prepared for a lot of pain and no gain. The only thing that this policy does is rehabilitate Elon Musk’s reputation. Yes, let us put Elon in charge and see what happens.

Canadians cannot afford another lost Liberal decade driven by bad Liberal policies. This is government interference extraordinaire. I hope the members opposite will support our common-sense motion to repeal this mandate. I will not hold my breath.

● (1245)

[*Translation*]

Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Madam Speaker, listening to the Conservative member, one would think that we are on the brink of apocalypse because of electric cars. He seems to believe that these cars would never sell and would be left on the lots. That is a surprise to me, because we know that Quebec’s figures show that EV sales targets are surpassed every year. More EVs are sold each year than is required by the government. That is surprising.

How does my Conservative colleague explain that? How does he explain the fact that 50% of EVs sold in Canada are sold in Quebec? Does it not look like there is an appetite somewhere for these vehicles?

*Business of Supply**[English]*

Fred Davies: Madam Speaker, I am not here to say that there is no market at all for EVs. What I am saying is that the government cannot impose its will on a private sector business without continuing to invest massive amounts of dollars to incentivize production and capital investment. That is the only reason why we are here today with the motion. We have been responding to a business case with a false narrative. The private sector will respond if the market is there, but let us let the private sector do the work and invest the money to make it work.

Hon. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, does the member know what all these lights are around us? They are LED lights. They are the most efficient, from a production perspective and also from an energy consumption perspective and, thus, an electrical perspective, in terms of the electricity produced to use them.

Does the member not realize that, 25 years ago, the light bulb that was most used was an incandescent light bulb? Does the member think that industry just created the LED light bulb and suddenly we started using them? No, it did not.

In the province of Ontario, the provincial government said that it was going to phase out the incandescent light bulb. The member might remember that, in the interim we had the compact fluorescent light bulb, which lasted for about 10 to 15 years. After that, the LED light bulb became the most prominent light bulb. It is now the cheapest light bulb to produce and use.

That all happened because the government in Ontario at the time said it wanted to phase out the incandescent light bulb and replace it with the LED light bulb. Because of its initiative, today, we only use LED light bulbs, which produce more light and produce it more cost-effectively.

Does the member wish that we still had the incandescent light bulb?

Fred Davies: Madam Speaker, that is some interesting gaslighting going on there. Nobody then was forcing anyone to completely redesign how they travel in this country. The hon. member is comparing a light bulb to an EV, while fundamentally changing the entire business model of a multi-billion-dollar industry. It is not a light bulb. Let us not confuse apples and oranges here.

Dave Epp (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC): Madam Speaker, I want to welcome my colleague to the chamber. I, too, come from the private sector.

On the subject of light bulbs, the government of Ontario did not ban incandescent light bulbs. To the member opposite, what it did was put a target out there. We met yesterday, and a year ago actually, with global and domestic automakers, and they said to give them targets. They are not opposed, and neither is the Conservative Party opposed, to EVs. However, we are saying the private sector will find the most efficient and best solution to get to targets. That is what we are hearing from global manufacturers.

Would my colleague agree that the private sector is best positioned to meet the challenges that we, as a society, face?

• (1250)

Fred Davies: Madam Speaker, I absolutely do. I have to repeat that there is a beautiful, brand new plant in my riding in the city of Welland, where I live. It is a 300,000-square-foot facility. The only reason it was built was because of the subsidies given to it. The plant is never opening. It is on the market for rent or for sale.

This is an incredible example of what happens when the government interferes with the private sector. Consumers will drive the market. We will make a transition to electric vehicles, but we cannot force it by saying that, in the next 10 years, thou shalt not produce another gas-powered vehicle in this country. It is not going to work.

This is going to be the new carbon tax, and I guarantee that the government is going to back down on this in a few years.

Alex Ruff (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC): Madam Speaker, considering this is my first speech of any length during this Parliament, I just want to thank all the constituents of Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound for giving me the privilege and honour of being re-elected for the third time to represent them. None of us get here without the incredible hard work of volunteers, supporters and family members, so I just want to thank all of them.

Another thing that I want to do before I get into the crux of my speech is pay tribute to the victims of a tragic vehicle accident. Just a few short weeks ago, on May 23, four high school students, Olivia Rourke, Rowan McLeod, Kaydance Ford and Danica Baker, all aged 16 to 17, along with their teacher, Matt Eckert, 33 years old, died in a tragic vehicle crash. The students and teacher were on their way home to Walkerton District Community School after competing in a high school softball tournament just east of London. Although Walkerton is in the riding of Huron—Bruce, two of the four teenage girls, Rowan McLeod and Kaydance Ford, were part of the Tara Twins minor softball team in my hometown, and all the victims have family in Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound.

On behalf of all the constituents of Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound and all Canadians, I send my deepest condolences to all the families, friends and communities impacted by this terrible tragedy. May they rest in peace.

What are we here to do today? We are here to talk about a Conservative opposition day motion addressing the Liberal government's ban of the sale of gas-powered vehicles that will force Canadians to buy electrical vehicles, and this motion is calling upon them to immediately end this ban, but this debate is really about freedom, choice and common sense.

I got involved in politics, and one of the key overriding factors was the increasing rural-urban divide that I was seeing across Canada. I was tired of seeing decisions coming out of Ottawa from the Liberal government that forced policies and legislation on rural Canadians that may work for some of our urban centres, but not the rest of the country. This ban is just one such example.

Let us assume this Liberal ban continues. With a broad brush, what is actually needed to implement this Liberal policy of banning gas vehicles and having nothing but EVs on the road en masse? I am really going to focus on the infrastructure challenge. We need transmission and distribution lines. We need housing infrastructure. We need charging infrastructure. We need road infrastructure. Finally, we need affordable and reliable EVs.

Specifically, let us look at the transmission and distribution lines. According to the government's own department, Natural Resources Canada, the:

estimate of grid upgrades required to meet EV demand—including generation, transmission and distribution—ranges from \$26 billion to 294 billion (mid-range: \$94 billion) over the 2025 to 2040 period, reflecting the significant uncertainty around the magnitude of costs, as well as regional variations.

That is very much aligned with a conversation I had a couple years ago with Electricity Canada and all the major stakeholders involved there. The sheer amount of money that needs to be put in to upgrade these lines is immense. Where is the federal support for that? Where is the provincial support? Where is the private industry support? It is not even close to what is needed to meet the mandate the Liberals are proposing.

Next, let us look at housing infrastructure for many rural Canadians and senior Canadians, even in my own riding. I live in a 150-year-old farmhouse. I am going to rip it down and build a new one, but in the meantime, I am using glass fuses. The power line that runs from the road to my house could not handle an electric vehicle even if I wanted to replace it all. I am just one example, and fortunately I am privileged enough to be able to eventually change and fix that, but that is not the case for the average constituent in my riding of Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound.

As well, the largest appetite for EVs comes in our more urban areas, but those people living in apartments or condos do not even have access to or control of the necessary charging infrastructure needed in their homes. Approximately 34% of households in Canada live in apartments. This is a huge issue.

• (1255)

On charging infrastructure, right now there are approximately 34,000 charging stations across Canada. Again, Natural Resources Canada's reports forecast that 680,000 public charging ports are needed to meet this Liberal mandate. Where is the plan? Where is the investment? Who is going to pay for all this infrastructure?

On road infrastructure, our current roads are ill-equipped to handle the increased weight of electric vehicles. If, by 2035, we see Canadians only able to purchase new electric vehicles, provincial and municipal budgets will be eaten up by the cost of road repairs alone. Provincial governments, as was brought up earlier in the debate, mainly dedicate the revenue generated from gas taxes to building and fixing the roads, which would no longer be available. These are just highlights on the challenges of infrastructure alone.

On the cost, Trevor Melanson, from Clean Energy Canada, said this about the biggest barrier preventing Canadians from going to EVs: "the biggest barrier, by far, is sticker price." The minimum price is \$15,000 over a brand new gas-powered vehicle. I would argue that this is if we are looking at high-end gas vehicles.

Business of Supply

The next question is addressing this. We need affordable, reliable and available EVs that Canadians actually want. Do Canadians want them? Let us look at a recent survey, published in the last couple of months or weeks, asking consumers about their purchasing intentions. There were 45% of Canadians who said that they quite possibly would consider buying an EV. However, this is a 13% decrease compared to when this question was asked in 2022. The bottom line is that the situation has changed.

I spent 25 years in the military. When we do what is called "battle procedure", getting ready to deploy into battle or an operation, we go through this whole tactical process. What is the last thing we do? We ask ourselves, has the situation changed? Guess what, we are in an affordability crisis. We are dealing with tariffs. We are dealing with a situation where we can no longer afford to go with this mandate; we need to revisit it.

Earlier, I mentioned the urban-rural divide. Not surprisingly, the majority of urban Canadians, statistics indicate somewhere between 52% and 69%, actually would not mind an EV. All the power to them, let them buy an electric vehicle, but as I have outlined, for those of us in rural Canada this is not an option and the interest is not there.

Let us talk about the reliability of electric vehicles. CAA found that EVs lose up to 40% of their battery life in cold weather, and this was a test that was done in the -7°C to -15°C range, which is actually pretty balmy for those who live in western Canada or even rural Ontario. I just went through one of the worst winters that we have had in decades, for the sheer amount of snowfall. If I get stuck out there in the snow during a snowstorm, the one thing I carry around is a spare gas can so that I am not going to run out of gas and I can keep myself warm. However, people driving an EV do not have that option.

What about the impact that this mandate will have on the Canadian economy? Will these EVs even be available? Ford Canada CEO Bev Goodman said on June 10, "The targets on full battery-electric vehicles need to be aligned with what customers want, and customers have spoken.... Ultimately, it will have a negative impact, if these mandates stuck, on the industry.... It will have downward pressure on vehicle sales, it will have upward pressure on pricing, and those are real concerns for consumers and the industry as a whole."

Business of Supply

In conclusion, this Liberal EV mandate makes no sense. It is unrealistic. There is no plan for infrastructure, whether it be transmission lines, charging stations, home upgrades or road upgrades. It will negatively impact Canadians' jobs and make life more expensive. I am not opposed to Canadians who want to buy or drive an EV. However, this EV mandate disproportionately impacts rural Canadians and seniors, and it takes away their choices of freedom. This mandate needs to end now.

• (1300)

Hon. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, if we were to assume that, on the low end, the average vehicle uses about 100,000 litres of gas in its lifetime, and the average price of gas right now is \$1.20 a litre, that means that driving an EV would save people, over the lifespan of the vehicle, \$120,000. We would come nowhere close to spending a quarter of that on electricity, so even if the price tag of purchasing the vehicle, in the member's words, was \$15,000 more, the average person would save tens of thousands of dollars over the lifetime of the vehicle.

Notwithstanding the fact that the sticker price is still going to impede a number of people, which I agree with the member on, would he not agree that, over the lifetime of the vehicle, people would see a significant cost savings?

Alex Ruff: Madam Speaker, I am not going to disagree with the member that over its lifetime, for somebody who is able to buy the vehicle in the first place, it could save money. He is missing the whole point in my speech. The government is forcing people to make this decision, people who do not have the option to buy it in the first place. In ridings like my own, Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, even if people buy the vehicle, the infrastructure does not exist to charge it at their house or drive it around the riding without running out of a charge or constantly keeping themselves limited in where they can go. It is not realistic.

We need to build the infrastructure and come up with a plan, and the market will drive people's choices in the future.

[Translation]

Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I find it rather surprising that my colleague is saying that a policy that encourages people to buy electric vehicles would have a disproportionate effect on Canadians.

He spent his time demonizing electric vehicles. I live 660 kilometres from Ottawa, and I drive here in an electric car. I have to wait 15 to 20 minutes to recharge my vehicle, so it is one of the best alternatives. The only disproportionate effect that I see is the disproportionate effect that the oil and gas industry is having on the environment, the disproportionate effect that internal combustion vehicles are having on the environment. Those things do have a disproportionate effect.

I do not understand my colleague's reasoning.

[English]

Alex Ruff: Madam Speaker, as I said countless times in my speech and in my previous response, I have nothing against Canadians who want the choice and can afford to buy an electric vehicle. I will not disagree that over the lifetime of the vehicle it can poten-

tially save people money. I do not disagree with the argument of the potential climate benefits that EVs have over a gas-powered vehicle. My point is that we cannot force Canadians to go down this path.

We can incentivize. Where are the incentives? Where is the plan? Where is the infrastructure needed to make this happen? If the government lays this all out, if it is upfront and transparent and lets the market get there, then we will eventually get there and technology will drive us there, but we are not there yet.

William Stevenson (Yellowhead, CPC): Madam Speaker, I heard my colleague say that he is from a rural area. My rural area is the third largest in Alberta, 83,000 square kilometres. There are sections where there are signs telling people to make sure they fill up because there are 200 kilometres before there are any services. When there are not even services for any kind of vehicles, how are people in rural areas going to be able to handle that?

For me, as a farmer, how am I going to pull my stock trailer with an electric vehicle?

• (1305)

Alex Ruff: Madam Speaker, I fully agree with my colleague's point. This is what I tried to highlight. For rural Canadians, it is just not an option. He specifically targeted farmers and those driving pickup trucks. I have been driving a pickup truck since 1997. I am never going to own a vehicle other than a pickup truck as my primary vehicle, because it is essential for living on a small farm and getting around to do what I need to do.

Would I like to buy an electric vehicle or have another option, or maybe even a hybrid? I looked at it, but even though I do well, I cannot afford to buy even a used hybrid right now if I found one on the market. Again, I am somebody who is doing okay. There are so many Canadians whose vehicles turn into being the second-largest cost for them. We need to make it affordable before we actually mandate it on all Canadians.

Julie Dzerowicz (Davenport, Lib.): Madam Speaker, it is a great honour, as always, to stand in this House and speak on behalf of the residents of my riding of Davenport.

Before I continue, I want to say that I will be very happily sharing my time with my colleague, the member for Kingston and the Islands.

I will be speaking to the opposition day motion today. I am also going to be speaking a lot about innovation and a lot of things that I think are shaping the future, not only in Canada, but for the whole world. What I am talking about is electric vehicles, also known as EVs.

Before I go further, I want to acknowledge that we are gathered on the traditional, unceded territory of the Algonquin Anishinabe people.

Business of Supply

The way we get around is changing fast. That change is driven by the need to cut pollution, slow down climate change, make our communities healthier, save money and build cleaner, smarter economies. Around the world, people are choosing electric vehicles more than ever before. Governments, businesses and families are all getting behind this movement. This is not just about cars; it is also about jobs, innovation, energy and fairness. This is about the kind of country and planet we want to leave behind for the next generation.

Let us take a look at what is happening around the world.

When it comes to EV use, Norway is leading the world. Nearly nine out of 10 new cars sold there are electric or hybrid. This did not just happen on its own; Norway made it much easier for people to make the switch, with things like tax breaks, toll-free roads and lots of charging stations.

China is another huge player. In fact, it has more electric vehicles on the road than any other country in the world. The Chinese government has made major investments, helping local companies grow and making EVs more affordable. It has also built strong supply chains, especially for batteries and key materials.

Other countries, such as Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, are also moving quickly. In these countries, people can see the benefits of cleaner air, lower fuel costs and quieter cities. Their governments are also thinking long-term, making public transport electric and improving infrastructure so that EVs are practical for everyone. In the United States, EV adoption has grown quickly as well, especially in states like California.

It is not just about how many electric vehicles are on the road; it is also about who is coming up with the best ideas, the best technology and the smartest ways to build these vehicles. Innovation matters.

Germany continues to be a global leader in automotive engineering. Its companies are working on better batteries, more efficient manufacturing and high-quality electric cars that people want to drive.

Japan was an early leader in hybrid technology and continues to work on alternatives like hydrogen-powered vehicles. These could play a role alongside battery EVs, especially for long-distance transport.

South Korea is a powerhouse when it comes to batteries. Its companies are helping improve how fast batteries charge, as well as how long they last and how safe they are. This is a key piece of the puzzle for making electric vehicles better and more affordable.

Of course, Canada is making important contributions, too. We have the natural resources the world needs, like lithium, cobalt and nickel. We also have skilled workers, strong research institutions and companies that are pushing the boundaries of clean technology. Across the country, Canadian businesses are working on things like vehicle automation, smart charging and cleaner battery production. We have also seen amazing work in indigenous communities, where clean energy and innovation go hand in hand with local leadership and sustainability.

Where is EV innovation headed? Let us talk about the future, because this is just the beginning. First, we are going to see better batteries. Scientists and engineers are developing solid-state batteries that charge faster, last longer and are even safer. That means EVs will soon go further on a single charge and cost less to maintain.

● (1310)

Second, EVs are becoming part of a smarter energy system. With vehicle-to-grid technology, EVs can actually help power homes and stabilize the electricity grid. This is a big step toward a cleaner, more resilient energy system, and it puts more control in the hands of everyday people.

Third, the electric shift is not just about personal cars. Buses, delivery vans, taxis and trucks are also going electric. This means cleaner air in our cities, less noise pollution and a big win for public health, especially in areas that have suffered most from traffic and emissions.

As we move forward, we need to make sure this transition is fair and inclusive. That is what we are doing, because we believe that everyone in Canada should be able to benefit from electric vehicles, not just people in big cities or with higher incomes. This means making sure there are charging stations in rural, remote and northern communities. It means working with first nations, Métis and Inuit communities so they are partners and leaders in this work, not just participants.

It also means supporting the workers whose jobs are changing. That is what we are doing. From the oil patch to auto assembly lines, we are making sure people know there is a place for them in this new economy. When we invest in retraining, local manufacturing and green jobs, we are working for those Canadians.

We are also thinking about the full life cycle of electric vehicles. I am talking about mining materials responsibly, recycling old batteries and making sure we are not solving one environmental problem by creating another one. Canada has a huge opportunity here. We are taking these important steps because EVs are a key part of our climate plan. We are seeing new investments in battery plants, EV manufacturing, and clean-tech hubs across the country.

Business of Supply

We are not stopping there, because we can lead the world in sustainable mining, green manufacturing and fair, accessible transportation. We can build an electric future, one that reflects our values of inclusion, fairness, innovation and care for the environment. We can work together across party lines, across regions and across industries to create a future where clean transportation helps us meet our climate goals, grow our economy and build stronger, healthier communities.

This is not a distant dream; it is happening now. The world is changing and Canada is ready to lead. The transition to electric vehicles is more than a shift in technology. It is a chance to reimagine how we move, how we live and how we take care of the planet we call home. Let us seize this moment with boldness, with fairness and with determination. Let us build a cleaner, stronger Canada together.

Kerry Diotte (Edmonton Griesbach, CPC): Madam Speaker, my Liberal colleague across the way extols the virtues of the electric vehicle. It sounds wondrous. It sounds like a grade 8 oral, in fact. It sounds like they are wonderful vehicles.

What would my colleague say to my friend who has a Tesla and cannot drive it in the winter because it is cold in Edmonton? He needs to borrow his spouse's vehicle because he cannot turn on the heater to get to work, so he does not drive the EV when it is cold in the winter. What would she tell him?

• (1315)

Julie Dzerowicz: Madam Speaker, the single biggest threat to Canada's auto sector, or to Canada in general, is American tariffs, not electric vehicles. We are fighting to protect Canadian jobs and are building an electric vehicle supply chain that is driving record investment into our economy. Transportation emissions have declined to levels that have not been seen in decades, demonstrating that we can grow our economy while also fighting climate change. That is what I would say.

[Translation]

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Madam Speaker, my colleague talks about the importance of vehicle electrification and technology development. I get the feeling that she is talking out of both sides of her mouth.

I just found an email that Annie Chagnon from Chagnon Honda sent me during the election campaign. In the email, she criticizes the end of, or cuts to, the incentives for zero-emission vehicles that goes completely against transport electrification and the government's EV production requirements.

By dithering on the issue of incentives, the government may have caused fewer people to buy EVs. It would be important to get back to promoting them.

[English]

Julie Dzerowicz: Madam Speaker, I agree with the hon. member. I think the types of incentives that our federal government has introduced in the past have led to an increase in Canadians buying electric vehicles. We have, for the moment, temporarily halted those incentives, but it is my hope that we will be returning to them in the near future.

Corey Hogan (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I live in Calgary, which also gets fairly cold in the winter, I think we might agree. Certainly, it is true that first-generation EVs did struggle with heat in the cold because, of course, they used electric heaters. That was all that was required in California markets. However, second-generation EVs and further are much more sophisticated. They use heat pumps and the like, which are very good for Canadian winters.

Considering this and considering the uniqueness of the Canadian market, can you speak to the benefit of a Canadian-made supply chain that reflects the values of Canada?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): I cannot speak about anything, but the hon. member for Davenport might.

Corey Hogan: Madam Speaker, can we hear the hon. member's comments about the virtues of a Canadian-made supply chain?

Julie Dzerowicz: Madam Speaker, I think we have been hearing about this a lot in the news. We are working very hard and very expeditiously to create a resilient, strong Canadian economy. As part of that, we are forming alliances with car companies around the world. One of them is Volkswagen. It will be the largest car company manufacturing EVs and batteries in North America. This is just one of our many investments.

We are partnering with these types of companies to make sure that we are creating cars and creating options that will lower emissions and meet our everyday needs. Whether it is in our urban life, our rural life, a cold environment or a hot environment, we are making sure that we create the cars we need here in Canada, moving forward.

Hon. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I have heard red herring after red herring: no heat, reduction in gas tax revenue, low range and not enough charging stations. That is all the Conservatives have to offer on this. Somebody accused me of gaslighting a few moments ago in a speech. This is a gaslighting tutorial being put on by the Conservatives right now, who are trying to make everybody fearful of electric vehicles.

I want to go to a quote from earlier today from the member for Huron—Bruce. He said that we should take as an example a Ford electric truck. He said it is great if someone is just “tooting down the road” with nothing to pull behind them, but as soon as they put a trailer on it with a bit of a load, the battery does not hold. He thinks people need a combustion engine to get the job done.

I am somebody who owns one of these “tooting down the road” Ford trucks. I have had it for two years and two weeks. I have put 89,000 kilometres on this vehicle just tooting it around.

An hon. member: How many pounds have you towed?

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, have I towed anything? I will get to that. I have towed a dual axle utility trailer with a Bobcat S150 on the back from one city to another. I have towed dump trailers with it. These vehicles are extremely capable of getting the jobs done that only a gas vehicle could do, as Conservatives would want us to believe.

An hon. member: Was it an electric Bobcat?

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, no, it was not an electric Bobcat, but one day it will be an electric Bobcat, despite the fact that Conservatives will do everything possible to try to prevent that from happening.

Let us think about this for a second. I gave a very easy example in responding to a member earlier. He said the ticket price of an EV vehicle is about \$15,000 more than that of a combustion engine vehicle. Let us assume we stay on the low end of things. I did a quick Google search to see how much gas the average vehicle uses in its lifetime. It is between 50,000 and 200,000 litres of gas.

Let us stay on the low end. I will not even push the high end; my vehicle is clearly way on the high end. If that vehicle is going to use 100,000 litres and the average price is \$1.20 a litre, which I think is fair to say would be on the low end, that is \$120,000 we are spending on gas during the lifetime of that vehicle.

Of course, there is going to be another red herring, which is that it is going to cost so much for the electricity. I have great news: With the technology in my EV, my F-150, I can plug it in and it knows not to bother charging until we have gone into the off-peak hours. It charges overnight, and I pay a lot less.

This is from somebody who has been driving EVs since 2011. The actual impact on our utility bill is negligible since there are too many other variables on the utility bill to see the difference. That is the reality of it. I have owned three Toyota Tundras. I have put \$150 in gas into those vehicles every week, week and a half for 10 years.

I have owned an F-150 Lightning for two years and two weeks. I would never go back. To any of the members here, I have it in Ottawa. I will pull up and take them for a drive. I will rent a trailer, and we can drive around the Gatineau region with it and I can bring them back here. I will show them that in reality, what they are saying, these red herrings they keep putting forward, is factually incorrect. To any member of the House who would like this demonstration, I will openly do it at their convenience just to show them that what they are saying is absolutely inaccurate.

I used an example earlier, because what the program is really about is incentivizing the marketplace and getting people and industry to start to look for different options. Yes, EVs are more expensive. An EV right now, and I will take the member's word for it, is probably about \$15,000 more than a gas equivalent. However, it was not like that 10 years ago. Ten years ago it was about \$60,000 more for the gas equivalent. Why is the price coming down? It is

Business of Supply

because governments around the world have been incentivizing private investors and private companies to find solutions and to mass produce product.

● (1320)

One would think Elon Musk, the darling child of the right, would be able to convince my colleagues on the other side of the House, but they seemingly do not even want to believe him. However, I am sure they believe just about everything else he says as it relates to his politics.

Earlier, I used the example of the lighting in here, which is LED lighting. Twenty-five or 30 years ago, we did not have LED lighting in this room, but rather the incandescent light bulb, which is extremely inefficient. It produces a ton of heat, a ton of waste and creates a lot of expense in the process of producing the light. What did the Ontario government do back in the early 2000s? It said it wanted to phase out and transition toward another technology that was a lot more efficient. What did it do? It said that by a certain date, I believe it was 10 years, the incandescent light bulb could no longer be sold in Ontario. What happened there? Industry started to look for options.

The first option was the compact fluorescent light bulb. Do members remember those spirally little light bulbs? Everybody was using those light bulbs at first. There was incentivization. If people went to a Home Depot or a Canadian Tire, there were little stickers they could pull off to get two or three dollars off the purchase of each light bulb. That was a government incentive that helped consumers pay the increased costs, knowing that later on those same options would end up costing less.

This is basic economics 101. One would think the party that purports to be the champion of understanding how an economy works would understand basic economic principles like this, yet Conservatives do not. What happened later on? It turned out the compact fluorescent light bulb was just a bridge to get to something else, because next came the LED light bulb. Now, as a result of Ontario and many other jurisdictions making that call 20 years ago, the only thing we can buy when we go into a store is an LED light bulb. As a matter of fact, if for some reason someone needs an incandescent light bulb, they end up paying more for it than an LED light bulb.

As a result of government intervention 25 years ago, we now have a more efficient light bulb that is cheaper to produce, to buy and to operate. The consumer wins all around. To boot, the Ontario government actually helped people buy those before as well. This is not ground-breaking. It is the exact same logic for the transition through the light bulb or the transition through any technology when government has seen the benefit and identifies the need to do that.

Business of Supply

We can continue to listen to the red herrings, like the member for Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong talking about the gas tax and all the money the government is collecting at the pumps and how it could be used to help fix the roads. What about the other side of it? What if we do not do that, and we just keep polluting the environment? What about the impacts on our health system as a result of people having more respiratory problems?

Conservatives used to be the champions of the environment, that is, the Progressive Conservatives. Brian Mulroney and Flora MacDonald, from my riding, were Conservatives who understood that acid rain was a problem. Brian Mulroney led the world with respect to dealing with acid rain by bringing people together. He went to see George Bush to deal with the problem. He came up with a protocol. The same can be said about fixing the ozone layer. Conservatives led the charge on the Montreal Protocol, bringing countries from around the world together in Montreal to deal with the problems we had with the ozone and the fact it was depleting. Whatever happened to those Conservatives?

• (1325)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): Questions and comments, the hon. member for New Tecumseth—Gwillimburg—no, Gwillimbury.

Scot Davidson (New Tecumseth—Gwillimbury, CPC): Let us just call it the soup and salad bowl of Canada, Madam Speaker.

We are still waiting for our rural top-up from the member for Kingston and the Islands, who thinks if he says it loud enough it must be true in this place.

There was a lot to unpack in the member's speech. I have driven a Ford F-150 Lightning and can tell the House that, under load, in cold conditions up in Thunder Bay, that thing is about as handy as a front pocket on a pair of underwear.

I turn to the hon. member's comment that he has owned four electric vehicles in the last 10 years. It is about affordability in my riding. Purchasing four new vehicles in 10 years? People in my riding would have to wait 10 years just to be able to afford a used vehicle, even with the government incentive, as he puts it, which is really the taxpayer, the people of Canada, paying for the subsidy for the people. I wonder if he can comment on affordability in my riding and on the true nature of the F-150 north of Thunder Bay.

• (1330)

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, what is the consumption of gas, and the inefficiency of a combustion motor, when towing something? It decreases significantly.

What I said is that I have owned several Toyota Tundras. When I put gas in one of those and was towing something, regardless of where I was towing it, I had to keep putting more gas in it. It is another red herring to somehow say that the range of an electric truck goes down when it is towing something. Well, thanks, but I think we all could have figured that out; it is pretty simple. When a truck is towing something, the range is going to go down, but the range goes down on combustion vehicles too.

I have good news. There are a lot of charging stations, if Conservatives would just open their eyes and start looking for them. Earli-

er, when the member for Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound was speaking, he started talking about how there are no charging stations in his neck of the woods. I just looked up Owen Sound alone and found six charging stations, just in the small town of Owen Sound. Again, it is red herring after red herring; that is all Conservatives have to offer.

[Translation]

Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ): Madam Speaker, since it is rare that I agree with my colleague, I wanted to rise to speak. This resonates with me.

Like him, I have an electric vehicle. I live in Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean, in northern Quebec. I can confirm that the winters are cold in northern Saguenay—Lac-Saint-Jean. However, I am still able to get here with an electric vehicle.

We have heard members try to demonize and vilify electric vehicles by saying that they do not work in winter and that there are no charging stations. However, the majority of people who own electric vehicles do 95% of their charging at home. They use their own charging stations. The network can be developed at home.

Here is what I want to ask my colleague. Does he agree with me that, ultimately, our Conservative colleagues' main argument is that we must protect the oil and gas sector's privileges?

[English]

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Speaker, 100%, the member is absolutely correct. That is the argument the Conservatives are putting forward. They should just be upfront about it. They should say that they want to continue to produce oil and gas for an eternity, because they want to protect these companies that produce it.

My colleague, before me, spoke about how other countries, like China and Japan and all these other countries, are widely adopting EVs. I wanted to get up and ask her a question. I was going to ask her if she thinks they are doing it strictly for the benefit to the environment. I do not believe that is the answer. It has a lot more to do with energy security. The reality is that what we pay at the pump is dictated by a global price. We cannot really control that. What we can control is when we produce electricity and how we produce it, where we produce it, what kind of electricity is manufactured, from what source, and then we can control the price. There is a huge incentive for countries, not just from the environmental perspective but from the energy security perspective.

[Translation]

Jason Groleau (Beauce, CPC): Madam Speaker, I would like to inform you that I will be sharing my time with my colleague from Oshawa.

Business of Supply

I rise today to defend a very concrete reality that is often overlooked when political decisions are being made in Ottawa or Quebec City. I am talking about the reality of the regions, and my region in particular. Beauce is proud, hard-working, entrepreneurial rural region, where people get up early, work hard and do not wait on others when they need to get ahead in life. In Beauce, we continue to build our homes to produce results and keep our regional economy going. We need our gas-powered cars and trucks.

Electric transportation is a good idea. However, it is not realistic in the regions. Yes, electrifying transportation is a noble goal; we agree with that. Yes, the goal should be to reduce greenhouse gas emissions; we all agree on that. However, the caveat is that regions like Beauce cannot be asked to make the leap without any infrastructure. There is no efficient public transit system in my region. There is no subway or streetcar. There is not even a bus system anywhere in the Beauce region. There are no fast-charging stations. I have heard plenty of people say that there are some here. In my area, they are not on every street corner. In many villages, the first charging station is 30 kilometres or even 40 kilometres away. In the winter, the range drops quickly when it is -30 degrees and there is a trailer hitched to the truck. Before thinking about forcing the transition, we need to ask ourselves a basic question: Is it feasible on the ground? In many regions, the answer is simply no.

People in Beauce use trucks for work. The Beauce region is full of entrepreneurs, SMEs, construction workers, farmers and transportation workers. People here deliver materials, transport bales of hay, install roofing and build houses. To do so, they need reliable heavy-duty trucks that can handle job sites, gravel roads and icy hills, and most importantly, these vehicles need to be long-range. In Beauce, electric vehicles do not really meet our needs. They are more expensive to buy, heavier and shorter-range. It is even worse in the winter, when it is impossible to do a hard day's work without recharging.

The other day, tool boxes were mentioned in connection with Beauce. What the minister does not realize is that our tool boxes are not little hand-held ones. In Beauce, our tool boxes are enclosed trailers towed behind pickup trucks. Has anyone here ever tried to hook up a trailer to an electric car? The range is 100 kilometres, and half that in the winter. That would not even get us out of the Beauce region. I will ask a simple question. How many construction sites have my colleagues seen that have a fast-charging station? The answer is zero. In Beauce, there are none.

It is also a matter of freedom and dignity. Putting an end to gas-powered vehicles also means imposing an urban lifestyle on rural areas. It ignores the fact that for many people in Beauce, their truck is not a luxury but a work tool and an extension of their workshop. It is a small business on four wheels. People in the regions are not against the energy transition. They want to take part, but not to their own detriment and not by sacrificing their independence, performance and livelihoods. We cannot tell them to sell their truck and to buy and make do with a vehicle that costs twice as much but that does not do the job. That makes no sense.

What we need here is for the government to be realistic and to listen. It is time for the Liberal government to listen to Canadians, including those in the regions. Once again, it is important to adapt to rural reality and stop copying the big urban centres. Let us talk a

bit about the false promise of uniformity. What we are experiencing today is bureaucratic pressure to apply the same rules to Toronto, Vancouver and Montreal as to Saint-Éphrem-de-Beauce. The government needs to give that some more thought. What works on the Island of Montreal does not work in rang 9 of Saint-Gédéon-de-Beauce. That is not an opinion. It is a fact.

• (1335)

In many regions, the transition to electric can only be done once charging stations are installed, prices come down, electric trucks achieve a range comparable to that of gas-powered vehicles, and the infrastructure follows. In the meantime, cutting access to gas-powered vehicles penalizes our workers and holds back our entrepreneurs. A just transition is a customized transition. No one here is saying that we should fight progress. What I am saying is that a brutal transition should not be forced on the regions. Gas-powered trucks should continue to be allowed, available and supported. It is simply unreasonable to say that they will be banned in 10 years' time.

If the government really wants to help the regions, it should invest in charging stations in rural areas, not just in major cities. It should invest in road infrastructure and support local garages so that they can maintain and repair electric vehicles, which cost a fortune. We have a shortage of mechanics. The government should offer realistic subsidies for vehicles that are adapted to the needs of the construction and agriculture industries, which are too often overlooked. Above all, the government should listen to the regions instead of telling them what to do once again.

Beauce is an example of an economy on four wheels. Every truck, van and pickup in Beauce is a tool for economic development. Farmers get their produce to market. Contractors transport their materials from Sainte-Marie to Saint-Isidore. Construction workers who leave home at 5 a.m. and go to three job sites during the day all need a reliable vehicle that can handle whatever challenges the road throws at them. Telling them that they should give up their gas-powered trucks without a credible alternative shows contempt for their reality.

The Liberal government is being unrealistic. The Liberals have been unrealistic and inconsistent from the very start in their reasoning and in their timeline for this decree.

First, the Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture said that the government would no longer invest in new highways and local streets, but electric vehicles still need roads to travel on. Second, switching millions of vehicles to electric will result in a significant increase in energy demand. Is Canada's grid prepared to handle this massive volume of electricity? Moreover, several provinces such as Alberta and Saskatchewan still rely on fossil fuels to generate their electricity. The grid will need to be modernized quickly or else the environmental gains will be negated.

Business of Supply

Lastly, EV batteries require critical minerals such as lithium, cobalt and nickel, which create pollution during extraction and recycling and are often controlled by countries such as China. Canada has mineral resources, but its extraction and processing capacity lags far behind demand. Canada does not even have a clear national strategy or the large-scale industrial infrastructure to recycle its batteries.

I am asking the government to show some respect for the regions. Let me be clear today. I support the energy transition, innovation and electric vehicles. I have no problem with any of that, but it must not be done at the expense of Canadians and the regions. We need to give the market time to adapt. We need to listen to the needs on the ground. Most importantly, we need to show respect for workers in construction, agriculture and logistics. They are the ones who keep Quebec running, the real Quebec, not just a theoretical version of it. In Beauce, we are moving forward, but not blindly. We want to participate in the transition, but in a way that makes sense.

I would invite all of my colleagues to think carefully and vote in favour of this common-sense Conservative motion.

● (1340)

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I just want to highlight the fact that as we continue to move forward in dealing with this particular issue, it is important that we recognize that there are American states, and in fact other countries like the United Kingdom, that actually have targets and are moving toward what we have been doing here in Canada.

I wonder whether the member could just provide his thoughts, in terms of reflecting on what is actually taking place around the world and not just here in Canada.

[Translation]

Jason Groleau: Madam Speaker, there is indeed an energy transition going on. We all know that.

However, I will once again bring up the rural reality, which is different from that of the big cities. In my region, we have trucks, sugar shacks and farmers. Sugar shacks mean tractors. Tractors run on gas. Tractors have trailers, and trailers tend to go with quads. There are also chainsaws, which require gas. Our regions have to use gas. It is a necessity, but I agree that we need to improve our structures. I am well aware of that.

Andréanne Larouche (Shefford, BQ): Madam Speaker, I also represent a rural riding. I have family members working in construction, and there are agricultural producers all over my riding. I am very involved in this issue of the rural reality and land use.

There are three points I would like to raise. First, I think it is shameful that we are debating a motion today that seems to completely ignore the issue of climate change. In fact, my Conservative opponent did not even show up for the environmental debate during the election, which I think is also shameful.

Second, when the member talked about standards, my colleague from Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères and I exchanged

glances, because today's debate is about electric vehicles, not tractors, which our farmers do need on their farms. Members should avoid spreading disinformation. We are talking about electric vehicles today; we are not here to hurt agricultural producers.

Finally, when a target is voluntary, that means there is no target. I will quickly give an example. In 2005, automakers and the federal government had a voluntary agreement. They committed to reducing their greenhouse gas emissions. Since there were no penalties, the target was not met. They missed it by 95%. Perhaps it is time to set some standards and rules for moving forward.

● (1345)

Jason Groleau: Madam Speaker, it is not disinformation. Transporting a tractor to a woodlot requires a trailer. Not everyone has a garage on their woodlot. I have an electric truck, and I know it cannot tow a trailer for more than 100 kilometres. The member for Shefford is the one who is spreading disinformation.

The reality is that EVs are simply not designed for towing. I am not against electric trucks, but it is important to understand what trucks are used for. People always forget to talk about that. They are not designed for our needs.

Gabriel Hardy (Montmorency—Charlevoix, CPC): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his very informative speech.

I would like to ask him a question. Does he believe that the government carefully explored all of the options before deciding to focus solely on electric vehicles? For example, we could use our fossil fuels to have a positive environmental impact on the entire planet by selling them and helping other countries to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions.

Does my colleague not agree that it would make more sense to take a holistic approach on a global scale rather than focusing solely on our own domestic policies?

Jason Groleau: Madam Speaker, there are, in fact, many possible solutions to explore. Have the studies had enough of an impact and did they go as far as they should have? I would say no. To answer the question from my colleague from Montmorency—Charlevoix, there is still a lot of work to be done in this area.

[English]

Rhonda Kirkland (Oshawa, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is an honour to rise today again to speak to our Conservative motion as the member of Parliament for Oshawa. We know that the motion is to end the ban on gas-powered vehicles, not to stop the production of electric vehicles in any way.

My city has been the heartbeat of Canada's automotive industry for over a century now. For generations, Oshawa has helped drive this country forward, literally and figuratively. From the early days of McLaughlin Motor Car Co. to becoming the national headquarters for General Motors Canada, my community has been building the vehicles that Canadians rely on every single day.

Business of Supply

The people of Oshawa know cars. We do not just buy them; we design them, we engineer them and we build them while also utilizing the CTC McLaughlin Advanced Technology Track, which supports building and combining software and hardware for advanced vehicle systems, helping make Oshawa and Durham Region leaders in automotive technology in Ontario. We have rolled up our sleeves through good times and bad. We have weathered plant closures and celebrated reopenings. Therefore, when the government tries to tell Canadians what kind of car they must drive, without listening to workers, to industry leaders or to the families who depend on affordable transportation, that is not leadership; it is simple overreach.

Even the president of General Motors Canada has said that no major automaker is even close to hitting the 2026 targets. He is calling for the entire program to be scrapped, not tweaked and not delayed but scrapped, because the unrealistic mandates would force automakers to restrict the sale of gas-powered vehicles just to comply, leading to job losses in dealerships and in manufacturing companies, to lost revenue for manufacturers and to higher prices for consumers. This typical Liberal one-size-fits-all approach does not reflect reality in my community and in many, many communities around this country.

When do the 2026 cars start rolling out? We used to say that we would expect them to roll out in the fall for the following year, but now the industry leaders are telling us that is not the case. They are starting to roll out right now, so this is a very important and timely debate.

The workers of General Motors in Oshawa who fought hard to keep the auto industry alive in this country deserve better than to be dictated to by politicians in Ottawa who have never punched a clock, perhaps, or maybe never even had to pay off a car loan. The Liberal government's top-down ban on gas-powered vehicles is not only unaffordable; it is also disconnected from reality. It threatens jobs, limits choice and raises prices on the very people who are already being squeezed by inflation, high taxes and rising debt.

In December 2022, the Canada Gazette, found on the Government of Canada website, in the regulatory impact analysis statement of the ban said this: "The proposed Amendments are expected to have a disproportionate impact on low-income households due to the higher upfront cost of ZEVs in early years and the potential for non-ZEV costs to increase due to a decreasing supply of these vehicles in response to the increasing ZEV sales targets." It goes on to say, "The proposed Amendments would also disproportionately impact households living in rural and northern communities that may have lower access to public charging infrastructure", and there is more to be said regarding that as well.

A skilled tradesperson in Oshawa hauling their gear in the dead of winter is not thinking about EV market share; they are thinking about whether their truck is going to start in -20°C or maybe whether they can afford the payments. These are the people the Liberal elite never think about, ever.

Canadians are not anti-EV. We are already leading the way in clean tech and in sustainable manufacturing. Since 2020, Ford, General Motors and Stellantis have announced nearly \$1.5 billion of new job-creating investments in Canada, strengthening the auto-

motive sector and its supply chains. These investments are driving growth across communities in parts manufacturing, logistics and technology development, reinforcing Canada's role in the global automotive industry.

• (1350)

As reported by the Canadian Vehicle Manufacturers' Association, EV sales have collapsed in recent months, falling to just 7.5% in April 2025. There is no longer a pathway to achieving the government's mandated sales level of 20% by 2026. The auto manufacturers cannot meet these quotas. In fact, in Quebec, sales decreased by 75% in the first quarter of 2025. That is a 75% decrease in EV sales. If auto manufacturers cannot meet these quotas, then there will be penalties. We know this. It was said before. Let us say a company is supposed to sell 10,000 vehicles in 2026, 2,000 of them must be EVs and they only end up selling 1,000. That is a cost of \$20 million to the manufacturer, so the government does not have to worry about the consumer carbon tax anymore. They probably looked at this policy and thought, "This is a new carbon tax. We will just get it this way from Canadians."

The Liberal government will impose this \$20,000 per vehicle tax at the expense of Canadians. Essentially, the result of the legislation would be lower vehicle sales, higher vehicle prices for Canadians and fewer jobs in the sector. It will undermine consumer affordability and choice, specifically at a time of rising costs, limited demand and growing uncertainty about infrastructure readiness.

The auto industry is already under stress because of the U.S. tariffs. I know all members of the House will agree that now more than ever, we must collectively protect this vital sector. Causing further avoidable harm would be irresponsible, jeopardizing Canadian jobs, investment, affordable access and choice for essential transportation needs and the stability of our economy. If our auto regulations are not aligned with those of the United States, for instance, it will threaten Canada's industrial future, and we risk losing our auto industry, which is why we must let the market and the industry dictate, not the Liberal government.

Conservatives reject this approach. We believe in common sense. We believe in trusting Canadians, not punishing them. Canadians deserve freedom to choose what they say, what they think, where their money goes and, yes, what they drive, whether it be gas-powered, electrical or both.

Statements by Members

We support cleaner technology. We support lower emissions. We support a strong, competitive Canadian auto sector. We do not support telling working-class Canadians that they must spend \$15,000 to \$20,000 more for a vehicle that does not fit their life or their region just to satisfy a mandate drawn up by this out-of-touch Liberal government. That is what Conservatives stand for. It is what we will always stand for.

The auto sector in Oshawa and across Ontario has a delicate balance. Our workers have proven time and time again that they can compete with the best in the world, but they need stable, realistic policies, not sweeping bans that ignore infrastructure, regional needs and consumer realities.

Let us be honest: This ban is not going to hurt the Prime Minister, his Bay Street donors or many of the elites across the aisle. They will still drive what they want. They will still get chauffeured around in motorcades with idling engines, and they will still fly their private jets to climate conferences overseas. Working Canadians will be left holding the bag.

• (1355)

Genette Lavack (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indigenous Services, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask my colleague across the aisle a question. Given the scientific consensus that immediate action is needed to combat climate change, as we are living and experiencing the worst wildland fire season on record to date, and recognizing that the electric vehicle availability standard is designed to gradually increase EV supply and affordability over time, how can the member justify delaying future targets, especially when motions like the one proposed by the Conservatives call for ending these efforts altogether? How can we do this without effectively abandoning Canada's climate commitments?

Rhonda Kirkland: Madam Speaker, I spoke with many auto manufacturers and groups yesterday, and the answer is this: The member said it; the word is "targets". Targets are just fine. Auto manufacturers and the auto sector are fine with targets. Targets are something they can strive for. A mandate that controls what Canadians buy is unacceptable.

Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Madam Speaker, our hon. colleague spoke of her community and her riding being the heart of vehicle manufacturing for our country.

When Bev Goodman, CEO of Ford Canada, called for the EV mandate to be repealed; Kristian Aquilina, president of General Motors Canada, urged the Liberals to scrap the EV mandate; and Brian Kingston, president and CEO of the Canadian Vehicle Manufacturers' Association, asked for the EV mandate to be scrapped as well, this must have sent a chill through my colleague's constituents. I wonder if she can share some of the stories she is hearing on the doorsteps about this.

Rhonda Kirkland: Mr. Speaker, yes, it does send a chill of fear through constituents in my riding. In Oshawa, it was announced that we are losing a third line, that third shift. Jobs are already being lost because of sales going down. It is really a matter of choice. It comes back to choice all the time. As I said before, targets are fine. We all want a cleaner environment and lower emissions. We want to reach goals and targets. Mandates are unacceptable.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

• (1400)

[English]

OVERCOMING GLOBAL CHALLENGES

Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, we are at a critical time in our nation's history. We know that Canada can no longer rely on the U.S. for our primary strategic trade and security needs. We must now forge a different and a strategic path to ensure that our security, our peace and our sovereignty are protected.

However, right now in Alberta, separatist groups are preparing a referendum to separate from Canada, thanks to Danielle Smith. At the very moment that we must come together for our country and for our future, Conservatives in my province are working to divide us. They are feeding Trump's "51st state" hallucinations.

While the Prime Minister is cozying up to human rights abusers and tyrants, he is rejecting meaningful consultation with workers, environmental groups and indigenous nations.

Our path to a stronger economy and a better future cannot bypass human rights in Canada or abroad. We must protect our democracy. We must protect human rights. That is who we are as Canadians.

* * *

CANADA DAY CELEBRATIONS

Gurbux Saini (Fleetwood—Port Kells, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I rise with great pride to announce that this year, I will be hosting our annual Canada Day celebration in my riding of Fleetwood—Port Kells.

Canada Day is a special occasion when we come together as one to celebrate our shared history, our many achievements and the joy of being Canadian.

My constituents can join me on Tuesday, July 1, from 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. at Chimney Heights Park.

Fellow citizens can come join me for delicious food, exciting performances and a day of Canadian pride. Canada Day is a moment to reflect on the greatness of our country and the values that unite us as Canadians.

Together, let us celebrate Canada strong and free.

[Translation]

EMMY FECTEAU

Jason Groleau (Beauce, CPC): Mr. Speaker, today I would like to salute a young woman who makes Beauce shine. On May 10, she was named athlete of the year at the 46th Beauce sports awards gala. Emmy Fecteau, a hockey player from Saint-Odilon, is an exceptional athlete and person.

On the ice, she led Team Canada to gold at the University Games. Emmy was named captain of the Concordia Stingers in the 2023-24 season, which ended in a victory at the national championship. Since 2024-25, she has been with the New York Sirens in the Professional Women's Hockey League.

As a disciplined young woman, Emmy never put her education on hold. She combined high-performance sports and academic achievement with the same passion and discipline, obtaining her bachelor's degree in English education. Emmy is an inspiration to all our young people. She is a real ambassador for Beauce. She is proud, determined and deeply compassionate.

I congratulate Emmy for all she has accomplished. Beauce is truly proud of her.

* * *

[English]

VACCINATIONS

Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Vancouver Centre residents for putting their trust in me again, for the 11th time. I will work hard to represent them.

I speak to them now, though, not as an MP but as a physician. I fear for the health of our children. Canada faces an outbreak of measles as has been unseen in decades. We eliminated measles in 1998, and now it is back. Measles is the most contagious of all viruses and can live in the air for 48 hours. Measles is deadly. Hundreds of thousands of young children died in the fifties from measles, and those who survived faced permanent brain damage.

I want to dispel some myths. Getting a kid to visit a friend with measles is risky. Measles is not chicken pox, so do not play Russian roulette with a child's life. Measles is preventable with the MMR vaccine. I beg parents to vaccinate their children. Women of child-bearing age should get the vaccine before becoming pregnant. Provinces should not allow unvaccinated kids to attend school. Surely, we owe our children that much.

* * *

SARNIA—LAMBTON—BKEJWANONG

Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the people of Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong for putting their trust in me for a fourth term as their member of Parliament.

I want to thank my campaign manager, Anne Denman, and the many dedicated volunteers who worked to ensure a victory.

Special shout-outs go to Mackenna, the best volunteer coordinator and door knocker ever; Brandon, the brains behind getting out

Statements by Members

the vote; and Bill, a.k.a. “Murph”, who made sure there were blue signs from one end of the riding to the other.

I also want to thank my husband, Paul, who put up signs, door knocked, and was a major support for me, as he always is.

I also thank my daughters, Gillian and Katie, for their love and support.

I commit to being a strong voice for our issues in this riding and to be helpful to all constituents who need my assistance. These are challenging times, and I will be standing up for their civil liberties and the rights and freedoms we hold dear.

I look forward to working with all sides of this House to build a better Canada for everyone.

* * *

● (1405)

[Translation]

NATIONAL PUBLIC SERVICE WEEK

Hon. Greg Fergus (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this week, we are celebrating National Public Service Week. This is a perfect opportunity to acknowledge the outstanding work of those who keep our country running smoothly every day.

The public service of 2025 needs to take advantage of new technologies and AI, which can help us build a more agile and efficient public service. Our government will give public servants the tools they need to keep up their excellent work in serving Canadians. New technologies can make it easier to complete routine tasks so that public servants can focus on what matters: creativity, judgment and problem solving.

To keep Canada strong, we need a strong public service. I wish everyone a happy National Public Service Week.

* * *

[English]

CANADIAN ENERGY SECTOR

Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, despite having the gift of abundant natural resources, Canada is not meeting its potential. Canada has the third largest oil reserves in the world, yet due to the lost Liberal decade and its anti-energy policies, we import nearly half a million barrels of oil a day. Liberals have preferred to support dirty dictator oil instead of our responsible Canadian energy.

Statements by Members

To many Canadians, Alberta represented a beacon of hope and prosperity, and an opportunity for a fresh start, but over the last decade, our economy has had the worst economic growth in the G7, and the hope is quickly fading. Canada cannot wait. We need Canadian energy projects, mines, pipelines, LNG, nuclear and so much more. Canada needs breakthroughs. We need to scrap anti-energy Bill C-69, the shipping ban, the energy cap and the industrial carbon tax to unlock our natural resources.

We have the people. We have the know-how. We have the energy. What we need is for the Liberal government to get out of the way and let Canada flourish.

* * *

RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Jessica Fancy-Landry (South Shore—St. Margarets, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as a lifelong rural advocate for South Shore—St. Margarets, and as a former educator and award-winning researcher on rural youth and development, I rise today to speak about the vital importance of rural economic development in Canada.

Rural communities are not just picturesque backdrops. They are the lifeblood of this country. They are where our milk is produced, where the seafood on our plate is hauled in and where the Christmas trees that brighten our homes in December are grown. In fact, my own grandfather, with Riverview Christmas Tree Farm, was a grower in Lunenburg county, the Christmas tree capital of the world.

My research has long been focused on ensuring rural people are not left behind. Too often, rural needs are treated as afterthoughts. We must change that, because when we invest in rural infrastructure, innovation and education, we invest in the sustainability of our food systems, our natural resources and our local industries.

Rural Canada does not just feed us, it grounds us. Let us prioritize it.

* * *

BUZZ HARGROVE

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the Conservative member of Parliament for Windsor West. I am deeply humbled by the trust the good people of Windsor have placed in me to represent their voices in Ottawa.

It is in that spirit that I pay tribute to a man who left an indelible mark on our community and our country's auto industry. That man was Buzz Hargrove, who passed away on June 15. Buzz started in the line of the Windsor Assembly Plant and later rose through the ranks to become the president of the Canadian Auto Workers Union.

He was a passionate advocate for working families, especially in Windsor, where the auto sector is not just a source of jobs but part of our identity. Buzz fought hard for wages, safer workplaces and the security that comes with a good contract. His legacy is felt not only in the assembly lines, but also in the strength and resilience of our communities.

May Buzz rest in peace. His voice may have fallen silent, but his legacy will live on.

* * *

● (1410)

[Translation]

JIMMY LAI

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, as world leaders gather at the G7 summit, we must speak with one voice about international human rights and freedom of expression.

The G7 is happening at a critical juncture. The trial of Jimmy Lai, Hong Kong political prisoner and defender of freedom of expression, is set to resume in mid-August. He is 77 years old, diabetic and has already spent four and a half years in arbitrary and illegal detention that UN experts have condemned.

Jimmy Lai's case is probably one of the most publicized in the world. In 2023, both the House of Commons and the Senate unanimously approved motions calling for Mr. Lai's immediate release.

Parliamentarians from all parties believe that granting him honorary Canadian citizenship will put pressure on the Hong Kong government to release him. I am one of them, and I sincerely hope that the members of this Parliament will join me in this call.

* * *

[English]

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF COMMISSIONAIRES

Hon. Darren Fisher (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 100th anniversary of Commissionaires, an extraordinary not-for-profit organization that has proudly served Canadians and supported our veterans for a full century.

Founded in 1925 to provide meaningful employment for veterans returning from war, Commissionaires has grown into one of the largest private security employers in the country, offering thousands of good jobs while continuing its original mission. From protecting federal buildings to supporting local communities, its work is vital, but its impact goes deeper. For countless former members of the Canadian Armed Forces and the RCMP, Commissionaires offers not just employment, but dignity, purpose and camaraderie after service.

We thank the entire Commissionaires family, past and present, for a century of service, loyalty and care. Here is to the next 100 years.

THE ECONOMY

Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in this short parliamentary session, we are rushing through legislation to temporarily, partially, perhaps, override the very laws that have defined the Liberal government's decade-long war on development. Let us name them: Bill C-69, the “no new pipelines” act; Bill C-48, the tanker ban; the oil and gas production cap; and the industrial carbon tax. These laws have made Canada one of the slowest-growing economies in the developed world. Now, as we host the G7, our allies are still asking why Canada cannot get anything built.

The government's latest response is Bill C-5, which is a patchwork fix for which they hope no one notices the mess underneath. Selectively overriding laws is a fake approach.

Here is the real solution: Repeal these anti-energy laws, approve energy projects, create jobs and build again. Let us stop pretending and start delivering stronger paycheques and a better future for Canadians.

* * *

COMMUNITY YARD SALE IN SCARBOROUGH CENTRE—DON VALLEY EAST

Salma Zahid (Scarborough Centre—Don Valley East, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity to attend the community yard sale and annual bake sale held by the Church of Our Saviour, Don Mills, in my riding of Scarborough Centre—Don Valley East. I thank Liz Liness and Reverend Pierre Niyongere for inviting me, and everyone who helped to organise this fantastic event. I appreciated the warm welcome.

It was wonderful to meet members of the community in this relaxed setting and to also see the talents of Don Valley East on display with the amazing art, homemade soups, donuts and other baked goods. Whatever our faith, we all want the best for our family, our community and our country. Events like this help to build strong communities, and I look forward to getting to know this part of my riding this summer.

I hope everyone has a productive and fulfilling summer.

* * *

GAS-POWERED VEHICLES

Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, never has it been more difficult for V8 truck owners in this country. After years of Liberal mismanagement, they have created hardships for farmers, families and forestry workers in northern Alberta. Now, the Liberal government plans to ban gas-powered vehicles and force Canadians to drive electric vehicles. It is just one more example of “Ottawa knows best”.

I will tell members what Albertans and rural Canadians know. The farmer hauling his livestock cannot wait for hours to recharge during a trip. The hunter who needs to bring home his moose cannot stick it in the back of a Prius. When it is -40°C out, oil and gas workers cannot rely on EVs to haul the heavy equipment needed to keep the heat on for the rest of the country. Even in Quebec, the number one selling vehicle is the gas-powered, F-series pickup.

Statements by Members

In a strong and free Canada, Canadians must have the choice to drive a vehicle that meets their needs at a price that they can afford. It is time to axe the ban on gas-powered vehicles.

* * *

● (1415)

[Translation]

COMMUNITY GRANDIOSES AWARDS

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last month, during my very first official activity as the MP for Madawaska—Restigouche, I had the pleasure of attending the Community Grandioses awards ceremony organized by the Grand Falls Regional Municipality.

[English]

Three individuals will receive a Grandiose award in recognition of their volunteer work. They generously give their time to organize activities and provide essential services to the community. Without these dedicated volunteers, many local initiatives would simply not happen.

I send my congratulations to Mariette Lafrance, Judith Thériault and Josée Roussel. Their contributions are both valuable and essential.

[Translation]

Three other individuals were honoured in the ambassador category.

This award recognizes individuals whose outstanding achievements bring prestige to the Regional Municipality of Grand Falls at the provincial, national or international level.

I want to congratulate Alain Lavoie, Morel Caissie, and Carole “Coco” Belliveau. They are a true source of pride for their region.

[English]

As I have said before, Madawaska—Restigouche is full of talent. It is a big privilege to represent this beautiful riding.

*Oral Questions***GAS-POWERED VEHICLES**

David McKenzie (Calgary Signal Hill, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government will soon ban the sale of gas and diesel-powered vehicles in our country. Liberals want to force Canadians to buy electric vehicles. It does not matter that the Liberal plan will add \$20,000 to the cost of a vehicle. It does not matter that Canada is one of the largest and coldest nations in the world. It does not matter that working Canadians rely on dependable vehicles to earn a living and provide for their families. It does not matter that we do not have the electrical generation or transmission capacity for their idea. It does not matter that EV sales in Canada are on the decline and that both General Motors and Ford have called for scrapping the ban.

Canadians demand that the Prime Minister support farmers, tradespeople, energy field workers and their families, who require reliable transportation and must be allowed to choose their vehicles.

* * *

[Translation]

JEAN-YVES GUINDON

Stéphane Lauzon (Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have the immense honour of acknowledging the exceptional contribution of an artist back home, watercolourist Jean-Yves Guindon. He is an artist from Saint-André-Avellin in my riding, Argenteuil—La Petite-Nation. With a more than 40-year career and 5,000 paintings to his credit, Mr. Guindon is an emblematic figure of Quebec art. From his unique perspective he has captured the beauty, the landscapes, the soul of the building and architectural heritage of our region with precision and remarkable sensitivity. He has exhibited his artwork in Quebec, Canada and Europe, in Toronto and Brussels, but his inspiration remains deeply rooted at home in Quebec.

Beyond his artistic career, Mr. Guindon is also involved in roughly 30 organizations, foundations and corporations in the region. Today, I am proud to present him the King Charles III Coronation Medal in recognition of his work, his invaluable contribution to Canadian culture and his community involvement.

ORAL QUESTIONS

[English]

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Chris Warkentin (Grande Prairie, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what if I said the government had a plan to increase the cost of vehicles by over \$20,000 and kill 40,000 high-paying Canadian jobs? Well, that is exactly what the Liberals are doing with their mandate to eliminate gas-powered vehicles, which starts to take effect next year. Workers and families across Canada, especially in rural and northern communities, cannot afford this dangerous Liberal experiment.

It is simple: Canadians do not want this shoved down their throats. Tonight, will the Liberals vote to end their radical ban on gas-powered vehicles immediately?

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, leave it to the Conservatives to hit one

of the most major industries we have in our country exactly at the same time as it is getting hit by unjustified tariffs from the United States.

We stand with our auto workers. We have been investing in our auto industry, and we will keep making sure that we have strong union jobs in our auto sector.

Chris Warkentin (Grande Prairie, CPC): Mr. Speaker, that is completely ridiculous, because a report out today projects 50,000 job losses in the auto sector because of trade uncertainty. Rather than providing the auto sector with any kind of certainty, the Liberals are doubling down on their risky and dangerous EV mandate.

Ford and GM are pleading with the government to end the insanity. Industry projects that the Liberal ban on the gas-powered engine will cost an additional 40,000 high-paying Canadian jobs. The combination of the Liberals' inability to get a deal on tariffs and their self-imposed radical EV mandate will destroy Canada's auto sector.

Will the Liberals join us today and call an end to—

• (1420)

The Speaker: The hon. Minister of Finance.

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we will take no lessons from the Conservatives. We will take no lessons from these guys. Under our government, we have seen record investment in the auto sector. Even Bloomberg ranked Canada first in the world for its EV supply chain. We should all be celebrating.

We are going to fight for the industry. We are going to fight for our workers. We are going to fight for Canada strong.

Rachael Thomas (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, we will take no lessons from them. We will stand up for Canadians' freedom of choice: the choice to drive the vehicle that suits their needs and the choice to drive the vehicle they need for their family. That is what this side of the House will stand for. We are—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: Order. I could not hear anything. The member can start over.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Rachael Thomas: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, but you have to bring the House under control.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Speaker: The hon. member has the floor. Would she like to ask her question?

Rachael Thomas: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that.

The Liberals over here do not believe in the freedom of choice that Canadians should have when it comes to the vehicle they drive. Right now, they have a mandate in place that makes it so Canadians will have to buy EVs. They will have to, but that does not fit the needs of Canadian families. Especially at this time when Canadian families are struggling to make ends meet, they cannot afford the additional \$20,000 that this mandate would add to their bill when they go to purchase a new car.

Right now, the government has an option, and that is to vote with Conservatives to relinquish the ban on gas-powered vehicles. Will they vote with us?

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what I will do is stand up for auto workers all across our country and stand up for a strong auto industry. I will stand up to make sure that we are climate-competitive and going where the world is moving. If the Conservatives looked at studies, globally EV sales are up.

If the members opposite actually care about making sure we are standing up for our auto workers, I hope they will stand up with us to make sure we are protecting the industry.

Rachael Thomas (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, if the Liberal government is truly going to stand with auto workers, then it should stop making the very vehicles they are producing illegal.

In my community of Lethbridge, a farmer cannot drive an EV to pick up seed or drive an EV to harvest their crop. Families in my community need choice when it comes to the vehicle they drive.

Will the Liberals stand with Canadians and relinquish their ban on gas-powered cars?

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, just as a point of clarification about the regulation they are talking about, which is not as they describe, let us be clear that there is no ban on gas-powered vehicles. They can read the regulations.

To be clear, what we are doing is making sure that EVs are available to Canadians. Some 546,000 Canadians accessed our rebate to purchase vehicles because they wanted them.

[Translation]

Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians do not realize it yet, but, thanks to this Liberal government, the cost of gas-powered vehicles is about to go up by \$20,000 because the Liberals want to force everyone to buy electric vehicles.

Banning gas-powered vehicles in Quebec means no more snow-mobiles, no more ATVs and no more F-150s. It means vehicles will get more and more expensive for Quebec families.

Will the Liberal Prime Minister, whose motorcade probably burns more gas than all the ATVs in the Eastern Townships, give Canadians the freedom to choose by casting his vote in favour of our motion to cancel the ban on gas-powered vehicles?

• (1425)

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague should be

happy that our government brought Quebec into the auto industry. There have been record investments in the auto industry. I invite my colleague to visit Bécancour to see what the auto industry looks like. We are building the industry of the future in Quebec, in Ontario and across the country.

Those of us on this side of the House have always fought for communities, be they in Brampton, in Oshawa or in Windsor.

Together, we will build Canada strong.

Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable—Lotbinière, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is cold in Canada. We live in a northern country. It is cold in Quebec. According to the CAA, cold weather reduces car battery life by 40%.

A ban on gas-powered vehicles in Canada is unrealistic. It will cost Canadians 38,000 jobs. This government wants to punish Quebecers who choose to drive gas-powered vehicles by imposing a \$20,000 tax.

Why do the Liberals want to punish Quebecers who live in the regions?

Will they vote in favour of our motion this evening, end the ban on gas-powered vehicles and give Quebecers the freedom to choose between electricity and gas?

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we should not be surprised to hear the Conservatives say that this is not a strong industry when it is actually so important here in our country.

We will always stand with auto workers. In Quebec, nearly 25% of new vehicles sold are electric.

* * *

GOVERNMENT PRIORITIES

Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is taking advantage of the distraction caused by the G7 summit to force his Bill C-5 through under a gag order. It is an attack on Quebec and indigenous peoples.

Fortunately, some people are paying attention. Yesterday, the Assembly of First Nations threatened to take legal action if Bill C-5 is passed without adequate consultation with indigenous peoples. Also yesterday, a former Liberal minister voted against his caucus, saying that the Liberals' approach would embarrass even Stephen Harper.

Will the Liberals take some time to answer questions about Bill C-5 instead of ramming it down our throats here in Parliament?

Oral Questions

Hon. Mandy Gull-Masty (Minister of Indigenous Services, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the federal government will determine whether a major project is in the national interest based on consultation with the provinces, territories and indigenous people.

Projects selected will also be subject to comprehensive consultation with indigenous people. For all projects, the Crown, including the provinces and territories, must consult indigenous people.

That is what the government is going to do.

Christine Normandin (Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the member for Beaches—East York is certainly not the only Liberal who is uncomfortable with Bill C-5. There are other Liberals who did not go into politics to force pipelines on Quebec without its consent and without a credible environmental assessment. There are other Liberals who did not go into politics to undermine reconciliation efforts by forcing energy projects on indigenous people. There are other Liberals who did not go into politics to copy Pierre Poilievre's ideas and pass them with a closure motion thanks to the Conservatives.

Will these Liberals ask the Prime Minister to let Parliament do its job instead of ramming through Bill C-5?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Parliament is doing its job. We are a governing party elected on the slogan “It is time to build” in Canada. We are doing that respectfully.

We are expediting projects of national significance of course, while respecting indigenous jurisdictions and rights.

We are doing this because Canada must take responsibility for its economy, for creating opportunities and for creating jobs.

It is time to build.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Patrick Bonin (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-5 does not just circumvent environmental assessments. It also enables oil companies to violate 13 laws and seven regulations that mainly concern the environment.

With Bill C-5, there is no longer any need to comply with the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, the Species at Risk Act, the Fisheries Act, the marine mammal regulations, and many more. Worse still, proposed section 21 states that Ottawa can suspend any other act by order in council, like Donald Trump.

Is there even one law that the Liberals are not prepared to flout to please the oil companies?

• (1430)

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians and Quebecers have asked us to build a strong economy. They asked us to build projects of national significance. That is exactly what we are going to do, but we are going to do it while protecting the environment each time.

I hope that the Bloc Québécois will consider supporting our bill.

[English]

AUTOMOTIVE INDUSTRY

Arpan Khanna (Oxford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Oxford is home to thousands of hard-working auto workers and spinoff jobs that fuel our economy.

A new report warns that the unjustified U.S. tariffs on the auto sector could kill 50,000 jobs. Our families are worried, our workers are terrified and the layoffs have already started. The Prime Minister claimed to be the man with a plan, but as we have not gotten a deal done, we are suffering right across the board. The Prime Minister talks a big game, but when it comes to fighting for auto workers, he is missing from action.

Can the Liberals tell us how many auto sector jobs will be lost because they failed to get a deal?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent on every member in this House to fight for the auto sector. We know they are the best workers in the world. We know they are in our communities across the country. We have been working with them hand in hand each time.

We are facing a trade war from our closest neighbour, but one thing is true. We are going to fight for our workers. We are going to fight for our industry. We are going to fight for Canada.

We are the true north strong and free, and we will fight for our workers.

Tony Baldinelli (Niagara Falls—Niagara-on-the-Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in May, GM announced a record-setting \$888-million investment in one of our local V8 engine plants. The problem is that it is investing it in Tonawanda, New York, just miles away from our very own V8 engine plant in St. Catharines. Workers in Niagara are worried about their future, and now a new report says that the unjustified U.S. tariffs could kill over 50,000 auto sector jobs in Canada.

Will the Liberals admit their failure to get a deal with the U.S. threatens to kill thousands of good-paying auto sector jobs in southern Ontario?

Karim Bardeesy (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Industry, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are in a trade war against these unjust and illegal tariffs. That is what we are fighting every day. That is what the Prime Minister is taking on in Kananaskis. We are fighting for workers and their investments.

Let us remember on this day, when we just remembered Buzz Hargrove in this House, what he would be fighting for. Let us fight together for the things that will keep us together strong, fighting for those investments and fighting for those workers. I invite the members opposite to join us in that fight.

Kathy Borrelli (Windsor—Tecumseh—Lakeshore, CPC): Mr. Speaker, a new report says that the U.S. tariffs on Canada's auto sector could kill 50,000 jobs. The Prime Minister promised elbows up with the U.S., but it has been elbows down. He said he was the man with the plan, but he has been unable to get a deal, directly threatening the jobs of Canadian auto workers. We need real solutions for Canadians.

Can the Liberal government tell us how many jobs will be lost in the auto sector because of its failure to get a deal?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Minister of Transport and Internal Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our government will always stand up for our auto sector. We will always stand up for our auto workers. That is what we were elected to do: to stand for Canada, to fight for Canada. That is what the Prime Minister is doing this week in Kananaskis.

I know Canadians recognize, as I hope all members of this House will recognize, that we cannot get a good deal for Canada if we negotiate in public.

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in Windsor we build cars. It is what feeds our families and pays our mortgages, but now 50,000 Canadian auto jobs are at risk because the Prime Minister could not get a deal with the United States. He promised to be elbows up, but instead it is elbows down. In Windsor, auto workers and suppliers are very concerned and they deserve answers.

If Buzz were here today, he would be asking how many jobs will be lost because the Liberal government failed to stand up for Windsor and the Canadian auto sector.

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Minister of Transport and Internal Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is a frightening time for our auto workers. It is a frightening time for all Canadians. This is why it is so important for Canadians to hear all of us say that our government was elected to stand for Canada, our government was elected to fight for Canada and that is what we shall surely do. It is what we are doing. Canadians are smart; they know we cannot get a good deal if we negotiate in public.

• (1435)

Aaron Gunn (North Island—Powell River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after 10 years of Liberal government, Canadians are facing a cost of living crisis. Now Liberals are proposing to ban all gas-powered vehicles, including pickup trucks and SUVs, in just 10 years, a policy that will cost 38,000 Canadian jobs and drive up the price of new vehicles by \$20,000 each.

Conservatives believe that Canadians who drive their kids to school or to sports, or themselves to work, should have the freedom to choose the vehicle that is right for them and their family, at a price they can afford. Why does the Liberal government apparently disagree?

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again it is so shocking, in a mo-

ment when our auto industry is under fire from the unjustified tariffs from the United States, that we have the Conservatives talking down a growing industry right in our country.

We are going to stand up for our auto workers, we are going to support our auto workers and we are going to make sure Canadians have access to a growing area for vehicles. It is actually growing globally. We are going to make sure Canadians have access to zero-emission vehicles.

Grant Jackson (Brandon—Souris, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government is banning gas-powered vehicles and forcing Canadians to buy electric. This will add \$20,000 on top of the average \$66,000 price of buying a car, as if they need to be more expensive in this country. This will jack up prices for Canadians and gut hundreds of energy sector jobs in western Manitoba. Canadians do not want to be forced to drive EVs.

With manufacturers like GM and Ford calling for its removal, will the Liberals admit their mistake and vote in favour later today of our Conservative motion to give Canadians back choice in what they drive?

Hon. François-Philippe Champagne (Minister of Finance and National Revenue, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what we are prepared to admit is that we landed generational investment in this country. We have seen companies like Volkswagen choosing Canada. We have seen companies like Honda choosing Canada. We have seen companies like Stellantis choosing Canada. The reasons are that we have the best workers in the world, we have a growing industry and they know Canada is the land of the future.

The Conservatives should rally with us, cheer for our workers and cheer for our industry. Let us cheer for Canada together.

[Translation]

Gabriel Hardy (Montmorency—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, back home in Montmorency—Charlevoix, we need our vehicles. We need them to take our kids to school, to take them to different sports activities, to go to work on our farms and even to explore our vast territory. We also need our ATVs and snowmobiles. Gasoline is not the only way, but it is an effective way that works everywhere.

The Liberal government is always holding families back, instead of letting them take charge of their own destiny, develop their own resources, grow our economy and, at the same time, protect the environment around the world.

Will the Prime Minister scrap his law to ban the sale of gas-powered vehicles and give Canadians freedom of choice?

Oral Questions

Hon. Julie Dabrusin (Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first of all, we are not banning snowmobiles and things like that. When we speak here in the House, we really have to have our facts straight. Second, the Government of Quebec has already established regulations to ensure that Quebecers have access to zero-emission vehicles. If my colleague wants to talk to us about that, then he should look at the regulations in his own province.

What is more, Quebecers are buying electric vehicles. In Quebec, 25% of new vehicles sold are electric.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister said that he would never impose energy projects on Quebec or any province without its consent. Unfortunately, Bill C-5 states the opposite. This bill allows Ottawa to make a unilateral decision by order in council and then hold bogus consultations once the project has already been approved. The Bloc Québécois thought this must be a mistake, because that is not what the Prime Minister had promised. We are proposing an amendment in line with what the Prime Minister said. It would require him to obtain the approval of Quebec and the provinces before moving forward.

Will the Prime Minister support it?

• (1440)

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the bill in question respects provincial jurisdictions. It respects the rights of indigenous peoples. It respects the regulatory processes that are in place, but it aims to speed them up in order to move forward with projects of national significance that will create opportunities, jobs and infrastructure across the country.

If the member does not believe me, then he can simply ask Quebec Premier François Legault, who supports the bill.

Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Bill C-5 allows Ottawa to impose pipelines on Quebec, the provinces and indigenous people without their consent. Bill C-5 allows the government to breach 13 laws and to add others by order in council. Bill C-5 sets out criteria for projects of national significance, but those too can be circumvented.

This is no joke. Bill C-5 even allows ministers to circumvent Bill C-5. That is why the Bloc Québécois is proposing amendments. Without our amendments, Bill C-5 is nothing more than a licence to steamroll over Quebec. Will the Liberals support that?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is not just the government that supports the bill. Quebecers do too. We just had an election where 44 Liberal members were elected across Quebec.

Why is that? It is because Quebecers see the big picture. Quebecers know that we need to build major projects and create good opportunities for our children and grandchildren. It allows us to dream. It allows us to build. Let us build Quebec.

[English]

HOUSING

Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after telling Canadians to live in shipping containers, will the housing minister go home to his \$2-million penthouse in Vancouver, his 11 acres in Tofino or his \$5.6-million property in Squamish?

The hypocritical minister is telling young Canadians stuck in their parents' basement that housing prices do not need to come down. Does he not see how arrogant and condescending that sounds from atop his Vancouver penthouse?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I honestly do not know where honourable colleagues across the aisle are going with the questioning. The minister is obviously in full compliance with the strictest ethics code known of in the western world. It applies to all of us; it applies to the minister. He will be in full compliance with that.

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would encourage the minister to come down from his penthouse and answer the question himself, rather than relying on the House leader. He has a \$10-million real estate portfolio that includes multiple properties and a beautiful Vancouver penthouse. I am sure it is very nice. It is no wonder, then, that his first act as housing minister was to announce that he does not want housing prices to go down.

Why is the minister putting his personal portfolio ahead of his cabinet portfolio and abandoning young people who are stuck without jobs and are still living with their parents?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it must be getting late in the month, because the level of innuendo coming from the other side of the House is, quite frankly, appalling. Obviously, the minister is in compliance with all of the disclosure obligations and is going to continue complying with the strictest ethics code in the world. At the same time, he will obviously be creating many hundreds of thousands of housing opportunities for young Canadians.

Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I do want to be generous today and offer the housing minister one more opportunity to respond. The issue here is that the minister, who is supposed to be solving the Liberal housing crisis, actually has a personal financial interest in seeing that crisis continue. I think to most Canadians, that would seem to be a little bit of a problem.

How can we expect the penthouse minister to actually solve the Liberal housing crisis while the same housing crisis continues to make him even richer?

• (1445)

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Let me take one more opportunity to denounce the juvenile, amateurish invective coming from the other side of the House, which impugns the motives of upstanding people who represent themselves for public office and who work tirelessly to create opportunities for Canadians.

The minister has a large mandate. He will create hundreds of thousands of housing units for Canadians. He will continue that work, and of course he will comply with all the rules.

[Translation]

Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as July 1 approaches, Quebecers who are still looking for a place to live are becoming increasingly concerned. Why? Housing is too expensive.

Meanwhile, the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure sees no need for prices to come down. He, of course, is a wealthy property owner, so perhaps it is in his interest to keep housing costs high. His refusal to answer the question is stirring up mistrust.

Why is the Prime Minister letting a real estate millionaire decide the future of struggling Quebec tenants?

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member opposite once served as a minister in a government. She knows full well what we are dealing with. Quite frankly, it surprises me to hear cheap shots like these in the House. She is imputing motives to ministers who are working hard, around the clock, to create housing and other opportunities on behalf of Quebecers. This minister is working tirelessly with Quebec to create opportunities. He will comply with all the regulations.

That member knows better.

Dominique Vien (Bellechasse—Les Etchemins—Lévis, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will tell this House what is scandalous here. We have a minister who is forcing Quebecers, young Quebecers, to move back into their parents' basements because they do not have a penny to pay for housing. That is what is scandalous.

He needs to stand up and tell us how he is going to solve the housing crisis, not as a millionaire, but as a member of Parliament.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are nearing the end of the sitting period. It has been intense, and I know there was an election.

Frankly, it is dishonourable for the member to say such things about someone who ran for public office to do good for his community and for his country. The minister is working closely with the Quebec government to create housing programs and opportunities for young Quebecers. He will continue to do so in full compliance with the code of ethics.

That member knows better. Frankly, that is dishonourable behaviour.

Oral Questions

[English]

JUSTICE

Sonia Sidhu (Brampton South, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, public safety is a key priority in my community of Brampton South. Could the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada share with my community and Canadians what the government's plan is to toughen the Criminal Code to make our communities safer for everyone?

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my hon. colleague for her work advancing important criminal reforms to keep communities safe.

In the recent federal election, we were elected on a mandate to help give law enforcement the tools it needs to keep communities safe and to strengthen the Criminal Code. Specifically, we will be advancing legislative reforms to strengthen the bail system when it comes to violent crimes involving home invasion, drug trafficking and auto theft, and stiffer penalties for organized crime and violent crime.

I look forward to working with my colleague who represents the good people of Brampton South, and with members of Parliament from every community in this country, to help keep Canadians safe.

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, extortion is up 357%. Let us take, for example, the Lehmanns in Mission. Last year, they lost \$300,000 to this heinous crime. While their lives were completely destabilized, the criminal never served a day in jail but got nine months of house arrest, and probation.

The Liberals rejected our common-sense extortion bill in the last Parliament, which would have reinstated mandatory minimums. Why will they not stand with Canadians and reverse their disastrous policies?

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, when dangerous people commit violent crimes, it is important they face serious criminal penalties. I would point out to the hon. member that extortion is illegal in this country, and its perpetrators must be apprehended and punished in accordance with the Criminal Code. When he looks at the mandatory minimum penalties, he will see that repeat violent offences involving firearms have a mandatory minimum penalty of seven years and a maximum penalty of life imprisonment. The Criminal Code is a serious document that will treat serious criminals very seriously.

I look forward to working with members of the Conservative Party to give law enforcement the tools it needs not only to punish criminals but also to prevent crime in the first place.

Oral Questions

● (1450)

Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Abbotsford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, extortion is obviously illegal, but it was the minister and the Liberal government that removed the mandatory sentences for these dangerous crimes. The sad reality is that the Lehmanns will probably never get their money back, and not only were they traumatized by this crime, but they were also forced to remove the \$300,000 from their business account, and now that money is subject to tax with the CRA.

When will the Liberals get serious, change the laws that protect Canadians, and put the Lehmanns, not the criminal, first?

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is beyond reprehensible for a member of the House of Commons to suggest that one party or another puts criminals ahead of victims. We are going to advance important reforms to strengthen sentencing. We are going to take extortion seriously to ensure that people who suffer the consequences of these crimes see recourse through the criminal justice system. Importantly, it cannot only be about stiffening penalties. It also needs to be about investing in frontline officers who can help keep communities safe to prevent crime in the first place. As we advance these important reforms, I hope we can, for once, gain the support of the Conservative Party to help keep communities safe.

Jagsharan Singh Mahal (Edmonton Southeast, CPC): Mr. Speaker, incidents of extortion are increasing at a rampant speed, and the Liberal government does not seem to be serious about it. In Edmonton, firebombs are being thrown at businesses and bullets are being fired at houses with demands for extortion money. Extortion is up by 357%. Liberals voted down the common-sense Bill C-381, which would have enforced a three-year mandatory minimum penalty, and a four-year penalty for extortion involving non-restricted firearms, which was repealed by the Liberals in Bill C-5.

Will the Liberals finally adopt the Conservative plan to crack down on violent extortion?

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we will hold extortionists accountable. Just yesterday, I was at a big announcement with Peel Regional Police. Eighteen extortionists were caught, involved in a criminal organization. This is a big accomplishment.

We are striking them where it counts. Criminals will be investigated. They will be charged. They will be sentenced. Extortion carries a maximum sentence of life in prison; a minimum sentence, when done with a firearm, of five years; and with—

The Speaker: The hon. member for Fundy Royal.

Hon. Rob Moore (Fundy Royal, CPC): Mr. Speaker, what the minister failed to mention is that thanks to 10 years of Liberal inaction on crime, half of those 18 individuals were out on bail when they were arrested. Thanks to the good work of the Peel Regional Police, half of them were charged with violent crimes like arson and extortion. Incredibly, half of those individuals are already out on the street today. It used to be that in Canada, if someone was charged with extortion, fraud, drive-by shootings or arson, they would go to jail, but thanks to the Liberals' soft-on-crime Bill C-5 and easy bail laws—

The Speaker: The secretary of state for combatting crime.

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will agree with the member that yesterday was a big day. Project Outsource was a big win for Canada. It was a big win for Peel region. I want to thank the officers of Peel Regional Police, Halton, York, the RCMP and everyone who was involved in this investigation.

When it comes to bail, the law says people who are a risk to public safety or of flight should not be given bail. It is important that the provinces, which administer justice, also make sure the criminal courts under the provincial jurisdiction function as they should.

[Translation]

Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadian bars and restaurants are grappling with a wave of extortion. The Montreal and Laval regions are no exception. In the past year, there have been dozens of these offences. Bars and restaurants have been burned down and have been the target of gunfire.

Over the past 10 years, the justice system has collapsed. Gang leaders use illegal cell phones to give orders to their underlings from prison. Gang members commit crimes with total impunity.

Can the Minister of Public Safety ask the justice minister to change the laws so that order is restored in Canada?

● (1455)

[English]

Hon. Sean Fraser (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada and Minister responsible for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague raises extortion with a firearm. When repeat violent criminals commit offences of this nature, they face a mandatory minimum of seven years and a maximum of life imprisonment. When we see this kind of behaviour, we need not only to reform criminal laws to punish wrongdoers on the back end of such conduct, but to invest in our frontline officers who are keeping communities safe.

As part of the recent election campaign, Canadians elected a new Liberal government to make these precise investments, and I look forward to implementing them. I only hope Conservative members will join us.

Larry Brock (Brantford—Brant South—Six Nations, CPC): Mr. Speaker, a so-called safe injection site, backed by the Liberal government, became the scene of a broad daylight drug shootout. A mother walking by was killed, yet the staff member at the site who helped the shooters escape, shockingly, will not serve a single day behind bars. This was not about harm reduction. It was chaos, violence and death in a residential neighbourhood.

Will the Liberal government finally accept responsibility for these sites becoming crime magnets, and end the dangerous policies putting Canadians at risk?

Hon. Gary Anandasangaree (Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the drug crisis across Canada and North America has impacted many communities, and there is not a community that we represent that has not gone through challenges. With respect to the matter in question, it is something that was made by an independent adjudicator, and I will not be able to comment on that.

Larry Brock (Brantford—Brant South—Six Nations, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after a decade of the Liberal government, serious violent crime has soared, but so has leniency. A mother is dead, and the so-called harm reduction worker who helped the accused killer gets to serve her sentence from home and enjoy her gym membership.

What kind of justice system does the Prime Minister believe in, one that protects victims or one that rewards criminals?

To correct what the crime minister had to say, there is no mandatory minimum for extortion, because she and her government voted in favour of Bill C-5.

Will the Liberals finally take responsibility for their soft-on-crime agenda?

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this new government was given a strong mandate from Canadians to keep our communities safe, and we will do exactly that.

We are committed to hiring 1,000 new CBSA officers and 1,000 more RCMP personnel to secure our borders and to keep our streets safe. We will make it tougher for violent criminals to get bail and impose stricter sentences for repeat violent offenders. This government is acting quickly. We brought in Bill C-2 immediately, to provide police with the tools necessary to catch criminals.

Michael Guglielmin (Vaughan—Woodbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, extortion is up 357% across Canada. In the GTA, 18 suspects were arrested in a major extortion bust. Firearms, ammunition and \$4.2 million in assets were seized. Get this: half of the suspects were already released on bail. Just last week, the York Regional Police chief called for urgent bail reform. The Liberals voted against a Conservative bill to crack down on extortion and reintroduce mandatory minimums.

Will the Prime Minister stop siding with criminals and support our plan to keep violent criminals in jail?

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, once again, yesterday was a good day. Project Outsource was a big bust. It is why our government is committed to

introducing new legislation that would toughen bail rules for serious offences and ensure sentences match the severity of crimes.

We are working hard to make sure law enforcement has the tools it needs to investigate, to catch, to prosecute and to put criminals behind bars.

Roman Baber (York Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, after a decade of the Liberal government, crime in Toronto is out of control. Last night in North York, what began as an armed carjacking at the Shops of Don Mills turned into a police pursuit and a man jumping off the Gardiner Expressway.

The Liberals have turned Toronto into Grand Theft Auto, real-life edition. Liberal Bill C-5 and Bill C-75 let criminals out on bail instead of locking them up and keeping us safe.

When will the Liberals repeal their soft-on-bail regime and start protecting Canadians from violent criminals?

● (1500)

Hon. Ruby Sahota (Secretary of State (Combatting Crime), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this new government is committed to working collaboratively with the provinces to ensure that our bail system works.

Bail is administered by the provinces through provincial judges and provincial courts and by Crown provincial prosecutors. They, too, should be given the resources and the tools that are needed, and they should have the space that is necessary to hold these criminals accountable.

* * *

[Translation]

CANADIAN IDENTITY AND CULTURE

Bienvenu-Olivier Ntumba (Mont-Saint-Bruno—L'Acadie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, one of the main reasons why I got into politics is that I enjoy meeting people, regardless of their background or where they come from. The great diversity in Quebec and in my riding of Mont-Saint-Bruno—L'Acadie reminds me every day that our differences are what make Canada stronger. I look forward to participating in the life of my community this summer.

Can the Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages tell us what major national events will be taking place this summer? How will these events bring Canadians together?

Hon. Steven Guilbeault (Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture and Minister responsible for Official Languages, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Mont-Saint-Bruno—L'Acadie for his commitment to his community.

Oral Questions

Our government's celebrate Canada program supports more than 1,500 events across the country to mark National Indigenous Peoples Day, Saint-Jean-Baptiste Day, Canadian Multiculturalism Day, Canada Day and National Acadian Day. Concerts, cultural festivals and community gatherings are all opportunities to celebrate our diversity and to strengthen the social fabric that unites us from coast to coast to coast.

* * *

[English]

HOUSING

Lianne Rood (Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, a new report confirms what Canadians already knew: The Liberal housing crisis is not just locking generations out of home ownership; it is dragging down our whole economy. Teachers are commuting hours just to afford rent; tradespeople are building homes they are priced out of owning; and permitting in London is taking over six months, even for a small renovation. Now the Liberals' own data shows collapsing housing starts: down 72% in London.

After nearly a decade in power, how does the government defend doubling housing costs and tanking our economy?

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians elected this new government to double construction and to make it more affordable across the country, and that is what we are going to deliver. We are focused on delivering tax breaks on GST and income tax. We are focused on lowering development costs. We are focused on delivering for Canadians with respect to affordability across housing, and we expect the members opposite to support that.

Lianne Rood (Middlesex—London, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians cannot live in press releases and recycled talking points. They need homes.

London received \$74 million from the Liberals' housing accelerator fund, and what did we get? We got a staggering 72% drop in housing starts, and zero transparency. Meanwhile, the government is under fire for funnelling public dollars to insiders and mismanaging every major project.

When will the Liberals admit their signature housing plan is a flop, and stop using taxpayer money to cover up their failure with photo ops?

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the good news is that housing starts across Canada are up this year to almost record levels. We are seeing challenges in Ontario, and we are working with our partners in Ontario to turn that around. Across Canada, we are building, and we are going to build more.

Chak Au (Richmond Centre—Marpole, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals' housing agency's May report confirms that housing starts in Vancouver dropped 10.4% from last year, despite the city receiving \$115 million from the housing accelerator fund. In Richmond, housing projects are stalled, and families are facing record-high prices.

When will the Liberal government admit its housing plan is failing and that Canadians are paying the cost for its incompetence?

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canadians made a very clear choice in April to elect a government that is focused on delivering housing, and we will do that. The housing accelerator fund has been extraordinarily well supported by over 200 communities across Canada. If the members opposite do not believe in the program, they can talk to their mayors and councillors and continue to throw them under the bus. This government is going to work in that partnership, and we are going to deliver housing with communities across Canada.

* * *

● (1505)

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Wade Chang (Burnaby Central, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today, leaders from around the world are meeting at the G7 summit in Alberta to tackle some of the most complex challenges. I understand that the Prime Minister met with President Zelenskyy today, to understand what Ukraine needs to secure its victory.

Can the Minister of National Defence please update this House on the discussion Canada is having regarding Ukraine at the G7 summit today?

Hon. David McGuinty (Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Burnaby Central for his dedication.

Canada's support for Ukraine in the face of Russia's illegal and unjustified war remains steadfast. Earlier today at the G7 summit, the Prime Minister announced \$2 billion in new military support to aid Ukraine in its time of need. This includes funding for drones, for ammunition and for armoured vehicles. We are also providing over \$2.3 billion to help Ukraine rebuild its infrastructure and its public systems. Make no mistake: Canada will stand with Ukraine until victory.

* * *

HOUSING

Ned Kuruc (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals' own May 2025 housing data is in and it is atrocious. The Liberal housing accelerator fund was put in place to accelerate housing. It has done the opposite. For example, the housing accelerator fund gave \$93.5 million to Hamilton, but housing starts are down by 50.7%.

Why would this so-called new Liberal government continue its old failed programs?

Hon. Gregor Robertson (Minister of Housing and Infrastructure and Minister responsible for Pacific Economic Development Canada, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as the member states, there are challenges in Ontario, and we are working with our partners in Ontario to turn that around.

Across Canada, housing starts are up this year. Housing starts are at near record levels. Having almost 280,000 starts this year is the trajectory we are on. We need to build on that. We are shooting for 500,000 units, and we are going to work with our partners provincially and locally to deliver that.

* * *

THE ENVIRONMENT

Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Mr. Speaker, it has been four years since we were promised new selenium regulations to protect Canada's water and fish from the devastating impacts of coal mining.

With the Conservatives and the Liberals in a bromance on Bill C-5, I am wondering whether the minister will be bringing these protections forward. Now that they have decided to ignore workers' rights, environmental laws and indigenous rights, these protections and regulations are more important than ever.

When will we see these long-awaited, long-promised regulations to stop foreign coal companies from destroying our beloved Rocky Mountains?

Hon. Chrystia Freeland (Minister of Transport and Internal Trade, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am really glad to get that question, because it is so important for us to support Canada's beloved Rockies. There is a consensus among Albertans of all political stripes that we need to protect this precious resource. We need to protect our precious national parks.

I want to assure the member opposite that our government will work closely with her and all members of this House to ensure that we do that. Ranchers believe in it. Environmentalists believe in it. Hikers believe in it. Our government stands with them.

* * *

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I am not disputing the need for Canada to fortify defences and defence spending, but the arbitrary 2% of our GNI for NATO stands in stark contrast to another goal long forgotten: 0.7% of GNI for development assistance. Poverty and failed states fuel terrorism and warlords, and fuel wars.

Now that we are investing in the war machine, will the government commit to upping our investment to wage peace in this country?

Hon. Randeep Sarai (Secretary of State (International Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, our new government commits to keeping our commitments to humanitarian aid and global development on a sustainable level despite other countries cutting back. Our country and our great Government of Canada will continue to

help those who are much in need, those who have been displaced and those who need help in times of dire straits.

* * *

● (1510)

[Translation]

PRESENCE IN GALLERY

The Speaker: Canadian Armed Forces Day is an opportunity for Canadians across the country to recognize the sacrifices that military personnel make on our behalf.

[English]

It is my pleasure to draw the attention of members to the presence in the gallery of six members of the Canadian Forces who are taking part in Canadian Armed Forces Day today: Royal Canadian Air Force Sergeant Brittany Shulga; Royal Canadian Navy Master Sailor Tyler Drayson-Ferrer; Canadian Army Lieutenant-Colonel Jeffrey Glen Brownridge; from the office of the vice-chief of the defence staff, Sergeant Guillaume Thibault; from the office of the chief of military personnel, Sergeant Jean-Charles Francoeur; and Canadian Army Sergeant Krista Rose Brake.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

* * *

DEPARTMENTAL PLANS, 2025-26

Hon. Shafqat Ali (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to table, in both official languages, on behalf of 92 departments and agencies, the departmental plans for 2025-26.

* * *

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER

Damien Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to briefly rise and acknowledge the letter I sent to you this morning outlining my intention to, at the earliest opportunity, which is today, resign as member of Parliament for Battle River—Crowfoot, as outlined in the letter.

It has been a true honour to serve the people of Battle River—Crowfoot over these last years. I will not repeat what I said in my farewell speech a number of weeks ago, but I will simply once again thank the people of Battle River—Crowfoot for the honour of being able to serve them.

I thank my team, both the campaign team and staff, who have become not just people I work alongside but truly friends in this process, and all the volunteers who make politics happen. Of course, I am so deeply appreciative of Danielle, my boys and my entire family.

Business of Supply

I will be officially resigning, as outlined in my letter, at the end of the proceedings today, but prior to my departure, I will be voting no confidence in the government. I want to emphasize again that Canada needs Pierre Poilievre and common-sense Conservatives to continue the fight. As I trigger this by-election and Pierre Poilievre works hard to earn the support of the people of Battle River—Crowfoot in east central Alberta, I know that if the people of Battle River—Crowfoot make that choice, they will be incredibly well served by him.

I hope the Prime Minister will honour his word to me and his word publicly that he will call a by-election without delay, which according to my math could be as soon as 11 days from now, on June 28.

I want to emphasize once again that it has been a true honour to serve. I have an incredible team of Conservatives I have come to know and serve with over the last number of years, whether it is those I was just elected with in this election or those I have served with since being elected in 2019. It is an incredible team, and it is truly an honour to call them not just colleagues but also friends. At times, things can get partisan, but across the aisle, there are also those I count as friends in other parties.

As I conclude, I would simply thank everybody who makes Parliament happen, whether it is the translators, the tech people, security or those who often go unrecognized in the operations of how Parliament works. I am truly thankful and grateful for having had this opportunity.

While I intend to run again in the 46th general election, this will be the last time I rise in my place in the 45th Parliament. It will be up to the people, after the next general election, to choose whether I have the honour to set foot back in this place.

As I referenced before in my remarks in my farewell speech, I hope all will fight for Canada, will not stop fighting and will fight passionately, because that is the least we can do for those who send us to this place.

May God bless the people of this nation, may God bless all and may God bless Canada.

• (1515)

The Speaker: I thank the hon. member. I did receive his letter. I enjoyed sitting on the environment committee with him, and I wish him well, as I am sure all members do.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—SALE OF GAS-POWERED VEHICLES

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise and address the opposition's motion. It would be no surprise that I will not be voting in favour of the motion. I would think the Conservative Party would have learned

some things over the past number of years in regard to the whole issue of climate change and the general feelings people have at the door.

I want to emphasize that with a new Prime Minister and a new administration, we have made it very clear that we want to establish and build the strongest economy in the G7. This means, in good part, that we have to recognize the reality of the economy in general. There is a time to recognize that, at times, technology matters, even for the Conservatives.

When I think of the Conservative posturing on the issue, I think of Luddites, individuals who do not quite understand the importance of technology, and how they resist any sort of change. Further, they would ultimately not do anything in terms of intervention to try to acknowledge and foster the benefits of technology.

If we listen to some of the speeches today, they say to let the free market decide, to let the free market determine everything, not recognizing that the government has a role to play. This is one of the biggest things that I believe distinguish Liberals from the far MA-GA right we see across the way. It is not the traditional Progressive Conservative Party that elected individuals like Brian Mulroney. It is a totally different party today, and we see that in a number of the speeches the Conservatives provide.

I look at it in terms of recognizing that Donald Trump, the tariffs and trade will have a very significant impact here in Canada. We campaigned on that, in good part. We also recognize a need to realize that technology and the advancement of sustainable development in the area of our automobile industry are in fact a reality. The Conservative Party has resisted that consistently, even with the former Justin Trudeau administration when we had major announcements, announcements that were worth literally billions of dollars. We can talk about Honda, Stellantis or Volkswagen.

I must say, I do not think people really appreciate and understand the massive investments that Volkswagen has committed to materializing here in Canada. If, in fact, we have the realization of its potential, it will be one of the largest factories, if not the largest, in terms of square footage in Canada and possibly even North America. It is anticipated that the size of that factory would be somewhere in the neighbourhood of 200 football fields. It is a massive factory. Let us think of all the resources that are going to be required in order to support that factory alone.

Members opposite talk about jobs and try to give the impression that they are concerned about the automobile industry. I would beg to differ. I would suggest that if they were genuinely concerned about the auto industry, they would take a look at what is happening around the world. What is happening around the world is a growing demand for electric vehicles.

• (1520)

We have, for example, the United Kingdom and the European Union, and one of my colleagues made reference to Norway. These are countries that have really picked up the ball on electric vehicles, recognizing that technology has changed significantly.

I love the example that the government whip gave earlier today when he talked about incandescent light bulbs. I can imagine what the Conservatives would have said: “What is wrong with the light bulb? It works. Let the market decide.” After all, GE and company were still making millions on those light bulbs. Why would they change their manufacturing process? Why would they adopt the new technology? The simple reason is that through change, technology and research, we see that there is a better alternative, the alternative being LED lighting.

The Conservatives' position would have been to leave it, not touch it and let the market decide. Progressive governments would recognize that what we can do is speed up that process by providing incentives and encouraging companies to invest in technology and to use that technology for the betterment of society. That is what I love about that particular example the member raised. We went from one form of a light bulb to a new form that ultimately was better for the environment, ended up costing less for the consumer and did an equal or better job in terms of providing light. At the end of the day, it is better for the environment. Everyone wins in a situation like that.

I realize there is a big difference between electric light bulbs and electric vehicles, but the principles of technology can be applied to both. The attitude coming from today's far-right Conservative Party has not changed and is applied to both on an equal basis, and that is why I find it unfortunate. If the Conservatives really cared about the jobs, they would be thinking about the future. They should be thinking about where the jobs are going to be.

Whether the Conservative Party wants to or not, the world is going to continue to rotate, and we will continue to see the expansion of EVs. We will continue to see young people drive environmental changes that are good for our environment and ultimately, I would argue, as the member for Kingston and the Islands did, good for the consumer too. Everyone can benefit by accepting policies that make a positive difference all around.

I will refer to two things that I think about when I think of electric vehicles. One is the taxi industry in the city of Winnipeg. I raise it because Winnipeg has a variety of weather. We get pretty hot summers, the best summers in the world, and we get some pretty cold winters. If we take a look at the taxi industry in the city of Winnipeg, I suspect it might be the first taxi industry that went electric as a whole, virtually all of it. It was with the Prius. At the turn of the century, we saw Priuses being purchased by taxi owners. It is truly amazing how that industry adopted the Prius, a hybrid, as a way to provide transportation among points A, B and C for people coming to Winnipeg and for local residents. We have over 450 Priuses driving around the city of Winnipeg, and it makes a difference.

● (1525)

When members opposite talk about, as has been pointed out, myths, they exaggerate some of those problems, such as that the batteries will not survive in cold weather or will not heat vehicles properly. I can assure members that the riders of Unicity Taxi were not complaining that it was too cold inside the taxi. I can assure members that a taxi driver and the taxi owners would not buy Priuses in Winnipeg if the vehicles were not good year-round in the ex-

Business of Supply

treme temperatures that the city of Winnipeg actually receives. The Winnipeg taxi industry, I believe, led the way when it came to taxis in Canada, and quite possibly North America, and I applaud the industry representatives who have done so.

The other thing I would like to highlight, as I think of hybrid or electric vehicles, is New Flyer industries. New Flyer produces electric buses that are now being driven all over North America. If we take a look to see what was there a decade ago, there was not much, but today the industry continues to grow. In fact, members can take a look at their website.

When we talk about how government can make a difference, we established the Canada Infrastructure Bank, and I know my Conservative friends are very familiar with the Canada Infrastructure Bank. My colleague from Waterloo says that they really like it, but actually, no, they oppose it. For the life of me, I do not quite understand why they would oppose the \$10 billion-plus through the Canada Infrastructure Bank, which was then matched by more than \$25 billion, creating 35 billion dollars' worth of different types of investment from every region of the country. The reason I bring it up is that many of those investments are in things like electric school buses and electric municipal public buses.

There are so many opportunities out there to create jobs, jobs of the future, green jobs, but the Conservatives just want to close their eyes, put their head in the sand and let them go by. At the end of the day, I would argue that it is at a substantial cost, because what we should be doing is much like what the Prime Minister is talking about. We need to strive to build a strong and healthy economy, arguably the strongest economy in the G7. We can do that, but it means that, at times, we have to recognize that we have to take advantage of the technology that is there and use government policy, whether it is taxation, regulation, incentives or whatever it may be, in order to encourage consumer choice or encourage a company to invest in technology. Those are absolutely critical in order for that to occur.

I made reference to the taxi industry in Manitoba. I believe there was a \$2,000 incentive grant for anyone who bought an electric vehicle, and I suspect many members within the taxi industry actually took advantage of that particular grant. As a national government, the previous administration, under Justin Trudeau, had a program that provided funds for individuals to purchase an electric vehicle; some provinces did likewise. We would have a federal government, along with a provincial government, promoting and encouraging people to purchase an electric vehicle, whether by providing those sorts of grants and incentives, providing tax breaks or providing subsidies to companies.

● (1530)

We get criticized by the far right, the Conservative reformers across the way, who say, “Well, we should not be subsidizing. We should not be providing grants.” I can remember that Volkswagen, Honda and Stellantis, I believe it was, were at a press conference we had, and if we take a look, we will see that Premier Doug Ford was there. Different political parties and different levels of government are recognizing the needs and taking a look at where the future is.

Business of Supply

Yes, at times there will be pauses and there will be concerns, but at the very least we are moving in a direction of working with provinces and other stakeholders in order to secure the type of jobs that we want in the future. We have a Prime Minister who is committed to working with provinces and territories, indigenous communities and communities as a whole in terms of how we can build a stronger economy. We saw that very visibly just over two weeks ago, when the Prime Minister met with the first ministers to talk about strengthening the economies.

When people raise the issue of the automobile industry as a whole, whether it is Ontario, Quebec, B.C., or any other province that contributes to the degree that we see today, it is wrong for the Conservatives to try to give the false impression that the government is not concerned about those jobs, because we are working with industry and unions. We understand the importance of those jobs. Equally important, we understand that as things change, we have to stay on top of them, because if we fail to do that, we will lose jobs. However, we are very focused on how we can not only preserve jobs but also grow the industry.

It is a targeted industry. It is something in which the previous administration, under Justin Trudeau, invested heavily, as other governments have done, likewise. We want to see the automobile industry continue to prosper. It is an industry I am very familiar with. In fact, when I was 11 or 12 years old, I used to pump gas at my father's gas station. From there, I worked in the automobile industry until I joined the Canadian Forces a number of years later. I have family members who are directly involved in the automobile industry. There are individuals, like Larry Vickers and others, who want to make sure I am aware of what is taking place in that particular industry.

• (1535)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The hon. member for Cariboo—Prince George is rising on a point of order.

Todd Doherty: Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind our colleagues, since we have a lot of new colleagues on both sides of the House, particularly in the back row of the government, that no photos are allowed to be taken during debate within the House. I just want to make sure that I have the ruling right, Mr. Speaker, and I put the question to you whether that is correct or not.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The member is correct. No cameras are permitted for taking pictures in the House; I will say that as a general warning.

Should anyone have taken a picture or a video, I would ask that it be deleted immediately. If members have a question about that, they can see us at the chair or at the table, and we can confirm that it has been deleted if that was the case. I will say that as a general reminder, and I hope all colleagues will refrain from taking pictures.

The hon. parliamentary secretary has the floor.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I think of the comments being made from across the way, and in particular by the member for Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke. If we were to read the speech she delivered and her answers to questions, we would think that gas will stop selling in Canada shortly. We would think that Russia and other influences are going to prevent all gas vehicles

from being sold in Canada virtually immediately. There are Conservatives who put a hard-right spin of misinformation in order to generate funds through their email network, and I know they have a massive one, to spread misinformation.

There are a lot of good things happening today, even with the threat of Donald Trump, the tariffs and trade. Whether it is union workers or the industry as a whole, different levels of government, in some cases municipal but always federal and provincial stakeholders, are there to protect the industry and to ensure that the jobs of the future are in fact being taken into consideration and that investments in one form or another are being delivered. That is how we are going to ensure that we continue to grow with a greener economy and beyond.

Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the hon. colleague got up once again to speak. I would be frustrated if I were one of the new members on that side of the House; they do not get up to speak, but the member gets up all the time.

Our hon. colleague and the one before him, the member for Kingston and the Islands, spoke of the light bulb industry and how Canada moved to LED bulbs. The EV mandate facts are that by 2026, 20% of new vehicles sold must be zero-emission, rising to 60% by 2030 and 100% by 2035. If dealerships do not meet their quotas, then they are punished.

I want to know whether the lighting industry also faced penalties if it did not make quotas for selling the new light bulbs that the members mentioned.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, even the question itself is somewhat misleading, because the member does not take into consideration hybrids, for example. The member would know that. He is asking about light bulbs as an example. I believe it was a government in Ontario that made it very clear that in 10 years, I think it was, it would be phasing in LED light bulbs. Corporations, and I think of Manitoba Hydro in the province of Manitoba, recognized the value of LED.

The point of my using that example was to reflect on the importance of technology. Using technology can benefit everyone: the consumer and the producer. All of us can benefit from using technology.

● (1540)

[Translation]

Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals seem to want to pick up where the Conservatives left off and abandon the fight against climate change. Their EV incentive program was discontinued well before the deadline, causing challenges for dealers who wanted to meet the zero-emission vehicle standard. Some dealers advanced as much as \$11 million to pay for federal subsidies, but they did not receive the expected payments. Dealers in Quebec alone accounted for approximately \$9 million of that amount.

The Minister of Industry announced that the government would resume the EV incentive program, but nothing is happening. I would like to know what my colleague thinks about this.

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, when we brought in the federal program, as I mentioned, the Province of Quebec had a complementary program that really provided incentive for people to purchase electric vehicles, and at the end of the day, the take-up on the federal program was very significant. I am quite encouraged by that.

My understanding is that the pot allocated to take care of that program was, in fact, exceeded. If I am wrong, the member can correct me, but that is my basic understanding of it. In the sense of demand, I see that as a positive thing, and hopefully we will be able to come up with additional resources going forward.

Parm Bains (Richmond East—Steveston, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my question for my dear colleague from Winnipeg is this: Despite generational investments into things like the SkyTrain in my hometown of Richmond, British Columbia, and other transit operational investments that have been made, how important are electric vehicles to our province of British Columbia, for example, where there has been tremendous climate impact from wildfires and floods, as well as other climate events that have taken place there?

How important is it to have people make these important choices when it comes to climate?

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, it is always encouraging to see individuals choose, as consumers, to invest in an EV. More and more Canadians are making that choice, and that is why it is important that the government continue to look at incentives, subsidies and so forth as a way to encourage that.

The consumer benefits tremendously. All one needs to do is take a look at the cost of having an electric vehicle after purchase price, compared to having a gas vehicle, not to mention the benefits to the environment, which goes to the question that the member asked in regard to the emissions from combustion engines.

Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, actually, we have a great example of different philosophies on display here in the House of Commons with the EV mandate debate.

As a Conservative, I think that if someone wants to buy an electric vehicle, they should go ahead. If they want to buy a gas vehicle, they should go ahead. It is their choice and up to them; the government should not have to mandate people to do something. Liberals who want to buy an EV vehicle think that if they are buying one,

Business of Supply

everyone has to buy one; everyone has to do the same thing they do. That is an example of how we view things differently on the Conservative side, as we think people should be able to make their own choices.

With that being said, there has been a lot of rhetoric from my friend from Winnipeg. According to the CAA, electric vehicles lose 40% of their battery capacity between -7°C and -15°C. How cold does it get in Winnipeg?

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the member should take a look at the taxi industry in Winnipeg. Maybe he will get some specific answers on that aspect.

Here is the difference between the Conservatives and the Liberals. Liberals will take a look at where the jobs are going to be into the future, good, hard-working, middle-class jobs, and how we can build an economy to support them. Right-wing Conservatives, on the other hand, will sit back and say, "Who cares? The jobs are there and we'll just stick with those jobs, even if they become outdated, even if the European Union and the United Kingdom are moving toward electric vehicles." In Norway, 90% plus are using electric vehicles—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The hon. member for Mirabel has the floor.

● (1545)

[Translation]

Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in response to the question from my Bloc Québécois colleague, the member for Winnipeg North told us to correct him if he was wrong. Here is the situation. The federal government paid incentives to get people to buy electric cars. Seventy per cent of the funds in Canada come from Quebec. Quebec dealerships, small and medium-sized businesses, were the ones that had to provide that money. They provided that money because the government, deciding not to have Parliament sit, could not appropriate the funds. At that time, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Industry met with Quebec dealers, looked them in the eyes, and told them that they would appropriate the funds, that the money to reimburse them would be in the next estimates, and that they had their word.

We have gotten the estimates, which we are still debating today, and there is not a penny for Quebec dealerships. It is not just a matter of saying that the coffers were empty. There was a promise to appropriate the funds. Where is that money, and does the parliamentary secretary believe that his government owes money to Quebec dealers, who provided those funds?

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I do not know the details of the situation the member across the way spoke of, but what I do know is that the intent of the government was to provide funds, and those funds ran dry.

Business of Supply

If a dealership were to take it upon itself to provide a subsidy, then that is something which the member can continue to lobby on behalf of if he so chooses. For me, what I will do is to continue to advocate for how we can increase consumer influence with regard to electric vehicles, full force.

Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member for Winnipeg North mentioned the whole progression of lighting from incandescent and then fluorescent to LED. That was maybe a natural progression. I would suggest to him that rather than mandate the change to EVs, maybe there will be a progression as the technology improves and as the demand is there, but we should not force people to do it. Let us get rid of the mandates and let people live here in Canada.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, using the light bulb as an example, I suspect that had the industry not been mandated, we would never have seen the Province of Ontario, and in fact virtually all of Canada nowadays, moving toward LED. If they have not, I am not 100% sure of that, but I also know that there are different ways we can do it. We are both from Manitoba, and we know that Manitoba Hydro actually promoted it also.

Dan Mazier (Riding Mountain, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Vaughan—Woodbridge.

The Prime Minister may be new, but his government's radical environmental agenda is not. The Liberals are banning the sale of gas-powered vehicles. In under 10 years, it will be illegal for companies to sell gas-powered vehicles in Canada. By 2035, the government will require that all new light-duty car and passenger truck sales be zero-emission.

The Liberals like to frame this as a target, but they conveniently forget to mention that the target is mandatory. The mandate is clear. If we want to buy a new vehicle, it must be zero-emission. By doing this, the Liberals are effectively banning the sale of gas-powered vehicles. There are few policies that will devastate Canadians more than this one.

When we take away someone's vehicle, we take away their freedom. For millions of Canadians, having a gas-powered vehicle is not a choice but a lifeline. When we take away a worker's freedom to drive to their job, we take away their livelihood. When we take away a parent's freedom to drive their kids to hockey practice, we impact their family. When we take away a senior's freedom to drive to a doctor, we put their health at risk. By banning the sale of gas-powered vehicles, the Liberals are taking away the freedom of millions of Canadians.

The Prime Minister and his Liberal government believe in a utopian fantasy in which all Canadians can take the subway or their bike to work, and if they cannot do that, then surely they can take a costly, unreliable electric car in the depths of winter without a charging station in sight.

This is absolute nonsense. The Liberals' plan to ban the sale of gas-powered vehicles is an attack on our freedoms. It is an attack on the freedom to choose where to go and when to go. The Liberals are banning the sale of gas-powered vehicles in Canada. By doing so, they are signing a death sentence for the future of rural Canada. I represent a rural region in western Manitoba, where life revolves around the ability to travel. If we took away the cars or the trucks

from Canadians living in a rural region, the vast majority could not get to work. They could not get to the grocery store. They could not get to the doctor's office. When we take away a rural Canadian's vehicle, we make it nearly impossible to live.

That is exactly what the Liberals are doing by banning the sale of gas-powered vehicles. They are making it impossible for rural Canada to function. A vehicle is needed to pursue the rural way of life. In fact, many rural Canadians rely on a truck to live the rural way of life.

There is a reason folks in rural Canada buy trucks that cost far more than an average car. It is because they have no choice. If we take away the pickup truck, we take away the countless jobs, such as the jobs of farmers, construction workers, natural resource workers and the list goes on.

They suggest that rural Canadians can simply replace their current vehicles with an electric car and life will go on. They call this a transition, a forced transition by government, I should add. What they will not mention is that there are very few places to charge an EV and that they are not equipped to drive long distances. Let us not forget that much of the electricity in Canada's north is generated from diesel; yes, electric vehicles would be charged by electricity generated from diesel. That is the Liberals' environmental policy in action.

In under 10 years, the Liberals will ban the sale of new gas-powered vehicles in Canada. They will force Canadians into buying costly and unreliable electric vehicles. Think about that. This is happening at a time when the industry itself is failing. Just read the news.

"Honda delays \$15-billion EV project citing demand," reports CTV News.

"GM to halt EV van production in Ontario to adjust for market demand", says Reuters.

"Ford delays new EV plant, cancels electric three-row SUV", reports CNBC.

Why should Canadians be forced to buy an EV when the companies making them are backing out?

● (1550)

The most damning criticism of the Liberal government's gas-powered vehicle ban does not come from industry or the media, and it may not even come from Conservatives; in fact, one of the most vocal opponents of the Liberals' gas-powered vehicle ban is the environment minister's very own department. Conservatives have uncovered damning evidence that revealed the environment minister was advised on the damage that banning gas-powered vehicle sales would do to Canadians but plowed ahead with the plan anyway.

When the government creates a new regulation, the department conducts something called a regulatory impact analysis. The purpose of the analysis is to advise the government on the impacts of the regulation, hence the term “regulatory impact analysis”. Conservatives obtained these documents, and what we discovered was very damning. According to the environment minister's very own department, the regulation to ban gas-powered vehicle sales will have a devastating impact on Canadians. The government's own regulatory impact analysis states that this policy will “lead to a loss of consumer choice for consumers”. In other words, Canadians will have fewer options when choosing a vehicle.

The government's internal analysis further reveals that zero-emission vehicles are expected to “cost more than non-ZEVs”. The analysis points out that the price increase could “lead to a reduction in the quantity of vehicles purchased”. This means that fewer Canadians will be able to afford these new, more expensive vehicles.

It gets worse. According to the government's internal report, “Mechanics will likely incur costs to retrofit their shops and invest in training to service ZEVs. These costs would likely be shared with consumers by passing much of the costs onto consumers through higher service costs.” Therefore, not only will Canadians be paying more up front for their vehicles, but they will also face higher repair costs down the road.

The government's internal analysis even highlights the increased wear and tear the Liberals' electric vehicle mandate will have on our highways and roads. It states, “ZEVs are generally heavier than non-ZEVs due to the size of the batteries used to power them.” The document goes on to say that this added weight could “lead to increased wear and tear on roads.”

It even gets worse than that. The analysis reveals that the EV mandate will “increase the demand on the electricity grid.” It goes on to state, “A significant increase in demand for electricity, particularly at peak time, could lead to an increase in electricity prices.”

On top of that, the regulatory impact analysis states that the costs of manufacturing will “tend to be higher than those for non-ZEVs”. It goes on to say that those costs “are expected to be passed directly to consumers”. In fact, the department states that the environment minister's regulations will cost Canadian consumers over \$54 billion. Can members imagine that? These are not my words, but the words of the government's analysis conducted by its very own department.

The Liberals were advised that their gas-powered vehicle ban would increase vehicle costs, increase maintenance costs, increase electricity costs, decrease vehicle choice and damage our roads, but guess what. They plowed ahead with their gas-powered vehicle ban anyway. The environment minister's own department was sounding the alarm over the Liberals' vehicle mandate, but the minister ignored its advice. Now Canadians are paying the price.

When Henry Ford first introduced the automobile, he envisioned a future in which everyone could own a car. He famously said, “I will build a motor car...so low in price that no man making a good salary will be unable to own one—and enjoy with his family the blessings of hours of pleasure in God's great open spaces.” That vision was not just about cars; it was about freedom and mobility.

Business of Supply

Whether it is for work, family or simply to explore the open road, we should be embracing Henry Ford's belief in affordability and freedom. Instead, the Liberals are mandating Canadians into expensive, unreliable electric cars. It is for these reasons that I join my Conservative colleagues in calling on the Liberals to immediately end the ban on gas-powered vehicles.

● (1555)

Alana Hirtle (Cumberland—Colchester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in the past, we know there have been incentives and subsidies offered at the federal and provincial levels to both encourage the growth of the industry and assist people with purchasing electric vehicles.

I am wondering if my honourable colleague across the aisle would support that.

Dan Mazier: Mr. Speaker, Canadians cannot even afford these things.

I do not think the member gets how much damage the Liberals are doing to Canadians' pocketbooks. Everything is more expensive. We are in the middle of an affordability crisis. People cannot afford housing, for heaven's sakes.

Now the government is going to incentivize people. It is going to give Canadian taxpayers more of their taxpayers' money and say, “Here, go buy something else.” It is absolutely ridiculous.

[Translation]

Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Mr. Speaker, apparently, the Conservatives are in favour of free choice. They are against EV subsidies and the incentive program for zero-emission vehicles.

If we apply their reasoning around free choice, oil companies that want to keep operating and polluting should receive no government subsidies.

Does my colleague agree that the federal government should provide no subsidies, whether direct or indirect, to oil companies?

● (1600)

[English]

Dan Mazier: Mr. Speaker, this is about affordability for energy. Canadians need energy, and they need affordable energy. That is the essence of our standard of living in Canada. If we do not have access to affordable energy, we cannot live at the proper level of life as a nation.

Business of Supply

The government is coming between Canadians and actually saying, “Here, we are going to pick this kind of car for people to drive.” By the way, what people have relied on, what they grew up with, they cannot even hand down. They cannot hand down the car they used for the last 20 years to their kids, which is what they can afford.

These are the kind of things the Liberals are talking about cutting off from families.

David Bexte (Bow River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, could the member expand on the damage to the road system that the EV mandate might present?

Dan Mazier: Mr. Speaker, ironically, when we were researching this piece for the motion, that was one thing that came up. We all know that the batteries and technologies are at the point where they actually weigh more than a lot of diesel engines. The biggest difference in putting batteries in light cars is that there are no tires to support that weight in the chassis, whereas if a big diesel engine is put into a four-by-four, they are nice 20-inch wide tires that distribute the weight.

I do not think the department even considered this, and the government obviously did not. It is going to further destroy our roads.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I was a bit surprised with the answer that the member provided.

He gave the impression that he, and possibly the entire Conservative Party, believes that the government should not provide any form of incentive or subsidy to encourage the growth of the industry. I am wondering if this is just a personal feeling that he has, or is this a shared value of the Conservative Party of Canada?

Dan Mazier: Mr. Speaker, the truth is that the Liberal government had a report in front of it demonstrating that this policy was going to devastate rural Canada, and it did absolutely nothing. The Liberal environment ministers, one after the other, have done absolutely nothing. I am very frustrated with the government right now.

William Stevenson (Yellowhead, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in regard to the member looking at the reports, did he find any evidence that the Liberals went in any other direction, looked at any other reasons for technology to save on efficiencies, or is it all about just going electric, not about other savings or other types of efficiencies?

Dan Mazier: Mr. Speaker, the actual report was on the impact analysis of implementing this policy, basically banning the sale of gas-powered vehicles by 2035. That was the only analysis that was done.

Michael Guglielmin (Vaughan—Woodbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always an honour and a privilege to rise in the House of Commons to speak on behalf of the residents of Vaughan—Woodbridge. However, today I rise to speak on behalf of Canadians across the country who are watching their choices being stripped away by a government that feels it should exercise more and more control over their lives, who are watching the cost of living rise and who, once again, are going to be faced with even more rising costs because of the ideologically driven agenda of the Liberal government.

This should not be a partisan issue. At a time when Canadian auto workers are facing unjustified tariffs from our neighbours south of the border, significant job losses are happening across the country, and with unemployment the highest it has been in decades outside the pandemic, our Conservative motion is a common-sense motion that the government should adopt. It is not like it is outside of its scope to recognize and course correct when it introduces bad policy. It did that when it recognized that Conservatives had been right and repealed the consumer carbon tax, for example.

For those watching at home, here is what the Conservative motion that we are debating today says. It reads, “That, given that the Liberal government is banning the sale of gas powered vehicles that will force Canadians to buy electric vehicles, and this mandate will drive up the cost of vehicles by \$20,000...the House call on the Liberal government to immediately end their ban on gas-powered vehicles.” This is so Canadians would be able to buy the cars that suit their needs and budget.

This is not about whether someone can or should buy an electric vehicle. If someone wants one, that is great. They should buy one. What we oppose is the government taking away consumer choice. We oppose the government thinking it knows best, and we oppose a government mandate that has negative impacts on our economy and the cost of living. Make no mistake, that is what this mandate does. It does not encourage EV use. It bans gas-powered vehicles altogether by 2035; forces quotas on manufacturers, during a time when they are facing tariffs from our neighbour to the south; and punishes Canadians with higher prices if they dare to choose something different, during a time when most Canadians can barely afford groceries, their rent or their car insurance.

Here is what is happening: Starting in 2026, automakers will be forced to ensure 20% of their sales are zero-emission vehicles. That target ramps up to 60% by 2030 and 100% by 2035. This is a radical government-mandated phase-out of gas-powered vehicles. It is ridiculous and ideologically driven. This mandate does not care if someone lives in an urban area like Toronto or a rural community in northern B.C. There is no consideration of the impact on cost and no thought of the impact on automotive manufacturers and the consequences for major automotive manufacturers and their workers. What about those who commute long distances to and from work, in the cold, when the battery life is barely half?

Business of Supply

This motion is not about opposing EVs. It is far from that. I was in an EV and drove from Vaughan to Ottawa. We had to drive 15 minutes out of the way to find a charger to charge it in the summer, and that took about 30 minutes. I can imagine, if it were -30°C outside, how many times we would have had to have stopped because of how dead our battery would have been. How about the grid and the infrastructure required to support it? We are far from being ready for that. We would need nearly 700,000 charging ports from coast to coast. We have about 60,000 now. This would require a radical transformation that, especially given the Liberals' track record for getting things done, would be next to impossible to achieve in the next 10 years.

We are installing fewer and fewer chargers year over year, not more and more. We would need over \$600 billion in new infrastructure to support this. These are the same guys who put billions into a housing accelerator fund, only to create more government bureaucracy with no results.

It gets even better. Only radical environmentalists could think of a scheme where, if automakers do not meet their quota, they would be faced with a \$20,000 penalty per vehicle when they are short of their targets. Let me repeat that. There would be a \$20,000 tax per vehicle, which would absolutely be passed on to the consumers in the form of higher vehicle prices. It is not rocket science.

This is not a climate plan. It is a tax plan, and it is a control plan, one that perfectly highlights everything that has been wrong with the Liberal government over the last decade. This mandate will have devastating consequences, not just for consumers, but for workers and the Canadian auto sector. A study published in the Canadian Journal of Economics estimates that the mandate will eliminate 38,000 jobs in the auto sector and cost the economy \$138.7 billion. Even auto industry leaders, those investing in EVs, are sounding the alarm.

• (1605)

Last week, while at the Canada Automotive Summit hosted in my hometown of Vaughan, Bev Goodman, CEO of Ford Canada, said the mandate would “have a negative impact”, including a “downward pressure on...sales, [an] upward pressure on pricing, and...real concerns for consumers and the industry”.

Furthermore, Kristian Aquilina, president of GM Canada, said, “It's unrealistic to believe that the country is going to go from 5 or 6 per cent [of EV sales] to 20 per cent by model year '26”. That would force them to have to restrict the ability to sell gas-powered vehicles, and we have to think about the dealership jobs across the country and the manufacturing jobs that are reliant on those sales.

Brian Kingston of the Canadian Vehicle Manufacturers' Association said, “The federal EV mandate needs to be repealed before serious damage is done to the auto industry at the worst possible time.” These are not political voices. They are industry leaders who want EVs to succeed, but who are being asked to do the impossible on an unrealistic timeline in a market that is not ready.

Canadians are not buying EVs in large numbers because they cannot afford them. Right now, demand for EVs is stalling at about 8% to 10% of new car sales in Canada. They remain, on average, \$15,000 more expensive than comparable gas vehicles. That is

even after taxpayer-funded subsidies. Those subsidies do not come from thin air. They come from Canadians' pockets. Even if someone does not drive an EV, they are paying for someone else's. It gets worse. Once these quotas and penalties take effect, automakers will raise their prices on gas-powered vehicles to offset the cost of compliance. This means that everyone would pay more, even those who cannot or will not buy an EV.

The CAA found that electric vehicles lose up to 40% of their battery life in cold conditions, as mild as -7°C to -15°C. Yes, that is mild in this country. What does this mean for Canadians in Winnipeg, Thunder Bay or rural Alberta, where winters last half the year? EVs are not a universal solution.

On the topic of the grid, our provincial grids are already strained. Ontario Hydro, Hydro-Québec and BC Hydro are warning of growing demand and rising costs. What happens when we go from 8% EVs to 100%? The Liberals have no answer. Their plan is more debt, more subsidies, more taxes and more big shiny announcements. Let us not forget the role of the Prime Minister, who seems to be the architect of much of this ideological shift.

Back in 2021, in the Prime Minister's book *Values*, he wrote that we need regulations to phase out the sale of new gas vehicles in the next decade. At the Council on Foreign Relations, he talked about using regulation to shape consumer behaviour through bans, quotas and carbon taxes. He even praised Europe's ban as the model that should be replicated right here in Canada.

If Liberals truly believed in reducing emissions, they would unleash Canadian innovation. They would support hybrid options, cleaner fuels, and the development of Canadian oil and gas with lower emissions rather than dirty dictator oil to arbitrarily offset emissions. They would back nuclear. They would invest in charging networks before mandating bans. They would trust the market. Instead, they have chosen top-down mandates, higher prices and fewer choices.

Business of Supply

The people who will be hurt the most include the single mom in Vaughan trying to afford a used Civic and the tradesman in Hamilton who hauls heavy equipment. These are the people the Liberals forgot. These are the people who we are standing up for. A Conservative government would repeal the EV mandate, scrap the industrial carbon tax, eliminate fuel standards that punish working people, and support innovation through freedom and competition, not coercion. Most importantly, we would let Canadians choose the vehicle that works best for them. If it is gas, hybrid, diesel, electric or whatever, it will be without judgment, penalties or government overreach.

It is time to put Canadians back in the driver's seat. I urge all members of the House to support this motion. Let us stand up for choice, affordability, common sense and the millions of Canadians who deserve better than a government that tells them what to drive, how to live and what to think. Let us repeal the mandate, end the ban and bring home control over our cars, our choices and our lives.

• (1610)

John-Paul Danko (Hamilton West—Ancaster—Dundas, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are some days when I think I am living in a *South Park* episode, where there is reality versus weird conspiracy theory nonsense.

The entire world is transitioning to an electric economy, but the carbon Conservatives just want to do nothing. The McMaster Automotive Resource Centre in Hamilton is world-leading in electric vehicle technology, working with every major manufacturer in the world. The Conservative solution is to just do nothing. The entire market, if we do nothing, will be taken over by high-tech, inexpensive Chinese EV imports.

Will the members support Canadian industry and Canadian workers and take action, or are they supporting Communist China's imports?

Michael Guglielmin: Mr. Speaker, these are the same old Liberals, just another day.

No one is talking about not investing in technology or developing industry. What we are opposing here is a mandate to remove the sale of gas-powered vehicles, a mandate opposed by industry leaders and industry experts and a mandate that would be opposed by Canadians as they see their costs rise at a time when they are already struggling to make ends meet.

Fred Davies (Niagara South, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am trying to formulate a coherent response to what I just heard across the way, but I appreciated the member's speech.

Triggered by this comment about EVs, I wonder if the member might give us some perspective on his view of what Chinese EVs mean in our marketplace and why the government raised the tariff on Chinese EVs. What does that mean to us in our marketplace, particularly in our domestic market, where a lot of these plants are not even opening?

• (1615)

Michael Guglielmin: Mr. Speaker, obviously, the issue with China flooding our marketplace with electric vehicle technology is that it puts our auto industry at a competitive disadvantage. From

my perspective, and I think the perspective of most people connected to the auto industry, steel, oil and gas, we want to support Canadian markets and the Canadian-made technologies in those industries. However, to go back to what I was saying in my speech, the whole purpose of the opposition to this plan is that by mandating car companies to shift to the production of EVs, we would create conditions where not only jobs are lost, but cars are more expensive.

[Translation]

Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski—La Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, in Quebec, we have chosen to ban gas-powered vehicles by 2035. That is our choice. It is our future. It is our economy. Why does the Conservative Party insist on imposing its oil-focused vision on Quebec?

[English]

Michael Guglielmin: Mr. Speaker, in the Conservative Party, we have the best interests of Quebecers in mind when considering this policy choice. We are worried about the increased cost to their pocketbook. We are worried about the increased costs to their families and the jobs lost in their industry. This is why we will continue to oppose these mandates and stand up for Canadian workers.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like the member to be very clear on this issue, and I have raised it on a couple of occasions. It appears that in the Conservative Party, and it is no surprise, Pierre Poilievre says that we should not provide any form of incentives or any sort of subsidy with respect to the EV industry. Is that something the member supports or is Pierre Poilievre wrong?

Michael Guglielmin: Mr. Speaker, we keep hearing about subsidies for EVs when what we are talking about here is mandating the ban of gas-powered vehicles, which would drive up costs and create more stress on the already stressed citizenry of our country. Of course, we are going to oppose the ban of oil and gas vehicle production because we stand behind Canadians.

Taleeb Noormohamed (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Innovation, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk.

It is a privilege to rise in this House today for the first time during this session. I do so with a strong sense of honour and responsibility.

I want to begin by thanking my constituents of Vancouver Granville, who have placed their trust in me. I also thank my family for their heartfelt support and the tireless volunteers who powered our campaign. It is because of them that I have the privilege to serve in this House. I will work every day to serve our community and to continue to make our community a stronger one.

To speak to this motion is to speak to what appears to be a Conservative effort to inhibit Canadian technology, to inhibit opportunity in this country, to inhibit innovation and, frankly, to inhibit looking to the future. What this motion seeks to do, on its face, is remove what is perceived to be, as the Conservatives call it, a ban on the sale of gas-powered vehicles. What it actually seeks to do is turn its back on the opportunity for Canadian industry to be world leaders in the production of components for electric vehicles, batteries and so on.

We all know that electric vehicles are the future, and this is a moment Canada needs to seize. It is a moment for us to define ourselves as a country willing to invest in making big, bold decisions to build for the future. Canadians made that very clear in the last election. They voted for a Liberal government because they demand ambitious action on climate change at the same time as we build a strong, forward-looking economy at a time of global crisis.

If this motion is passed, it will put Canada at a substantial disadvantage on the world stage. Given the ongoing trade war with the United States, which certainly on this side of the House we are deeply concerned about, we cannot and must not allow that. This is not just about shifting political ideologies, technology or market trends. It is a matter of recognizing this unique historic moment that we find ourselves in. It is a matter of recognizing the opportunity we have been given to do something about it, the opportunity to tackle one of Canada's biggest challenges, which is climate change, while leveraging Canadian innovation, which we all know is the envy of the world. I would challenge anyone in this House to say that Canadian technology and innovation when it comes to electric vehicles and components are second to anyone else.

We all know that climate change is a serious issue. In my riding of Vancouver Granville, my constituents know this and our government knows this. It threatens our present and it threatens our future.

We know that transportation is one of the highest-emitting sectors in Canada, so we have to address the role it plays in accelerating the climate crisis. Putting more electric vehicles on the road is not only essential to fighting climate change; it is also smart economic policy. It is about recognizing the innovation in the sector that is happening here in Canada. For the first time in many years, we can look forward to the production of Canadian electric vehicles that we will be seeing on the roads of this country.

Our Liberal government consulted extensively with our automotive sector, with workers, with provincial and territorial governments, with indigenous organization and with experts to develop the electric vehicle availability standard. What does that standard do? It says that by 2026, 20% of all new vehicle sales need to be zero-emission vehicles, and that by 2030, 60% of new vehicle sales must be zero-emission vehicles.

We know change does not happen overnight. We know that misleading Canadians into thinking that there is going to be this drastic change overnight is irresponsible. This is why we set up obtainable goals for over the next 10 years.

When it comes to the environment, this policy is projected to reduce cumulative greenhouse gas emissions by approximately 362 megatonnes between 2026 and 2050. That is what fighting climate

Business of Supply

change actually looks like. We recognize the issue on this side of the House, and we are working to fix it.

We know that air pollution from gas-powered vehicles has detrimental health effects and increases the risk of serious illnesses in children and older people. Improving air quality for Canadians will decrease illness as well as mortalities associated with smog and air pollution caused by vehicles.

Health Canada analysis shows that air pollution from on-road vehicles in Canada contributes to asthma, lung disease, 1,200 premature deaths and millions of cases of non-fatal health outcomes. Climate policies are good economic policies not just for the industry but also for Canadians and Canadian workers.

Our climate plan creates a clear, predictable pathway for manufacturers, consumers and infrastructure developers to follow. It gives industry ample time to adjust, innovate and invest. It aligns closely to what many auto manufacturers are already doing in electrification and helps Canada keep pace with similar ambitions in other major economies, such as the European Union and the U.K. This is one part of how we make Canada a world leader.

● (1620)

Our government is also tackling one of the main barriers to buying EVs, which is limited availability and long wait times. We are ensuring that Canadians will have access to the vehicles they need as the world transitions away from fossil fuels. We will make sure that Canadians will have control over their own future, because we are putting Canadians first by supporting Canadian-made solutions at home and promoting them abroad. That is why Canadians voted for this Liberal government. They can trust us to lead the way and put their interests first.

It is a matter of economic opportunity. Electric vehicles are here and they are scaling fast, and we have to seize the opportunity before us. Canadians are looking for cost-effective solutions and it is our duty to deliver. Gas-powered vehicles are not getting any cheaper and gas prices are not coming down, and because we know that in the long term, zero-emission vehicles save money, we are investing in them. There are savings on fuelling because the electricity someone buys to power their electric vehicle is much cheaper than gasoline. There are savings on maintenance costs, such as oil changes, replacing engine parts and repairs. Zero-emission vehicle prices are also heading down as we increase zero-emission vehicle availability. As supply is increased, prices for battery-electric vehicles, plug-in hybrids and batteries come down.

Business of Supply

Despite what may be said on the opposite side of the House, climate policies are not about forcing choices. Climate policies will ensure that Canadians have access to the vehicles they are saying they want to buy. We have to be prepared to demonstrate flexibility, compromise, hope, commitment, vision and action. That is exactly what we are trying to do, but let us not forget leadership. Showing leadership is what governing is about. It is exactly what our new Liberal government is ambitious about doing. It is about making ambitious choices when it comes to building an economy and taking on climate change.

We all know that the world is moving fast. We have to keep up the pace and we have to leave this world better than we found it. Countries around the world are making decisions like this. Countries like ours, our peer countries, are taking the steps that are required.

The Conservatives want to take us back in time, as they do on every issue, nostalgic about an era that is not coming back. We have to build for a better future, and this motion speaks to exactly what Conservatives seek to keep doing: wishing and hoping for things that are not happening.

When we look at the opportunity for this country, the opportunity to invest in a nation, the opportunity for Canadians and Canadian sectors to lead, electric vehicles and electrification are places where Canada continues to make gains and become a world leader. That is why investment is coming to this country and this sector and why our government is investing in this sector. Most importantly, that is why Canadians are seeing this sector as a way for their economy to grow for the future.

The choice is clear, and Canadians made that choice in the last election. They chose to vote for a government and for policies that understand the important and urgent need to balance the current concerns of Canadians, rural and urban, with the need to build a strong economy for the future; invest in sectors in this country that will create good, long-term jobs; allow Canadians to innovate; and take that innovation and make it into something that can be commercialized. That is exactly what the sector is doing every single day.

As for the Conservatives' choice, they have made it very clear. They want to try to roll back the clock, turn back time. It is not possible. What is possible is to build for the future, and that is exactly what we are trying to do.

The motion presented today seeks to do only one thing. It seeks to mislead Canadians into thinking that somehow our government is trying to take away the choice of Canadians, which this plan simply does not do. What it does is recognize the ambition of this country and of Canadians to invest in sectors that will create economic growth in this country and to fight the urgent climate crisis that Canadians from coast to coast to coast recognize.

Whether we are talking about forest fires in British Columbia or other parts of this country, we have seen first-hand the impact of climate change. We have seen first-hand the importance of taking this up head-on and seeing it not just as a chance to do the right thing, but as a chance to build economic success for this country. Turning crises into opportunity is what we are going to do for

Canadians so we can build a strong, powerful economy in this country while fighting the climate crisis.

• (1625)

Dave Epp (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as this is the first time that you have acknowledged me, I want to say you look good in that chair.

I want to congratulate the member across the way for his impassioned speech about how the Liberal government knows better than Canadians know about what they should be doing with their futures.

Is it the intention of the government to expand this mandate to tractors? I come from the farm. Will it be expanded to tractors, possibly to construction equipment, and if not, why not?

Taleeb Noormohamed: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows full well that on this side of the House, our government has made and continues to make unprecedented investments in supporting farmers and the agricultural sector. As for his part of the country, we appreciate the work the farmers in his riding do and those riding tractors and other important pieces of equipment who are helping to bring food to the table.

We continue to support those sectors, and we are going to continue to work hard with them to ensure that over the course of time, we do the best we can to ensure they can produce food in the way that is most sustainable for the future.

[Translation]

Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, this is a period for questions and comments. There will be no questions. I will make a comment. I rarely do that.

I listened to my colleague's speech. It has become clear to me. The Liberals no longer have a moral compass, any ideas, values or principles. They have nothing left. They are prepared to do anything to keep their seat, their big salary and their pension. We saw that today: carbon tax eliminated, no more climate policy, Bill C-5, disregard for democracy, approving pipelines without assessments. We can add all of that to the list of violations of their purported principles.

Today we are debating a Conservative motion. I disagree with the Conservatives, but at least they are consistent. There is a Conservative motion on zero-emission standards and my Liberal colleague is teaching us a lesson on environmentalism. I wish him all the best in his career and his personal life. I hope that one day he will be able to look himself in the mirror and reflect on the values he wanted to convey in politics because they are hard to identify today.

• (1630)

Taleeb Noormohamed: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his very interesting comment. As someone who lives in and represents a riding in British Columbia, I can say that we know that climate change is real. We understand the reality of the climate crisis.

For me, the choice was clear in the last election. Canadians, and even Quebecers, chose the vision that we presented, one where we can build a strong economy for the country while also building to address climate change. For us, the Liberals, it is important to do both.

The Conservatives are only interested in creating an economy by taking a laissez-faire attitude to climate change. We Liberals are here to fight both battles at the same time. We are here to work for Canadians and Quebecers.

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if my colleague could provide his thoughts with regard to the potential growth of green jobs in that industry well into the future. This is a major aspect to why it is important that the government not only support current jobs, but look at ways to see the future growth of the industry here in Canada.

Taleeb Noormohamed: Mr. Speaker, as I said in my speech, this is an opportunity for us to ask where the economy of the future is going today and how we can make sure we are on the leading edge of that as a country and as a series of industries in this country. As the member rightly points out, this is an opportunity for us to create the types of jobs for the future that young people can look to so we can advance the use of science and technology, concepts that may be alien to some folks across the way. Really, for us, it is about ensuring that the foundation is laid for the types of careers and industries that this country can rely on for generations to come.

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the government keeps selling this EV mandate as a climate utopia, but for workers and suppliers in Windsor facing job losses and rising costs, it looks more like a policy-made dystopia.

How can the government keep calling this a just transition when the reality on the ground tells a very different story?

Taleeb Noormohamed: Mr. Speaker, if I were the Conservatives, I would be taking a long, hard look in the mirror wondering why union after union in that sector has turned its back on their party. They do not care a damn about workers.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Order. I will ask the member to use his language judiciously.

[Translation]

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

Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to participate in this debate.

We know that Canada's automotive industry is big. It is one of the strongest parts of our economy and has been for over a century. I know that some people are aware of this, but I am pleased to inform all Canadians watching us that, on December 5, 1893, a Torontonians by the name of Frederick Fetherstonhaugh created a car. It was the second car created in Canada, and it was electric. This proves that our country and our party have absolutely nothing against electric cars. On the contrary, electric cars are part of our

Business of Supply

history. We need to look at this in a positive way, not a negative way.

That is why we are gathered in the House today to talk about a Conservative Party motion to end the ban on selling gas-powered cars in Canada. We have absolutely nothing against electric cars. We have absolutely nothing against gas-powered cars. We do have something against forcing people to do things.

• (1635)

[English]

The main issue today is about the mandate to no longer sell conventional gas cars, instead of letting people decide that themselves.

[Translation]

That is the focus of today's debate.

Let me say at the outset that I am in a conflict of interest. For almost two years now, I have owned a 100% electric car. For almost two years now, I have been travelling back and forth between Quebec City and Ottawa, close to 500 kilometres each time, in an electric car. To be honest, I bought the car used, so without the benefit of a subsidy. A Conservative is a Conservative. I installed a charging station too. It is no fancy charging station. It cost me it \$455, and came without a subsidy. It is indeed possible to drive an electric car without one. I am living proof of that, or I should say, driving proof.

I carefully assessed my needs and knew that I needed a certain type of electric car to travel nearly 500 kilometres with only one stop, since there are several fast chargers along my route that allow me to do this. Every type of car has its challenges. There is no magic wand here. Everyone must carefully assess their needs. It is important to consider the ease of using an electric vehicle compared to the ease of using a conventional car. People should be allowed to make their own choice. I knew what to expect. That is the key element of this debate, which my colleague from Oshawa summed up very well when she spoke earlier today. A Liberal member asked the following:

[English]

A Liberal asked her why she was opposed to targets, and she said that we are not talking about targets; we are talking about a mandate. We do not disagree with having a target, but a mandate is an obligation. We do not want to live in a country where the government will pick the winners and losers and mandate an issue. People should address their own needs for mobility.

Business of Supply

[Translation]

That is why we think it is a shame that the government's approach is pitting one against the other. The government is pitting conventional cars against electric cars. That is not the way to look at it. It should be seen as things that can work for everyone and other things that cannot work for some. Not everyone's daily needs are conducive to having an electric car. It can work in some cases. In others, it may not work. People need to be given the freedom to choose. That is why, when the government imposes things, it is the government that creates the battle, creates the opposition and makes it so that communities are not involved in decisions about the future. When people are forced to do something, it creates sadness in communities, precisely because the government is imposing its choice on them.

Let us not forget that, last January, in an unfortunate improvised move, the government literally sabotaged the subsidy programs for car buyers. The program was cancelled overnight, leaving car dealerships with dozens, if not hundreds, of applications. I personally received calls from dealers asking what had happened with the Canadian government over the weekend. It was sabotage and improvisation, with the Liberal government's stamp.

When we talk about cars, we are talking about industry. Let us not forget that the appeal of electric cars really took off in 2008 when Tesla introduced its famous Roadster. In 2012, the Model S was released, followed a few years later by the Model 3. These were so well received by the public that many people, instead of buying a luxury car, including traditional German brands, chose to buy a Tesla. People found that interesting, even though the charging system was not very well developed.

[English]

At that moment, all the other players in the industry decide to go to EVs. Why? Do members think they did that because they wanted to save the planet, or did they want to save their wallets? Obviously, they wanted to save their wallets because they saw that a lot of people were attracted to electric cars.

[Translation]

That is why all the big manufacturers invested massive amounts of money to electrify their cars. Things were evolving normally until came the obligation to stop selling gas-powered cars by 2035.

One after another, companies and manufacturers are saying that we should not get ahead of ourselves, that we need to go one step at a time. Volvo, which committed to stop producing conventional vehicles by 2030, went back on its decision and dropped that obligation. GM Canada and Ford Canada feel that the 2035 target is too strict. We need to listen to the industry while keeping in mind that other players could enter the Canadian EV market and also balance out our trade.

We need to acknowledge that GM Canada and Ford Canada are saying that the 2035 deadline is unreasonable and that Volvo abandoned its goal for 2030. That is the distinction to be made between a target and an obligation. There are many challenges to electric vehicles in terms of production, price, range, access to critical minerals, the number of charging stations currently available and the amount of electricity required to power all these cars.

As we know, Quebec has set the exact same targets. However, there is ongoing debate in the province about whether to uphold the ban on the sale of new gas-powered vehicles starting in 2035. Polls have been conducted. According to a poll conducted by the firm Synopsis, 54% of people say they disagree. This percentage rises to 59% according to another poll conducted by Pallas Data.

The interim leader of the Quebec Liberal Party, Marc Tanguay once said, "It is not just up to the government, in its ivory tower, to set a target and say that everything must change. The government needs to take stock of the market and the public's ability to pay, and assess for itself whether its target is realistic." The leader of the Quebec Conservative Party started a petition and said, "I am not against electric vehicles. I drive a hybrid vehicle myself." He added, however, that it was unrealistic and irresponsible to go down that road.

MNA and Liberal transport critic Monsef Derraji said that he thinks that things are moving too fast. He said that setting a realistic goal first requires taking stock of the situation, and that continuing to pursue an unrealistic goal means selling people a bill of goods. He said that a realistic approach is what is needed now. Then there is Quebec environment minister Benoit Charette, who said that the approach has always been to not be dogmatic. If it becomes apparent over the years that the market is not ready, then adjustments will be made.

It is true that Quebec has the most electric cars in Canada. Half of Canada's electric cars are in Quebec. Electric cars account for 25% of the car fleet in Quebec. There is obviously some appetite, although there is some debate about making them mandatory. This led news anchor Pierre-Olivier Zappa to express his views in a recent column, because he himself bought an electric car. He said that while it was perfect on paper, real life is another story. He talked about problems accessing fast-charging stations, the impact of winter, insurance costs, and so on. He said that the target was modelled on California, that even American interest in EVs is starting to wane, that the shift was too abrupt, and that there is an urgent need for a realistic shift. That is what we are increasingly hearing.

We support giving people a choice. We are not against electric cars or gas-powered cars. We are in favour of them being able to coexist, not pitting one against the other. We should not insult people who choose one car over another. Let people make their own choices. The market can decide for itself.

• (1640)

[English]

As a Conservative, I bought a used electric car with no subsidies. I like it. It is okay; it fits my needs. That is fine. I will never impose it on anybody, but if they want to know, then yes, a Conservative can drive an electric car.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, interestingly, Norway is virtually leading the world with regard to EVs. I believe it is now at well over 90% and is ultimately hoping to achieve 100%, if it has not already. I am not sure of that, but let there be no doubt that if it was not for government engagement, it never would have been able to achieve that.

Does the member opposite believe that Norway, as a community, did well by having targets and mandates in order to achieve what it achieved? It is leading the world today.

Gérard Deltell: Mr. Speaker, there is no magic bullet. We have to build everything step by step, with confidence, with experience. This does not fit everybody; it is not a wall-to-wall way to travel and to have mobility. Electric cars are a fit for some people but not a fit for all the people. However, imposing it on the people is the worst way.

The government shall not impose something on the people. The people make their own choices based on what they want, what their daily needs are and what they and their family want to do with their car. Imposing it as a mandate is the worst-case scenario for convincing people to have an electric car.

[Translation]

Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski—La Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives support freedom of choice, but only when it suits them. When scientists choose climate, they muzzle them. When the public wants public services, they slash funding for those public services. When Quebec wants to choose transportation electrification, particularly through electric vehicles, they oppose it in the name of freedom of choice.

It seems that Conservatives only advocate freedom of choice when it suits them and fits their own ideology. I would like my colleague to explain to me today whether he will respect Quebec's collective choice to begin an energy transition and move toward electric vehicles.

• (1645)

Gérard Deltell: Mr. Speaker, as my colleague knows, there is a debate going on in Quebec right now on the obligation to no longer sell conventional vehicles as of 2035. I quoted a few politicians who are quite high ranking and who are expressing reservations about this. Their approach is entirely pragmatic, not dogmatic.

I want to say to the member that this morning, his colleague from Jonquière was not at his best. He said that Pierre-Olivier Zappa, who had some trouble with his electric car after owning it for over a year, had grossly exaggerated. Mr. Zappa said that he unfortunately had to give up on his electric car. That was his personal perspective based on his own experience. The Bloc member for Jonquière said it was a gross exaggeration. It is very disappointing.

Business of Supply

Joël Godin (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Louis-Saint-Laurent—Akiawenhrahk for his excellent speech. I need to come clean. I do not have an electric car, but I do not have a gas-powered car either. I have a hybrid car, and I am a Conservative.

Now, I would like my colleague to talk about the impact on consumers. Apparently this could cost an extra \$20,000. Can my colleague talk about the fact that consumers will be on the hook for that? Given the current economic context, I think our friends opposite seem uncaring.

Gérard Deltell: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier for his very relevant question. He cares about the future of the planet, and hybrid transportation matters to him. He has had that kind of car for some time now.

When the government imposes standards or fines or an extra \$20,000 tax, will GM or Ford absorb those costs? No, GM, Ford and the rest will make buyers pay.

We are not going to change people's minds by penalizing them. Pulling on a flower will not make it grow any faster. If people want an electric car, they can choose to have one. If it does not meet their needs, they will be able to do something else. If it happens one day, so much the better for them and so much the better for everyone.

[English]

Branden Leslie (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is always an honour to rise in this place. I will first say that I will be splitting my time with our excellent leader of the opposition in the House of Commons, the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle.

Let me begin by saying this. It is something that may come as a surprise, at least to some of my colleagues across the way. I am not opposed to electric vehicles. If a person wants to buy one, go for it, but what I am opposed to is the Liberal government's mandate that would ban gas-powered vehicles by 2035.

In a free country, with a free market, the Canadian people should be free to choose what vehicle they drive, among many other things. This is not a radical idea. It is simply called choice. If somebody wants to spend their hard-earned money on an electric vehicle, that is their right. I hope it serves them well. It is their business. It is not the government's business. It should never become the business of the federal government. Unfortunately, under the old and new federal Liberal government, it has become its business.

Business of Supply

It is not environmental policy. It is elitism. At the end of the day, Canadians are going to be the ones paying the price for it. The truth is that Canadians are not stupid. They know what kind of vehicle works for them. They shop around for prices and for options. They know what will serve them and their families. They do not need lectures from politicians whose only experience with a vehicle is getting in and out of the back seats of one of those government-issued black cars, like the Minister of Transport or the Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture, who have admitted they do not even own vehicles.

Whether we drive a pickup truck, an SUV, a van or a compact car, Canadians make the choice to buy these products based on their own realities, not based on ideology.

Let us start with the cost of all of this. Has anyone across the way looked at the prices associated with some of these vehicles? Even with the federal rebates, which, let us be honest, were a band-aid solution, EVs are expensive. They are expensive vehicles. When the rebates ran out, sales plummeted.

To purchase an EV, we are talking \$50,000, \$60,000, \$70,000 or maybe over \$100,000, where they get the further punishment of the Liberals' luxury tax. They are going to be paying even more for these vehicles. Then there is the additional cost, of course, of installing the in-home charging station. It is going to be thousands of dollars, assuming that their home even has the electrical panel and capacity to handle it.

There are a lot of houses out there that are 60 amp or 100 amp. A level 2 EV charger can draw up to 50 amps of power. We add in our air conditioner, our hot water tank, our dishwasher, our lighting, just life, and a lot of electrical panels cannot handle it. Therefore, we would have to upgrade the amperage availability within our homes.

We can talk about the street transformers that we all know from our own homes. Each pole-top transformer typically serves five to 10-ish homes. This is based on traditional electrical loads. When everyone starts having to charge their EVs at night, those transformers may not be able to handle the extra load per home. They will need to be upgraded by the local hydro provider, costing thousands of dollars each. Of course, the entire neighbourhood's circuits may then need thicker wires and upgraded breakers, which, if done in communities across our country, will cost billions of dollars.

Who is going to pay for it all? First of all, it would be everybody who pays an electricity bill; second, it would be taxpayers. Those are the same people, though.

Meanwhile, we have household debt at historic rates. Mortgages are increasing and stretching budgets extremely thin for so many Canadians. Grocery bills are going up every week. After paying \$150, we walk out wondering what we are actually going home with and how many days it may last, yet the Liberals think that now is still the time to focus on this, to demand and mandate that EVs be in every garage or outside every house or apartment building right away.

People cannot afford it. It is easy to mandate something like this when we make hundreds of thousands of dollars a year, but try telling this to the families that I represent, the folks who have al-

ready picked up that second job after they thought their first one was good. As a welder, they are making a pretty good salary. They had to pick up a second job just to make ends meet, just to make sure their kids have an opportunity for a little bit of a better life.

• (1650)

We could talk about the infrastructure component or, more importantly, the lack thereof. In rural Canada, there is not a lot of options to charge EVs. Some of our smaller communities do have some and, frankly, they are often empty. We do not have chargers on every street corner. In many parts of my riding, most people are still waiting on reliable cell service. They are not waiting for an electric vehicle charger to be placed up on the gravel road. Even if those chargers existed, what about the electrical capacity required?

In my home province, Manitoba Hydro has already warned that we do not have the generation capacity for any major new projects in our province and, worse, even for existing usage within about five years. Manitoba Hydro is proposing about a billion dollars in new spending to try to prepare for that increased demand over the next decade or two. Here is the punchline, though. It is looking at using two new fuel combustion turbines. We cannot make this up. This is what is happening. The Liberal government is plowing ahead regardless of the generation requirements.

If we are talking about common sense, one of the things the Liberal government has forgotten is the Canadian winter. I am from the Prairies, and I can assure the House that winter is not just a season; it is a test of endurance. We might get March break, but it is a long season. It is endurance when we have -20°C days on a regular basis, -30°C for weeks at a time, and wind chills that blow snow across every single street and road. In these conditions, electric vehicles do not perform the way that they were advertised to, that they were supposed to. The battery range plummets, charging takes longer, running the heater or the defroster drains the power, and suddenly the EV becomes a liability when someone gets stuck in the middle of a gravel road on a dark, windy, storm-filled night.

Forgive me if I am a little skeptical when the government that is unable to introduce a budget tells me it has figured out this whole plan, this infrastructure plan and this EV mandate plan. It cannot even plant trees right. Do members remember the two billion trees the government was supposed to plant? It cannot even do that right, never mind get a network of EV chargers across this country.

I believe in innovation. I believe in technology. I believe in smart environmental policy. However, I also believe in freedom, something the Liberal government seems to have forgotten. I also believe in common sense, something the Liberal government has yet to come close to mastering.

If EVs are the future, which they may be, they should not need government mandates to succeed. They should win on the open market by competing on cost and competing on performance and reliability. That is how innovation works, not through force but through freedom.

The Liberals do not seem to believe in freedom. They believe in control, a command and control economy. This mandate is not about helping the environment. It is about expanding government power over yet more aspects of our lives. To what end, I do not know, but that is all it seems to be. Worst of all, it ignores a simple truth, which is that Canada is a diverse country. It is not a small country. It does not have one climate. It is not one geography. Despite the government's desire, it is not one income bracket either. This is a vast country, a country of gravel roads and busy highways, of farmers and commuters, and of truckers and tradespeople.

Let me say this very clearly. I trust Canadians to make their own decisions. The Liberals seem to think differently. They trust the lobbyists, their friends at the green-tech start-ups who line up for subsidies for programs like this, and the left-wing think tanks, which are full of folks always cooking up ways to make people's lives a little more miserable and expensive.

I trust the farmer in Morris or Rosenort, the electrician in Portage, the nurse in Morton, the trucker in Winkler and the mom in Altona, juggling groceries and rent and trying to put her kids in hockey or music. I will fight to allow them to drive what they think is best for them and their family, not what somebody in downtown Toronto thinks they should drive. This is simply ridiculous. It is unaffordable. It is out of touch. If the Liberals do not listen to me, I think they will hear it loud and clear from Canadians when their choices are taken away. I do not think Canadians are aware that this mandate is about to be pushed down upon them.

Let electrical vehicles rise or fall on their own merit, not what the government says they must do. Let us stop pretending this is about saving the planet, because it is not. It is about activists deciding how we should live our lives, what we should drive, how we should drive and how much privilege we have to have to pay to do so.

I thought the Liberals might have learned their lesson after the carbon tax, but they seem hell-bent on continuing down this path of forcing Canadians to choose between rent, heat, gas, just the cost of living, and their ideology.

● (1655)

Let us stop the madness. Let us stop punishing the hard-working people who make this country run. Let us support this motion.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but think about the word “freedom”, because every member who has spoken has, I believe, harped on about the word “freedom”. I am trying to think of Pierre Poilievre as the

Business of Supply

mayor of Edmonton back in the 1920s, with a few of his Conservative caucus friends there, when we had horse-drawn carriages. Can members imagine them yelling, “We want freedom. Allow them to continue with the horse-drawn carriages. Think of the industry that is there. Freedom”? That is what they would argue.

Keeping to the theme of freedom, when we have provinces that have passed a law saying seat belts are the law, would the member opposite oppose mandatory seat belt laws?

Branden Leslie: Mr. Speaker, that still exists. If someone wants to do that, they still can. That is the beauty of freedom. We do not believe in trying to impose our beliefs on everyone else. That is up to the Liberals, and I hope they learn from Canadians, because that is not what people want. If someone wants to take a cart and buggy down the gravel road I grew up on, they can do so. That is okay, but what the government cannot do is say they have to take a cart and buggy down there. That is freedom, and I will stand up for that every step of the way.

[Translation]

Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we know that transportation accounts for 25% of greenhouse gas emissions and that oil development and mining operations generate 30% of greenhouse gas emissions.

Does my colleague believe that climate change is real and that we need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions? If so, how would he go about it?

[English]

Branden Leslie: Mr. Speaker, I will always stand up for the rights of the people I represent to heat their homes and to get where they are going with a little heat in a vehicle of their own choosing. This member might want to try to distract from the motion we are talking about today, but it is simple. Should the government mandate the end of the distribution and sale of gas-powered vehicles, and should the government control every aspect of our life, including how we get where we are trying to go? It is pretty clear where I stand. That member should get on our side.

● (1700)

Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to ask if the member remembers whether the Liberals actually campaigned on net zero or campaigned on mandating to Canadians what type of vehicle they should own or purchase.

Business of Supply

Branden Leslie: Mr. Speaker, I do not recall the Liberal candidate in my riding openly saying people shall all soon be buying electric vehicles because that is what they must do. I do not recall that coming up. The reality is, again, that if someone wants to buy an electric vehicle, I do not care. I think that is great. I hope it works out well for them. If someone wants to toot around downtown X, that is fine.

The difference here is that the government should not control what we can and cannot buy. We should let the market decide. Maybe someday we will all have them, and maybe we will not. It should not be the government telling us how we get there.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): 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 Calgary Centre, Finance; the hon. member for Kamloops—Shuswap—Central Rockies, Finance; the hon. member for Cloverdale—Langley City, Housing.

Hon. Andrew Scheer (Leader of the Opposition, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to rise on behalf of all my constituents in Regina—Qu'Appelle, indeed on behalf of everyone in Saskatchewan and, I dare say, across Canada who would like to continue to have the choice to buy the vehicle that suits their needs at a price they can afford. That is what today's motion is all about. Let me read it for them, because it is important that people watching understand what the government is doing. The motion states:

That, given that the Liberal government is banning the sale of vehicles that will force Canadians to buy electric vehicles, and this mandate will drive up the cost of gas-powered vehicles by \$20,000, in order to allow Canadians the choice to purchase any vehicle that meets their needs at a price they can afford, the House call on the Liberal government to immediately end their ban on gas-powered vehicles.

I have heard so much nonsense from the government today. The Liberals are dressing this up as providing an opportunity to Canadians to do something, but they are banning an entire category of vehicles that Canadians have demonstrated over the course of the last few years that they enjoy buying and driving. I would ask members to remember the time when they purchased their first vehicle. I imagine that for many Canadians, it is a special moment. I know people who worked hard all summer in their last year of high school. They scrimped and they saved, and as they got back to school on the opening day, they were able to buy that first vehicle, and they were able to pick up their friends and drive them to school. They were able to do that because a used car back then was affordable.

Now, thanks to Liberal inflationary policies and thanks to policies like this ban on gas-powered vehicles, the cost of cars is going through the roof. According to AutoTrader, the average price of a new car is now \$67,000, and a used car is now over \$38,000. Under the tired 10-year Liberal government, not only has the cost of housing been pushed out of the grasp of hard-working Canadians, but the cost of car ownership is now becoming something that more and more hard-working Canadians simply cannot afford. In fact, the price of a used car is now about the same as a down payment on a new house. That is just astounding.

I was astonished the other day. We are in the market for a new used vehicle. We have another driver in the household this year, and I went online and started looking. I expected I could probably

find something for my daughter in that \$10,000 to \$15,000 range. In my head, I was thinking I may be able to pick up something with a bit less than 100,000 kilometres for \$14,000 or \$15,000. I found this on Used.ca in Regina: a 2018 Jeep Wrangler with 123,000 kilometres on it. How much do members think that might cost? In my head, thinking back to when I bought my last vehicle, I thought it might be \$15,000 or \$16,000. It was \$28,000, for a seven-year-old car with 120,000 clicks on it.

That is something that never used to happen in this country. There were so many Canadians who used to be able to count on working hard to afford a vehicle. However, the busybody Liberal government, the “Ottawa knows best” group of elites, likes to sit on high and dictate to Canadians what they must do to be the right kind of person. The Liberals are doing that by taking away choice. They all have something in common. They all tend not to have to face the consequence of their decisions. They all have this insane need to boss people around and dictate how they are going to live their lives. They all can afford electric vehicles, but many hard-working Canadians either cannot or simply do not want to.

My colleague from Manitoba was talking about how the free market has evolved to produce the kinds of vehicles that people want to buy. The auto industry is ruthlessly competitive. Millions of dollars are spent by each of the automakers every single year, trying to drill down and find out exactly what it is that consumers want to buy. They go out and offer it to consumers, and if Canadians buy one and not the other, that auto manufacturer has to go back to the drawing board and figure something out. They have to serve the needs of the market.

When the government comes in with its heavy hand and bludgeon and says it is going to take an entire category of vehicles off the table, that is when the government not only distorts the market and drives up costs but also kills jobs.

• (1705)

Let us look at the impacts of the Liberal ban on people's favourite car or truck. It is going to lead to nearly 40,000 jobs lost. That is not from my research; that is from an independent analysis looking at how the cost of these vehicles will lead to job losses. A new report states that because of the Liberals' failure to get a deal on those unjustified U.S. auto tariffs, another 50,000 jobs could be lost. Not only is Canada dealing with the terrible policies of the U.S. government, but the auto sector has to deal with the terrible policies of its own domestic Liberal government. That is a brutal double whammy that is not fair to consumers and auto workers.

Business of Supply

There are 128,000 auto workers in Canada. The U.S. has no mandate to ban traditional, conventional gas- and diesel-powered vehicles. This insane policy to dictate to Canadians what kind of vehicle they must buy, what they must drive, will send even more jobs to Donald Trump's economy. I do not know why Liberals keep finding ways to punish Canadian industry and Canadian consumers by driving jobs and investment to the United States. It is a serial part of their DNA. Canadians will not tolerate this ban on their favourite car or truck.

I heard a lot of rhetoric about the need for this to satisfy climate change targets. Let us have a quick peek at exactly what that looks like. This ban, according to the government's own documents, will result in approximately 362 megatonnes' worth of reductions from 2024 to 2050. That is 26 years. On an annual basis, that works out to just shy of 14 megatonnes a year. Now, to put that in perspective, China's greenhouse gas emissions were 15,797 megatonnes in 2024. If we assume that China's emissions stay flat and do not increase at all, Canada's reduction, thanks to this ban on consumers' favourite car, truck or minivan, would represent 0.08%.

We are going to cripple our auto manufacturing sector and deprive Canadians of the ability to buy a car, truck or minivan at a price they can afford, that meets their needs, while China continues to emit more and more every year. We are going to suffer here in Canada. We are going to put up with the lack of choice and lack of ability to suit our needs in the way we see fit, and it will have absolutely no impact on global emissions.

The insult added to injury on that is knowing Canada could have actually helped reduce those global emissions by exporting more of our LNG, our clean and ethical natural resources, to help countries get off coal-fired electrical generation. Not only do we have a government that says no when our allies come looking to buy that clean and ethical energy, but then it turns around and punishes Canadians by taking away their right to choose what kind of vehicle they want to buy.

I would like to close my remarks with a couple of statements.

First of all, I agree with all of my colleagues today who said they fear Canadians do not know this is coming. This is a typical play-book by the members of the radical left. They pick a target that is just far enough away that they will not be around to be held accountable, but it is close enough that it feels like real action is being taken. They slide these things through in bigger packages. That is why Conservatives are highlighting this today, because this ban is already impacting the market. It is already having an effect on driving up costs. It is only going to get worse.

I would like to close with my favourite quote when I think about busybody Liberal government overreach. C.S. Lewis said:

Of all tyrannies, a tyranny sincerely exercised for the good of its victims may be the most oppressive. It would be better to live under robber barons than under omnipotent moral busybodies. The robber baron's cruelty may sometimes sleep, his cupidity may at some point be satiated; but those who torment us for our own good will torment us without end for they do so with the approval of their own conscience.

The government should stop tormenting Canadians and give them back the freedom to buy the car, truck or minivan of their choice.

• (1710)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I have some advice for the leader. I just quickly googled a 2018 Jeep Wrangler. It has 77,000 kilometres, and it is \$21,000. That is thousands of dollars less. He might want to do a bit of research.

At the end of the day, there is an issue as to how we could use the technology and advance the industry as a whole, which would create thousands of green jobs. We have seen that in the investments that the previous administration made. Does the Leader of the Opposition not recognize that the potential job opportunities, from moving in this direction, are immense, and all Canadians would benefit?

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Mr. Speaker, if the Liberal member wants to tell Canadians that car prices are not becoming more expensive, I will go with him. I will go with him door to door, and he can tell every household he wants to that cars are not getting more expensive.

We all know they are. They are being pushed higher and higher out of the grasp of hard-working Canadians who used to be able to afford them.

All the questions about technology and investment are not what this motion is about. The Liberal policy is not about investing in technology or improving the grid or giving more options to Canadians. It is about banning an entire category of vehicles that Canadians have proven they want to be able to buy, and Conservatives will always fight for their right to do so.

[Translation]

Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski—La Matapédia, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we have just been served up the usual Conservative rhetoric. I do not recycle because my neighbour does not recycle. That is what my colleague just said.

We should put everything on hold because China pollutes more than we do. What a profoundly cynical abdication of responsibility. We should refuse to do anything to fight climate change because other people are worse than we are.

The only question I have for my colleague is this. Quebec has made its choices for its future, for its economy and for its transition. Will the member respect Quebec's simple choice to limit the sale of gas-powered vehicles by 2035?

[English]

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Mr. Speaker, the member asked about a few points. First of all, there are lots of ways we can help reduce greenhouse gas emissions without depriving Canadians of choice, and that is what this Conservative motion is all about.

Business of Supply

Conservatives have a long track record of investing in technology and incentivizing advancements in new methods of production and whatnot that will help reduce those emissions. I mentioned exporting more Canadian LNG to countries that use coal to create electricity. I did not even get into the topic of how bad for the environment some of the production methods of extraction for the component materials of EVs are in the economy.

When it comes to the situation in Quebec, we believe that every Quebecker should have the right to choose what kind of vehicle they want. We believe every Canadian should have the right to buy whatever vehicle they choose. This is not about one particular province's approach. This is about the rights of individuals, for whom Conservatives fight.

• (1715)

Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I, like the member, represent a rural riding, and people in my riding tell me on a regular basis that they want to have the choice when it comes to which vehicle they drive. Oftentimes, they pick vehicles based on safety and what is going to be best if they were to encounter a moose or something else that perhaps some of the people in Toronto are not necessarily familiar with seeing on a regular basis.

I am wondering if the member can speak to some of what he hears in Regina—Qu'Appelle and if it is similar to what I hear in Fort McMurray—Cold Lake.

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague has it exactly right. I know many of these points have been raised, but it is worth repeating because we are dealing with an unprecedented assault on consumer choice from a Liberal government that just cannot help itself. It is always increasing costs. It is always banning things. The government is like a no fun government. Why do we not let Canadians make the choice themselves? Let a thousand engines roar. Let Canadians decide which vehicle they want.

As my colleague pointed out, there are so many places in this country where consumers just do not believe that an electric vehicle fits their needs. It could be because they have a lack of access to charging stations. It could be because they require a certain model or one with the ability to operate in cold weather and go long distances. That is why Conservatives believe in choice for consumers.

Parm Bains (Richmond East—Steveston, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Terrebonne today.

I rise today not only as a representative of my constituents but also as a voice for Canadians who believe in a cleaner, more prosperous future for our country.

We are at a turning point, a moment that calls for both courage and collaboration. Climate change is not a distant threat; it is a present reality, and in my home province of British Columbia, we have seen the effects of climate change. We have felt its effects with wildfires, floods and heat waves, which cost lives, homes and billions of dollars every year. In 2023 alone, insured damages from wildfires topped \$8 billion. These are not abstract figures. There are families displaced, workers unemployed and futures uncertain. However, with this tremendous challenge, there is also a massive

opportunity to reimagine our economy, to empower workers with good jobs and to protect the health of Canadians.

One of the most immediate, visible and impactful tools in that transformation is the electric vehicle. Let us be clear: Transportation is Canada's second-largest source of greenhouse gas emissions and a major source of air pollution that is harming our health. If we are serious about building a net-zero economy by 2050, we must continue to address how we move people and goods across this vast land. Electric vehicles represent a transformative shift in that journey.

EVs are more than technology; they are a cornerstone of our national climate plan and a catalyst for economic growth. I will share a few facts. Over 80% of our electricity grid is already non-emitting, meaning charging EVs in Canada will have a much lower life cycle carbon footprint than in many other countries, and the environmental benefits are clear. EVs produce zero tailpipe emissions, which means cleaner air in our cities and towns, reducing respiratory illnesses and improving the quality of life. Air pollution from our road transportation emissions in Canada costs approximately \$9 billion in health-related economic costs, and that burden falls disproportionately on vulnerable populations, including children, seniors and marginalized communities. By accelerating the supply of EVs, not only are we reducing greenhouse gases, but we are also advancing public health, energy independence and economic inclusion.

It is worth noting that while oil and gas remain a significant part of our economy and our export profile, our long-term prosperity depends on diversifying our energy mix. It depends on ensuring Canadians have cleaner choices at home, and EVs are that choice.

Critics sometimes ask whether Canadians are ready for this shift. The answer is yes, and they are asking us to lead. More and more Canadians want clean, reliable and affordable transportation.

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

Parm Bains: Mr. Speaker, I heard someone say “choice”, and that is their choice, actually.

Families want to save money at the pump. Workers want to participate in building the vehicles of tomorrow. Municipalities want to electrify bus fleets, and I have had the opportunity to make major announcements in the electrifying of bus fleets in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia. Also, young Canadians want to inherit a livable planet. This is why our government has invested over \$120 billion in clean technologies, including EV innovation and manufacturing. We have also introduced the zero-emission vehicle availability standard so that Canadians will have many choices when they are ready to make the switch.

The long wait times we saw in the past few years left many drivers feeling frustrated and anxious when they needed a new vehicle to get around or commute to work. These policies will help to ensure that 100% of new light-duty vehicles sold in Canada will be zero-emission by 2035. However, Canadians should not worry; they will always be allowed to drive their favourite gas-powered vehicle and sell their old vehicle when they are ready for another one.

Our government's plan to put more EVs on the roads applies to new vehicles, but that is not all. Electric vehicles also represent a major economic opportunity.

● (1720)

In 2023 alone, Canada added over 350,000 green jobs. These are not just jobs in labs or boardrooms; they are jobs for mechanics, electricians, miners and assembly line workers. They are jobs rooted in communities from Windsor and Winnipeg to Whitehorse, and these jobs are not fleeting; they are foundational. One of the reasons for this is that Canada is one of a number of trading partners with EV targets, and we are aligned with the 2035 targets in the United Kingdom, the E.U., China and U.S. states covering 40% of the auto market, including New York State, California, Colorado, Oregon, Washington and Maine.

As countries around the world race to transition to clean energy, Canada has the potential to become a trusted global supplier, not just of clean electricity and critical minerals but also of the vehicles and technologies that will drive a net-zero future. We are not alone in this race. According to the International Energy Agency, global investment in clean energy doubled that of fossil fuels in 2024. Major economies, such as those of the United States, Germany and China, are moving aggressively. If we hesitate, we risk falling behind. If we lead, and if we continue to invest in our people, our resources and our ideas, Canada can win.

I know some will argue that the transition is too fast or too costly, but the cost of inaction is far greater. The wildfires, floods and economic disruptions of climate change are already here, and they are growing. Canadians understand that climate policy is economic policy. They want energy that is affordable and clean. They want an economy that works for everyone, not just today but tomorrow.

Canadians want leadership, so let us be clear in our purpose: The electric vehicle is not just a cleaner car, but it is a symbol of what is possible when we unite technology, policy and public will. It is a vehicle not only of transport but of transition toward a future that is sustainable, equitable and prosperous.

Business of Supply

Let us continue to build that future. Let us ensure that every Canadian, regardless of their region, income or background, can be part of the clean energy economy. Let us invest in people, infrastructure and innovation so Canada not only meets the challenges of this moment but leads the world in addressing them.

If we continue to work together with vision and determination, Canada will not only build back better, but we will build forward stronger, cleaner and more united than ever.

● (1725)

Cheryl Gallant (Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the average battery in an electric vehicle contains about 286 kilograms of aluminum. The United States only makes 1% of its aluminum and also has 25% tariffs on imported aluminum. Right there, from the very beginning, we have a large proportion of an EV that has an extra 25% added to it because of a tariff. Then if Canada is importing an electric vehicle, or any vehicle for that matter, it is another 25% in tariffs.

How does the member expect any average Canadian, who cannot even afford rent these days or a house, to pay at least 50% more because of tariffs on a vehicle, let alone all the extras required to plug in an electric vehicle and redo the electrical to the house so it can take the amperage? Whoever decided all Canadians wanted EVs or even wanted to go to net zero?

Parm Bains: Mr. Speaker, in the speech I made, I talked about how we are aligned with other nations that have the same focus for 2035, nations like the U.K., the E.U. and China. If we do not work with them and alongside them to make these advancements in technology, we are going to fall behind. I do not know why you do not want to work with us on that.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Again, I remind members to address their comments through the Chair.

Questions and comments, the hon. member for Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong.

Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the whole point of this EV mandate is to try to reduce our carbon footprint, but we are going to reduce our carbon footprint by only 0.08%. China and India are 60% of the footprint. We could do more by shipping our LNG to displace coal and heavy gas there.

Business of Supply

At the same time, it is going to be very destructive for Canadians, killing 38,000 jobs and costing \$138.7 billion from the economy, so why does the member think it is a good idea to do this EV mandate?

Parm Bains: Mr. Speaker, again, I can talk about the advancements. We are talking about creating jobs in the sector, and if we continue to work with the nations that are also advancing in this way, that is exactly what we will do.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that throughout the debate, there is consistency coming from the Conservative Party, which is that it does not support any form of subsidy, incentive or support for an industry that has great potential for jobs in the future. We are talking about tens of thousands of good, middle-class jobs by investing in EV development. We could talk about Volkswagen, Honda and Stellantis, even with pauses that take place, working with different governments.

We have a very much far-right Conservative Party that says it does not care about the industry. It is more focused on the issue of just letting things be the way they are. I am wondering whether my friend can provide his thoughts on why we should not be ignoring the potential of the industry and of investing more in EVs.

Parm Bains: Madam Speaker, it is extremely important, as I mentioned, to be talking about the advancement not only of the technology but also of the innovation, and about creating these jobs, which every other nation is focused on also. We do not want to be left behind in those.

More importantly, as I mentioned earlier, air pollution from road transportation emissions in Canada costs approximately \$9 billion in health-related economic costs. This is a way forward, thinking about not only our economy but also the health benefits of Canadians moving forward as well.

[Translation]

Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Madam Speaker, sooner or later, we are going to have to limit greenhouse gas emissions and the use of gas-powered vehicles. Sooner or later, we are going to have encourage the use of electric vehicles.

Does my friend think that the federal government should bring back the electric vehicle incentives?

• (1730)

[English]

Parm Bains: Madam Speaker, as we look forward to making these investments, I think it is important to look at whether we can make the vehicles cheaper. This is why, when we work with other nations that are doing the same, I think we can look at different options to make them cheaper for people.

[Translation]

Tatiana Auguste (Terrebonne, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I rise today not only as the representative of my constituents, but also as the spokesperson for all Canadians who believe in a cleaner, more prosperous and more inclusive future for our country,

I want to acknowledge that we are gathered on the traditional, unceded territory of the Algonquin Anishinabe people.

I am pleased to speak today to a topic that is critical to our future and that of our planet: the transition to electric vehicles. We all see it and a report published by the International Energy Agency last month confirms it: Global sales of electric vehicles are booming and will continue to grow every year.

Some time ago, Canada decided to become a world leader in the transition to zero-emission vehicles, committing to 100% new electric vehicle sales by 2035. Putting more electric vehicles on the road is an essential part of Canada's approach to fighting climate change. Electric vehicles will allow consumers to save money in the long run. Everyone wins.

Making electric vehicles more affordable and easier to access is one of the most important steps we can take to support a healthy environment and a healthy economy. As we know, the electric vehicle availability standard increases access to affordable electric vehicles and improves air quality. In fact, the Parliamentary Budget Officer's August 2024 report confirms the need for the electric vehicle availability standard.

According to forecasts, the Canadian market will not be able to keep pace with the demand for electric vehicles in Canada nor will it be in a position to help us quickly meet our climate targets. We know that rapid advances in global electric vehicle manufacturing and improvements in technology have narrowed the price gap between electric vehicles and internal combustion engine vehicles, even as the performance of electric vehicles continues to improve.

Despite an upward trend in electric vehicle sales in Canada in recent years, the beginning of 2025 saw a notable slowdown. However, it is worth mentioning that one in seven vehicles sold in 2024 was electric. Quebec continues to dominate EV sales with almost half of all EV registrations in Canada. Ontario follows with almost 23%, and British Columbia with 21%. This shows a positive trend in terms of accessibility.

Let us move on to the affordability of electric vehicles. This is a key issue for many consumers. Buying an EV in Canada has many advantages, both for consumers and for the environment. Electric vehicles have lower operating costs than gas-powered and diesel vehicles. In other words, they represent significantly lower ownership costs over the life of the vehicle.

First, battery charging costs are lower because electricity is significantly cheaper than fuel at the pump. Second, CAA estimates that the average owner of a battery-powered electric vehicle saves between 40% and 50% on maintenance costs compared to a gas-powered vehicle, as EVs require less frequent and less complicated maintenance. Third, the purchase price of some models has fallen, making it possible to break even within a few years. After 10 years, the savings can be considerable.

All levels of government and the industry have a role to play in the transition. The Government of Canada is committed to spending \$4.7 billion to support the rollout of electric vehicles and charging infrastructure. We are also helping the auto and critical minerals industries manufacture electric vehicles and become part of the EV supply chain in Canada. The Government of Canada is committed to protecting the jobs of auto workers. It is also committed to supporting innovation and investment in the EV supply chain, which is especially crucial for making Canada the fastest-growing economy in the G7.

The Government of Canada is working closely with the Canadian auto industry and provinces such as Ontario to ensure that the Canadian auto industry remains competitive. It is worth noting that the new vehicle sales standard is flexible in that some sales objectives take into account hybrid vehicles.

• (1735)

The Government of Canada will continue to monitor developments in the electric vehicle sector to ensure that targets are achievable. It is clear that Canada has everything it needs to be a global leader in EV assembly and battery manufacturing, with projects across the battery value chain. The battery value chain for automotive and transportation captures the step-by-step process to produce batteries that are needed in the industrial transformation and the electrification of the automotive and transportation sectors. It guides a “mines to mobility” approach to developing a sustainable Canadian battery ecosystem for transport and electric vehicles. This allows Canada to lead in designing and building the vehicles of the future.

When the lithium-ion batteries are at the end of their useful life, the materials and metals they contain are, as much as possible, recovered and processed to be recycled and reused. Currently, between 95% and 98% of the components of electric vehicle batteries are recyclable. Recycling presents its own challenges and is an evolving sector. Given the inherent value of the essential materials in the batteries, this industry is highly incentivized to innovate to conserve these precious materials in the battery value chain. It is essential to reduce the need to extract new materials for the batteries. We are exploring several options to recover materials from electric vehicle batteries in order to improve their sustainability and manage their cost and impact on the environment. This guarantees the environmental sustainability of the value chain.

In the decades to come, the transition to zero-emission vehicles will significantly reduce the pollution from millions of light-duty vehicles in Canada. Even though increasingly stringent greenhouse gas emission standards have been put in place for new vehicles since 2011, total emissions have continued to rise due to Canada's growing population and the increased number of vehicles on the

Business of Supply

road. What that means is that the electrification of transportation is essential to achieving net-zero emissions by 2050. With over 100 new zero-emission vehicle models currently available in Canada, rapid improvements in battery life and performance, and a growing charging station network, this year is the ideal time to choose a zero-emission vehicle. Many Canadians are increasingly eager to switch to cleaner, more affordable and more stable modes of transportation.

However, the Government of Canada is well aware that some people are still hesitant due to the lack of nearby charging stations and the higher initial outlay. That is why the government helped over 559,000 drivers make the switch to electric vehicles. The government is also supporting the country's economy on the global electric vehicle market through measures that include allocating an additional \$900 million under the 2030 emissions reduction plan to build 50,000 additional charging stations. This funding is on top of the \$280 million that the Government of Canada has invested since 2016. A total of nearly 85,000 charging stations will be installed across the country by 2029.

The government will also support the auto industry's competitiveness and transition by investing up to \$8 billion from the strategic innovation fund and the net-zero accelerator initiative.

The Government of Canada recognizes that EV battery recycling is essential to ensuring a clean and sustainable transition to a clean economy. This process not only prevents these batteries from ending up in landfills, but also recovers critical minerals such as lithium, cobalt and nickel, which are vital to the growth of clean technology and Canada's competitiveness. While end-of-life battery management is the responsibility of the provinces and territories, which are responsible for regulating and monitoring waste treatment operations, the federal government actively supports circular solutions through its critical minerals strategy. This strategy aims to strengthen recycling capacity, develop secondary markets and maximize the use of resources from industrial waste and post-consumer waste. EV batteries are designed to last several hundred thousand kilometres, but as the EV fleet grows, the volume of end-of-life batteries will increase significantly over the next decade. The—

• (1740)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): We will have to end it there because we are out of time.

The hon. member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith.

*Business of Supply**[English]*

Tamara Kronis (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, CPC): Madam Speaker, Canadians want clean air and innovation, but they do not want and cannot afford another heavy-handed Ottawa mandate that drives up cost and takes away choice.

I have listened to the hon. member, and that is exactly what the Liberal “no more gas” policy does. It is not a target; it is a mandate backed by fines that will be passed down to the consumer. It is true that EV adoption has grown, as the hon. member said, but it has grown through choice, not coercion, and through incentives, infrastructure and demand working together. Today that balance is tenuous. Rebates have been cut, and as the hon. member said, charging stations are still missing in many rural areas, condo buildings and areas where there is only street parking. This is not smart climate policy; it is central planning at its worst.

The member said demand is going up, so why force Canadians to adopt EVs at a rate they do not want and cannot afford?

[Translation]

Tatiana Auguste: Madam Speaker, it is very important to make the energy transition. One of the best ways to do that is through electric vehicles. In addition, EVs have lower operating costs that are going to help all Canadians with affordability.

Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Madam Speaker, my regards to the member for Terrebonne and congratulations on her election.

Last Thursday, we were studying the estimates with the Minister of Finance. He was asked if he intended to restore the electric vehicle subsidy. He told us that he was not interested and that he would find other ways to help dealers. Barely an hour ago, I asked the parliamentary secretary, the member for Winnipeg North, a question. He said that he did not know if the program would be reinstated. He said to keep lobbying to help the dealers, and he wished us good luck. That was the answer we got an hour ago.

Fifteen minutes ago, we checked our phones, we checked La Presse, we checked our news channels, and we saw that the minister just announced that she is reinstating the subsidy program. That is good news, but it points to all the decisions in the Liberal Party being made at the top. Even august members—no pun intended—like the member for Winnipeg North are not consulted. Nobody is consulted.

I would like the new member for Terrebonne to tell me whether, as a Liberal backbencher, she feels she is consulted. Does she feel she is able to contribute to policy? Does she feel that the Prime Minister or the ministers listen to her, or on the contrary, as a new politician, does she feel like a spectator in the Liberal Party?

Tatiana Auguste: Madam Speaker, I want to assure my colleague that I have been welcomed into the Liberal Party very well. I have no further comment on that matter.

I thank him for his concern.

Bienvenu-Olivier Ntumba (Mont-Saint-Bruno—L'Acadie, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I congratulate my colleague on her election and on her fine speech. She clearly explained how our government is working to reduce the cost of consumer goods for Canadians.

I would like my colleague to explain to me what our government is doing right now to reduce the cost of living for Canadians.

As the member opposite said earlier, there is also some good news. The government is going to continue its efforts to help reduce the cost of living for Canadians.

Tatiana Auguste: Madam Speaker, electric vehicles have significantly lower operating costs than gas- and diesel-powered vehicles. Consumers will save between 40% and 50% on maintenance costs compared to gas-powered vehicles.

That is good news for everyone.

● (1745)

[English]

Marc Dalton (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, CPC): Madam Speaker, it does not seem that the Liberals are cognizant of how stressed out Canadians, including people in Vancouver, where I live, are with the cost of living. The EV mandates are just something else. They will make cars, both used and new, more expensive.

I wonder whether the member could address that and also the fact that vehicles, as far as pollution control devices and everything go, are so much better than they used to be.

[Translation]

Tatiana Auguste: Madam Speaker, it should be noted that EV sales in British Columbia have increased by 21% over the past year.

[English]

Connie Cody (Cambridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am sharing my time with the member for Central Newfoundland.

Canadians are being sold a shiny, Liberal red, electric dream, but under the hood, it is full of empty promises and hidden costs.

The Liberal government's plan to ban gas-powered vehicles by 2035 might sound bold and exciting, but when we look closer, it is really a blueprint for confusion, higher prices and broken supply chains. Canadians did not vote for the electric vehicle mandate; it is being dropped on them like a federal hammer. It is not policy; it is a proclamation. It is a one-size-fits-all order from Ottawa that ignores cost, geography and common sense. Canadians should not be forced to buy electric vehicles, especially when the Liberals have not fixed the infrastructure needed to support them.

The Liberal EV mandate pushes people into expensive new cars without making them affordable. The mandate also fails to consider the everyday Canadians who rely on passenger trucks for their livelihoods: tradespeople, landscapers and other small business owners whose work depends on their vehicles. These workers cannot afford to wait hours to recharge while working on the clock. It ignores the realities that many Canadians face every day when it comes to transportation.

The government announced that automakers will have just 12 years to phase out combustion engine cars, trucks and SUVs. It will set strict annual targets to increase electric vehicle sales, and any automaker that misses these targets will face fines of \$20,000 per vehicle. What does that mean for carmakers and Canadians? For carmakers, it means millions of dollars in penalties. We all know who will pay for that in the end: Canadian families and consumers will face higher prices, which they cannot afford.

In effect, this is a \$20,000 tax on every new internal combustion engine vehicle. It is no wonder the automakers are speaking out against it. Ford Canada's CEO has warned that without enough charging stations and without addressing affordability, many Canadians will be left behind and will not be able to switch to electric vehicles. Stellantis Canada also points out that government support needs to be in line with what the industry can realistically deliver.

It is one thing to set targets on paper; it is another thing entirely to make those targets achievable on the ground. Too many times, the Liberal government is disconnected from the practical realities of the people it is supposed to serve. This looks like just another example. Right now, about one in every 10 new vehicles registered in Canada is electric. That means the Liberals expect electric vehicle sales to double within just three years and then continue growing quickly after that. They have no credible plan whatsoever to do it, and certainly no plan to pay for it.

We know that vehicle markets are very different across the country. Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia meet or exceed the 20% EV sales goal, but many provinces are below 8%, and now both Quebec and B.C. have suspended their subsidies. Canadians should not have to buy vehicles they do not want. According to Statistics Canada, zero-emission vehicles were less than 9% of new vehicle registrations in 2025.

A lack of interest is not the only problem. Charging infrastructure seems to be heavily concentrated in just a few provinces. There are reportedly over 25,500 public charging ports across Canada, but around 85% of those appear to be in only three provinces. Many EV owners report that many of those chargers are often too busy, resulting in long wait times. Worse yet, many are inoperative.

Business of Supply

There is so much work to be done, but the government has not done the work to maintain our existing charging infrastructure, much less plan for new, reliable infrastructure. About 80% of electric vehicle charging happens overnight at home, making access to home charging essential for EV ownership, but many Canadians do not have that option. People who live in apartments, condos or rental buildings often face another challenge: Charging stations are unavailable or are even banned by landlords or building regulations. This creates a serious obstacle. How can the Liberal government expect people to switch to an electric vehicle if they cannot easily charge it where they live?

The government also seems to have overlooked another big limitation for the many long-distance commuters. In Cambridge, as in most of the country, we have winter. In places where winter is measured in wind chill and snowbanks, an unreliable battery is not an inconvenience; it is a safety hazard. Ottawa cannot mandate away Canadian weather. In the coldest months, EV driving range can drop by up to 40%. For those people with short commutes, that might be acceptable, but for many others it becomes impractical at its best.

● (1750)

Experts estimate that by 2030, Canada will have to manage over 125,000 tonnes of battery waste. We know that Canada needs a clear and comprehensive plan to recycle electric vehicle batteries, but once again, the Liberal government has failed to put one forward. Worse yet, the mandate will add hidden costs to every Canadian household.

Increased demand for electricity to power all the vehicles will drive up energy prices, and Canada's electricity grid is not ready for the surge. The Canadian Climate Institute says that to meet net-zero emissions by 2050, Canada's electricity generation must double or even triple. This means building new power plants, upgrading transmission lines and spending billions to modernize the grid. That would require a plan and a budget.

Business of Supply

Jobs are at risk. Canada's automotive industry employs over 500,000 people in factories, parts manufacturing, dealerships and repair shops. Electric vehicles have fewer parts and require less maintenance, which means fewer jobs for skilled workers and mechanics. Compared to traditional internal combustion vehicles, electric vehicles cost more to buy, which means fewer sales, which means, again, fewer jobs. Without a clear and fair transition plan, thousands of Canadian workers face an uncertain future. Small garages and other businesses that rely on gas vehicles are also at risk.

Meanwhile, Canadian families are already struggling; inflation, higher interest rates and rising housing costs mean they have less money to spend. It is no wonder they do not trust the Liberals' EV mandate, and Canadians are not buying it, literally. A recent Ipsos poll found that 55% of Canadians disagree with the mandate to make all new car sales electric or zero-emission by 2035. Everyday Canadians are opposed to the mandate, and so are the experts. Professor Ross McKittrick at the University of Guelph says that the mandate "will have sufficiently large negative consequences". What might those consequences be? He says that the mandate could "effectively destroy the Canadian auto industry and will cause widespread economic losses elsewhere." It is incredible.

People understand that the Liberal government is not acting in their best interests or according to common sense. People understand that they cannot afford what the Liberals are selling. Banning new gas-powered cars will make it harder for families to afford a vehicle. As the supply of new gas-powered vehicles dries up, the used car market could become increasingly volatile, with higher prices at first and far fewer affordable options down the road. It seems that the government needs to be reminded that in many parts of this country, including in my riding of Cambridge, and in North Dumfries, cars are a necessity not a luxury. It is not always possible to take transit, as there are still places where transit is inadequate or non-existent.

The Liberal government likes to play a constant game of hide-and-seek, hiding real solutions while seeking headlines. It hides behind flashy announcements but fails to deliver the infrastructure and plans Canadians actually need. It is the same Liberal formula: big talk, no delivery, no pipelines, no housing and no budget, just hide-and-seek with Canadians' hopes and wallets. The mandate is not about helping Canadians; it is about telling them what to do. The Liberal government seems to think it can decide what kind of car people can drive, how much they will pay and where they are supposed to charge it, whether the infrastructure exists or not.

On this side of the House, we believe in something pretty simple: choice. We trust Canadians, not Ottawa, to decide what works for their life. We stand with the drivers, the auto workers, the mechanics and every Canadian who keeps this country running and just wants a vehicle that fits their needs and their budget. The mandate is not a road map; it is a dead end, with higher prices, fewer jobs and fewer choices for the people who can least afford it. It is a bit like selling snow shovels in July: completely out of season and nobody asked for it.

Canadians want real solutions that keep our economy moving, our shelves stocked and their family on the road. When it comes to

running a country, common sense works a lot better than a Liberal-issued mandate.

• (1755)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.):

Madam Speaker, the member made reference to a number of provinces' exceeding their targets. In my home province of Manitoba, the government is hoping to be able to triple its number. In fact, it has come up with a rebate program that will be expiring in March 2026. It seems to me that there is a lot of buy-in in terms of provincial governments, because we see governments at different levels that are actually encouraging their citizenry to purchase EVs.

Can the member indicate whether she is aware of any provincial government that has come out against the policy?

Connie Cody: Madam Speaker, there is a lot of hope but no real solutions. What we need to do is focus on listening to the people who are saying they cannot afford to put a roof over their heads and food on their tables. These mandates are going to cost them a lot more in the end.

A study in the Canadian Journal of Economics said this plan will eliminate 38,000 auto sector jobs and cost \$138.7 billion, assuming the sector never shuts down. We are going to end up losing a lot more jobs. People are going to have less money. We will have to deal with people in our rural areas who require certain vehicles to get to work, to bring their children to school and to pick up their groceries.

We need a lot more than hope. We need real solutions, and that is why banning the—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): Questions and comments, the hon. member for La Pointe-de-l'Île.

[Translation]

Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to know what my colleague thinks about greenhouse gas emissions and climate change.

Does she think that electric vehicles are better for the environment than gas-powered vehicles?

[English]

Connie Cody: Madam Speaker, what we heard earlier today is that emissions would be reduced by 0.08%. The better way to fight climate change is by bringing more business to Canada and dealing with matters within Canada so we have better and more stricter environmental regulations. Also, if we can take more away from China, we will do much better here in Canada.

Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC): Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague from Cambridge for her well-thought-out and researched speech.

One thing I found really interesting that the member brought up was innovation in the Canadian context. I know she is from an Ontario riding. I am wondering if she could further explain some of the innovation she has seen and why she thinks it is important to give consumers a choice as they inquire about this space, rather than removing any possibility of choice, which is what has been suggested by the Liberals. It leads Canadians to have a harder time when they are making decisions for their families when they have a limited budget.

Connie Cody: Madam Speaker, my riding has a large rural area as well as an urban area, and having a choice is very important. We have a lot of farmers who require trucks to get around. They do not have the proper infrastructure or transit to run their business otherwise. We have a lot of small businesses in our automotive industry. It would shut down a lot of businesses, so it is very important that we keep our gas-powered vehicles going.

We also have a lot of car shows, and a lot of those people cannot convert their vehicles to electric. There is a lot of pride when they are showing these vehicles. They keep them. They could have been their parents' or their grandfather's vehicles. We have to respect that for many reasons. We have to understand that everyone should have the choice to decide what car they wish to drive.

• (1800)

Clifford Small (Central Newfoundland, CPC): Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise as the member representing the newly named riding of Central Newfoundland, formerly known as Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame. I am truly grateful for those who supported me, put their trust in me and sent me to this place again to bring their thoughts, concerns and worries to this place.

I owe a world of gratitude to all those who helped on my campaign. We had a tremendous campaign, and it meant so much to everybody and even more to me. God bless everybody who was involved. I thank them very much. I will continue to speak out on behalf of the people of the riding of Central Newfoundland while I am in Ottawa, in this chamber or on the fisheries committee.

I rise today to speak to our Conservative opposition day motion calling on the Liberal government to immediately end its mandate to ban gas-powered vehicle sales in Canada. This is supposed to happen by 2035, when all vehicles sold in Canada are to be zero-emitting, and there are various targets along the way. By 2026, 20% of all vehicles sold in Canada are to be zero-emitting. By 2030, that figure is supposed to go to 60%. Of course, by 2035, it goes all the way up to 100%.

Consumers are rejecting EVs for various reasons. There is the fact that they lose 40% of their battery life in cold weather. We have lots of cold weather in Canada, and we certainly have it in Newfoundland and Labrador. That stat is based on the Canadian Automobile Association. They did the test. This is not something we are coming up with off the top of our heads. It is scientifically proven that these batteries cannot take the cold.

Business of Supply

There is a lack of charging stations. In Newfoundland and Labrador, right now there are only 120 charging stations. Another reason people are choosing to be against electric vehicles is the cost of these vehicles. They cost, on average, \$15,000 more than an equivalent gas-powered model.

Where do we stand heading into 2026? The latest data from February and March is that only 6.6% of vehicles that were purchased were EVs. In order to get on target for the 20% mark by the end of 2026, EV sales would have to triple what they were in the last recorded months. This is not going to happen.

What will be the result of this consumer rejection and of this Liberal plan? The Liberals would charge auto manufacturers that fail to meet this target a \$20,000 tax per vehicle. I see my colleague from Winnipeg. He is listening intently because he knows this is the case.

Consumers are going to pay the price, and this is exactly what the Prime Minister wants. This is not straying from his mantra. We can go back to 2021, when he wrote a book called *Values*. I will give a little quote from that book. He said, “A host of other fiscal and regulatory policies can be highly effective in setting out the contours of a net-zero economy, including...regulations to phase out the sale of new internal-combustion vehicles in the next decade”. That is 10 years. That is not a long time.

• (1805)

“Fiscal and regulatory policies” is what the Prime Minister stated in his book. Let us unpack that a bit.

EVs are a failure in Canada. People do not want them, and as a result, Canadians are going to pay the price. They are going to pay the price for Liberal failures.

The government has known for quite some time that this mandate will fail. It has been warned by utility companies that the grid will not stand up to it. Electricity demand will go up by close to 23% by 2035, and the electricity market is governed by supply and demand like every other commodity. With the continued electrification of everything, the price of electricity is going to go up. That will be another inadvertent consequence, with collateral damage to the people of Canada.

To have our grid ready with additional power generation, with an upgraded transmission grid and with more charging stations, the cost is forecast to be \$300 billion. This is according to the Liberal government's own research, published last July by Natural Resources Canada. The government knows its zero-emissions EV target will not work.

Building electricity generation and transmission infrastructure takes time. If we are going to expand our grid by 23% just to have enough electricity to power these vehicles, it is going to take decades to build that kind of infrastructure.

Business of Supply

What is the Liberal Prime Minister's real goal? It is to tax Canadians. Canadians will pay the price. They will pay for this doomed plan. Who will also pay for it, besides the consumer? According to the peer-reviewed Canadian Journal of Economics, in the best-case scenario, our auto sector will lose \$140 billion by 2035 under these mandates, and the worst-case scenario is that it continues to lose until 2050, at a cost of \$1.3 trillion. Can members believe that? It is possible that these EV mandates could cost the automotive industry \$1.3 trillion.

Job losses in the sector are projected to be 137,000 jobs. That is not my number. The hit to our GDP would be 4.8% nationally per year, and the demand for autos would drop by 10.5%.

All of this is to drop our emissions in Canada by a mere 6%. It will cost \$3,400 per tonne. That is 20 times the original Trudeau carbon tax nominal rate per tonne. There is no need for this. If consumers think electric vehicles are better, they will choose them.

According to the Fraser Institute, "Electric vehicle mandates mean misery all around". That was the headline out of the Fraser Institute, a very respected organization. It goes on to say, "The latest news of slowing demand for electric vehicles highlight the profound hazards of the federal government's Soviet-style mandate". That sums it up. It is a Soviet-style mandate. EV mandates will mean lots of suffering and no freedom.

• (1810)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I think the member opposite underestimates the acceptance rate. In some provinces, well over 20% of new cars being sold are electric. These are provinces like Quebec and British Columbia. I understand Ontario is doing exceptionally well. Manitoba has come out with a program with which they are hoping to tipple sales.

Does the member believe that provincial governments and the federal government are doing a good thing in promoting consumer choice by providing subsidies and assistance for electric vehicles?

Clifford Small: Madam Speaker, if folks in certain regions have more of an acceptance of EVs, if there is more demand, and if they like them more, then they can buy them.

The member spoke about choice. It is their choice, but if they do not work in other regions, and folks do not want to buy them, they should not be forced to buy them and forced into poverty. It is all about choice. This is democracy and capitalism, and I do not know why the Liberals are trying to take those away from Canadians.

Marc Dalton (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, CPC): Madam Speaker, the Liberals like making big announcements with fanfare. I think of my riding of Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge when, in November 2023, there was an announcement of \$280 million being put into a battery plant. Where is that right now? Well, the company has basically said that, no, it is backing right out of it, or it is putting it on pause, because it is not seeing the market, the demand.

I wonder if the member could comment on how the Liberals are forcing businesses and consumers to go in a certain direction and how that is just going to add to costs.

Clifford Small: Madam Speaker, I think it is just completely wrong for the Liberal federal government to meddle in a free economy by creating mandates like this to force people. Whether they like it or not, everyone is going to pay if this mandate is followed through with because all vehicles will get more expensive.

Cheryl Gallant (Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke, CPC): Madam Speaker, I know that new homes have 200 amps or more, but in Newfoundland, what percentage of homes would have less than 200 amps? To have a plug-in installed for an EV, 200 amps or more is required. If the case is that the majority do not have sufficient amperage and transformers around the province, will the member be asking for an "auto-immune system" for the province of Newfoundland and Labrador?

Clifford Small: Madam Speaker, I do not have the exact stats on how many homes have greater than a 200-amp service, but I suspect there are a lot that do not. I really could not make a stab at that, but the cost to upgrade for those who need to go to 200 amps is atrocious. It is another cost. Once consumers are forced down that pathway, it is not just the cost of the vehicle. It is also the cost they will incur at their home residence. It is terrible.

[Translation]

Mario Beaulieu (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to know what my colleague thinks about the fact that the oil and gas industry causes an increase in greenhouse gases.

Does my colleague agree that we need to find a way to transition away from the oil economy to one that is more reliant on renewable energy?

[English]

Clifford Small: Madam Speaker, what I really believe in is moving towards natural gas away from either diesel, coal or any type of heavier fuel. If we want to solve the emissions problem in this world, natural gas is the way to go. The member knows it, and I wish that Quebec would get in on the game and start producing some natural gas.

• (1815)

Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong, CPC): Madam Speaker, we are here tonight to talk about the EV mandate the Liberal government has put forward, which states that 20% of Canadians will have to be driving electric vehicles by 2026, 60% by 2030 and 100% by 2035. These are not targets. It is going to be a mandate that will force Canadians to drive electric vehicles whether they want to or not.

There is a cost associated with this, because within the mandate it says that the auto manufacturers will have a quota of how many EVs they have to sell. For every one they do not sell, they will be charged a punitive fine of \$20,000 per vehicle. We can be sure they are not going to absorb that cost themselves, but will pass it on to the consumers, which will drive up the price of the electric vehicles people are being forced to buy.

I am opposed to this EV mandate on a whole number of grounds, which I will outline.

The first thing I would say is that this mandate is not freedom of choice. I really believe there has been a huge war on our freedoms under the Liberal government over the last 10 years. We know that freedom of expression has been under attack with bills such as Bill C-11, where the government gets to control what social media content is put up, such as videos and the like. We have seen Bill C-63, where it wanted to put people in jail in the future if it thought they might commit a hate crime. Fortunately, that one died on the vine. I hope not to see it again. There have also been attacks on freedom of the press, not just through buying the media by donating huge sums of money to mainstream media, but also with bills such as Bill C-18, which really compromised the ability of Canadians to share news links now on things like Meta and hurt a lot of local smaller media because of it.

Freedom of religion has got to be a concern for every person of faith across this country. It does not matter which faith one talks about, we have seen attacks on people and their places of worship, and a rise in violence against them and vandalism. We have seen our freedoms under attack, and now the Liberals want to add another freedom. They do not want to let people choose what kind of vehicle they want to buy. They want to make them buy an EV.

If somebody wants an EV, I am happy for them to have it. I am all about choice. I do not want one because I live in a really rural part of the riding and there are no charging stations. I have not seen a plan from the government to put any charging stations in place. I can just see myself trundling around the riding and running out of juice with no options. I would have to get towed, and then the next day I would have to get towed, because there is no infrastructure there.

What I would also say is that EVs do not work very well in the cold. If it gets to -40°C, they lose 40% of their efficiency. We have all seen online the experiences of people who have electric vehicles and were trapped in snowstorms. They were very concerned about the fact that they were trapped and did not have enough power to keep the car warm. That is another risk there.

Also, the current technology for lithium batteries is not great in that they catch fire. According to the U.S., 3% of vehicles catch

Business of Supply

fire. We saw the horrific accident that happened in Toronto recently where the battery caught fire in an electric vehicle, and that shorted out the electricity in the car so the doors could not be opened. Sadly, four people burned to death.

The technology is developing, and the proposed solid-state batteries do not catch fire, so I think better technology is coming, but at this time, with the existing technology, I have concerns. I am sure other Canadians do as well.

When it comes to freedom, I see this as another step through which the government is trying to remove our freedom. What is next after this? Is it going to try to control what we can and cannot eat or what kind of house we buy? Where does the control of the government stop? I have a problem with that.

What are we trying to achieve with the mandate? We talk about how we are trying to address climate change, but the reality is that this mandate will reduce the carbon footprint of Canada, which is now 1.6% of the world's footprint, by 0.08%. If we compare that to those of China and India, which are at about 60% of the world's footprint, it is an insignificant change. It is not going to impact climate change in a real way.

• (1820)

If we really wanted to impact climate change, we would sell Canadian LNG to supplant coal and heavy oil in China and India, and that would reduce their 60% to 15%. That is huge. It would create well-paying jobs here in Canada, and it would help the environment and address climate change.

I just think that the initiative would not make any difference, but it would really hurt Canadians because it would cost us 38,000 jobs and \$138.7 billion. That is assuming it does not put the car businesses and the auto manufacturers out of business, which is a real possibility.

The next reason that I do not like the mandate is that there is no plan. The Prime Minister was supposed to be the man with the plan. What do we need to put this mandate in place? We have to have places to plug the things in. We have to have a source of electricity. We have to have the infrastructure in the residential and commercial places where people are in order to make it all go.

With respect to the issue of charging stations, it is being said that we would need 670,000 charging stations across Canada, and we currently have fewer than 150,000. How much would that cost, and how long would that take? The government has not provided any answers. It does not know. That is not a plan.

Business of Supply

Also, with respect to the practical details, people living on a suburban block will notice that there are 600-volt transformers. If one person has an electric vehicle, it is no big deal, but if everybody is forced to buy an electric vehicle, there is this little equation in electricity that says voltage is equal to current times resistance, and plugging in cars is resistance. If the resistance is increased with the same voltage, that will reduce the current, and eventually people will not have enough current to turn the lights. This is especially problematic with respect to high-rise apartment buildings, where there could be 20 or 40 floors. If everybody has to plug in, the infrastructure is not there to supply the electricity to them. How much would it cost to get that? Again, there is no plan for that.

Then there would not be enough electricity in the grid. We can see that people recognize that we are going to be increasing our take of electricity. We have brought four million people into Canada, which increases, by about 10%, the usage of electricity. We have emerging businesses, which is a good thing, but it takes electricity. There is a pinch point, and we are going to see brownouts before we can build the capacity in electricity that we need.

In my riding of Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong, the Ontario government has provided a mandate to build a facility, the Riverside Generating Station. It is going to build a cogen plant, small modular nuclear reactors and alternate energy in conjunction with the indigenous people in my riding. That is fantastic, and it will take a certain number of years to get it in place, but the federal government has no plan for how the rest of the country would get electricity and get it into the grid with the infrastructure. Again, there has not been a lot of thought to that.

How much is all of this going to cost? The government will not even come forward with a budget, and I would like to be helpful, so here we go. This is from the government's own web page and finances.

The government gets about \$459 billion in revenue every year. It has to pay \$75 billion on the debt, \$55 billion for health transfers, \$25 billion for social transfers, \$20 billion for equalization payments, \$5 billion for territorial transfers, and \$259 billion for the cost of running the government. That gives the government \$20 billion before it starts doing any other projects. However, the government announced \$77 billion during the election, and then after the election, with the estimates, it announced \$486 billion. Now we are talking about possibly \$543 billion in deficit before we even talk about building more charging stations, building the electrical infrastructure and building the infrastructure in apartment buildings and neighbourhoods to take it on. This would absolutely bankrupt Canadians and drive the affordability crisis even further into the ground. We need to check what we are doing here.

There is also no solution for the roads. EVs are heavier than regular cars. They do more damage to the roads. Today, the system is that people pay a gas tax and that gas tax is sent back to the municipalities to build roads. In rural communities, it is very difficult, with the number of people the communities have and the amount of gas tax they get back, to maintain the roads.

• (1825)

Now the roads are going to be in even worse condition. How will we address that? I am sure there is another tax coming, because if it is not spending with the Liberals, it is taxing. That is why people call them tax-and-spend Liberals. Those are some concerns.

The other concern I would highlight is my concern about the whole cradle-to-grave of the lithium batteries. The amount of energy that it takes to mine, process and turn them into batteries is actually net destructive to the planet. Then, at the end of life, there is currently no idea of how we are going to dispose of these things, so we may be creating another contamination issue that, again, will cost money to fix. That is not part of the plan, because there is no plan. These are all concerns that I have when it comes to why I do not think these EV mandates need to happen.

I think a much better way to go would be to introduce targets. The automotive industry has said that it will work towards that. The technology, as I said, is developing and I think people are willing to do something, but we are not going to fix the fact that Canada is cold. The solid-state batteries do run better at cold temperatures, so we will see. It is not commercially proven yet, so we do not know.

If people have a desire to do it, my question again is, why are we trying to do it? Are we really going to get this kind of reduction in our footprint? No, we are not. We should be building LNG facilities and shipping it to China and India. That is the bigger success for Canadians. It would also help pay down the huge \$2-trillion deficit that we have racked up and that we will keep racking up, as far as I can see. Those are things that would be of great concern to every Canadian, and I am sure that when it comes to the mandates, we are going to continue to see them.

We know that the previous minister of the environment, the radical environmentalist who is like a convicted felon, is now the Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture. I can say that this is certainly not my definition of Canadian identity and culture. He has said so many ridiculous things, starting with saying that he is not going to build any more roads. Do members remember that? Now there is this EV mandate, which is an ideological thing, but it is not practically something that we are able to afford to do. I really think there needs to be some reflection on the Liberal benches to say, "We do not have a plan. Let us at least cost the plan, figure out how much it is going to cost to build all this stuff or at least figure out the timing."

The Liberals have already set the time in the mandate: 20% by 2026. We are only at 7.5% right now. How are we going to incentivize people to buy EVs? The government invested \$55 billion of taxpayers' money trying to build battery plants, EV facilities and the downstream supply chain, so they were trying to pick winners and losers. What have we seen from that money that was spent? Most of them have gone bust, and those that have not, like Stellantis, have announced they are going to move their production to the U.S.

The government has already put out a huge amount of money without getting anything for it. I think Canadians are right to be concerned that we will not be able to meet this mandate. The automotive manufacturers are raising the flag; many of them have already shut down their facilities because of lack of demand. There are a lot of Canadians, as I said, including myself, who will not buy them.

I do not see any evidence of a plan of how we are going to essentially triple in one year, by 2026, the uptake in electric vehicles. There is nothing, not even a marketing campaign that I can see, that would drive any kind of behaviour like that. The incentive program is out of money, and people are not going to pay the additional cost.

All of these reasons, from freedom to cost, the lack of a plan, the cradle-to-grave and the fact that we are not going to achieve anything, are good reasons why I cannot support an EV mandate, and I will continue to stand against it.

• (1830)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): It being 6:30 p.m. and this being the final supply day in the period ending June 23, 2025, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the opposition motion.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion 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.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Madam Speaker, I request a recorded vote, please.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): Pursuant to Standing Order 81(18), the division stands deferred until later this day.

* * *

[Translation]

MAIN ESTIMATES, 2025-2026

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—DEPARTMENT OF CANADIAN HERITAGE

Hon. Marjorie Michel (for the President of the Treasury Board) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of \$253,537,041, under Department of Canadian Heritage—Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2026, be concurred in.

[English]

Tom Osborne (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am honoured to stand before this Parliament to outline the government's spending

Business of Supply

priorities for the fiscal year 2025-26. Today, I will speak to the 2025-26 main estimates and provide an overview of supplementary estimates (A), 2025-26. Together, these documents outline how government plans to invest in Canadians while meeting the challenges as well as the opportunities that lie ahead.

Before getting into the details, I recognize that the process behind the government's financial reporting cycle may not be well known to all members in the chamber, especially so soon after the general election. Therefore, I will take a moment or two to provide some information to my hon. colleagues, as well as those watching at home.

Each year, the government prepares detailed spending plans known as the estimates. These are a series of reports that provide details on how each department plans to spend public funds on programs and services. There are approximately 130 federal organizations that are required to undergo this process. The Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat gathers all of these planned expenditures into a document called the main estimates, which is tabled in the House of Commons at the start of the year by the President of the Treasury Board.

When departments are in need of funds outside of the main estimates, they go through the supplementary estimates. Supplementary estimates might include funding for new programs or responses for urgent requests or an unforeseen situation, such as a natural disaster, or they could be items that were not fully developed in time to be included in the main estimates. There are three supplementary estimates tabled in the House at different times throughout the year. The supplementary estimates (A) are tabled in the spring; the supplementary estimates (B) are tabled in the fall; and the supplementary estimates (C) are tabled in the winter, as required.

I will turn to some of the highlights of the 2025-26 main estimates. In these main estimates, the government is seeking approval for key investments and priorities like the Canadian Armed Forces, health services for first nations, dental care, border services and immigration, veterans benefits and housing. In total, this year's main estimates present \$486.9 billion in budgetary spending.

Transfer payments to provinces and territories, other organizations and individuals account for over 60% of spending, equalling \$294.8 billion. These transfer payments reflect increases in benefits for the elderly, the Canada health transfer and the Canada disability benefit.

Business of Supply

Approving the main estimates would allow the government to support programs, activities and services for Canadians and Canada, from national security, defence and border security to reconciliation, housing and veterans benefits. For example, \$33.9 billion in voted funding is proposed for the Department of National Defence. This includes funding to support our women and men in uniform through military procurement, building sustainable bases, improved IT systems and infrastructure. It would also be put toward recruitment efforts to encourage more Canadians to find a rewarding career in the military, so we can actually make that career rewarding.

Another vital issue is Canada's relationship with its indigenous peoples, where true reconciliation requires concrete action. That is why the proposed spending for the Department of Indigenous Services and the Department of Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs includes investments in capacity building to support self-determination, as well as on-the-ground support to improve health outcomes and to support children and their families and education.

I would like to take a moment to speak about the supplementary estimates (A), 2025-26, which were tabled on June 9. Canada is at a pivotal moment in its history, and we need the resources to protect our country and citizens against foreign threats. Through these supplementary estimates (A), the government will do just that.

● (1835)

Canada's defence begins with a clear vision: to be strong at home, secure in North America and engaged throughout the world. To that end, the government is moving quickly to ensure that our military has the tools to defend our country and continent, while remaining an engaged and reliable partner to our allies.

The supplementary estimates (A) propose spending of \$9 billion in incremental budgetary spending for two organizations: the Department of National Defence and Communications Security Establishment Canada. This spending would provide key investments in Canada's defence and security capabilities to enhance Canadian Forces retention, recruitment and training, and equipment. It would also support our international defence partnerships and obligations.

I would now like to speak to some of the specific investments. For example, for the Department of National Defence, there is \$2.1 billion to allow it to accelerate the recruitment of new members in both the regular and reserve forces. This will make sure the Canadian Armed Forces has the personnel it needs to respond to threats at home while engaging meaningfully abroad. This would also allow it to increase its capacity to provide training, reinforce retention of existing members and improve health services to its members.

The Department of National Defence is also requesting another \$2.1 billion to improve partnership with industry. This means enhancing our Canadian industry's ability to provide critical support to the Canadian Armed Forces, focusing on both immediate needs and projects that can be advanced quickly. This would help move forward the government's efforts to strengthen Canada's defence industrial base, boost made-in-Canada production and drive new innovation in vital sectors. This means real benefits and new opportunities for Canadians from coast to coast to coast.

To support these efforts, this investment would also be used to lay the groundwork for a defence industrial strategy. This is about more than just protecting our country. It is about creating good jobs, growing our economy and ensuring a secure and prosperous future for Canadians.

Let me also mention the \$2 billion being requested to support Canada's extended co-operation with our international partners. Global safety and security can only be possible by working together with our allies around the world.

I would like to note the importance of the Arctic. Over 40% of the Canadian land mass lies within the Arctic, including 75% of our coastlines, but Canada can no longer rely on its geography and oceans for protection. Climate change is melting our glaciers, and competitors are building up their military and cyber-capabilities. Today's rapidly shifting and increasingly challenging geopolitical environment requires more lines of effort than ever before to defend Canada, more co-operation with allies and partners, and more focus on asserting our presence in the north.

To that end, the Department of National Defence is seeking \$1 billion to help support its strategic military capabilities, with a focus on the Arctic. Among the initiatives to be supported are joint support ships, an undersea monitoring and surveillance system, Arctic over-the-horizon radar and long-range artillery.

In addition, the Department of National Defence is requesting \$834 million for procurements such as defence equipment, personal gear, technology, infrastructure maintenance and essential services. This funding would also support modernization of range and training infrastructure and the expansion of ammunition infrastructure, as well as preventive and corrective maintenance on the department's real property portfolio.

● (1840)

Finally, Communications Security Establishment Canada and National Defence are partnering on a request for \$550 million. This would bolster Canada's cyber-capabilities, support greater interoperability with our allies, better equip Canada to counter the full spectrum of cyber-threats, and enhance network infrastructure, information management, connectivity and data storage.

As parliamentarians, our job of exercising oversight on Government of Canada spending is one of the most important roles we play on behalf of all Canadians. It is crucial to maintaining trust in government, the proper functioning of our government and the integrity of our parliamentary democracy.

The Government of Canada is committed to delivering essential services to Canadians and to helping the country meet the challenges and the opportunities that lie before us. I encourage all members to authorize the spending outlined in these estimates and to help Canada move forward, strong and free.

Before I accept questions from members, I will warn them my wife is in the gallery and my parents are watching.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): I have to remind the hon. member that we cannot recognize people outside of the chamber, but he is new here so we will give him a little break.

The hon. member for Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke.

Cheryl Gallant (Algonquin—Renfrew—Pembroke, CPC): Madam Speaker, with the allocations towards National Defence, what increase in salary can the members of the Canadian Armed Forces look forward to and, specifically, what type of equipment can they look forward to receiving and learning how to train on?

Tom Osborne: Madam Speaker, the Prime Minister and our government are committed to ensuring that our Canadian Forces, the men and women who serve in our Canadian Forces, are paid appropriately, that they have the health care and health insurance they require both during their service and post-service, and that they have the equipment to properly protect Canada.

[Translation]

Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for his scholarly presentation. I would also like to take this opportunity to greet his family members, who are here on the Hill today.

At the end of his speech, my colleague said something very important. He said that it is important to study the estimates, because it is the role of Parliament and, by extension, that of the opposition, to serve as a check on the government and its spending.

After what my colleague just said, I wonder if he feels uncomfortable being part of a government that introduced Bill C-5, which is not even split up and in which the government, with the help of the Conservatives, is taking away the ability of Parliament and committees to exercise oversight and conduct a detailed analysis of such a substantial bill. How can they not be uncomfortable saying such a thing about the estimates and doing something completely different for everything else, under the pretext that one line in the Liberal election platform mentioned what is in Bill C-5?

I would like my colleague to tell me about the feelings and emotions he experiences when he tells us contradictory things like that.

• (1845)

[English]

Tom Osborne: Madam Speaker, today we need decisive and deliberate action, and one Canadian economy is that action. The Prime Minister and our government are focused and have accomplished a great deal, since we formed government just a couple of months ago, to ensure that we tear down barriers and build up the Canadian economy. That is what is important here today.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I am actually quite encouraged. Individuals

Business of Supply

watching this debate will get a better sense of the new Prime Minister and the new administration. The member who just spoke amplifies why we see a new administration. From what I understand, the member brings us his talents from being a former minister of finance in Newfoundland and a parliamentarian for many years who has articulated well on a number of different issues.

I want to continue with two aspects of a question. The Prime Minister brought in a significant tax break in four or five weeks. He committed up to 2% of the GDP for the Canadian Forces, and we have legislation before us, which is going to pass on Friday, to build one Canadian economy.

Can the member provide his thoughts in regard to how the new Prime Minister and administration are working hard for Canadians?

Tom Osborne: Madam Speaker, I think that is the best question so far tonight. We have an increase in health care spending. We have an increase in spending for seniors. There is the tax cut that the member talked about, making homes more affordable for first-time buyers and for Canadians. The one Canadian economy would tear down barriers and build up the economy across the country.

We have almost 22 million Canadians who would see a benefit with the tax break. Not only are we making life more affordable, but we are creating the economic conditions to strengthen our economy.

Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong, CPC): Madam Speaker, I thank the member opposite for outlining the spending. I believe he said that \$2.1 billion would be spent for the men and women in uniform, on items such as equipment and recruiting. I was happy to hear this.

I know the Prime Minister announced \$4.3 billion for Ukraine, additionally, today, on top of the \$25 billion that we already spent. I have heard concerns that people in the Canadian military are having to buy their own boots and equipment. Can the member tell me if the \$2.1 billion is going to fix that problem?

Tom Osborne: Madam Speaker, the \$2.1 billion is part of a larger spending package, as I outlined in my remarks tonight, for the Canadian Armed Forces. There are a number of areas, which I outlined in my remarks tonight, where we are investing in the Canadian Armed Forces with increased spending to ensure that they have the equipment, that they have the respect and that we actually recruit people to the Canadian Armed Forces and they see it as a rewarding career. We want to ensure that we, as parliamentarians, as a government and as a country, ensure that it is a rewarding career, and that, after service, they have the supports that they require.

Business of Supply

[Translation]

Bienvenu-Olivier Ntumba (Mont-Saint-Bruno—L'Acadie, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask my colleague a question. Can he tell us more about how the building Canada strong plan will help families access home ownership?

● (1850)

[English]

Tom Osborne: Madam Speaker, the Prime Minister and our government, during the election campaign, committed to build up to 500,000 homes a year, to make homes more affordable for Canadians across the country, to bring down prices because of supply and demand, and to ensure that homes become more affordable for Canadians.

We have talked about premanufactured homes as part of that. I know the government has talked about using surplus government properties to create housing. There are a number of ways that we are able to approach making housing more accessible and more affordable for Canadians.

Jennifer McKelvie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I was wondering if the member could outline some of the measures that would help with affordability, especially for families. We heard loud and clear, during the last election, that this was an important issue, and I am sure that is reflected in this budget.

Maybe he could summarize some of those measures for us.

Tom Osborne: Madam Speaker, the tax cut would provide about \$800 per working couple or family, making homes more affordable for first-time homebuyers, strengthening the economy and lowering the cost of products and services by breaking down barriers across the country and making products more accessible to Canadians. It would also create jobs because of Canadian-made and Canadian-supplied products being more accessible across the country, due to having one Canadian economy as opposed to 13.

[Translation]

Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski—La Matapédia, BQ): Madam Speaker, the government has not increased graduate scholarships by a single cent in 20 years. We were told that it was not a priority. Now the government has a new argument. It is saying that it will follow through on what it said during the election campaign. The Liberals told us that they would invest in science, research and innovation.

I would like my colleague to clarify the following point today. Will there be indexation of graduate scholarships, which, I would remind members, were not increased by a single cent between 2000 and 2024?

[English]

Tom Osborne: Madam Speaker, I am not ashamed to admit when I do not have an answer to a question; we can get that answer for the hon. member in due course.

What I will say is that the Liberals will provide opportunities for graduating students throughout the country by increasing employment, by building the economy and making it stronger, and by pro-

viding the opportunities to keep Canadians at home in Canada to help strengthen our Canadian economy and build our populations.

David Bexte (Bow River, CPC): Madam Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Miramichi—Grand Lake.

I rise today to speak for the people the Liberal government has forgotten or maybe never understood to begin with: the people who make this country run. They are up before the sun, coffee in hand, long before the world starts moving. They drive into town for feed, parts and mail. There is no home delivery here. They are starting a frozen tractor at -20°C to feed cattle that we depend on as much as the cattle depend on us. They are planting the first seeds of spring, carrying the quiet hope of harvest months away. They are checking cows in the dead of night, calving by flashlight and welcoming new life into a hard world.

Then there is harvest, the golden hour. Farmers use a combine just before sunset, when the beauty hides the urgency, the sweat and the push to beat the frost. It is not just in the fields. It is someone crawling under a frozen truck to fix a brake line, welding pipe in a -30°C wind or scaling a rig tank in the dark, soaked in grease and grit, because the world does not stop just because it is hard.

These people feed this country. They fuel the economy. They do the work that does not make headlines but keeps the lights on. They are farmers, ranchers, rig hands, truck drivers, mechanics, welders, electricians and diesel technicians. They are the kinds of people this country was built on and still depends on every single day.

These are not folks sitting on panels at the World Economic Forum. They do not fly business class to climate conferences. They do not pretend to save the world one virtue signal at a time. They get up before sunrise. They get their hands dirty. They produce something real. Today, those Canadians are under attack by a government that seems more interested in scolding them than serving them.

Let us talk about the EV mandate, this Trudeau-era fantasy still being pushed forward by the Liberals. Under this policy, the sale of new gas-powered vehicles will be banned by 2035. Starting in 2026, just months from now, manufacturers will be forced to meet EV sales quotas or pay penalties of up to \$20,000 per vehicle that does not comply with the mandate. Who pays for that? It will not be the Prime Minister; he does not even buy his own groceries. It will be working Canadians, the people who need their vehicles for work, not for show, and the people who drive F-350s, not Teslas.

Let me walk everyone through what that means on a farm. Grain elevators used to be 12 miles apart because that is how far a horse and wagon could travel in a day. Today, grain has to be trucked 30 miles, 60 miles, 100 miles or more because local rail lines have been torn up or left to rot. The only way to move that grain now is by truck and trailer, and not the kind that we plug into a wall outlet.

Let us look at some numbers: \$130,000 for a service truck, \$350,000 for a basic tractor, over \$1 million for a four-wheel-drive tractor, \$1.3 million for a combine, and these are just the base models. There is no electric replacement for that equipment, none. However, the government wants to regulate it out of existence. One regulation can make that entire fleet obsolete overnight. That is not policy; that is economic destruction.

Every part of life on the land depends on engine-driven machinery. That is what took farming from a family feeding a few dozen people to that same farmer today feeding hundreds of thousands. That is the scale we are talking about, and now the government wants to pretend we can swap out a diesel-powered combine for an electric toy with a three-hour charge time and pray it does not die before the frost hits.

Let me tell people something about real farming. We do not get to pause and recharge when it is -20°C and the cows need to be fed. We do not get a do-over if we miss the seeding window or cannot finish harvest before the first snow. We refuel in 10 minutes, not three hours, because out here, range anxiety is not an inconvenience; it is survival.

The Liberals will say not to worry because they will build a charging network. Really? They had better start fast because their own report says they will need 679,000 charging ports by 2040, and right now they have 30,000. They are already 95% behind schedule, and the policy has not even kicked in yet.

On top of that, we would need to double the grid capacity, a 30-year project at best estimates. What about cost? Natural Resources Canada says it will take over \$300 billion to prepare for this so-called gas-free future. That is roughly \$11,500 per vehicle on the road today, a hidden tax on every Canadian driver on top of the \$20,000 coercion fine.

• (1855)

While the government pushes its fantasy, EV sales are collapsing. After federal and Quebec subsidies were paused, EV registrations dropped by over 40% in early 2025. Auto trader and dealership groups have reported declining interest for years, while inventories pile up and sales slow down. What is the plan? It is to force EV quotas, slap \$20,000 on car companies and then pretend there is a consumer demand while prices skyrocket and unsold stock collects dust on the lot.

GM and Ford are begging the government to scrap the mandate. Toyota is warning that people do not want to buy what the Liberals are forcing them to buy. Even Europe, where green ideology runs deepest, is hitting the brakes. Germany and Italy are demanding carve-outs. Farmers are protesting by the thousands. In the United States, several states are already delaying or scaling back their mandates. However, in Canada, we are going full speed off the cliff because ideology matters more to the Prime Minister than the people who actually keep this country alive.

Let me be very clear and dispel a myth held by many of my Liberal friends across the aisle. I support innovation. I support energy alternatives, and I support real choice in the market. The agriculture and energy industries have been some of the earliest adopters of new technology: GPS-guided equipment operating down to the mil-

limetre; precision ag that conserves water, fertilizer and pesticide; daily satellite imaging to monitor field health; and automated drilling rigs powered by AI. However, that is only when it actually makes sense. I should know as I was in the middle of it. The people I am speaking about do not need government to force them into the future. They pull this technology into their businesses at the right time and in the right way, with no mandate, no federal handouts and no Liberal intervention required.

There is nothing green about wrecking Canadian agriculture. There is nothing progressive about taking away the tools that build this country, and there is nothing just about a transition that bankrupts farmers and truckers just to hit a government quota. This is not a climate plan. It is a “government knows best” plan, a central planning fantasy dreamed up by people who have never seen a -30°C morning or changed a set of hydraulic hoses in the dark.

We are witnessing a deliberate dismantling of the Canadian economy dressed up as environmental virtue, and I will not stand for it. I will fight this EV mandate. I will fight for the people who get up before dawn and keep working long after the sun goes down. I will fight for Alberta. I will fight for common sense, because if we lose this battle, if we let them take the diesel out of our fields, the gas out of our trucks and the independence out of our lives, we will not be a free country anymore. We will be an experiment. I did not come to this chamber to watch Canada become a failed one.

• (1900)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the member's speech is just wrong. It is factually incorrect. We have heard from the far right of the Conservative element. Where in the EV mandate does it talk about tractors? Where in the EV mandate does it talk about heavy trucks?

I love farmers too. I grew up on the Prairies in Alberta, Saskatchewan and in the province of Manitoba. When I was in Alberta, it was more during the time I was in the military. However, the point is that the member does not know what he is talking about. The EV mandate does not apply to tractors.

Can the member indicate where he got his source from that shows it would apply to tractors and heavy-duty trucks?

Business of Supply

David Bexte: Madam Speaker, I appreciate the member opposite's comments because the last time he had a question for me, he acknowledged I was right, so I really thought that was good. In this case, he thinks I am far-right, farther right or more right.

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

David Bexte: I am fantastically proud. I love it.

Madam Speaker, getting back to the subject, I would say this is a first step. We have seen this game play out before, time and time again. I know it is gas vehicles today, but all internal combustion engine-derived equipment is on the block, and it is just a matter of time.

Connie Cody (Cambridge, CPC): Madam Speaker, you raised important points about how the Liberal gas ban would impact farmers and rural communities. I keep thinking back to the blackout in Alberta earlier this year, where people were told to turn off the lights, lower thermostats and avoid using appliances right in the middle of winter.

Are your constituents worried that forcing everyone onto the electrical grid will make things worse, not better? What are you hearing from people about the reliability risk of this rushed transition?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): I cannot answer the hon. member. The hon. member has to pass the question through the Chair so that I can direct it.

The hon. member for Bow River.

David Bexte: Madam Speaker, I appreciate your indulgences in a new House with new members who are just learning the ropes.

We talked about range anxiety with EVs a lot in the debate, but grid anxiety is something that is emerging. Blackouts all over the world, not just in Alberta and western Canada, are showing that the combination of different input sources to electricity are not balanced, and we have not quite gotten that figured out yet. If we just add more and more demand to the grid, we know, by projections, that the grid will be 50% too small for any projected use. It is a 30-year project at least to get the grid up to some sort of scale that will handle the load that is anticipated by this. There is a lot of grid anxiety.

[Translation]

Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Madam Speaker, I want to say hello to my colleague and wish him a good evening. It could be a long night.

I understand from my colleague that he had a good career in the energy sector and in the business world and that he has now been elected as a Conservative member of Parliament. This is his first term.

Since taking office, since we have been sitting, he voted with the Liberals last week to steal \$814 million from Quebeckers. This week, he voted with the Liberals to support a gag order, and then to support a gag order on the gag order to short-circuit the work of Parliament.

I would like to know whether, as a new member, he was expecting to vote with the Liberals so often and whether that surprises him.

● (1905)

[English]

David Bexte: Madam Speaker, I thank the member for the comments and for taking the time to respond. Actually, I expected that the Liberals would not have copied so much of the Conservative platform. It is all a question of half measures, but we are the party of building, we are the party of cutting taxes and we will not hold up tax cuts. It is a pleasure that the Liberals are supporting the Conservative platform. We wish they would finally just go all the way and go all in with no half measures.

Mike Dawson (Miramichi—Grand Lake, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is always a pleasure to stand and speak in the people's House. In my riding of Miramichi—Grand Lake, we have great people, folks who do not ask for much from the government except to defend our borders, protect our streets and then kindly get out of the way. Now we have a Liberal government trying to tell us what kind of car we can drive.

The government's plan to ban the sale of gas-powered vehicles by 2035 is not just out of touch; it is out to lunch. This is the kind of thing someone dreams up after a latte in a downtown Toronto espresso bar, not after a hard winter on the Plaster Rock-Renous Highway. This is the plan of an urban elite who are blind to the hard facts of geography, weather, industry and the dignity of hard work borne by everyday Canadians who work hard for a living.

Let me put it plainly: Where I come from, a truck is not a toy. It is not a fashion statement, and it is not a mobility solution, as one Liberal minister so helpfully called it. It is a lifeline. It hauls the lumber, tows the boat and plows the driveway. It gets people's kids to hockey and their parents to the doctor. One cannot strap 10 sheets of drywall to the roof of a hatchback and call it progress. Unless someone has figured out how to get 500 kilometres out of a battery in -30°C with no charger in sight, I suggest the Liberals stop trying to reinvent the wheel. Any path to a cleaner-energy future must proceed at the pace of possibility, not ideology.

The Prime Minister says he is all about progress. Well, let me tell people something about progress. Progress is not forcing a single mom in Blackville to buy a \$70,000 electric car she cannot charge and does not want. Progress is not replacing the family mechanic with a government-approved software update technician. Progress is not shutting down the dealerships, the mechanics and the supply chains that keep rural Canada moving. If the government wants to build electric vehicles, that is fine, but it does not have to kill the combustion engine upon which our modern society depends.

Let us remember that freedom is not about the right to vote; it is about the right to choose. Let us be real here: This is not about the environment. If this were about the environment, we would instead be debating a national charging network and a plan to build more reliable charging stations. If this were about the environment, we would be talking about grid resilience, rural access, battery disposal and the cost, both present and future, of electricity.

Does the government have a plan where everyone in New Brunswick plugs their Liberal-mandated vehicles in at 6 p.m. in January? In Miramichi, our power flickers when the next-door neighbour turns the microwave on during the evening news. Our electrical infrastructure can barely stay ahead of current demand. What do the Liberals decide to do? Let us burn out the grid. Let us double electricity bills. Let us crash the system and blame it on the provinces.

We know the Liberal government prefers Canadians to stay at home. We saw it during the pandemic, and we see it today in the federal civil service, still on Zoom, still on mute, still on break. Maybe that is the plan. Maybe the Liberals do not want people to drive at all. Maybe they do not want them to leave their homes or go to work or take their kids to the rink. Maybe they want Canadians to be at home, dependent, plugged in and powerless because the government has slogans, not solutions.

Now, let me be clear about one thing: The government has a strategy. Just one month ago, in the middle of the federal election, the Liberals' promise was that they were going to pretend they were Conservatives and axe the carbon tax. That is what Canadians heard. What Canadians did not hear and what the Liberals did not say was that their real plan was to replace the tax with something even worse. They did not say they wanted to ban the very vehicles Canadians use to work, raise their families and live their lives.

This was not a change of heart; it was a sleight of hand. The Prime Minister did not kill the carbon tax; he replaced it with something even worse, a carbon ban. He figured, why bother taxing the gas in people's trucks when he can just make sure they are never allowed to own one? The Liberals did not ban carbon pricing because they changed their minds. The Liberals abandoned it because they were blaming the very thing they used to tax. How very Liberal of them. They do not need to tax gas when their plan is to outlaw the engine that burns it.

The only thing this plan is guaranteed to reduce is freedom, people's freedom to choose what they drive and to work where they want, live where they want and drive what suits their family and their job. It is typical Liberal government overreach, plain and simple, and here is the kicker: Hard-working New Brunswickers are not going to trade in a sturdy, reliable, rustproof pickup truck for a plastic pop can on wheels because some deputy minister in Ottawa wearing a turtleneck said so.

● (1910)

People in Miramichi—Grand Lake do not take kindly to being told they are backwards just because they know how to run a chainsaw and change their own oil, and they sure do not want to be lectured by a Prime Minister who spent 10 years sipping champagne at the Bank of England. This plan is a slap in the face to rural Canada. This is a slap in the face to every tradesman, farmer, hunter and

Business of Supply

contractor in this country. This is one more example of the government thinking it knows better than the people it is supposed to serve. Let us not forget that once the government takes away people's ability to choose what they drive, it will not stop there. Today it is gas vehicles; tomorrow it is our furnaces, our wood stoves and maybe even our barbecues.

We cannot call it a choice when there is only one option on the shelf. This is not a plan about lowering emissions; it is about increasing control. It is not about saving the planet; it is about control. This is not about climate; it is about compliance.

The truth is that this ban will not save the environment, but it will make life harder, colder and more expensive for millions of Canadians. The people paying the highest price will not be the downtown elites or the Tesla crowd. It will be the diesel mechanics, the forestry workers, the young family in Doaktown trying to barely make ends meet.

Through you, Madam Speaker, I say this to the government: Back off. Scrap the ban. Let Canadians decide for themselves.

The Conservative Party does not fear the future; we believe in it. We believe in people, and we believe in choice. We know the best decisions do not come from Ottawa; they come from the ordinary Canadians who pay for and live with the consequences. The Conservative Party respects and has faith in the common sense of the people of Canada, because the only thing more dangerous than a government that wants to take away someone's truck is a government that thinks it knows better than the guy who drives it. If the Prime Minister wants to take away our pickup trucks, he had better bring himself a convoy.

[Translation]

Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Madam Speaker, I listened carefully to the speech by our colleague, who spoke about the opposition motion, which we have now finished debating. I would ask him whether he has anything to say about the main estimates, since that is what we are looking at now.

I realize that, as part of the study of the main estimates and the supplementary estimates, we can talk about various subjects, but I have not heard much about the budget here.

I would like my colleague to talk about spending.

*Business of Supply**[English]*

Mike Dawson: Madam Speaker, it goes back to the same old failed policies of the former minister who brought these problems to us in the first place. I cannot say much more than that: a failed minister on the other side who is still a minister and will make more mistakes in the next four years.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, one can get fairly depressed listening to the member opposite with the picture he tries to paint. It reminds me of Pierre Poilievre going all over Canada saying that Canada is broken.

We can look at the number of initiatives taken on this debate now before the House, whether it is the tax cut for Canadians, the first-time homebuyer GST elimination or, for the first time, seeing 2% of the GDP go to the Canadian Forces. I would ask the member if he has anything to say about those initiatives. They are the initiatives we are debating this evening.

• (1915)

Mike Dawson: Madam Speaker, for the last four weeks, I think, this side of the House has been listening to the member opposite get up, pat himself on the back and puff his chest out about all the good things the government has done. Well, the doom and gloom on this side of the House is coming from the doom and gloom from all the Canadians we spoke to, at every door we knocked on, about the last 10 years of the failed government that seemed to sneak its way in to get another mandate. The doom and gloom is on the other side, from everything the Liberals do and what they have done the last 10 years.

[Translation]

Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Madam Speaker, my colleague is once again talking to us about the opposition motion. I am looking at the orders of the day. We have reached the debate on the main estimates. It is hard to tell whether my colleague knows where we are on the agenda.

I will ask a very simple questions. Can my colleague tell us what the main estimates and the supplementary estimates are?

[English]

Mike Dawson: Madam Speaker, the mandate was brought forward by the previous minister. We are talking about the estimates, and I had just started speaking about the \$40,000 it is going to cost each person who buys a new vehicle moving forward.

Marc Dalton (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, CPC): Madam Speaker, it is mind-boggling what the Liberals are doing with this EV mandate and the impact it is going to have on Canadians. I am thinking specifically of British Columbia. I represent a riding in the greater Vancouver area.

Electric vehicles run on electricity, and the fact of the matter is—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Marc Dalton: Yes, the Liberals can clap, but they are not considering the impact on the grid and the demand they will have for producing electricity. B.C. used to produce and export, but now it is importing. The new Site C dam was completed last year, and we

saw an 8% increase in the electrical grid, but we need two more of these dams by 2030 just to meet the increases, and a lot of it has to do with the EV mandate. We are just not ready for this.

The Liberals are charging ahead without thought, because they are saying it is in the name of the environment. In the name of the environment, they are causing a lot of problems. I will also say that there was a lot of push-back from the environmental sector when putting these dams forward. Could the member comment?

Mike Dawson: Madam Speaker, I am not sure what happens in B.C., but I know New Brunswick is definitely not ready for EVs at 100%. During the winter, our electrical grid is stressed to the max at all times. If we get two centimetres of snow, we have power outages for days.

[Translation]

Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Madam Speaker, I would like to wish you a good evening. It may be a long night for you as well.

Since this may be my last speech before the House adjourns in the next few days, I would like to take this opportunity to wish everyone in my riding a very happy Saint-Jean-Baptiste Day and national holiday. We are going to celebrate in style. We are going to celebrate our national holiday, our French-speaking nation in Quebec. We will be celebrating from Saint-Placide, Kanesatake and Oka to Saint-Joseph-du-Lac. We will be celebrating in Sainte-Marthe-sur-le-Lac and in all areas of Mirabel, as well as in Saint-Eustache. There is a new part of my riding in Saint-Eustache, and I fully intend to get involved there. I would like to tell all my constituents that I look forward to seeing them. Once the House adjourns in this very troubling democratic context, I cannot wait to spend time on the ground visiting the people who elected me. I am really looking forward to it.

I began my speech this way because we need to find moments of joy in the House. We need to find them because what is happening in the House is sad. The business of supply is sad. The situation is sad, and what is even sadder is that I forgot to say that I will be sharing my time with the member for Berthier—Maskinongé. Sharing my time with my adored whip is another moment of joy. We need to find these little moments. This is one of them. The business of supply is very sad.

It is hard to get the truth out of ministers and the government. I will give one example that I referred to when I asked a question earlier. The Minister of Finance is not supposed to be a door-to-door vacuum salesman. He is the Minister of Finance.

Business of Supply

We spoke to him on Thursday about how he had run out of funds for subsidies under the incentives for zero-emission vehicles program. We talked to him about how he had made a promise to car dealers in Quebec and about how they had advanced 70% of the money owed by the federal government out of their own pockets. We asked the minister whether he intended to keep his promise and fund the missing subsidies. The minister, who never answers a question, floundered. He did not answer. He was all over the place. In the end, he never did answer the question.

Today, we put the question back to the Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, whom we love because he puts on a very good show. We asked him whether the government intends to pay back the dealerships the money they are owed, given that they are small businesses. There are some in my constituency, and people have been talking to me about it. The parliamentary secretary congratulated me. He told me to keep lobbying in the corridors and that I would get there eventually.

Twenty minutes later, I read a newspaper article saying that the minister had announced that the program would be reinstated. However, the funding is still not there. With the Liberals, we have to see the money to believe it. However, at least there has been an announcement. It is not easy getting honesty and truth out of the Liberals. Frankly, the conclusion we have come to from studying the appropriations is that the government makes decisions on a whim. The Liberals do not know what they are going to announce from one week to the next. There might be good news on the military spending front. We do not even know if they came up with that the day before, the day before that, or three days prior. We do not know.

The same applies to reimbursing Quebecers for the rebate on the carbon tax that the eight other provinces did not pay. During the election campaign, the Liberals said that they would abolish the carbon tax while giving an advance rebate to provinces where the tax had not been collected. During the consideration of the business of supply, we told the Minister of Finance that he owed Quebecers \$814 million. We asked him many times to confirm that these cheques had been sent out before the tax was collected. We asked him once, twice, three times, four times, but the minister refused to answer. That is clear proof of the strange relationship he has with the truth, to say the least.

Yesterday, the Parliamentary Budget Officer, Mr. Giroux, was in the Senate. According to the Senate committee blues, Mr. Giroux said, "The Canadian carbon rebate, or CCR, is an advance payment to offset what people will pay for the carbon tax. Since the rebate was paid in April, but the carbon tax is no longer being collected, the money will come from the consolidated revenue because there will no longer be a fuel tax rebate or surcharge. The money will come from the consolidated revenue fund."

It will therefore come out of the consolidated revenue fund, and Quebecers will pay for it. That is what the Parliamentary Budget Officer said yesterday in the Senate. Senator Forest asked again if everyone would pay, then, including Quebecers. Mr. Giroux, the Parliamentary Budget Officer, answered that that was exactly right.

● (1920)

The Parliamentary Budget Officer would make a good finance minister, because he knows what he is talking about, he tells us the truth and he says things clearly. The corollary to what was said yesterday at the Standing Senate Committee on National Finance is that Quebecers paid for the Liberals to buy votes. The Liberals bought votes. They handed out rebate cheques. However, it was not a rebate, because if something was not paid, then it cannot be rebated. Quebecers were robbed, and they need to be reimbursed. That is how the business of supply works. We moved a motion, and the Conservatives joined forces with the Liberals to steal from Quebecers.

Earlier, the Conservative member for Bow River said that the Conservatives were going to vote with the Liberals and that they never expected the Liberals to steal so many of their ideas. They are not stealing ideas, but they are stealing from Quebecers. Where in the Liberal platform did it say that Quebecers would be robbed? Where in the Conservative platform did it say that they were going to steal \$814 million from Quebecers? I am being told that the Liberals stole this idea from the Conservative platform. It is this murky relationship with the truth that is preventing us from carrying out the business of supply properly.

That is to say nothing of the government's Bill C-4, which will pass with little or no study. The Liberals say it is urgent because people need the tax cut immediately. The notice of ways and means motion means that people are already entitled to the tax cut. It is now in effect. We have all the time we need to properly study the bill and invite witnesses to appear before the committee, particularly with regard to the housing measures, about which we have technical questions to ask. The tax cut is already in effect. In this case, the Liberals and the Conservatives have an unhealthy relationship with the truth.

The same goes for Bill C-5, which should have been split in two. In that case, the ministers will not be lying in committee because they will not be appearing before the committee. We know that there is a cult of personality among the Liberals. The Liberals could almost have a Mao-Zedong-style poster of the Prime Minister and everyone would prostrate themselves before him. It is a cult of personality.

The Prime Minister appoints the minister he wants and the minister can select the projects. After that, he can do bogus assessments. When he adds his project in a schedule and to a list, all the legislation that might have been able to protect the public, the environment and the ecosystems are suspended. The Liberals tell us that is what we are going to do to build Canada strong. They need to stop saying that. When the pipeline is built, Donald Trump will no longer have been in power for six or seven years. This gives certain companies incredible lobbying power over the minister. This gives the Prime Minister discretionary power. The Liberals are telling us that no minister will be appearing before the committee. The Liberal ministers are too busy to come testify.

Business of Supply

Although they support the bill, and we understand why, the Conservatives are voting to muzzle Parliament. The new trend among Liberals is to tell us that everything was in their election platform and that replaces the work normally done by legislators. Was it written in their election platform? Where in the Liberal election platform did it say that the platform would replace legislators if the Liberals were elected, even as a minority?

The problem in all this is that we have a Prime Minister who fails to grasp that he is the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister thinks he is a CEO. He thinks he can show contempt for the House. He thinks he can show contempt for our work. He thinks he can show contempt for our committees. He thinks he is a CEO, but fortunately, he is only a minority shareholder. His party does not have a majority of seats. Do people realize that this gentleman is behaving like the majority shareholder of Canada, like the CEO of Canada? I want to look the Conservatives in the eye and tell them that they should be ashamed to hand him such power.

No budget was tabled. The Liberals' fiscal framework was flawed and incompetently put together. The government budgeted an expected \$20 billion in revenues from retaliatory tariffs. That amount currently stands at \$1.6 billion. Obviously, we are not going to get to \$20 billion. The tax cuts were supposed to be paid from that amount. This framework was in the Liberals' election platform. Why is no budget being tabled? Why is that no substitute for legislators?

That is the problem. The problem is that we are unable to do our job as parliamentarians because neither the government nor the ministers give us the sort of respect we need to do our job. That is upsetting. It is also upsetting to see the Conservatives supporting this process.

• (1925)

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the member asked where the platform made any reference to Bill C-5. I recommend that the member opposite read page 1. Page 1 captures the essence of what the Liberal Party talked about throughout the election: one Canadian economy. Bill C-5 is about having one Canadian economy. Why did the Prime Minister meet with all the premiers, the first ministers? It was to talk about having one Canadian economy.

We had an election on April 28, and the mandate was followed by meetings and legislation. Only the Bloc and some of the independents are saying no. The Conservatives and the Liberals are respecting the election outcome of April 28. Why will the Bloc not respect it?

• (1930)

[Translation]

Jean-Denis Garon: Madam Chair, my colleague does not seem to have understood my speech, even though we have excellent interpreters with us. Actually, it seems he did not listen to my speech.

Here is what I asked: Where in the Liberal election platform does it say that a sentence on the front page replaces the will of the legislator and the work done in committee? I did not get an answer to

that. Our colleague rises and says that we are the only ones against this bill.

What we want is to study this bill, call witnesses and accomplish our parliamentary work. As I said, I know that the Conservatives support this bill. I know that we think differently on the matter, and I respect that. What I respect less is the fact that they are undermining parliamentary work that might lead us to pass a better version of the bill. That seems to be having trouble getting through the parliamentary secretary's head.

Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC): Madam Speaker, as I listened to my colleague's speech, I noted that he began by wishing everyone a happy Saint-Jean-Baptiste Day. I want to point out that this holiday is celebrated by French Canadians across the country. I, too, want to wish a happy Saint-Jean-Baptiste Day to my Franco-Albertan constituents, since people in Quebec are not the only ones who celebrate this day.

That being said, I have a question for my colleague: Why does he think that the Liberals are so afraid of being transparent and accountable to Parliament?

Jean-Denis Garon: Madam Speaker, my colleague from Fort McMurray—Cold Lake is someone I really enjoyed working with. We are far from agreeing on everything, but she is always very easy to work with. I must remind her that in Quebec, we are obviously celebrating our national holiday, which, coincidentally, falls on Saint-Jean-Baptiste Day. We wish a happy Saint-Jean-Baptiste Day to all francophones in Canada.

The Liberal government is worn out, and to claim that it is new is untrue. It has been around for around 10 years. I will be very direct and honest with my colleague: The Conservatives' job is to monitor this government. However, only three weeks in, the Conservatives voted in favour of a closure motion. They also voted for closure on the closure. It is like a bad movie: boring and lacking suspense. The Conservatives also voted against a motion about stealing money from Quebecers.

I am not the one to ask why the Liberals are afraid of transparency. She should ask her own party. She should also ask her party leadership why they are not doing their job as the official opposition and why a party with only 22 seats needs to do it for them.

[English]

Tom Osborne (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the hon. member is a great orator. I enjoy listening to him. I am going to learn French, and I commit to that so that I can listen to him without an interpreter.

The Conservatives say we are not going far enough with oil and gas, and the Bloc is saying we are going too far with oil and gas. We are trying to build up the Canadian economy.

The hon. member just said this is a tired, old government. We have a new Prime Minister, and we have been criticized in the House for going back and changing some of the decisions the previous administration made. Does the member agree with the new decisions and new direction this government is taking? Canadians voted for it.

[Translation]

Jean-Denis Garon: Madam Speaker, you can put a new label on a jar of expired peanut butter, but it is still the same old stuff in the jar. Members need to stop telling me that this is a new government.

We have not talked about oil per se. I talked about environmental regulations because it seems to me that, for the Conservatives and the Liberals today, environmental regulations are only good when they do not do their job and when they let everything go through. We are questioning the processes by which projects are approved and the fact that many laws that are very important to protecting Canadians can be suspended.

We are calling for a committee. My colleague will see in committee whether we oppose everything.

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Madam Speaker, in the last Parliament, we saw the NDP vote with the Liberals to adopt one closure motion after another. Then we saw what happened in the last general election.

Does my colleague think that the Liberals are playing the same game with the Conservatives as they did with the NDP, by forcing them to vote with them to adopt one closure motion after another?

Are the Conservatives not shooting themselves in the foot by doing that?

• (1935)

Jean-Denis Garon: Madam Speaker, what the Conservatives are doing is incomprehensible. They are telling us that the Liberals are stealing their ideas, so we are proposing that they study the bill in committee. The Conservative position in the debate is that the Liberals are not going far enough. They have an opportunity to improve Bill C-5 and have even more of their ideas stolen, but they are passing it up.

I think they will pay for it one day.

Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Madam Speaker, it is an honour to rise in the House.

Like my colleague from Mirabel, I too will take this opportunity to wish all the residents of my magnificent riding of Berthier—Maskinongé a very happy national holiday. I am pleased because my colleague and I are often in ideological symbiosis. I, too, made the decision to prioritize the new sector in my riding. First, I will visit the people of Saint-Sulpice and, of course, everyone else, everyone we can go and meet in the short time we have to cover our vast territory.

That said, today we are debating the main estimates and the supplementary estimates. We are glad to be here to talk about spending, state our case and give our opinion. However, we know that the main estimates and the supplementary estimates contain previously announced spending. This is not a new vision. The government is

Business of Supply

announcing spending adjustments and changes to budget items. Now that there is a new label on the peanut butter jar, meaning the new Prime Minister, we would have loved to know what the vision is and where we are going. We would have liked to make informed, intelligent and sensible decisions about the government's announced tax cuts. People at home are watching us. Ironically, the people at home make budgets. Normal people make budgets. Before they spend anything, they need to plan and know where the money is coming from. People who do not make a budget hit a wall and often have to declare bankruptcy. We hope that does not happen with the government. I repeat: We are running out of time; there are only a few days left, but it would have been a good idea to produce a budget. In the absence of one, we will talk about the main estimates and the supplementary estimates.

I have to say that I am quite supportive of increasing spending in the military sector, in the defence sector. In the last Parliament, it was rather ironic because we usually ended up being the only political party advocating compliance with NATO's request to allocate 2% of the budget to defence. I say it is ironic because we are often asked what we are doing here, since we want independence for Quebec, and we are told that we are here to cause trouble.

This shows that the Bloc Québécois is usually the adult in the room, or the reasonable one. We are the ones who continue to demand a budget, despite the fact that the Conservatives have let us down in the fight. They decided to cave to the government, which is asking us to shut our eyes and vote without knowing what will happen. We are still here, and we are the ones who were here when it was time to talk about foreign interference. We were the ones who were here when the time came to talk about military spending. For that reason, I am pleasantly almost surprised to see these new intentions, because in the world we live in, they are unfortunately necessary.

It needs to be done intelligently. It needs to be done with an eye to the future. The estimates mention increasing recruitment and providing equipment. There is a bit of a concern that the government seems to want to focus on small, quick expenditures in order to make the budget look good. Perhaps it needs to include some long-term vision, like properly equipping the people who defend us. That doubt crept up when I read the documents. Nevertheless, I will not say that we disagree on the principles.

Business of Supply

What we are surprised to see in the main estimates is the increase in spending. It is unfortunate that people are not always there; I did not name anyone, so I can say that broadly speaking. They are not always there to listen to our speeches, but sometimes they say things to us, and we would like to be able to respond. They often tell us that they said it during the election, that it is written in their platform, and that we should go read page 1. However, during the campaign they keep talking about, some people said they were going to keep spending increases to 2%. That is what they told us. Now it is 8%. That is not reassuring. Going from 2% to 8% is a fourfold increase. I hope that every little thing will not quadruple all the time, or else things will not balance out at the end of the month. That is why we are calling for a budget. It is so we can know where we are going.

• (1940)

What is sadder still is that the government is making cuts to certain areas. In fact, spending is increasing almost all the time, except at the Canada Revenue Agency, and I did not quite understand why. What is going on? Are we no longer collecting taxes? It seems to me that there are many places where we could invest, including in research to legislate tax havens. However, I do not think the peanut butter label is very interested in us digging into that area. Perhaps it is because, on the back of the label, there are a few investments in foreign countries to save on taxes. I am not saying that anyone has done anything illegal, but when people like that lecture others and then tell us that it is a pension fund when we ask them whether it is moral, I find it hard not to be shocked. We are told that the fund is more profitable because it has not paid taxes, but when money goes to the old folks, they have to pay taxes. What I hear when they say that is that the people, the masses, will pay taxes, while the people at the top do not have to pay because they are planning a better future for us. I find that incredibly sad. However, that is an answer we got. It raises questions about the rest of the shares.

I just mentioned our seniors, and among the areas that have seen the smallest increase are transfers to individuals. The government has decent control over that. That is one area where the government has been able to tighten its belt. The increases do not come as quickly, and that is because these are ordinary people who do not have much lobbying power or influence. That is how it works. Transfers to the provinces and Quebec are not increasing much either. The government is keeping a tight rein on that, too. It has control over spending. It is a good government. However, when it comes to contracts for subcontractors, contracts signed with cronies, that is where spending is increasing exponentially. I could name a dozen scandals. How can we expect the public not to be disillusioned with numbers like that? The sad thing is that not everyone knows what I am talking about. I am not making this up; it comes from the main estimates. These are the numbers we were given.

First, I would like them to be serious and to prepare a budget, and I would like to see serious investments in the future. I have been the agriculture and agri-food critic since 2019, and I am extremely passionate about it. I cannot help talking about it in every speech, so now is the time to talk about it today. I would like to see more spending in this area. I have said it a few times already, but I will say it again today: 0.81% of the budget is allocated to agricul-

ture and agri-food. That is not a lot of money. There was a time when it was much more than that. It was 2.6% in the 1980s and 1990s. If we can allocate 2% of the budget to defence, which is something that I agree with, would it not be a good idea for our military to be fed before defending us? If so, we should be able to spend at least 1% or 1.5% of the budget on agriculture and agri-food and on the people who feed us. We should be able to take care of them properly. We need to stop having bad programs that merely compensate people. First of all, these programs only compensate half of the people who need it and then it takes two years for those who are eligible to actually get their compensation. Meanwhile, the government has the nerve to call them emergency programs. We had to pressure the minister for who knows how long to get a program like AgriRecovery. It makes no sense.

Rather than doing that, we should be focusing on innovation, technological improvement, and research and development. We need a bold approach. Most of all, we need to encourage our businesses to become more climate-resilient. These would be forward-looking policies, but this will require having leaders with a vision. I am not sure that we have that.

• (1945)

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Madam Speaker, in his speech, my colleague mentioned that he was concerned about our government's lack of clear direction.

However, as a new member, I can say that the direction has been very clear since the election campaign. Our platform is crystal clear. The first subsection of the platform, entitled "One Canadian Economy", talks about a plan to build the strongest economy in the G7, to create one Canadian economy, not 13, and to remove all barriers to internal trade. The second subsection talks about nation-building projects.

What is surprising about this? The direction we were going to take was written in black and white in our platform.

Yves Perron: Madam Speaker, I would like to welcome the new member of the House of Commons. I wish him a warm welcome to Parliament. He is very kind.

Unfortunately, I can see that he is a true Liberal, because he is able to tell me in two or three short, generic sentences that all of this was included in the Liberal platform. He said that the platform indicates that they are going to build a pipeline, that they are going to build Canada, build highways, mine, and do whatever else they want. In short, the platform says that they are going to build Canada.

Please. Let us be serious. Not everything they do is written on page one of their platform. They should stop repeating this nonsense.

Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong, CPC): Madam Speaker, the Liberals have continued to spend taxpayers' money without a plan or a budget. They are not following the rules of Parliament. This is unacceptable.

What does the member think about that?

Yves Perron: Madam Speaker, being the member that I am, I think it must be very hard to make speeches all day criticizing the government and then in the evening, before going to bed, supporting the government and voting with it. I do not know how the members of the official opposition do it.

I know another party that did that for several months, if not years. Its members criticized the terrible government that was making large corporations richer and, in the evening, they would rise and vote with the government. Today there are not as many members of that party in the House. I hope that the official opposition will learn something from that

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Madam Speaker, the Liberals are saying that since it is written in their platform, they are doing it. In their election platform, in their leader's speeches, during the leaders' debates and during the election campaign, they kept talking about seniors. They said that they would help seniors financially.

The Liberals are in the habit of stealing bits and pieces of every party's platform. In fact, their party is referred to as the chameleon party. It is not really the Liberal Party. They look for items in each platform to get themselves reelected every time.

The Liberals all but said in their election platform and during the election campaign that they would provide financial assistance for seniors. Is my colleague aware of anything that has been done to improve seniors' finances since the Prime Minister has been in office?

Yves Perron: Madam Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from Lac-Saint-Jean for his question.

He is absolutely right to raise this point. That is basically what I was trying to highlight in my response to the first question. The Liberals are very good at making generic speeches. They say they are going to help seniors but, in their minds, that might mean a small increase to the GIS for the poorest seniors, and it would be a very small increase because that costs less.

However, when we want to properly improve people's standard of living, when we want to build Quebec and Canada, we are told that \$3 billion a year is far too expensive to improve the standard of living for seniors, people we should respect.

At the same time, they spent \$6 billion before the holidays to scrap the tax on chips. That was not too expensive. They also spent billions of dollars refunding the carbon tax, even though people had not even paid it. They pulled that off by pilfering \$814 million of our money. That was not too expensive either.

They choose who they are going to give the money to. I find that shocking and shameful. I hope people will realize that.

• (1950)

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Madam Speaker, the member says that he wants to see specific actions. A specific action would be Bill C-2, which deals with borders. Specific actions would be dealing with giving a tax cut to Canadians, having one Canadian economy, meeting with the differ-

Business of Supply

ent premiers, and hosting a G7 summit. We have a very proactive, aggressive Prime Minister who believes in hard work, and we are seeing the results today.

I am wondering whether the member would not agree that this is actually action. That is more than words, and there are a lot more words and action to follow.

[Translation]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (Alexandra Mendès): The hon. member has 15 seconds to respond.

Yves Perron: Madam Speaker, it will be very short, so I will choose the best part of my response for the parliamentary secretary.

He is right to say that the Prime Minister is progressive. The parliamentary secretary said "aggressive".

I, too, find it a bit aggressive to force a vote on a bill in one week without giving the opposition parties the power to properly study and amend the bill to improve it for citizens.

That is what we have a problem with.

[English]

Sherry Romanado (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of National Defence, Lib.): Madam Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Richmond East—Steveston.

I rise today to speak about the main estimates, along with the supplementary estimates, for 2025-26. I would like to speak about a topic near and dear to my heart, our Canadian Armed Forces. For too long, we have not done our part in celebrating and sharing the stories of the brave men and women of the Canadian Armed Forces. We know that when a member serves, their family serves along with them. I know that to be true.

I would like to focus my remarks today on our new government's investments in national defence, and most importantly, the people on the defence team. Let us remember that estimates documents are more than just numbers on a page; they are a detailed blueprint of our government's planned spending for the fiscal year ahead. The planned investments in the main estimates and the supplementary estimates align with a broad range of priorities and address matters that are of significant concern to Canada, to Canadians and of course to the members of the Canadian Armed Forces.

[Translation]

Canada is a sovereign country. Our responsibility is to ensure that Canada remains strong. The Canadian Armed Forces are facing new challenges day after day.

*Business of Supply**[English]*

Our Canadian Armed Forces are on the front lines of our critical work at home, within the continent and around the world. At home, our forces deployed on Operation Lentus have most recently evacuated nearly 4,000 people from dangerous wildfires in northern Manitoba and Ontario. Within the continent, our forces deployed on Operation CARIBBE have seized 1,300 kilograms of illegal narcotics in the Caribbean Sea. Around the world, our forces deployed on Operation Reassurance are leading NATO's forward land forces in Latvia. Let us not forget our Canadian Armed Forces deployed on NORAD missions, who have the watch.

Let us talk numbers. In the main estimates, the Department of National Defence is requesting voted expenditures with a total of \$33.9 billion. Of this, \$12.3 billion is being processed to ensure the readiness of our armed forces, \$9.5 billion for military procurement and \$4.9 billion for sustainable bases, IT systems and infrastructure.

In the supplementary estimates (A), National Defence is requesting over \$9 billion. This includes \$2.5 billion for recruitment, retention and support programs for Canadian Armed Forces members; \$2 billion for defence research and development for the Canadian defence industry; and let us not forget an additional \$2 billion in military aid to Ukraine. The estimates provide critical funding as Canada enters an increasingly complex world and ever-changing threat environment. Taken together, the main estimates and the supplementary estimates mean that Canada will achieve NATO's 2% target this fiscal year.

• (1955)

[Translation]

This is not just an investment in our armed forces. It is an investment in well-paid jobs, Canadian innovation and economic growth.

Let us talk about the positive impacts that our investments will have across the country. There are already 300,000 jobs in the wider defence sector, and this investment will increase that number.

[English]

Our investments will help Canadian businesses lead, innovate and deliver, and help make Canada safe and strong for generations to come. The main estimates are a critical part of that practice, helping to ensure that every dollar spent serves the public good.

Many people in the chamber know that the Canadian Armed Forces members will do anything that is asked of them to support Canadians, to support our allies and to defend our values. I have spoken with many members across the way who have all said they support the brave men and women in uniform and their families. When it comes to the Canadian Armed Forces and our defence, I think we can all agree that these are non-partisan issues. I think we can all come together to support our troops.

I want to close my remarks by speaking to the members of the Canadian Armed Forces and the families that support them. I know full well the sacrifices they and their families make: the missed birthday parties, Christmas in November, the stress of frequent postings and the challenges of uprooting their family, including finding new day care, a family doctor and employment in a new

city. Just when their family settles down, it is time to move again or prepare for another deployment.

My military family is what motivated me to run for federal office. To the members of the Canadian Armed Forces and to their families, please know I am here for them. I see them. Together, we will continue to advocate for them always.

Hon. Wayne Long (Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me congratulate you on your new role; it looks very good on you up there.

I have a question for my friend and colleague with respect to our government's bold new agenda. Obviously we were recently re-elected, and I am very pleased to hear our Prime Minister commit to the 2% spending amount with NATO. I am wondering whether my friend could just comment on what that means for the armed forces in our country and what it means for our economy.

Sherry Romanado: Mr. Speaker, the reality is that we need to invest more in our Canadian Armed Forces. I have had the opportunity of visiting 12 bases and wings over the course of the last couple of years, and I see what the state of some of our military bases is.

We need to make sure that the men and women in uniform have the equipment they need and are able to focus on the job at hand, and to make sure their families are supported as well. With that, we also know there are significant funds we spend on procurement that are going outside the Canadian economy. We are going to focus on supporting the Canadian military industry.

Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am thankful to the member for her focus on our Canadian military. We truly are proud of it, and we want to support it in the best way as we can.

However, I am a bit curious. The member states that she wants to give the military the tools and the resources it needs to do its job, yet the Liberals cancelled the F-35 contract. At the very best, that is going to be a delay. How do you respond to that, with your passion to give it the tools it needs and then cancelling the contract for jets we desperately need?

The Deputy Speaker: Before I allow the parliamentary secretary to respond, I will remind the member that questions go through the Chair. I did not cancel contracts.

• (2000)

Sherry Romanado: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the F-35 replacement project, we have not cancelled the project; that is not correct. We are reviewing the purchase. We have committed to the first 16 we will be receiving in the next two years.

We will be looking at all expenditures from top to bottom across the government in terms of making sure we have the most appropriate spend for what we need. We have not cancelled it, and our plan is absolutely to replace the fighter jet fleet.

[Translation]

Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my colleague is a member from Quebec. She must know that, when the Parliamentary Budget Officer appeared before the Standing Committee on National Finance, he confirmed that during the election campaign, there were so-called carbon tax rebates in eight provinces on a tax that had not been collected. That is further proof that Quebecers were robbed of \$814 million.

I know that we never get a clear answer. However, I would like to ask my colleague if she trusts the Parliamentary Budget Officer or not.

Sherry Romanado: Mr. Speaker, as a proud Quebecker, I know that Quebec is a leader on the environment. It is Quebec that proposed the carbon pricing program.

I am very proud of the fact that Quebec is ahead of all the other provinces when it comes to the environment.

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my colleague just said that she has full confidence in the Government of Quebec. The Government of Quebec and all the other parties at the National Assembly, or all 125 elected members from Quebec, called for the reimbursement of \$814 million. Like the Parliamentary Budget Officer, they understood that we were robbed.

Since my colleague has confidence in the Government of Quebec, should she not have voted in favour of our motion, which sought to give Quebecers back their \$814 million?

Sherry Romanado: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, since Quebec has never contributed to the federal carbon tax system, it is only natural that it did not receive a rebate.

[English]

Parm Bains (Richmond East—Steveston, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is an honour to appear before the House today to talk about the main estimates, but I want to take a moment to thank my friend, who went before me. I share the respect she showed for our military and those who serve to protect the freedoms we enjoy. I thank her very much for that and her heartfelt speech.

Voted expenditures cover an extraordinarily wide range of programs and activities, including the Canadian Forces, health services for first nations, veterans' benefits and support for housing. In my speech today, I will be focusing on the Canadian dental care plan and the wonderful impact it has already had on the oral health of eligible Canadian residents across the country and of course in my hometown of Richmond, British Columbia.

With respect to the importance of health care, we all know that Canadians need accessible and affordable health care services. It is important that we recognize that dental care is health care. We know that regular visits to oral health professionals can help reduce the risk of a number of serious health issues, including cardiovascular disease and stroke. Helping catch health issues early on is im-

Business of Supply

portant to our own well-being and is also important on a much larger scale since it helps reduce the burden on our health care system. Unfortunately, too many Canadians have been going without regular oral health care. Studies have found that a third of Canadians do not have dental insurance and one in four has not been able to see an oral health provider because of the cost.

Canadians should not have to choose between paying their bills and getting the care they need. That is why, in December 2023, the Government of Canada launched one of the largest social programs in Canadian history, the Canadian dental care plan, also known as the CDCP.

The CDCP is a national plan being delivered in all provinces and territories. It is making the cost of oral health care more affordable for up to nine million Canadians who do not have access to dental insurance and who have an adjusted family net income of less than \$90,000 per year. The plan is making a wide range of oral health care services more affordable. The services include preventative care, such as scaling, as well as other services, such as exams, X-rays, fillings, dentures and root canal treatments. The CDCP also considers coverage for additional services and treatments, such as crowns, the initial placement of partial dentures and general anaesthesia through pre-authorization.

As members can imagine, launching one of the largest social programs in Canadian history was no easy task. To ensure a smooth onboarding process for eligible Canadians and providers alike, the CDCP was rolled out using a phased approach. The Government of Canada started its onboarding first with seniors in 2023, then adults with a valid disability tax credit certificate and children under 18 in 2024. Last month, the CDCP applications opened to all remaining eligible Canadians, fulfilling the government's commitment to fully implementing the plan in 2025.

Throughout the launch, letters were sent to Canadian residents in the eligible income range inviting them to apply to the CDCP, increasing the plan's awareness at each stage of implementation. So far, more than four million Canadians have been approved to be part of the plan, and more than two million have already gone to get care.

This is a remarkable achievement in a very short amount of time and one that would not have been possible without the support of oral health providers and their associations across the country. Oral health providers from coast to coast to coast acknowledge the need to provide better access to oral health services, and their dedication and commitment to providing care to their patients are very commendable.

Business of Supply

The Government of Canada, with the help and collaboration of many stakeholders across the country, implemented a plan informed by provider associations, oral health experts and research findings. This work continues to solidify the importance of working together with partners within the oral health community to inform the implementation of the CDCP now and in the future as the plan continues to evolve.

● (2005)

To date, more than 25,000 oral health providers are participating in the plan. That is more than 22,000 dentists and dental specialists, more than 2,000 denturists and more than 1,000 independently practising hygienists caring for patients covered under the CDCP. Additionally, 19 educational institution clinics that train future Canadian oral health providers are participating in the CDCP. Their participation means greater access to oral health care for patients and more learning opportunities for students in training settings.

By participating in the plan and accepting to take on CDCP clients, these providers are helping millions of Canadians get access to the care they need. The success of the plan would not have been possible without the high level of participation of these oral health professionals. On behalf of the Government of Canada, I wish to thank all the oral health professionals who contributed to this success and continue to do so.

I am going to share some stories. The stories heard since the launch of the CDCP have been heartbreaking and uplifting at the same time.

A patient had half of their complete denture broken off for over a decade, unable to afford a replacement. Another Canadian shared that the CDCP has been life-changing for them, as having an autoimmune illness impacted their teeth and their confidence. Being able to finally get their smile fixed has been life-changing. An 89-year-old woman in a wheelchair got her teeth cleaned by a mobile dental hygienist. She was finally able to receive the care she needed at her long-term care facility. These are only a few of the many patients who had difficulty eating properly or who lived with pain for decades because they could not afford the care, patients who, thanks to the CDCP, are finally getting the care they very much needed.

A denturist told us that some of his CDCP patients had gone 15 years without dentures because they could not afford them. An independent dental hygienist shared that some of her CDCP clients had not received dental care in the last 30 years. A dentist was surprised to find three cases of undiagnosed oral health cancer in his first week of treating CDCP patients. That is three patients with a better chance of survival because of the CDCP. These are just a few testimonials of the many heard over the past year and a half from providers and their patients. It is fair to say that the CDCP has been life-changing for many. The CDCP has helped and continues to help improve the oral health of millions of Canadians.

The CDCP has also helped the average person save more than \$800 per year, which is hundreds of dollars that can now be spent on other important basics they need, such as housing, heating and food. Thanks to the CDCP, many Canadians no longer need to choose between paying their bills and getting the oral health care they need.

I will conclude by reiterating that by investing in Canadians' oral health, the Government of Canada is investing in a healthier Canada and a stronger health care system. Together, we are improving the lives of millions of people and in turn improving the Canadian health care system.

● (2010)

Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC): Mr. Speaker, one thing that troubles me about this program is what I hear frequently in my constituency office. People come in and say, "The government said this was a free program and that my dental expenses were now covered, but they were not covered."

One of my questions is, why did the government do such a poor job rolling this out, misleading people to think that all of their dental care was going to be free? The other one is, would it not have been nice to present a budget to the House so we could know what we can afford and what we cannot?

Parm Bains: Mr. Speaker, the plan was rolled out in phases, as I indicated, and it was a success, with more than four million Canadians being approved to be part of the plan and more than two million having already gone to get care. The plan, as it was presented, was effective and efficient, and people are getting the care they need.

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague spoke about the positive impact of expanding dental care coverage in his community. I have heard the same thing in my riding of Madawaska—Restigouche. When I was door knocking during the campaign, a lot of people spoke about the positive impact this new program has had on their life and about the importance of having access to affordable dental care.

I would like to hear the views of my colleague on why it is important for him and our team to build a strong economy that benefits everyone.

Parm Bains: Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for sharing the story from his community. When we look at this, and I will speak specifically to the CDCP program, and when we talk about the economy, this is actually a productivity program. People can get the care they need and maybe get an opportunity to get a job that they could not get when they did not have that care. I thank the member for raising a very important point on how we can link this program specifically to our economy.

[Translation]

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, that is fantastic, because we were told that the Prime Minister is a master at managing public finances.

I might be forced to admit that is true, since none of these members are following up on what the Parliamentary Budget Officer said about the rebate paid out on a carbon tax that was never collected. None of these Liberal members is repeating the Quebec National Assembly's call for a reimbursement of the \$814 million.

I have to wonder if being a master at managing public finances means robbing Quebec. That is my question for the member.

[English]

Parm Bains: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I mentioned anything about stealing from anyone. I am talking about providing services, health care and programs, not only to the benefit of Canadians, but also to the benefit of our economy. We are making people more productive so they can do things that they may not have been able to do previously. Today, I was focusing on those programs.

Marc Dalton (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are being left in the dark, as members of Parliament and as Canadians, because we do not have a budget to know how much we can afford and how much we cannot afford. We do know one thing: The Liberals are spending money willy-nilly. It is for good programs, yes, but there could be a little more restraint and thoughtfulness. I believe the money we are spending just on the deficit is approaching \$50 billion, maybe more. We could spend money on these type of programs and more by just living within our means.

Do the Liberals have any appreciation of how to live within our means so we can afford programs like this?

• (2015)

Parm Bains: Mr. Speaker, not only do we know, but we actually have a plan. I am sure the member has heard the Prime Minister talk about a plan to make sure that we can continue to provide funding for important programs, such as the CDCP, and at the same time look at our operational spending and make those reductions and find those savings so we can continue to serve Canadians in the right way.

Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, we are the company we keep.

The Prime Minister, who is desperately trying to rebrand himself and his Liberal government as being new, responsible, pro-energy and non-radical, picked the most radical and corrupt minister from the Trudeau government, who oversaw the most corruption and debt in Canadian history, to be in his Liberal cabinet. Solomon said, "A mirror reflects a man's face, but what he is really like is shown by the kind of friends he chooses."

The new Prime Minister chose the old environment minister who was in charge of the green slush fund and put him in his new Liberal cabinet. As I just said, now the former environment minister, the Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture, wants approval tonight in the estimates to spend \$253 million more of hard-earned taxpayer dollars. Remember, this is the same radical environment minister who was in charge of the green slush fund, who saw 400 million of taxpayer dollars go to Liberal insiders and his friends. Do people trust this minister to spend their money properly this time?

Business of Supply

Let us have a quick look at who the former minister of the environment, current Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture, is. A recent article by Jim Warren states:

An intriguing detail to emerge in the House of Commons Committee proceedings is that Environment and Climate Change Canada minister...holds a beneficial interest in Cycle Capital, a Quebec-based venture capital firm that received tens of millions in SDTC grants....

[The minister] first came to the attention [of] environmentalists across Canada and internationally for performing a couple of infamous media stunts. In 2001 he scaled Toronto's CN Tower, unfurling a banner that read "Canada and Bush Climate Killers." The following year he led activists in an assault on the home of Alberta premier, Ralph Klein. They managed to erect a fake solar panel on the roof and scare Klein's wife, Colleen, who was home at the time.

It sounds to me like he is a radical.

The article continues, saying that by 2016-17, the minister "was helping engineer the demise of Trans Canada's Energy East Pipeline". Again, this is a minister who does not sound like he is a supporter of Canada's being an energy superpower.

As well, I will be splitting my time with the member for Elmwood—Transcona.

Getting back to the minister, the article continues with a "partial list of his former employers and clients", which includes Equiterre, a Montreal-based environmental organization; Greenpeace Canada; and Greenpeace International. He was also a consultant and shareholder in "Cycle Capital, a Quebec company that received as much as \$250 million in Green Slush Fund money."

Again, this does not sound to me like a minister who is all of a sudden going to be pro Canada's being an energy superpower, and I do not think it sounds like that to most Canadians watching tonight.

Here is a quick recap of the record of corruption of the former Trudeau environment minister, current Canadian culture minister: The minister was a lobbyist for a company that benefited from the green slash fund to the tune of \$250 million. The minister also owned shares in a company that benefited from the green slash fund to the tune of \$250 million. The minister refuses to say what the value of those shares is, and caused Parliament to be in gridlock just before the last election because of that. Most of us know this, but I will remind Canadians today that, while he was minister of the environment, he gave another three-quarters of a billion dollars to the same green slush fund to, again, be given to friends and Liberal supporters.

• (2020)

The puzzling thing to me, and I think to a lot of Canadians who watched the choice of the new Prime Minister and his cabinet, was why the PM would choose this obviously corrupt former minister to be in his new cabinet. Similarly, why would the radical former minister choose the new Liberal leader, who is so pro-energy development and no longer a radical?

Business of Supply

Again, the current Prime Minister sold a bill of goods to most people. He took most of the Conservative platform and said, “this is what I am going to be now if I am the Prime Minister in the new Liberal government.” Then why would a radical minister support him in his leadership bid and in his bid to become the next Prime Minister?

I will share a quote from the current Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture: “[The current Prime Minister] is the leader we need to build Canada's future...Let's choose Canada. Let's choose [the new Prime Minister]!” I will share another quote about the Prime Minister by the corrupt minister: “He's all in...[The new Prime Minister] is the right person for Canada's future and this is why I am supporting him as the next leader of the Liberal Party”.

Again, what does it say when a known radical chooses the Prime Minister to be the leader of the party? I think it begs a lot of questions for Canadians out there. Here is a Prime Minister who says that, all of a sudden, he has seen the light. He is going to build pipelines and turn Canada into an energy superpower. Meanwhile, he is fully aligned with radicals such as the former environment minister, the current Minister of Canadian Identity and Culture.

We all know the phrase that it is impossible for a leopard to change their spots. It is just as impossible, I would argue, for two enviro-radicals to change their views on energy development in Canada. I think Conservative voters saw that. We saw the wolf in sheep's clothing that the current Prime Minister is, but I digress.

Some Canadians believe what the Prime Minister had to say, and I think it is our job to prove that what he said was not true. If the PM is changing the course of the last disastrous decade, why would he pick the most radical minister from the last Trudeau government to be in his inner circle in his new Liberal government? It is because the secret is getting out, and the new Liberal government really is not new at all.

It is the same old same old. The same radical, anti-development Liberals we saw ruin our economy under Trudeau are now putting their foot on the gas under the Prime Minister.

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

Bob Zimmer: Mr. Speaker, I hear heckling across the way from the member for Winnipeg, but the truth hurts, I guess.

I will finish with this: A recent article called “[Prime Minister] poised to dethrone Trudeau as biggest spender in Canadian history” reads:

under [the Prime Minister's] plan, this year's deficit will increase to a projected \$62.4 billion while the combined deficits over the subsequent three years will be \$67.7 billion higher than under Trudeau's plan.

Consequently, the federal debt, and debt interest costs, will rise sharply. Under Trudeau's plan, federal debt interest would have reached a projected \$66.3 billion in 2028/29 compared to \$68.7 billion under the new [Prime Minister's] plan.

That is a lot higher, for sure.

The Prime Minister is desperately trying to pretend to be different than the last Liberal leader, Justin Trudeau, but he handpicked the most radical and corrupt minister from the old Trudeau government to be in his cabinet. They are both now taking Canada further down a radically dangerous road of massive debt, corruption and

economic destruction. Again, as Solomon once said, “A mirror reflects a man's face, but what he is really like is shown by the kind of friends he chooses.” Indeed, Canadians are seeing that the Prime Minister is the company he keeps.

● (2025)

[Translation]

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in his speech, my colleague used words like “radical” and all sorts of adjectives to describe us. Unfortunately for him, that is not what Canadians believe.

We were just re-elected with the most votes ever won by a political party in a federal election. Our team was deemed to be the most competent and best prepared to govern and to build a strong economy.

Rather than using divisive language, rather than seeking division in the House tonight, I would like my colleague to tell me how he might work with us to strengthen our economy. We have put forward a number of concrete measures. I would like my colleague to comment on that.

[English]

Bob Zimmer: Mr. Speaker, I would argue that the platform the hon. member ran on was the one that was actually the Conservative platform.

The thing of it is that Canadians are going to be watching whether the Prime Minister is actually going to follow through on this pro-Conservative, developing-the-economy type of language. We have already seen a few holes form, and his costume is wearing thin.

I think what Canadians really wanted was to see a change from the previous 10 years of the last Liberal government. What we are seeing and what they are seeing is that there has been no change at all, just the same radical, anti-development Liberals.

[Translation]

Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to my colleague. I found it interesting when he spoke about reflections in the mirror because, in fact, we are still trying to make sense of what we are seeing from the new Prime Minister.

My colleague also criticized the subsidies being handed out. He talked about the green slush fund. I would rather talk about the oil slush fund. Does he agree with the idea of subsidizing oil companies and giving them outrageous tax credits for decades, and seemingly for decades to come? That is what they seem to be planning.

Furthermore, if he disagrees with the Liberal Party's positions, why does he vote with the Liberals?

[English]

Bob Zimmer: Mr. Speaker, this is not what Canadians expected, even the ones who would say, “Take our carbon tax dollars.” The carbon tax has not gone away, by the way, for all the Canadians watching. We are waiting to see what this new industrial carbon tax is going to be. We know what the Prime Minister has set as the standard to truly cause change. It is in his book. He has said it many times. It is going to be a lot higher than it was under former prime minister Trudeau.

In talking about the mirage, absolutely, it is. I see it in a different way. I see it as a costume that is wearing thin. We are starting to see the wolf that is in that sheep's costume appear. We are seeing it happen quickly. I really hope, for the sake of all Canadians, that he really does what he says he is going to do and develops us into this economic and energy superpower.

Again, I do not believe that who the Prime Minister says he is is actually who he is.

Dave Epp (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am going to say that the new Prime Minister has introduced something new, and I wonder what my colleague thinks of it. He has proclaimed that he is going to account for things differently. He is going to separate spending into two categories, operational and capital. My colleague referenced the deficits that have been announced, the deficits that are projected out for the next three years.

How would this accounting make a difference on the interest that Canadians pay and the debt that our children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren will incur?

Bob Zimmer: Mr. Speaker, it is a great question. Again, there is this mirage that the Quebec member spoke about. All of a sudden, this guy who is supposed to be a responsible spender of taxpayer dollars is not. I just mentioned how he is going to spend dramatically more than what the irresponsible Trudeau government already spent in the previous 10 years. Is that even possible? Yes, it is, because they are going to do it. Under Trudeau's plan, the federal debt interest would have reached a projected \$66.3 billion in 2029, compared to \$68.7 billion under the new Prime Minister's plan.

That is the truth. Regardless of how he is accounting and fudging the numbers, or whatever process he is trying to do, he is spending more. Canadians cannot afford it, and we need a change in government, bottom line.

• (2030)

Colin Reynolds (Elmwood—Transcona, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is with great honour and humility that I rise today to speak in this House. I would like to start by thanking the people of Elmwood—Transcona for putting their trust in me to represent them in this House of Commons. I would also like to thank my amazing campaign team and caucus colleagues for working tirelessly, day in and day out, to support me and the Conservative Party. Without all of them, I would not be in this House today.

To my three amazing sons, Cameron, Jordan and Brendon, my two wonderful daughters-in-law and three incredible grandchildren, I thank them for being there for me. I thank my father Herb, my mother Linda, my brother Mark and my sister Shannon for working so hard to help me get here and having my back. I would like to

Business of Supply

thank my mother-in-law and father-in-law, as well as my sister-in-law and three brothers-in-law. Lastly, to Sandra, my beautiful wife of 30 years, I thank her for always unconditionally supporting me and believing in me.

People with my story do not end up here. I was raised by a teacher and a homemaker in the Valley Gardens area of Winnipeg. I graduated from Kildonan-East Collegiate, where I met my wife. Fresh out of high school, we became very young parents, and our life together did not start out easy. Working full-time as a printing press operator, we struggled, working opposite shifts for many years to save on child care. We saved every penny, and eventually we were able to buy a house. Home ownership did not make life easier, but it did mean that we had a place to call our own. Now, for so many, home ownership is just a dream.

After many years establishing our family together, I changed careers and became a construction electrician. After working as an apprentice for a number of years and experiencing first-hand how employees in the trades are often poorly treated, I joined the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. My involvement with the IBEW increased over the years as my passion for workers' rights grew. Now I am the sitting vice-president. As a long-time union member, I have always paid attention to politics and watched every day as the NDP-Liberal government turned its back on workers like me.

The community I grew up in is made up of hard-working people, tradespeople, blue-collar workers and union workers. These are the people who build this country and keep it running. With the runaway NDP-Liberal spending that caused excessive inflation and the out-of-control immigration that caused ballooning house prices and rapidly rising food costs, I decided it was time to stand up and do something. The message from Pierre Poilievre was clear, that the Conservative Party is the party for the working class, so I joined the fight.

As I knocked on thousands of doors and spoke to people just like me, I realized I was not the only one who feels this way. Working-class people felt abandoned by the NDP-Liberal government, and everyday Canadians are struggling to make ends meet. It was not always like that. In 2015, before the lost Liberal decade, the middle class was doing well. We were outperforming the United States, and our dollar was stronger. Now that is gone, and the only thing the Liberals are doing about it is the same thing they have been doing for 10 years: spend more money. However, now it is even worse. They are spending more money with no budget and no accountability.

Business of Supply

I spoke with a young family on their doorstep, and they were worried about what they were going to do later this year when their mortgage comes up for renewal. Interest rates have soared over the past five years, and we know that the raising of interest rates is a measure to slow inflation, the same inflation that was caused by government overspending, the same inflation that is driving up food prices and the same inflation that is forcing hard-working, everyday Canadians to line up at food banks just to make ends meet.

During the campaign, I spoke with a colleague of mine, a construction electrician. He was concerned with the future of employment in the construction industry in Manitoba. With no large projects on the horizon and only a few months left to complete the projects already under way, the work picture does not look good. Without any policy changes from the Liberal government regarding mining and energy, and with a looming recession brought on by dangerous and destructive tariffs from the United States and the Liberal government's lack of action, the outlook will not change. This is the same government with the same policies and the same economic outcome.

• (2035)

The ministerial musical chairs will not solve Canada's problems. It is clear that the same Liberal ministers with the same Liberal policies are delivering even worse results. Canadians need a real plan that will unleash Canada's economic potential and deliver powerful paycheques for our people. Under the current Prime Minister, bloated bureaucracy will grow by 6%, more than double the combined rate of inflation and population growth.

Consultant spending will increase by 37% to \$26 billion a year, requiring the average family to pay \$1,400 on consultants alone. None of the extra spending the Liberals have asked for will actually help Canadians. Almost all of it is for bureaucratic administration and high-priced consultants, who will be out the door and gone forever. It seems the Liberal government thinks that this country is built by consultants sitting in an office shuffling paper. I assure members that it is not. Canada is built by people who get up every morning, put on their boots and do hard work. These are the people who serve and protect, deliver our goods, bring our mail, teach our future generations, pick up their tool boxes, manufacture our products and grow our food.

I love this country. I have lived here my whole life. I raised my kids here, and now they are raising their kids here. It is a great honour to serve in this House. I am here to stand up and protect the future of Canada, the future of our children and the future of our grandchildren. I am here to fight for workers and their families. I am here to fight for workers' rights and good-paying union jobs. I am here to protect hunters, sport shooters and law-abiding gun owners. I am here to represent the hard-working people of Elmwood—Transcona and all the hard-working people in Canada, the greatest country in the world.

As a Conservative, I believe in removing barriers to work, reducing the tax burden on working Canadians and getting government out of the way so businesses can grow, hire and thrive. Canadians deserve a government that works for those who do the work and a government that works for students and young people desperate to pursue their dreams.

I am thankful for this opportunity to stand before the House and speak to the nation. It is an honour and a privilege to serve the Canadian people.

Hon. Wayne Long (Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the member opposite.

It has always puzzled me how sometimes the members across hold themselves up as these great economic masters and stewards who have all the economic answers.

Let us look at some economic facts. Inflation has gone down from 8.1% in June 2022 to 1.7%. We have an AAA Moody's credit rating, a debt-to-GDP ratio that is the best in the G7, the lowest debt in the G7 and the lowest deficit in the G7. Workforce or labour force participation is at 65.3%, versus the U.S. at 62.5%.

Sure, we have challenges, but our economy is strong. The fundamentals are strong and we have a Prime Minister who can build the strongest economy in the G7.

My question is this: Do we not deserve credit for driving inflation down to 1.7%, below Bank of Canada expectations?

Colin Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, I believe inflation has only gone down because of the removal of the consumer carbon tax under great pressure from the Conservative Party.

[*Translation*]

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my colleague said he wants to work on behalf of workers, on behalf of hard-working people.

This kind of talk really hits home for me. Before I was elected, I worked in a pulp and paper mill. I am probably one of the only members in the House who never sat in a university classroom, so this kind of discourse resonates with me. I am also here to work for the workers, for my friends at the mill. They look to me and expect me to do a good job.

When people have their money stolen, it upsets my friends at the mill. The member wants to work for workers, for those who work hard, who get up every morning and work 12-hour shifts at night and on weekends. I am therefore wondering why he voted with the Liberals to prevent Quebec from getting \$814 million, when the Parliamentary Budget Officer said it was theft. That surprises me. If the member wants to work for people, he should not work to help others steal from them.

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

• (2040)

[English]

Colin Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, Canadians struggled over the past 10 years under a Justin Trudeau government that ignored the concerns of hard-working everyday Canadians. The Liberal government owes those Canadians a break in the controlled rise in the cost of living.

Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberals announced \$77 billion during the election and an extra \$486 billion of spending in the ways and means motion. That is like pouring gas on the inflationary fire. It is going to raise the cost of everything, and they have no plan and no budget to indicate they are going to address it. What does the member think about that?

Colin Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, I think we really need a budget so we can hold the government accountable for half a trillion dollars in spending.

[Translation]

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am glad my colleague spoke about the importance of putting strong measures in place to support families and workers.

On our side of the House, we understand that the best way to make life more affordable is to build a strong economy that allows us to maintain programs that save families thousands of dollars a year, such as dental care, affordable child care and the Canada child benefit.

I would like my colleague to tell me about the positive impacts that programs such as the Canadian dental care plan have had on the people he represents in his community.

[English]

Colin Reynolds: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be able to measure the benefits of the programs; however, without a budget, it is pretty hard to have anything to compare them to.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to share a number of thoughts, particularly with the members opposite. This is important for people who follow the debate of the estimates. It is a very important debate that is actually taking place.

We often make reference to our having a new Prime Minister, a new administration and a government that truly understand the economy. There are 8.5 million Canadians from coast to coast to coast who have supported the Prime Minister and the Liberal Party, which is a record number of votes in the history of Canada.

Ultimately, I think it is important that we respond to the mandate that we have been given in a very aggressive yet positive fashion. We need to work hard for Canadians and co-operate where we can with opposition parties, in anticipation that opposition parties will also co-operate with the government at times, as they have demonstrated to a certain degree already. I will get into more of those details, but suffice it to say that there has been a change in government, the Prime Minister and the administration. An example

Business of Supply

would be the consumer price on carbon. The Conservatives called it the carbon tax. It is now gone. We have a new Prime Minister, and that policy is now gone.

We now have a Prime Minister who has brought in legislation through the cabinet and caucus to deal with issues such as border control through Bill C-2. We could talk about the tax break, Bill C-4. We could talk about the one Canadian economy, Bill C-5. We could talk about what the Prime Minister has done since April 28, over and above that substantial legislation and over and above the estimates that have been provided in the ways and means. We can talk about, for example, the first ministers' meetings that have taken place. We could talk about the G7 conference that is taking place today, not to mention the many other initiatives where we have seen the new Prime Minister tackle the issue of building Canada strong, elbows up. Damn right.

I believe that we have a Prime Minister who does have his elbows up going at it, dealing with the different issues that are before Canadians today, with an objective of building the strongest, healthiest economy in the G7. That is the goal, and I believe we will be able to achieve that goal. Now, we are very much, given the minority situation, going to be looking for a co-operating partner. Today it might be the Conservatives, while tomorrow it might be the Bloc. That is possible. It could even be some of the independents, but at the end of the day, we are going to continue to move on important initiatives to build the economy.

Before I go into the details on that, I want to talk about something that has been referenced by the Prime Minister: our social programs. I have always been a very strong advocate on the issue of health care. I do not say that lightly because, since I was first elected in 1988 to the Manitoba legislature, I have had the opportunity to play many different roles. Since I came to Ottawa in 2010 as a member of Parliament, one of the consistent issues has been health care. It seems to have always been one of the top three issues over the past 35-plus years. I truly believe it is a part of our Canadian identity. It is one of the reasons why many people feel passionate about saying, "I am a Canadian."

One of the shared values we have is our health care system. I am a nationalist in the sense that I believe that individuals, no matter where they live in Canada, should have access to a very basic level of health care services throughout the nation. That is why it is important that we support and get behind the Canada Health Act. That is why health care transfers are so critically important. The federal government does have a role, a significant role, to play in health care in Canada.

• (2045)

I was glad when the Justin Trudeau administration, of which I was a part, put such a strong emphasis on health care and providing health care services through issues such as long-term care and mental health; the creation of the true national pharmacare program, or at least the beginning of one; and the advancement of the dental care program, something I think we should be looking at ways we could ultimately be improving still.

Business of Supply

Having said that, I want to go to what the Prime Minister has been so focused on. We can review the last election and look at election night. I hear a lot from my friends in the Bloc, who said that all that people wanted to talk about was the Trump factor, the trade and the tariffs, and that this was the reason the Bloc lost all the seats in the province of Quebec. I think the result was 44 Liberals, 22 Bloc members and 11 Conservatives. We had a substantial increase, but the province of Quebec was not alone; there were 8.5 million votes, and every province in the country has Liberal members of Parliament.

I can tell members that it did not matter where we went in the country, people were genuinely concerned, and that concern was addressed in a very tangible way by the Liberal Party of Canada, in particular by the Prime Minister of Canada. I reflect on the election, and one of the very first announcements, which, if it was not on day one of the election, it was shortly thereafter. The Prime Minister indicated that he was going to give a tax break to Canadians. By the way, that promise was kept, and I will get to that point, but shortly after and throughout, he also amplified the issue of Trump trade tariffs and the impact that they were going to have on Canada.

I believe that Canadians saw a contrast between the Prime Minister, the current leader of the Liberal Party, during the campaign, and Pierre Poilievre, and what they saw in the Prime Minister was an individual who had a background in dealing with the economy. He was appointed by a Conservative prime minister to be the Governor of the Bank of Canada. He was appointed to the Bank of England, again as the governor. The leader of the Liberal Party, the Prime Minister of Canada, has a history of working with and developing an economy, and when Canadians looked at that and compared it to what the Conservative Party was offering, I not only believe that they made the right decision, but I also believe that it was in the best interest of Canadians.

Shortly after the election, we saw the Prime Minister take on the issues and put things into place in the form of legislation and budget measures. I will cite one of the best budget measures coming from the Prime Minister, which was announced just last week: the 2% of GDP for the Canadian forces. How long have we waited for a prime minister to not only actually make the commitment but also to realize it in the form of a budget, which we will be seeing later this year? "Patience is a virtue", they say. The budget will be before us, and we are going to see the 2% of the GDP.

If members flash back to the time Pierre Poilievre sat in the cabinet of Stephen Harper, it was borderline 1%, or maybe even a little less than 1%, of the GDP. In the following administration, Justin Trudeau did increase it substantially.

• (2050)

For the first time in generations, we can now say that Canada is going to be living up to the United Nations target of 2%, which is a significant budget achievement.

We can also take a look in terms of the other actions that this new Prime Minister and government have put into place.

We talked about border controls, and we now have Bill C-2 before us, which will be complemented by an additional 1,000 CBSA officers along with another 1,000 RCMP law enforcement officers.

The legislation would even improve the strength of our border, which is something we talked about during the campaign. The campaign ended April 28, and we now have legislation before us to be able to deal with the election platform. Again, we would think that members opposite would see the true value. They are a little slow on Bill C-2, but I will not push them too hard on that. At the end of the day, I know in my heart that this is substantial legislation that will ultimately make a positive difference, especially if we contrast it to the days in which Pierre Poilievre sat around the cabinet table with Stephen Harper, and they actually cut border control officers, cut money from our borders and the safety of our borders. It is an amazing contrast.

We can advance to yet another piece of legislation, Bill C-4, which would primarily do three things. First, it would provide the 2% tax break that the Prime Minister committed to during the election. Second, it would provide, for first-time homebuyers, the elimination of GST on a home of up to \$1 million, which does a couple of things in itself. It would make it more affordable for young people to actually purchase a home, and, ultimately, it would assist in increasing Canada's housing stock at the same time. Again, I could draw the comparison of when Pierre Poilievre sat around that cabinet table. In fact, he was actually the minister of housing. How did he do on the housing file? Well, everyone knows he was challenged to build six houses, and as I have said in the past, we still do not know where those six houses were, but we are told that there were actually six houses. Contrast is really quite surprising. However, third, the bill would ultimately take out of law the consumer price on pollution, which is a substantial piece of legislation, again from April 28. This is legislation that should pass.

Let us fast-forward to another piece of legislation that we have had a great deal of discussion on: Bill C-5, the one Canadian economy act. It should be no surprise to anyone in this House that the government has made that legislation a priority. From my perspective, it was the number one priority for the Prime Minister of Canada during the campaign. It provides assurances to Canadians that, as a government and a Prime Minister, we are going to push, and push hard, to build a stronger, healthier one Canadian economy by taking down those federal barriers before July 1. It was a solid commitment that was provided by the Prime Minister. I appreciate the fact that my friends in the Conservative Party actually recognize that, because without the support of at least one other party or some independents, we would not be able to pass Bill C-5, and that has been made abundantly clear by my friends in the Bloc.

• (2055)

It does not take much to prevent legislation from passing. Time allocation and closure motions are tools used at times in order to be able to get something through the House, because often there is no commitment to seeing it pass. If we listened to the Bloc members, that bill would never pass, so we had to bring in closure. The Bloc then says doing that is anti-democratic and is not parliamentary. We are a minority government and cannot do it alone.

Fortunately, the Conservatives were also listening to Canadians in all regions and recognized that it was an important piece of legislation. If they would like to see amendments to it, that is fine, but at the end of the day, Bill C-5 is a reflection of what Canadians expect of this Parliament. I am disappointed in my friends in the Bloc.

Take a look at what the Prime Minister has done. I made reference to the fact that there was a first ministers meeting two weeks ago, where the Prime Minister sat with premiers of the different provinces and territories and had a thorough discussion about identifying national projects that would advance Canadian interests. Even the Province of Quebec participated in that. Each province has projects. I can recall the Prime Minister asking what those national projects were and soliciting opinions and thoughts on them.

As opposed to potentially filibustering the bill, the Bloc could have actually contributed by talking about the many things that could assist the Province of Quebec through a national perspective. For example, hydro is something that could ultimately help not only my own province of Manitoba in terms of grids but also the Province of Quebec. I would suggest there are other potential projects there that need to be talked about and brought to the attention of the administration, to the premiers and the Prime Minister so that we can develop those projects.

I think of things such as the Port of Churchill and the potential of rail, and, absolutely, pipelines matter. There are issues we can take on as national projects and advance them. Bill C-5 is an important piece of legislation.

In a very short period of time, we have seen a Prime Minister who understands what Canadians want and developed a platform that highlights the legislation we introduced and that highlighted many of the budgetary allocations that are already starting to go out. The budget will be coming out in the fall, but it will be a budget that reflects Canadian interests and the direction this Prime Minister, the cabinet and the Liberal caucus want us to move forward on, which is based on listening to what our constituents are telling us. It is a true reflection of what Canadians want.

We are going to continue to build a country that is second to no other in the G7 in strength and economic power on a per capita basis. This is something that can be achieved. All we need is to continue to work together, where we can, to develop those ideas. When an idea is sound and good, I suspect it will receive a very positive outcome. It might take some time, but at least let us talk about those issues. We can, in fact, make a difference.

To conclude, I look forward to the questions that might be asked.

• (2100)

William Stevenson (Yellowhead, CPC): Mr. Speaker, unlike the member opposite, I do not like spending a whole lot of time listening to my own voice here.

It has been a long time. The member has stated a lot of things, and I did not see where he was going with it. He did state that he has been a member in the House, feeding at the trough, for a very long time. However, he did not seem to tell me how long he has been part of the Liberal government and when this dumpster fire had started. He still wants to go back prior to the last 10 years.

Business of Supply

If he can tell me, when are the problems he is fixing actually being addressed?

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I have not been around Ottawa as long as Pierre Poilievre has been. The member will notice that when I talked about our current Prime Minister and his background, I did not talk about Pierre Poilievre being a career politician or anything of that nature.

It has some merits. I, after all, am likely close to a career politician myself, especially if we combine both provincial and federal. However, I also acknowledge where there is a weakness, whether it is myself or Pierre Poilievre.

Fortunately, given the time we are in today, we have a Prime Minister who has the background to ensure we will be able to excel into the future as a direct result of the personal experiences and the individuals he has put around him, whether it is the inner circle, the cabinet—

• (2105)

[Translation]

Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that you are giving me the floor right now because we have a lot to say about this speech.

The parliamentary secretary said many things. He said that the government was in a minority and that it could not adopt its motions alone. That was raised earlier and it is very sad. We have come to the same conclusion as him, unfortunately. The other thing we share with him is his disappointment. He said he was disappointed in the people from the Bloc Québécois. As for us, we are rather disappointed in the parliamentary secretary and his party, which glosses over some elements of democracy. He said that we would say the same things and he repeated that there are 44 elected Liberals from Quebec and that they beat us. We have accepted the result of this election. Indeed, the member correctly identified the reasons and the specific context that explain this result.

I am starting to really look forward to the next election. The saddest thing in all this is that there are simply more elected members from Quebec who vote against the interests of Quebec. We saw that with the \$814 million from the carbon tax. Quebec attended the meetings and Quebec contributed to paying that cheque and the 55 elected members from Quebec who are not part of the Bloc Québécois voted against the interests of Quebec. People will remember that.

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, that is not true. I was born and mostly raised in the city of Winnipeg. I love the province of Quebec. I like to think I can actually advocate for the province of Quebec, even though I am a member of Parliament from Winnipeg. At the end of the day, whether it is Nova Scotia, Quebec, Ontario, Alberta or B.C., I like to see myself as someone who understands and appreciates the value of being a Canadian.

I have family, direct siblings who live in B.C., Alberta, Saskatchewan and Ontario. Obviously, I myself live in Manitoba. I have siblings in all of those provinces. In fact, I had a sibling who just moved out from Newfoundland.

Business of Supply

I am a very proud Canadian, and I see the value of national projects, especially from Quebec, where my ancestors actually come from.

[Translation]

Guillaume Deschênes-Thériault (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as a new member, I am very happy to be able to work and learn from my colleague within our new government. Fortunately, my colleague won his seat and was able to keep his seat in Winnipeg North.

What will be the benefits of our ambitious plan to unify the Canadian economy?

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, the biggest benefit comes from having an attitude of a team Canada approach and working together with individuals who want to be able to build one Canadian economy. The real beneficiary is every Canadian. It does not matter the region of the country. We are talking about billions of dollars of opportunities that can be saved by developing and enhancing one Canada.

Anna Roberts (King—Vaughan, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for my hon. colleague. I listened to his speech, and he continues to discuss what happened in the past. The Liberals have been in power for 10 years.

Over two million people are using food banks. Seniors are living on the street. What is happening? The housing minister's own issues in Vancouver increased homelessness for seniors by 40%. You have been in power for 10 years. What have you done to help ensure the seniors in this country, the ones who built this country, are not living on the streets?

The Deputy Speaker: Before I give the floor to the parliamentary secretary, questions are through the Chair. I have not done things.

The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid you will not give me enough time to be able to answer that question.

Suffice to say, Pierre Poilievre sat around a Conservative cabinet table for many years. He was part of a Conservative caucus when the manufacturing industry was devastated, during Harper's era. We can look at the loss of manufacturing jobs in the province of Ontario during the Harper regime.

There was more change in the Liberal benches in the last election than there was in the Conservative benches. They have been there for the last 10 years, and if they do not make any changes, they are going to be there for another 10 years.

• (2110)

Harb Gill (Windsor West, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a comment rather than a question.

People can call a rose anything they like, and it will still smell amazing. No matter how one spins it, a pile of manure is not going to turn into a charming hill in the countryside. Dressing up any old policy in new fancy packaging does not change what it is or what it demands of the Canadian people, which is more sacrifices.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I am not too sure what to say to that.

At the end of the day, I sense the Conservatives are a little sensitive on the issue of change. They resent the fact that the Liberal Party was able, through the change of leadership and the election, to provide the change that Canadians wanted. That was demonstrated on April 28.

I am very grateful to Canadians, to every one of them who took a look and took the time to understand the platforms of both the Conservatives and the Liberals. Ultimately, I would argue that they made a good decision, and we will find out more in the months and years ahead.

[Translation]

Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the member for Winnipeg North just told us that he was proud to represent Quebec. I have a simple question for him: Is the National Assembly of Quebec important to him? If so, does he think that when 125 elected members from Quebec call—

I will stop there because this is a big moment for us right now. I am being told that the Bloc Québécois bill on supply management has been adopted in the Senate. Supply management is a done deal. I forgot my question, but I say bravo. I am happy. I hope that my colleague from Winnipeg North is happy too. The Bloc Québécois bill to fully protect supply management has just been approved by the Senate. That is a Bloc Québécois victory.

An hon. member: Hear, hear.

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I do not quite fully understand the interjection. I think what the member wanted to ask was in regards to a unanimous motion that passed the National Assembly of Quebec. I am being completely honest when I say that I am very passionate about the province of Quebec. I care about Quebec, and I will always advocate for Quebec.

There were times in the Manitoba Legislature when a unanimous motion passed that Ottawa did not necessarily take into consideration to the degree that MLAs wanted in Manitoba. That is a part of being a part of a federalist system.

At the end of the day, we can do so much better if we all work together to build a stronger, healthier country. As the Prime Minister says, we can be the strongest, healthiest country in the G7 if we work together.

Sukhman Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I will be splitting my time with the member for Nanaimo—Ladysmith.

I am rising today on this motion because I will not stand here and let the “new” government deceive Canadians any longer. This so-called plan props up monopolies and makes life more unaffordable for Canadians under the guise of saving carbon emissions. This ban on gas-powered vehicles is exactly that. I must call out the Liberal hypocrisy. The government has not met even one of its environmental targets in this last decade, yet it has the nerve to keep imposing its unaffordable, ineffective climate agenda on Canadians.

Business of Supply

Tonight, I want to cover three things: how the bill is in fact not sustainable or environmentally friendly; how it makes life in Canada even more unaffordable; and lastly, how this is classic Liberal lying and, ultimately, another broken promise. Starting next year, the Liberals will be rolling out a zero-emission vehicle mandate that will become more extreme over the years. By 2026, automakers and importers will be forced to ensure that 20% of their vehicle sales are zero-emission. That target jumps to 60% by 2030 and 100% by 2035. Within just a decade, sales of gas-powered vehicles will be banned entirely.

While the Liberals lecture the rest of Canadians from their elitist circles, they seem to forget that Canadians do not like what they have done and that EVs simply do not work everywhere. In fact, in some areas, like my community, there is no facility to safely recycle the batteries that EVs use. According to the Canadian Automobile Association, electric vehicles can lose up to 40% of their battery life in weather from -7°C to -15°C. For northern British Columbians, starting an electric vehicle in winter is basically impossible.

Should this mandate stop families from taking their kids to school or hockey practice? What is the government doing? Do the Liberals think that BC Hydro, Ontario hydro and Hydro-Québec are ready to charge tens of millions of EVs every night, all while keeping up with the growing residential and industrial demands? I will answer that. They are simply not ready for that.

To make matters worse, the government continually blocks pipelines and energy projects across the country to line the pockets of foreign dictators. Why can it not admit that exporting foreign oil emits more carbon emissions than using clean Canadian energy? It would be far more affordable for Canadians if the government focused on developing our own natural resources. It should let Canadians work in pipeline and LNG programs, let them drive Canadian-made vehicles and let them heat their homes and start their cars with Canadian energy. Instead, the government is restricting consumer choice, driving up costs and punishing working families with policies like prioritizing ideology over affordability.

This is not a climate plan; this is a control plan, a Trojan Horse for a top-down mandate dressed up in green buzzwords. It will prop up monopolies, kneecap working Canadians and hand more power to the Liberals while pretending to save the planet. It will not just make cars more unaffordable. It will drive prices through the roof, shut down auto plants and send thousands of Canadian jobs straight to the U.S. economy.

A study in the *Canadian Journal of Economics* found that this mandate will eliminate 38,000 Canadian auto sector jobs and cost our economy up to \$138.7 billion. However, it is not just the auto sector that is at risk. It is the everyday Canadians who work in rural areas and rely on trucks, long commutes and reliable vehicles just to get to work. This mandate hits the very people who keep our resource industry running, like forestry, fishing, mining, and oil and gas. They will be the ones who will end up paying the price.

Liberals' policies are already making life much harder for Canadians, especially those in resource sectors, so why are they targeting them again? Let us not forget that life is already very much a struggle for the everyday Canadian. Think about the single mom

who must drive her kids from school and day care to hockey practice, or the senior in a rural community who just wants to commute to their medical appointment. Do the Liberals really think the average Canadian can pay for a brand-new electric vehicle? Under their mandate, every year the Liberals crank up their EV quota, manufacturers will not keep up because they will be forced to buy credits that cost up to \$20,000. Guess who gets stuck with that bill in the end. It is Canadians.

● (2115)

The Liberals act like the cost vanishes into thin air, but it all gets passed down to the Canadian consumer. For most Canadians, a reliable gas-powered car is not a luxury but a lifeline. This mandate would push the very people who can afford it the least. The Liberals want to force top-down decisions, take away choices from hard-working Canadians and call it “green” while ignoring the damaging impacts. It is time to bring some common sense back to the government. No one should be told what kind of car they need to drive. Conservatives, especially, will not force Canadians to buy a vehicle they do not want, cannot afford and cannot count on.

It is not just Conservatives raising concerns. Even former Liberal MPs are pushing back on the new government's electric vehicle mandate. Former Liberal MP Dan McTeague also said this is the wrong policy for Canada. The truth is that the Liberals think they know better than the average Canadian. The government is not interested in choice but wants to dictate how Canadians live, what they drive and how they spend their money. Conservatives believe in something different. We believe in freedom, practicality and respecting our Canadian workers.

EVs are great for many families, who always should be free to purchase the vehicle of their choice. For many Canadians who live in cold environments or travel long distances, they are practically useless, especially without the infrastructure to power them. That is why the Conservatives have put forward a motion to protect Canadians' right to choose in their everyday lives. Soon this House will have a choice: Will it vote in favour of the Conservative motion that calls on the Liberal government to immediately end the ban on gas-powered vehicles, or will it take away the choice for Canadians for generations to come?

Business of Supply

I urge my colleagues to vote in good conscience for the Conservative motion, not just because it makes sense economically or environmentally but because it defends something even more fundamental: our right to choose what to do with our lives. At its core, this motion is about freedom and personal choice, values that built this country and must never be taken for granted.

Canadians were promised leadership, but instead they got bureaucracy. They were promised jobs, but instead they got pink slips. They were promised a choice, but instead they are being told exactly what to drive. Canadians were promised change, but instead they received empty slogans and rising costs. I guess it is not elbows up. I guess it is elbows down.

• (2120)

Jessica Fancy-Landry (South Shore—St. Margarets, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, my colleague across the way talked a lot about affordability and planning, so thank you for that. Tonight, you talked a lot about having choice and lots of indicators for choices we should be making.

What do you feel are some of the largest indicators of affordability?

The Deputy Speaker: Before I recognize the member for Abbotsford—South Langley, I would just remind the member that questions go through the Chair.

The member for Abbotsford—South Langley.

Sukhman Gill: Mr. Speaker, an affordability crisis has been led by the government for decades now. We see what has happened to our economy and our nation. Canadians are struggling. If we point our finger at affordable housing, we do not have any. If we point our finger at the resources, we are not using them. I would say that we need to do is put Canadians first and Canada first.

[Translation]

Jean-Denis Garon (Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Speaker, my colleague is a right-wing Conservative. He talks about freedom ad nauseam.

What always surprises me about these right-wing Conservatives is that they become communists when it comes to taking public money and sending it to the oil and gas industry, with subsidies for small modular nuclear reactors that make oil with nuclear power, or with subsidies for research and development for carbon capture. The taxpayer would even have to pay the oil and gas companies to sequester their own carbon. We are talking tens of billions of dollars over the next 10 years.

How does my colleague reconcile the fact that he repeats the word freedom every time he opens his mouth with the fact that, when it comes to pouring public money into oil and gas companies, he essentially becomes a communist?

[English]

Sukhman Gill: Mr. Speaker, the reality is that what we have right now is not the true North American dream. What we need to do is build Canada up from the ground up. We are ready to work with first nations. We are ready to work with the provinces. We want to work with Quebec and all the other provinces to make sure we do what is right for Canadians.

Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the hon. member for his election. He had one of the most exciting victory parties. I got to watch it online. He livestreamed the whole thing. I want to congratulate him for that as well.

I am wondering if the hon. member could talk a bit more about the housing situation in the Lower Mainland of B.C.

Sukhman Gill: Mr. Speaker, I will touch on what it is like for the unaffordable housing sector. I am a prime example of that.

Today, for 25- and 26-year-olds in the community of Abbotsford—South Langley, it is out of reach. It is a dream to envision that they can own their own home one day. They have to pick and choose. It is either they have a family, work three jobs and stay in a basement or they decide not to have a family, work and maybe have the opportunity to one day own a house, but that will be after a long period of time.

What I see in my community is a struggle. What I am here to do is work hard for my community and put Abbotsford—South Langley first.

• (2125)

[Translation]

Caroline Desrochers (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I heard my colleague talk about how we all need to work together to build a strong Canada. I think that is what I heard. The points he raised about affordability and housing are strong commitments that we made in our platform. It is because of these commitments that we were elected with a strong mandate.

My question for my colleague is this. Does he think his party could stop repeating slogans here in the House and really start working with us? The moment is much bigger than any of us. Canadians expect us to work together.

Does my colleague think that we can work together to push ahead with real measures for Canadians and Quebecers?

[English]

Sukhman Gill: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I definitely think we can work together. As the Liberals have already stolen many ideas from the Conservative platform, we are ready to work together. We want to force the Liberals to keep taking our policies and keep taking from our platform, making sure that we work together and vote in some great policies.

Tamara Kronis (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians want clean air. Canadians want innovation. Many Canadians, especially in my home province of British Columbia, are eager to embrace electric vehicles. I come from one of the most beautiful and most creative parts of the country. We are deeply committed to preserving that beauty, and we strive to find the technologies that will protect it.

I am genuinely excited about the future of electric vehicles and the role they can play in reducing emissions and driving technological progress. I am also excited about hydrogen fuel cells, renewable fuels and many other breakthroughs revving up across the transportation sector, as well as the technologies that have not even been conceived yet.

When innovation is allowed to flourish, Canada wins. Variety, they say, is the spice of life. On our vast roads and rugged terrain, Canadians want and need a full range of options, all the gears in the gear shift, so to say, from EVs to hybrids, sustainable fuels and even increasingly efficient internal combustion engines. I am so glad to see our entrepreneurs and our market delivering just that.

What Canadians do not want and absolutely cannot afford are heavy-handed mandates from Ottawa that jack up costs, punish small businesses and stall out consumer choice in the fast lane of central planning. That is not welcome in my community.

Unfortunately, that is exactly what the Liberal government's so-called zero-emission vehicle sales target does. It is being branded as a target, but it is a 10-year road to a ban, the "no more gas vehicles" ban, a regulatory sledgehammer disguised as a goal. Backed by fines and compliance quotas, this is not about helping the environment; it is about pushing all Canadians to the outcome the Liberal government wants, whether they like it or not. That is why our Conservative motion today puts the brakes on this policy and puts Canadians back in the driver's seat. We are calling on the government to immediately give Canadians the freedom to choose vehicles that meet their needs at a price they can actually afford.

I have been listening to the auto sector. The Canadian Automobile Dealers Association has been sounding the alarm. It knows what the Liberals refuse to admit: that this plan is out of step with the reality on the ground.

EV adoption has been growing, and that is a good thing, but it has happened because of consumer choice, smart incentives and infrastructure investment, not because of government strong-arming. Instead of encouraging choice, the government is taking it away. Federal and provincial rebates are being scaled back. Charging infrastructure is still patchy, especially in rural and northern communities. People in apartments and townhomes cannot plug in.

Canadians want clean transportation, but they also want vehicles that fit their budgets, their geography and their daily lives. That is why the Canadian Automobile Dealers Association has warned that this Liberal policy is unrealistic and will lead to significant cost increases for consumers. The mandate forces car dealers to carry large, expensive EV inventories that often do not match local demand, especially in small cities like mine and in rural areas. The burden of compliance, along with penalties for non-compliance, is being downloaded onto dealers. That means it will ultimately find its way to consumers.

The Automotive Parts Manufacturers' Association has also raised concerns about supply chain readiness and the speed of transition. A decade may feel like a long time, but in the world of design and in the current context, 2035 is actually quite near. Canada still lacks the domestic capacity to fully support the shift at this

Business of Supply

speed. The automotive industry in Canada is already coping with tariffs and volatility. It does not need this on top of it.

● (2130)

Under this policy, car companies that sell even one gas vehicle above the Liberal quota could face penalties of up to \$20,000 per car. That cost gets passed down straight to the consumer. At a time when groceries are out of reach, mortgages are ballooning and food bank lines are growing, the Liberals want to make vehicles more expensive by design. How out of touch can they get?

This is not just bad for drivers; it is a head-on collision with small businesses. Dealerships, especially in small cities like Nanaimo, are being forced to carry excess or even double inventories. They have to stock expensive EVs that may sit unsold alongside the gas-powered vehicles that are more affordable and more in demand in their showrooms. That is a massive financial burden, and then Ottawa penalizes them if they do not sell enough of the EVs that no one is asking for. That is not a policy. That is a lemon. It is going to hurt the very Canadians the government wants to help.

In the rural parts of my community, people rely on pickups. In northern climates, they need vehicles that can handle snow, cold and long distances without worrying about where they are going to find a charging station. In all of the communities across this great country, people want choice. They want the freedom to choose what works for their family, what works for their job and what works for their wallet. What they do not want is a Prime Minister in the driver's seat deciding what kind of car they are allowed to buy.

Conservatives believe in innovation. We believe in clean technology and we believe in reducing emissions. We also believe in choice and competition, and yes, we believe in common sense.

The demand for electric vehicles is plateauing. It may be that the current economy is creating challenges for affordability. It may be that the demand for electric vehicles has reached its saturation. After years of growth driven by early adopters and government rebates, the market is now cooling because many Canadians simply cannot afford the high upfront costs, do not have access to charging infrastructure or might not be convinced that EVs meet their needs in our climate and geography.

Business of Supply

However, rather than adjusting government policy and adjusting course to help Canadians during these difficult times, the Liberals are demanding that we adjust course, that we change our behaviour to suit their needs and desires. They are not responding to market trends. They are trying to manufacture those trends and coerce Canadians with quotas. That is not innovation. That is desperation and control.

We have an opportunity to steer Canada back in the right direction. Let us invest in infrastructure. Let us support a range of clean technologies. Let us let demand grow organically. Let us recognize that there is more than one route to an emissions reduction. Hybrid vehicles, hydrogen power, sustainable fuels and, yes, even better internal combustion engines all have a place on the road to a more sustainable future. Above all, let us listen to the workers who build our cars, the family-run dealerships that sell our cars and the Canadians who drive them every single day.

The Liberal plan is broken. It is unaffordable, it is unrealistic and it is unfair. It is time to shift gears. Let us support this Conservative motion. Let us end the ban, and let us give Canadians back the keys to their own decisions and their own future.

• (2135)

[Translation]

Steeve Lavoie (Beauport—Limoilou, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to my colleague's speech.

I would like to read a few words from a document I have before me. It talks about something "expensive, unreliable and limited in its performance". I was sure it was talking about electric vehicles but no, that is not it. It is talking about the internal combustion engine, when it made its debut on the market. It was expensive, unreliable and limited in its performance. However, through research and the development of suitable infrastructure, like roads and service stations, the combustion engine became what it represents today in the car world.

We are currently entering a new era. Electric cars are undergoing the same change. We are right in the middle of this change. I have a question for my colleague. Would she rather be part of this evolution and propel Canada into the future, or would she rather sit idly by and do nothing?

[English]

Tamara Kronis: Mr. Speaker, the incredible thing about evolution and the incredible thing about innovation is that, when we embark on that journey, we do not know where it is going to take us. When the combustion engine was originally created, and when it was originally started, there were lots of models and lots of designs.

Over time, we got an incredible variety. From the little horses and buggies and the little engines of the past, we now have sports cars, convertibles, family cars, station wagons and all manner of transportation.

We got there by letting industry take the lead. We got there by letting people innovate. I believe that, if we allow that in this case—

[Translation]

The Deputy Speaker: Questions and comments.

The hon. member for Berthier—Maskinongé.

Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Mr. Speaker, there are moments in history that are important. We have just experienced one. Tonight, the bill to protect supply management, which we passed unanimously here just a few weeks ago, passed third reading in the Senate. It will soon receive royal assent at Rideau Hall.

Let me say a few words. First of all, I want to thank everyone who believed in it. Despite the fact that no one believed in it at first, we managed to get it passed. A great man once said, "They did not know it was impossible, so they did it." That is what we did. We protected our agricultural model.

We are celebrating tonight. I want to congratulate and thank everyone.

[English]

Tamara Kronis: Mr. Speaker, while I think my hon. colleague is incredibly eloquent, I do not believe there was a question in his remarks, so I would like to return the floor to you because perhaps someone else might have a question.

• (2140)

Connie Cody (Cambridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for sharing the concerns being heard within the community. The member raised important points about the impact of the gas ban on affordability and access, particularly in high-cost regions such as Vancouver.

Given the pressures already facing families and businesses, could the member expand on what specific hardships this policy may create and how those impacts could further challenge communities already struggling with the rising cost of living? In particular, what might this mean for local dealerships that could be burdened with added costs, inventory challenges or penalties tied to compliance?

Tamara Kronis: Mr. Speaker, one of the incredible things about car dealerships is that they are often family businesses. I grew up down the street from a car dealer, and his son is now running that particular business.

There is incredible investment that comes with running a car dealership. It involves renting space. It involves hiring a large number of employees. Car dealers are among the largest employers in my community of Nanaimo.

When they only have a limited amount of floor space and are trying to run a business, for the government to come in and tell them that the business they have been running needs to be augmented by a different business that needs to be run in the same space with the same people, it creates a second set of overhead. It creates a second set of services, and it makes it very difficult for them to be able to innovate and manage their business. The hardship—

The Deputy Speaker: Time has elapsed for the member.

Resuming debate, the member for South Shore—St. Margarets.

Jessica Fancy-Landry (South Shore—St. Margarets, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, tonight is my maiden speech, and it is on a topic that is the heart of many Canadian lives: housing. Some of us have mentioned this quite a bit tonight. As we consider the main estimates for the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, I want to reflect not only on the numbers before us, but also on the human realities that they represent, such as families striving for stability, young people trying to enter the housing market, and communities working to grow with both dignity and inclusivity. It is more than a fiscal conversation. It is a conversation about how we build a more affordable, accessible and equitable Canada for everyone.

These were the issues and the concerns that I heard as I knocked on the doors of and talked on the phones to the people of South Shore—St. Margarets.

I am thankful for this opportunity tonight to revisit the department of Housing, Infrastructure and Communities Canada's main estimates for 2025-26, and I would like to highlight today how these estimates, the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation's programs in particular, will help Canadians get ahead.

In terms of public infrastructure, it has always been and will continue to be a key driver of Canada's success as a nation. It plays a vital role in building a resilient community and supporting economic competitiveness, both at home as well as abroad. Communities are the foundation of a country and are built upon the vast and complex network of transit systems, roads, water, waste-water infrastructure, active transportation systems, cultural facilities and more. This network reaches into every community and touches every Canadian. It allows our businesses to thrive locally and globally, makes life affordable for Canadians, and helps protect our environment.

HICC, with its proposal of investments, wants to support affordable housing and a modern climate-resilient infrastructure that is also resilient to extreme weather events. It wants better transit and federally owned bridges under this portfolio, effective and reliable water and waste-water facilities, and important community spaces, all the infrastructure that we are longing for. In addition to this department, it works with these communities to deliver programs designed to prevent and reduce homelessness, something that we have talked quite a bit about during QP.

The CMHC plays an integral role with this portfolio as the lead organization delivering housing programs. To accomplish this important and large mandate, the HICC collaborates with indigenous partners, as well as all orders of government and other important stakeholders. In the 2025-26 estimates, as most members have been privy to, the HICC is seeking just over \$16 billion in total portfolio authorities for investments in housing and homelessness, public transit, major infrastructure projects and green, rural and northern infrastructure across the country.

As we all know, sometimes laying the pipe is not sexy, but it is the pipe and the infrastructure that we need to get into the ground in order to build the things on top of it. Some of the things that they also wish to deliver are the new HICC programming announced in budget 2024, including the Canada housing infrastructure fund, and continued funding for programs like Reaching Home: Canada's

Business of Supply

Homelessness Strategy, the green and inclusive community build-ings program, and the investing in Canada infrastructure program.

Managing federally owned bridges is also in this portfolio, including the rehabilitation of the Québec Bridge, a historically important bridge that requires a major structural maintenance program; the reconfiguration work on the Bonaventure Expressway and steel reinforcement work on the Jacques Cartier Bridge.

The portfolio also includes funding for these CMHC programs. In these main estimates, CMHC is seeking to access \$6.4 billion to support delivery of important programs. This would include an increase of \$740 million, primarily related to three key programs. These programs are \$101.5 million under the housing accelerator fund, \$309.1 million under the affordable housing fund, and \$248.1 million under the urban, rural and northern indigenous housing strategy.

● (2145)

In terms of the Governor-General's special warrants, as the House is aware, the typical process calls for the standard interim supply of three-twelfths of the first quarter of the year. This ensures that departments have sufficient spending authority to cover the period of these main estimates to receive the royal estimate. Given the dissolution of Parliament back in March 23, the Governor General's special warrants of just over \$2.75 billion were issued to this portfolio to cover the period between April 1 and June 29 to ensure that Canadians will continue to have access to these programs that support their communities.

CMHC has accessed \$1.58 billion of this funding to help maintain important housing programs at a time when Canadians are facing a housing crisis. Some of the positive outcomes, and I have mentioned a few, are that the Government of Canada remains committed to delivering an unprecedented level of programming to support housing and infrastructure needs across this country. We are continuing to implement programming to improve housing supply and affordability. Overall, more than 320,000 units have been repaired or committed to under this national housing strategy, exceeding the target of 300,000. Of these, 33.2% of funding went towards meeting the needs of women and their children, exceeding that original target again, which was 25%, and helping to ensure that equity-deserving groups and vulnerable populations are being housed, having a place to call home.

Business of Supply

Programs like the housing accelerator fund are creating better homes and outcomes for Canadians by incentivizing municipalities to cut the red tape and increase housing densification. As of March 31, \$4.3 billion has been committed under these housing accelerator funds to fact-track over 119,000 permits for new homes. The Government of Canada has already signed more than 200 agreements under the fund with these municipalities to commit to breaking these barriers to housing and streamlining this regulatory process, once again getting those pipes and lines into the ground.

These are actions that are expected to support the construction of over 750,000 new homes over the next decade. CMHC has also committed to \$23 billion in loans through the apartment construction loan program to support the creation of almost 60,000 units and build rental apartment projects across Canada. These are the different types of housing that we are talking about here tonight. This is in addition to other incentives, such as the housing design catalogue, which makes 50 standardized designs readily available for homebuyers, which will actually speed up the construction.

In 2021, 47% of the renter households in Canada reported experiencing one or more of the following challenges, because we know that there are some challenges, such as housing costs being over 30% of their income, housing not being suitable for the size of their household, or housing that needed repairs. Once again, that is the infrastructure repair renewal.

Helping Canadians access affordable and non-market housing is a key priority for our government. Social housing programs deliver meaningful results to Canadians. As of March 31, there have been 1,328 approved applications under this affordable housing fund, with a total commitment of almost \$11.99 billion. To put this in a more meaningful context, to date, 46,000 new units have been committed through the affordable housing fund, nearly 30,000 of which are under 80% of the median market rent, with rents expected to average \$716 per month.

• (2150)

Another almost 175,000 units have been repaired or renewed through that fund, with 135,000 falling under 80% of the median market rent value, averaging about \$827 a month. The affordable housing fund is making a difference alongside programs like the federal community housing initiative, which is helping to preserve 48,000 community housing units, and the \$1.5-billion co-operative housing development program will help support a new generation of non-profit co-operative housing. As the former board chair of the Rural Communities Foundation of Nova Scotia, I know that it is these types of non-profit and co-operative housing that are making a meaningful impact in my riding of South Shore—St. Margarets.

The Government of Canada is deeply committed to walking the path of reconciliation alongside our indigenous partners and communities. We recognize that indigenous households are almost twice as likely to experience poor housing conditions compared to the general population. The funding included in the main estimates will support indigenous housing needs in urban, rural and in northern areas.

Notably, the urban, rural and northern indigenous housing strategy will make a meaningful contribution to the realization of indigenous self-determining for housing. We need to keep building a re-

newed and meaningful relationship with indigenous peoples based on collaboration and partnership. We are hearing a lot about collaboration and partnership in the House, and I hope my colleagues across the aisle will take note of this.

The Government of Canada is focused on addressing the housing crisis. Investments made through CMHC are critical to the success of our housing programs. Housing, Infrastructure and Communities Canada is continuing to support and complement CMHC's work through further housing investments, programs, supportive infrastructure and public transit through the Canada housing infrastructure fund and the Canada public transit fund, respectively.

In closing, the challenges we are facing as a country begin at home, and so must our response. That is why the Government of Canada remains firmly committed to building the housing and infrastructure that form the backbone of our strong, inclusive and affordable communities.

The main estimates before us today will support the HICC and its portfolio to deliver on these commitments to Canadians in addressing affordable housing. We are taking bold new action, such as the launch of “build Canada homes” to accelerate housing construction and also to unlock supply. At the same time, we are building on proven programs in partnerships that are already delivering results. I talked about a couple of them already that are surpassing goals.

Through it all, we are focused on making housing more affordable, helping Canadians get ahead and building the strongest economy in the G7. I hope that as colleagues from all walks of life across the table, we will work together to get some of these programs established to help all Canadians, because at the end of the day, that is who we are here for, our constituents, and we are here to help all Canadians.

• (2155)

Andrew Lawton (Elgin—St. Thomas—London South, CPC):

Mr. Speaker, I extend my congratulations to the hon. member opposite on her maiden speech. She spoke a lot about the Liberal government's plans, dreams and aspirations for housing, but missing from a lot of this was a frank discussion about its record.

Under the last 10 years of the Liberals, home prices have doubled. The housing accelerator fund the member touts gave out hundreds of millions of dollars to municipalities that ended up hiking home taxes for people trying to build homes, making them further and further out of reach. All we have received from the government is a vague pledge for Brookfield bungalows, but very little that is going to make homes more affordable long-term.

Will the member denounce the last 10 years of the Liberal housing record?

Jessica Fancy-Landry: Mr. Speaker, I do feel that my colleague's question is quite skewed. I would like to say that the housing accelerator fund is what is putting those pipes and those lines into the ground. Talking about housing starts and housing finishes, sometimes we need the infrastructure first, which is something that we know we need in order to build all of the homes we are in need of right now. I would say that it supports first-time homebuyers.

Our plans are incentivizing the purpose-built rentals. There are also our public lands and public housing. We are focusing on affordable non-profit housing, where there are stronger protections against speculation. I really hope my colleague takes note of all of the different programs that I just listed, and supports and works with us so that everybody can have a place to call home.

Kent MacDonald (Cardigan, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the hon. member for South Shore—St. Margarets on her detailed speech on housing. Because I come from a rural riding, I will ask this: How is the housing strategy that our government has presented going to help rural communities meet their housing requirements?

Jessica Fancy-Landry: Mr. Speaker, I also come from a rural riding, and I have been the board chair for the Rural Communities Foundation of Nova Scotia. To answer my colleague's question, I would say that the housing accelerator fund has been a staple in our community. In addition, the affordable and non-profit housing sector in our area, and I can speak from experience, is a work in progress and is getting results.

It is time. We are working together and putting shovels in the ground, and we are trying to have everybody have a roof to call home.

Dave Epp (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to welcome to the chamber my colleague across the way as a new colleague.

The new Prime Minister, as the party wants him to be known, has also introduced the concept of new accounting. With all the measures that the member outlined in her speech, what would be her rationale for the thought that the government should now split the main estimates and the record of debt into two separate categories: operational versus capital spending?

Is it to capture differential interest rates on our debt, which keeps on growing and growing? What would be the rationale for that? Is it actually to provide the mirage of a balance in one portion while we continue to incur debt for our next generations?

Jessica Fancy-Landry: Mr. Speaker, sometimes it is the investment piece. Once we put the investment in, there is going to be buy-off at the end of the day. For us—

• (2200)

The Deputy Speaker: It being 10 p.m., it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of the business of supply.

Call in the members.

Business of Supply

• (2230)

BUSINESS OF SUPPLY

OPPOSITION MOTION—SALE OF GAS-POWERED VEHICLES

The House resumed consideration of the motion.

The Speaker: The question is on the opposition motion relating to the business of supply.

The question is as follows. Shall I dispense?

Some hon. members: No.

[Chair read text of motion to House]

• (2240)

[Translation]

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

(Division No. 14)

YEAS

Members

Aboultaitf	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	Dalton
Davidson	Davies (Niagara South)
Dawson	Deltell
d'Entremont	DeRidder
Diotte	Doherty
Duncan	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)	Falk (Provencher)
Gallant	Généreux
Genuis	Gill (Calgary Skyview)
Gill (Brampton West)	Gill (Calgary McKnight)
Gill (Windsor West)	Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Groleau	Guglielmin
Gunn	Hallan
Hardy	Ho
Hoback	Holman
Jackson	Jansen
Jeneroux	Jivani
Kelly	Khanna
Kibble	Kirkland
Kmiec	Konanz
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kronis	Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot)
Kuruc (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Kusie
Lake	Lantsman
Lawrence	Lawton
Lefebvre	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd	Lobb
Ma	Mahal

Business of Supply

Majumdar
Mantle
Mazier
McKenzie
Melillo
Moore
Morrison
Muys
Patzner
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Richards
Rood
Rowe
Scheer
Seebach
Small
Stevenson
Strauss
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta
Viersen
Wagantall
Waugh
Zimmer— 141

Malette (Kapusking—Timmins—
Mushkegowuk)
Martel
McCauley
McLean (Calgary Centre)
Menegakis
Morin
Motz
Nater
Paul-Hus
Reid
Reynolds
Roberts
Ross
Ruff
Schmale
Shipley
Steinley
Strahl
Stubbs
Tochor
Uppal
Vien
Vis
Warkentin
Williamson

Greaves
Gull-Masty
Hanley
Hepfner
Hodgson
Housefather
Iacono
Jaczek
Joseph
Kelloway
Klassen
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)
Larouche
Lauzon
Lavoie
Leitão
Lightbound
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Cardigan)
Malette (Bay of Quinte)
May
McKelvie
McKnight
McPherson
Mendès
Miedema
Mingarelli
Myles
Nathan
Noormohamed
Ntumba
Olszewski
Osborne
Petitpas Taylor
Provost
Rana
Rocheffort
Royer
Saini
Sari
Sawatzky
Sgro
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Solomon
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Thériault
Turnbull
van Koeverden
Villeneuve
Weiler
Yip
Zerucelli

Guay
Hajdu
Harrison
Hirtle
Hogan
Hussen
Idlout
Johns
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Lapointe (Sudbury)
Lattanzio
Lavack
LeBlanc
Lemire
Long
MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)
Ménard
Michel
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Nguyen
Normandin
Oliphant
O'Rourke
Perron
Powlowski
Ramsay
Robertson
Romanado
Sahota
Sari
Savard-Tremblay
Schieffe
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sodhi
Sousa
St-Pierre
Tesser Derksen
Thompson
Valdez
Vandenbeld
Watchorn
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 194

NAYS

Members

Acan
Ali
Anand
Auguste
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Belanger (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill Riv-
er)
Bittle
Blanchet
Blois
Boulerice
Brunelle-Duceppe
Casey
Champagne
Chang
Chatel
Chenette
Church
Connors
Coteau
Dandurand
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Deschênes
Desrochers
Dhillon
Duclos
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fancy-Landry
Fergus
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Gaheer
Garon
Gaudreau
Gerretsen
Gould

Al Soud
Alty
Anandasangaree
Bains
Bardeesy
Battiste
Beech
Bendayan
Blair
Blanchette-Joncas
Bonin
Brière
Carr
Chagger
Champoux
Chartrand
Chen
Chi
Clark
Cormier
Dabrusin
Danko
DeBellefeuille
Deschênes-Thériault
Dhaliwal
Diab
Duguid
Earle
El-Khoury
Eyolfson
Fanjoy
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Fuhr
Gainey
Gasparro
Gazan
Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassi-
nan)
Grant

Mendès
Miedema
Mingarelli
Myles
Nathan
Noormohamed
Ntumba
Olszewski
Osborne
Petitpas Taylor
Provost
Rana
Rocheffort
Royer
Saini
Sari
Sawatzky
Sgro
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Solomon
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Thériault
Turnbull
van Koeverden
Villeneuve
Weiler
Yip
Zerucelli

PAIRED

Members

Carney
Dowdall
Joly
Dancho
Guilbeault
Plamondon— 6

The Speaker: I declare the motion defeated.

*Business of Supply**[English]***MAIN ESTIMATES, 2025-26**

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—CANADIAN HERITAGE

The House resumed consideration of Motion No. 1.

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 1.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion 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.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion No. 1 agreed to)

• (2245)

[Translation]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—CANADA MORTGAGE AND HOUSING CORPORATION

Hon. Shafqat Ali (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of \$6,363,904,082, under Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation — Repayments to the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2026, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 2.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion 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.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion No. 2 agreed to)

[English]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—CITIZENSHIP AND IMMIGRATION

Hon. Shafqat Ali (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of \$2,223,420,163, under Department of Citizenship and Immigration — Operating expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2026, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 3.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion 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.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion No. 3 agreed to)

[Translation]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY TO THE GOVERNOR GENERAL

Hon. Shafqat Ali (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of \$22,077,800, under Office of the Governor General's Secretary — Program expenditures and expenditures incurred for former Governors General, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2026, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The question is on Motion No. 4

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion 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.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion No. 4 agreed to)

[English]

CONCURRENCE IN VOTE 1—LEADERS' DEBATES COMMISSION

Hon. Shafqat Ali (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That Vote 1, in the amount of \$3,422,808, under Leaders' Debates Commission — Program expenditures, in the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2026, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The next question is on Motion No. 5.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion 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.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Motion No. 5 agreed to)

[Translation]

Hon. Shafqat Ali moved:

That the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2026, except any vote disposed of earlier today, be concurred in.

The Speaker: The next question is on the motion to adopt the main estimates.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion 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.

[English]

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, we would like a recorded vote.

• (2255)

[Translation]

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

*Business of Supply**(Division No. 15)***YEAS****Members**

Acan	Al Soud
Ali	Alty
Anand	Anandasangaree
Auguste	Bains
Baker	Bardeesy
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Belanger (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River)	Bendayan
Bittle	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blois	Bonin
Boulerice	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Carr
Casey	Chagger
Champagne	Champoux
Chang	Chartrand
Chatel	Chen
Chenette	Chi
Church	Clark
Connors	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Dandurand	Danko
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	DeBellefeuille
Deschênes	Deschênes-Thériault
Desrochers	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Earle
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Eyolfson
Fancy-Landry	Fanjoy
Fergus	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Fuhr
Gaheer	Gainey
Garon	Gasparro
Gaudreau	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)
Gould	Grant
Greaves	Guay
Gull-Masty	Hajdu
Hanley	Harrison
Hepfner	Hirtle
Hodgson	Hogan
Housefather	Hussen
Iacono	Idlout
Jaczek	Johns
Joseph	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Klassen	Koutrakis
Kwan	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)	Lapointe (Sudbury)
Larouche	Lattanzio
Lauzon	Lavack
Lavoie	LeBlanc
Leitão	Lemire
Lightbound	Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacDonald (Cardigan)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malette (Bay of Quinte)	Maloney
May	McGuinty
McKelvie	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McKnight	McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)

McPherson	Ménard
Mendès	Michel
Miedema	Miller
Mingarelli	Morrissey
Myles	Naqvi
Nathan	Nguyen
Noormohamed	Normandin
Ntumba	Oliphant
Olszewski	O'Rourke
Osborne	Perron
Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski
Provost	Ramsay
Rana	Robertson
Rocheport	Romanado
Royer	Sahota
Saini	Sarai
Sari	Savard-Tremblay
Sawatzky	Schiefke
Sgro	Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simard	Sodhi
Solomon	Sousa
Ste-Marie	St-Pierre
Sudds	Tesser Derksen
Thériault	Thompson
Turnbull	Valdez
van Koeverden	Vandenbeld
Villeneuve	Watchorn
Weiler	Wilkinson
Yip	Zahid
Zerucelli	Zuberi— 194

NAYS**Members**

Aboultaif	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	Dalton
Davidson	Davies (Niagara South)
Dawson	Deltell
d'Entremont	DeRidder
Diotte	Doherty
Duncan	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)	Falk (Provencher)
Gallant	Généreux
Genuis	Gill (Calgary Skyview)
Gill (Brampton West)	Gill (Calgary McKnight)
Gill (Windsor West)	Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Groleau	Guglielmin
Gunn	Hallan
Hardy	Ho
Hoback	Holman
Jackson	Jansen
Jeneroux	Jivani
Kelly	Khanna
Kibble	Kirkland
Kmiec	Konanz
Kram	Kramp-Neuman

Business of Supply

Kronis	Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot)
Kuruc (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Kusie
Lake	Lantsman
Lawrence	Lawton
Lefebvre	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd	Lobb
Ma	Mahal
Majumdar	Malette (Kapusasing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)
Mantle	Martel
Mazier	McCauley
McKenzie	McLean (Calgary Centre)
Melillo	Menegakis
Moore	Morin
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Reynolds
Richards	Roberts
Rood	Ross
Rowe	Ruff
Scheer	Schmale
Seebach	Shipley
Small	Steinley
Stevenson	Strahl
Strauss	Stubbs
Thomas	Tochor
Tolmie	Uppal
Van Popta	Vien
Viersen	Vis
Wagantall	Warkentin
Wagh	Williamson
Zimmer— 141	

PAIRED

Members

Carney	Dancho
Dowdall	Guilbeault
Joly	Plamondon— 6

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[*English*]

Hon. Shafqat Ali moved that Bill C-6, An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the federal public administration for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2026, be now read the first time.

(Motion deemed adopted and bill read the first time)

Hon. Shafqat Ali moved that the bill be read the second time and referred to committee of the whole.

The Speaker: The question is on the motion.

If a member participating in person wishes that the motion 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.

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you will find consent to apply the results from the previous vote to this vote with Liberal members voting yea.

Chris Warkentin: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply the vote, with the Conservative members voting opposed.

● (2300)

[*Translation*]

Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

Alexandre Boulerice: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will be voting yes.

Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party also agrees to apply the vote and will be voting yes.

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

(*Division No. 16*)

YEAS

Members

Acan	Al Soud
Ali	Alty
Anand	Anandasangaree
Auguste	Bains
Baker	Bardeesy
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Belanger (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River)	Bendayan
Bittle	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blois	Bonin
Boulerice	Brière
Vien	Carr
Brunelle-Duceppe	Chagger
Casey	Champoux
Champagne	Chartrand
Chang	Chen
Chatel	Chi
Chenette	Clark
Church	Cormier
Connors	Dabrusin
Coteau	Danko
Dandurand	DeBellefeuille
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	Deschênes-Thériault
Deschênes	Deshaliwal
Desrochers	Diab
Dhillon	Duguid
Duclos	Earle
Dzerowicz	El-Khoury
Ehsassi	Eyolfson
Ersine-Smith	Fanjoy
Fancy-Landry	Fisher
Fergus	Fortier
Fonseca	Fragiskatos
Fortin	Freeland
Fraser	Fuhr
Fry	Gainey
Gaheer	Gasparro
Garon	Gazan
Gaudreau	Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)
Gerretsen	Grant
Gould	Guay
Greaves	Hajdu
Gull-Masty	Harrison
Hanley	Hirtle
Hepfner	Hogan
Hodgson	Hussen
Housefather	Idlout
Iacono	Johns
Jaczek	Kayabaga
Joseph	Khalid
Kelloway	Koutrakis
Klassen	

Business of Supply

Kwan	Lalonde	Gill (Brampton West)	Gill (Calgary McKnight)
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux	Gill (Windsor West)	Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)
Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)	Lapointe (Sudbury)	Gladu	Godin
Larouche	Lattanzio	Goodridge	Gourde
Lauzon	Lavack	Groleau	Guglielmin
Lavoie	LeBlanc	Gunn	Hallan
Leitão	Lemire	Hardy	Ho
Lightbound	Long	Hoback	Holman
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacDonald (Malpeque)	Jackson	Jansen
MacDonald (Cardigan)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Jeneroux	Jivani
Malette (Bay of Quinte)	Maloney	Kelly	Khanna
May	McGuinty	Kibble	Kirkland
McKelvie	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	Kmiec	Konanz
McKnight	McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)	Kram	Kramp-Neuman
McPherson	Ménard	Kronis	Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot)
Mendès	Michel	Kuruc (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Kusie
Miedema	Miller	Lake	Lantsman
Mingarelli	Morrissey	Lawrence	Lawton
Myles	Naqvi	Lefebvre	Leslie
Nathan	Nguyen	Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Noormohamed	Normandin	Lloyd	Lobb
Ntumba	Oliphant	Ma	Mahal
Olszewski	O'Rourke	Majumdar	Malette (Kapuskasing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)
Osborne	Perron	Mantle	Martel
Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski	Mazier	McCauley
Provost	Ramsay	McKenzie	McLean (Calgary Centre)
Rana	Robertson	Melillo	Menegakis
Rochefort	Romanado	Moore	Morin
Royer	Sahota	Morrison	Motz
Saini	Sarai	Muys	Nater
Sari	Savard-Tremblay	Patzer	Paul-Hus
Sawatzky	Schiefke	Redekopp	Reid
Sgro	Sheehan	Rempel Garner	Reynolds
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)	Richards	Roberts
Simard	Sodhi	Rood	Ross
Solomon	Sousa	Rowe	Ruff
Ste-Marie	St-Pierre	Scheer	Schmale
Sudds	Tesser Derksen	Seeback	Shiple
Thériault	Thompson	Small	Steinley
Turnbull	Valdez	Stevenson	Strahl
van Koeverden	Vandenbeld	Strauss	Stubbs
Villeneuve	Watchorn	Thomas	Tochor
Weiler	Wilkinson	Tolmie	Uppal
Yip	Zahid	Van Popta	Vien
Zerucelli	Zuberi— 194	Viersen	Vis
		Wagantall	Warkentin
		Waugh	Williamson
		Zimmer— 141	

NAYS

Members

Aboultiaif	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	Dalton
Davidson	Davies (Niagara South)
Dawson	Deltell
d'Entremont	DeRidder
Diotte	Doherty
Duncan	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)	Falk (Provencher)
Gallant	Génereux
Genuis	Gill (Calgary Skyview)

PAIRED

Members

Carney	Dancho
Dowdall	Guilbeault
Joly	Plamondon— 6

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried. Accordingly, the bill stands referred to a committee of the whole.

(Bill read the second time and the House went into committee of the whole thereon, Tom Kmiec in the chair)

(On clause 2)

Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC): Mr. Chair, can the President of the Treasury Board confirm that the bill is in its usual form?

[English]

Hon. Shafqat Ali (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Chair, the form of this bill is the same as that passed in the previous supply period.

Business of Supply

The Chair: Shall clause 2 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.
(Clause 2 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall clause 3 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.
(Clause 3 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall clause 4 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.
(Clause 4 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall clause 5 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.
(Clause 5 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall schedule 1 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.
(Schedule 1 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall schedule 2 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.
(Schedule 2 agreed to)

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Shall clause 1, the short title, carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.
(Clause 1 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall the preamble carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.
(Preamble agreed to)

The Chair: Shall the title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.
(Title agreed to)

The Chair: Shall the bill carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Bill agreed to)

The Chair: Shall I rise and report the bill?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Bill reported)

[*English*]

Hon. Shafqat Ali moved that the bill be concurred in.

The Speaker: If a member participating in person wishes that the motion 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.

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, if you seek it, I believe you will find consent to apply the results of the previous vote to this vote, with Liberal members voting yea.

Chris Warkentin: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives agree to apply the vote, with Conservative members voting against.

[*Translation*]

Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour of the motion.

● (2305)

Alexandre Boulerice: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour of the motion.

[*English*]

Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply the vote, with Greens voting yes.

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

(*Division No. 17*)

YEAS

Members

Acan	Al Soud
Ali	Alty
Anand	Anandasangaree
Auguste	Bains
Baker	Bardeesy
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Belanger (Desnethé—Mississippi—Churchill River)	Bendayan
Bittle	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blois	Bonin
Boulerice	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Carr
Casey	Chagger
Champagne	Champoux
Chang	Chartrand
Chatel	Chen
Chenette	Chi
Church	Clark
Connors	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Dandurand	Danko
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	DeBellefeuille
Deschênes	Deschênes-Thériault

Business of Supply

Desrochers	Dhaliwal	Zerucelli	Zuberi— 194
Dhillon	Diab		
Duclos	Duguid		
Dzerowicz	Earle		NAYS
Ehsassi	El-Khoury		Members
Erskine-Smith	Eyolfson	Aboutaif	Aitchison
Fancy-Landry	Fanjoy	Albas	Allison
Fergus	Fisher	Anderson	Anstey
Fonseca	Fortier	Arnold	Au
Fortin	Fragiskatos	Baber	Bailey
Fraser	Freeland	Baldinelli	Barlow
Fry	Fuhr	Barrett	Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt)
Gaheer	Gainey		Bexte
Garon	Gasparro	Berthold	Block
Gaudreau	Gazan	Bezan	Borrelli
Gerretsen	Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)	Bonk	Brassard
	Grant	Bragdon	Calkins
Gould	Guay	Brock	Chambers
Greaves	Hajdu	Caputo	Cobena
Gull-Masty	Harrison	Chong	Dalton
Hanley	Hirtle	Cody	Davies (Niagara South)
Hepfner	Hogan	Davidson	Deltell
Hodgson	Hussen	Dawson	DeRidder
Housefather	Idlout	d'Entremont	Doherty
Iacono	Johns	Diotte	Epp
Jaczek	Kayabaga	Duncan	Falk (Provencher)
Joseph	Khalid	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)	Généreux
Kelloway	Koutrakis	Gallant	Gill (Calgary Skyview)
Klassen	Lalonde	Genuis	Gill (Calgary McKnight)
Kwan	Lamoureux	Gill (Brampton West)	Gill (Calgary McKnight)
Lambropoulos	Lapointe	Gill (Windsor West)	Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)
Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)	Lapointe (Sudbury)	Gladu	Godin
Larouche	Lattanzio	Goodridge	Gourde
Lauzon	Lavack	Groleau	Guglielmin
Lavoie	LeBlanc	Gunn	Hallan
Leitão	Lemire	Hardy	Ho
Lightbound	Long	Hoback	Holman
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacDonald (Malpeque)	Jackson	Jansen
MacDonald (Cardigan)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Jeneroux	Jivani
Malette (Bay of Quinte)	Maloney	Kelly	Khanna
May	McGuinty	Kibble	Kirkland
McKelvie	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	Kniec	Konanz
McKnight	McLean (Esquimalt—Saenich—Sooke)	Kram	Kram-Neuman
McPherson	Ménard	Kronis	Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot)
Mendès	Michel	Kuruc (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Kusie
Miedema	Miller	Lake	Lantsman
Mingarelli	Morrissey	Lawrence	Lawton
Myles	Naqvi	Lefebvre	Leslie
Nathan	Nguyen	Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Noormohamed	Normandin	Lloyd	Lobb
Ntumba	Oliphant	Ma	Mahal
Olszewski	O'Rourke	Majumdar	Malette (Kapuskasing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)
Osborne	Perron		Martel
Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski	Mantle	McCauley
Provost	Ramsay	Mazier	McLean (Calgary Centre)
Rana	Robertson	McKenzie	Menegakis
Rocheffort	Romanado	Melillo	Morin
Royer	Sahota	Moore	Motz
Saini	Sarai	Morrison	Nater
Sari	Savard-Tremblay	Muys	Paul-Hus
Sawatzky	Schiefke	Patzer	Reid
Sgro	Sheehan	Redekopp	Reynolds
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)	Rempel Garner	Roberts
Simard	Sodhi	Richards	Ross
Solomon	Sousa	Rood	Ruff
Ste-Marie	St-Pierre	Rowe	Schmale
Sudds	Tesser Derksen	Scheer	Shipley
Thériault	Thompson	Seeback	Steinley
Turnbull	Valdez	Small	Strahl
van Koeverden	Vandenbeld	Stevenson	Stubbs
Villeneuve	Watchorn	Strauss	Tochor
Weiler	Wilkinson	Thomas	Uppal
Yip	Zahid	Tolmie	Vien
		Van Popta	

Viersen
Wagantall
Waugh
Zimmer— 141

Vis
Warkentin
Williamson

PAIRED

Members

Carney
Dowdall
Joly
Dancho
Guilbeault
Plamondon— 6

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Shafqat Ali moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

The Speaker: If a member participating in person wishes that the motion 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.

[*English*]

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, if you seek it, I believe you will find consent to apply the results from the previous vote to this vote with Liberals voting yea.

Chris Warkentin: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply the vote, with Conservatives voting against.

[*Translation*]

Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, as whip for the Bloc Québécois, I wish to inform you that the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour of the motion.

Alexandre Boulerice: Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of informing you that the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour of the motion.

[*English*]

Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply the votes and will be voting in favour.

[*Translation*]

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

(*Division No. 18*)

YEAS

Members

Acan
Ali
Anand
Auguste
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Belanger (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill Riv-
er)
Bittle
Blanchet
Blois
Boulerice
Brunelle-Duceppe
Casey
Champagne
Chang
Al Soud
Alty
Anandasangaree
Bains
Bardeesy
Battiste
Beech
Bendayan
Blair
Blanchette-Joncas
Bonin
Brière
Carr
Chagger
Champoux
Chartrand

Chatel
Chenette
Church
Connors
Coteau
Dandurand
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)
Deschênes
Desrochers
Dhillon
Duclos
Dzerowicz
Ehsassi
Erskine-Smith
Fancy-Landry
Fergus
Fonseca
Fortin
Fraser
Fry
Gaheer
Garon
Gaudreau
Gerretsen

Gould
Greaves
Gull-Masty
Hanley
Hepfner
Hodgson
Housefather
Iacono
Jaczek
Joseph
Kelloway
Klassen
Kwan
Lambropoulos
Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)
Larouche
Lauzon
Lavoie
Leitão
Lightbound
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
MacDonald (Cardigan)
Malette (Bay of Quinte)
May
McKelvie
McKnight
McPherson
Mendès
Miedema
Mingarelli
Myles
Nathan
Noormohamed
Ntumba
Olszewski
Osborne
Petitpas Taylor
Provost
Rana
Rocheffort
Royer
Saini
Sari
Sawatzky
Sgro
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Solomon

Business of Supply

Chen
Chi
Clark
Cormier
Dabrusin
Danko
DeBellefeuille
Deschênes-Thériault
Dhaliwal
Diab
Duguid
Earle
El-Khoury
Eyolfson
Fanjoy
Fisher
Fortier
Fragiskatos
Freeland
Fuhr
Gainey
Gasparro
Gazan
Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassi-
nan)
Grant
Guay
Hajdu
Harrison
Hirtle
Hogan
Hussen
Idlout
Johns
Kayabaga
Khalid
Koutrakis
Lalonde
Lamoureux
Lapointe (Sudbury)
Lattanzio
Lavack
LeBlanc
Lemire
Long
MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Maloney
McGuinty
McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)
Ménard
Michel
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Nguyen
Normandin
Oliphant
O'Rourke
Perron
Powlowski
Ramsay
Robertson
Romanado
Sahota
Sarai
Savard-Tremblay
Schieffe
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sodhi
Sousa

Business of Supply

Ste-Marie
Sudds
Thériault
Turnbull
van Koeverden
Villeneuve
Weiler
Yip
Zerucelli

St-Pierre
Tesser Derksen
Thompson
Valdez
Vandenbeld
Watchorn
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi — 194

NAYS**Members**

Aboultaif
Albas
Anderson
Arnold
Baber
Baldinelli
Barrett

Berthold
Bezan
Bonk
Bragdon
Brock
Caputo
Chong
Cody
Davidson
Dawson
d'Entremont
Diotte
Duncan
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)
Gallant
Genuis
Gill (Brampton West)
Gill (Windsor West)
Gladu
Goodridge
Groleau
Gunn
Hardy
Hoback
Jackson
Jeneroux
Kelly
Kibble
Kmicc
Kram
Kronis
Kuruc (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Lake
Lawrence
Lefebvre
Lewis (Essex)
Lloyd
Ma
Majumdar

Mantle
Mazier
McKenzie
Melillo
Moore
Morrison
Muys
Patzner
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Richards
Rood
Rowe

Aitchison
Allison
Anstey
Au
Bailey
Barlow
Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt)
Bexte
Block
Borrelli
Brassard
Calkins
Chambers
Cobena
Dalton
Davies (Niagara South)
Deltell
DeRidder
Doherty
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Généreux
Gill (Calgary Skyview)
Gill (Calgary McKnight)
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)
Godin
Gourde
Guglielmin
Hallan
Ho
Holman
Jansen
Jivani
Khanna
Kirkland
Konanz
Kramp-Neuman
Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot)
Kusie
Lantsman
Lawton
Leslie
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lobb
Mahal
Malette (Kapuskasing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)
Martel
McCauley
McLean (Calgary Centre)
Menegakis
Morin
Motz
Nater
Paul-Hus
Reid
Reynolds
Roberts
Ross
Ruff

Scheer
Seeback
Small
Stevenson
Strauss
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta
Viersen
Wagantall
Waugh
Zimmer — 141

Schmale
Shipley
Steinley
Strahl
Stubbs
Tochor
Uppal
Vien
Vis
Warkentin
Williamson

PAIRED**Members**

Carney
Dowdall
Joly
Dancho
Guilbeault
Plamondon — 6

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

(Bill read the third time and passed)

* * *

[English]

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES (A), 2025-26

Hon. Shafqat Ali (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.) moved:

That the Supplementary Estimates (A) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2026, be concurred in.

The Speaker: If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes to request a recorded division, or that the motion be adopted on division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, if you seek it, I believe you will find consent to apply the results from the previous vote to this vote, with Liberals voting yea.

Chris Warkentin: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply the vote, with the Conservatives voting against.

[Translation]

Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour of the motion.

Alexandre Boulerice: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour of the motion.

Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party also agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour of the motion.

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

(Division No. 19)

YEAS**Members**

Acan
Ali
Anand
Auguste
Baker
Barsalou-Duval
Beaulieu
Belanger (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill Riv-
er)

Al Soud
Alty
Anandasangaree
Bains
Bardeesy
Battiste
Beech
Bendayan

Business of Supply

Bittle	Blair	Royer	Sahota
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas	Saini	Sarai
Blois	Bonin	Sari	Savard-Tremblay
Boulerice	Brière	Sawatzky	Schiefke
Brunelle-Duceppe	Carr	Sgro	Sheehan
Casey	Chagger	Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Champagne	Champoux	Simard	Sodhi
Chang	Chartrand	Solomon	Sousa
Chatel	Chen	Ste-Marie	St-Pierre
Chenette	Chi	Sudds	Tesser Derksen
Church	Clark	Thériault	Thompson
Connors	Cormier	Turnbull	Valdez
Coteau	Dabrusin	van Koeverden	Vandenbeld
Dandurand	Danko	Villeneuve	Watchorn
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	DeBellefeuille	Weiler	Wilkinson
Deschênes	Deschênes-Thériault	Yip	Zahid
Desrochers	Dhaliwal	Zerucelli	Zuberi— 194
Dhillon	Diab		
Duclos	Duguid		
Dzerowicz	Earle		
Ehsassi	El-Khoury		
Erskine-Smith	Eyolfson	Aboultaif	Aitchison
Fancy-Landry	Fanjoy	Albas	Allison
Fergus	Fisher	Anderson	Anstey
Fonseca	Fortier	Arnold	Au
Fortin	Fragiskatos	Baber	Bailey
Fraser	Freeland	Baldinelli	Barlow
Fry	Fuhr	Barrett	Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt)
Gaheer	Gainey	Berthold	Bexte
Garon	Gasparro	Bezan	Block
Gaudreau	Gazan	Bonk	Borrelli
Gerretsen	Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)	Bragdon	Brassard
	Grant	Brock	Calkins
Gould	Guay	Caputo	Chambers
Greaves	Hajdu	Chong	Cobena
Gull-Masty	Harrison	Cody	Dalton
Hanley	Hirtle	Davidson	Davies (Niagara South)
Hepfner	Hogan	Dawson	Deltell
Hodgson	Hussen	d'Entremont	DeRidder
Housefather	Idlout	Diotte	Doherty
Iacono	Johns	Duncan	Epp
Jaczek	Kayabaga	Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)	Falk (Provencher)
Joseph	Khalid	Gallant	Généreux
Kelloway	Koutrakis	Genuis	Gill (Calgary Skyview)
Klassen	Lalonde	Gill (Brampton West)	Gill (Calgary McKnight)
Kwan	Lamoureux	Gill (Windsor West)	Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)
Lambropoulos	Lapointe (Sudbury)	Gladu	Godin
Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)	Lattanzio	Goodridge	Gourde
Larouche	Lavack	Groleau	Guglielmin
Lauzon	LeBlanc	Gunn	Hallan
Lavoie	Lemire	Hardy	Ho
Leitão	Long	Hoback	Holman
Lightbound	MacDonald (Malpeque)	Jackson	Jansen
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)	Jeneroux	Jivani
MacDonald (Cardigan)	Maloney	Kelly	Khanna
Malette (Bay of Quinte)	McGuinty	Kibble	Kirkland
May	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)	Kmiec	Konanz
McKelvie	McLean (Esquimalt—Saanic—Sooke)	Kram	Kramp-Neuman
McKnight	Ménard	Kronis	Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot)
McPherson	Michel	Kuruc (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Kusie
Mendès	Miller	Lake	Lantsman
Miedema	Morrissey	Lawrence	Lawton
Mingarelli	Naqvi	Lefebvre	Leslie
Myles	Nguyen	Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Nathan	Normandin	Lloyd	Lobb
Noormohamed	Oliphant	Ma	Mahal
Ntumba	O'Rourke	Majumdar	Malette (Kapusasing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)
Olszewski	Perron	Mantle	Martel
Osborne	Powlowski	Mazier	McCauley
Petitpas Taylor	Ramsay	McKenzie	McLean (Calgary Centre)
Provost	Robertson	Moore	Menegakis
Rana	Romanado		Morin
Rocheffort			

NAYS

Members

Aitchison
Allison
Anstey
Au
Bailey
Barlow
Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt)
Bexte
Block
Borrelli
Brassard
Calkins
Chambers
Cobena
Dalton
Davies (Niagara South)
Deltell
DeRidder
Doherty
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Généreux
Gill (Calgary Skyview)
Gill (Calgary McKnight)
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)
Godin
Gourde
Guglielmin
Hallan
Ho
Holman
Jansen
Jivani
Khanna
Kirkland
Konanz
Kramp-Neuman
Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot)
Kusie
Lantsman
Lawton
Leslie
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lobb
Mahal
Malette (Kapusasing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)
Martel
McCauley
McLean (Calgary Centre)
Menegakis
Morin

Business of Supply

Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Reynolds
Richards	Roberts
Rood	Ross
Rowe	Ruff
Scheer	Schmale
Seebach	Shipley
Small	Steinley
Stevenson	Strahl
Strauss	Stubbs
Thomas	Tochor
Tolmie	Uppal
Van Popta	Vien
Viersen	Vis
Wagantall	Warkentin
Wagh	Williamson

Zimmer — 141

PAIRED

Members

Carney	Dancho
Dowdall	Guilbeault
Joly	Plamondon — 6

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.*[English]*

Hon. Shafqat Ali moved that Bill C-7, An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the federal public administration for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2026, be now read the first time and printed.

(Motions deemed adopted and bill read the first time)

Hon. Shafqat Ali moved that the bill be read the second time and referred to committee of the whole.

The Speaker: If a member of a recognized party present in the House wishes to request a recorded division, or that the motion be adopted on division, I would invite them to rise and indicate it to the Chair.

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you will find consent to apply the results from the previous vote to this vote, with Liberals voting yea.

• (2310)

Chris Warkentin: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives agree to apply the vote, with Conservatives voting against.

[Translation]

Yves Perron: The Bloc Québécois agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour of the motion.

Alexandre Boulerice: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will totally be voting in favour of the motion.

[English]

Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party agrees to apply the vote and will be voting yes.

[Translation]

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

*(Division No. 20)***YEAS**

Members

Acan	Al Soud
Ali	Alty
Anand	Anandasangaree
Auguste	Bains
Baker	Bardeesy
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Belanger (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill Riv- er)	Bendayan
Bittle	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blois	Bonin
Boulerice	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Carr
Casey	Chagger
Champagne	Champoux
Chang	Chartrand
Chatel	Chen
Chenette	Chi
Church	Clark
Connors	Cornier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Dandurand	Danko
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	DeBellefeuille
Deschênes	Deschênes-Thériault
Desrochers	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Earle
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskind-Smith	Eyolfson
Fancy-Landry	Fanjoy
Fergus	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Fuhr
Gaheer	Gainey
Garon	Gasparro
Gaudreau	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassi- nan)
Gould	Grant
Greaves	Guay
Gull-Masty	Hajdu
Hanley	Harrison
Hepfner	Hirtle
Hodgson	Hogan
Housefather	Hussen
Iacono	Idlout
Jaczek	Johns
Joseph	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Klassen	Koutrakis
Kwan	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)	Lapointe (Sudbury)
Larouche	Lattanzio
Lauson	Lavack
Lavoie	LeBlanc
Leitão	Lemire
Lightbound	Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacDonald (Cardigan)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malette (Bay of Quinte)	Maloney
May	McGuinty
McKelvie	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McKnight	McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)

Business of Supply

McPherson
Mendès
Miedema
Mingarelli
Myles
Nathan
Noormohamed
Ntumba
Olszewski
Osborne
Petitpas Taylor
Provost
Rana
Rocheffort
Royer
Saini
Sari
Sawatzky
Sgro
Sidhu (Brampton East)
Simard
Solomon
Ste-Marie
Sudds
Thériault
Turnbull
van Koevorden
Villeneuve
Weiler
Yip
Zerucelli

Ménard
Michel
Miller
Morrissey
Naqvi
Nguyen
Normandin
Oliphant
O'Rourke
Perron
Powlowski
Ramsay
Robertson
Romanado
Sahota
Sarai
Savard-Tremblay
Schiefke
Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton South)
Sodhi
Sousa
St-Pierre
Tesser Derksen
Thompson
Valdez
Vandenbeld
Watchorn
Wilkinson
Zahid
Zuberi— 194

NAYS

Members

Aboultaif
Albas
Anderson
Arnold
Baber
Baldinelli
Barrett

Berthold
Bezan
Bonk
Bragdon
Brock
Caputo
Chong
Cody
Davidson
Dawson
d'Entremont
Diotte
Duncan
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)
Gallant
Genuis
Gill (Brampton West)
Gill (Windsor West)
Gladu
Goodridge
Groleau
Gunn
Hardy
Hoback
Jackson
Jeneroux
Kelly
Kibble
Kmieć
Kram

Aitchison
Allison
Anstey
Au
Bailey
Barlow
Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt)
Bexte
Block
Borrelli
Brassard
Calkins
Chambers
Cobena
Dalton
Davies (Niagara South)
Deltell
DeRidder
Doherty
Epp
Falk (Provencher)
Généreux
Gill (Calgary Skyview)
Gill (Calgary McKnight)
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)
Godin
Gourde
Guglielmin
Hallan
Ho
Holman
Jansen
Jivani
Khanna
Kirkland
Konanz
Kramp-Neuman

Kronis
Kuruc (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
Lake
Lawrence
Lefebvre
Lewis (Essex)
Lloyd
Ma
Majumdar

Mantle
Mazier
McKenzie
Melillo
Moore
Morrison
Muys
Patzner
Redekopp
Rempel Garner
Richards
Rood
Rowe
Scheer
Seeback
Small
Stevenson
Strauss
Thomas
Tolmie
Van Popta
Viersen
Wagantall
Waugh
Zimmer— 141

Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot)
Kusie
Lantsman
Lawton
Leslie
Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lobb
Mahal
Malette (Kapuskasing—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)
Martel
McCauley
McLean (Calgary Centre)
Menegakis
Morin
Motz
Nater
Paul-Hus
Reid
Reynolds
Roberts
Ross
Ruff
Schmale
Shipley
Steinley
Strahl
Stubbs
Tochor
Uppal
Vien
Vis
Warkentin
Williamson

PAIRED

Members

Carney
Dowdall
Joly
Dancho
Guilbeault
Plamondon— 6

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

[*English*]

(Bill read the second time and the House went into committee of the whole thereon, Tom Kmiec in the chair)

(On clause 2)

Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC): Mr. Chair, I wonder if the President of the Treasury Board could confirm that the bill is in its usual form.

Hon. Shafqat Ali (President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Chair, the form of this bill is the same as that passed in the previous supply period.

The Chair: Shall clause 2 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 2 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall clause 3 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

Business of Supply

(Clause 3 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall clause 4 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 4 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall the schedule carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Schedule agreed to)

The Chair: Shall clause 1 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Clause 1 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall the preamble carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Preamble agreed to)

The Chair: Shall the title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Title agreed to)

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Shall the bill carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division

(Bill agreed to)

The Chair: Shall I rise and report the bill?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: On division.

(Bill reported)

[*English*]

Hon. Shafqat Ali moved that the bill be concurred in.

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, I believe if you seek it, you will find consent to apply the results from the last vote to this vote, with Liberals voting yea.

Chris Warkentin: Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives agree to apply, with Conservatives voting against.

[*Translation*]

Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, as chief whip of the Bloc Québécois, I have the privilege of announcing that we agree to apply the result of the previous vote and we will vote in favour of the motion.

Alexandre Boulerice: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, the Green Party also agrees to apply the vote and will be voting in favour.

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

(*Division No. 21*)

YEAS

Members

Acan	Al Soud
Ali	Alty
Anand	Anandasangaree
Auguste	Bains
Baker	Bardeesy
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Belanger (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill Riv- er)	Bendayan
Bittle	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blois	Bonin
Boulerice	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Carr
Casey	Chagger
Champagne	Champoux
Chang	Chartrand
Chatel	Chen
Chenette	Chi
Church	Clark
Connors	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Dandurand	Danko
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	DeBellefeuille
Deschênes	Deschênes-Thériault
Desrochers	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Earle
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Eyolfson
Fancy-Landry	Fanjoy
Fergus	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Fuhr
Gaheer	Gainey
Garon	Gasparro
Gaudreau	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassi- nan)
Gould	Grant
Greaves	Guay
Gull-Masty	Hajdu
Hanley	Harrison
Hepfner	Hirtle
Hodgson	Hogan
Housefather	Hussen
Iacono	Idlout
Jaczek	Johns
Joseph	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Klassen	Koutrakis
Kwan	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)	Lapointe (Sudbury)
Larouche	Lattanzio
Lauson	Lavack
Lavoie	LeBlanc

Business of Supply

Leitão
 Lightbound
 Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)
 MacDonald (Cardigan)
 Malette (Bay of Quinte)
 May
 McKelvie
 McKnight
 McPherson
 Mendès
 Miedema
 Mingarelli
 Myles
 Nathan
 Noormohamed
 Ntumba
 Olszewski
 Osborne
 Petitpas Taylor
 Provost
 Rana
 Rochefort
 Royer
 Saini
 Sari
 Sawatzky
 Sgro
 Sidhu (Brampton East)
 Simard
 Solomon
 Ste-Marie
 Sudds
 Thériault
 Turnbull
 van Koeverden
 Villeneuve
 Weiler
 Yip
 Zerucelli

Lemire
 Long
 MacDonald (Malpeque)
 MacKinnon (Gatineau)
 Maloney
 McGuinty
 McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
 McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)
 Ménard
 Michel
 Miller
 Morrissey
 Naqvi
 Nguyen
 Normandin
 Oliphant
 O'Rourke
 Perron
 Powlowski
 Ramsay
 Robertson
 Romanado
 Sahota
 Sarai
 Savard-Tremblay
 Schiefke
 Sheehan
 Sidhu (Brampton South)
 Sodhi
 Sousa
 St-Pierre
 Tesser Derksen
 Thompson
 Valdez
 Vandenbeld
 Watchorn
 Wilkinson
 Zahid
 Zuberi— 194

Hardy
 Hoback
 Jackson
 Jeneroux
 Kelly
 Kibble
 Kmiec
 Kram
 Kronis
 Kuruc (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)
 Lake
 Lawrence
 Lefebvre
 Lewis (Essex)
 Lloyd
 Ma
 Majumdar

Mantle
 Mazier
 McKenzie
 Melillo
 Moore
 Morrison
 Muys
 Patzer
 Redekopp
 Rempel Garner
 Richards
 Rood
 Rowe
 Scheer
 Seeback
 Small
 Stevenson
 Strauss
 Thomas
 Tolmie
 Van Popta
 Viersen
 Wagantall
 Waugh
 Zimmer— 141

Ho
 Holman
 Jansen
 Jivani
 Khanna
 Kirkland
 Konanz
 Kramp-Neuman
 Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot)
 Kusie
 Lantsman
 Lawton
 Leslie
 Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
 Lobb
 Mahal
 Malette (Kapusking—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)
 Martel
 McCauley
 McLean (Calgary Centre)
 Menegakis
 Morin
 Motz
 Nater
 Paul-Hus
 Reid
 Reynolds
 Roberts
 Ross
 Ruff
 Schmale
 Shipley
 Steinley
 Strahl
 Stubbs
 Tochor
 Uppal
 Vien
 Vis
 Warkentin
 Williamson

NAYS**Members**

Aboultaif
 Albas
 Anderson
 Arnold
 Baber
 Baldinelli
 Barrett
 Berthold
 Bezan
 Bonk
 Bragdon
 Brock
 Caputo
 Chong
 Cody
 Davidson
 Dawson
 d'Entremont
 Diotte
 Duncan
 Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)
 Gallant
 Genuis
 Gill (Brampton West)
 Gill (Windsor West)
 Gladu
 Goodridge
 Groleau
 Gunn
 Aitchison
 Allison
 Anstey
 Au
 Bailey
 Barlow
 Bélanger (Sudbury East—Manitoulin—Nickel Belt)
 Bexte
 Block
 Borrelli
 Brassard
 Calkins
 Chambers
 Cobena
 Dalton
 Davies (Niagara South)
 Deltell
 DeRidder
 Doherty
 Epp
 Falk (Provencher)
 Généreux
 Gill (Calgary Skyview)
 Gill (Calgary McKnight)
 Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)
 Godin
 Gourde
 Guglielmin
 Hallan

PAIRED**Members**

Carney
 Dowdall
 Joly
 Dancho
 Guilbeault
 Plamondon— 6

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.

Hon. Shafqat Ali moved that the bill be read the third time and passed.

The Speaker: If a member participating in person wishes that the motion 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.

[*English*]

Hon. Mark Gerretsen: Mr. Speaker, for the last time, I believe if you seek it, you will find consent to apply the results from the previous vote to this vote, with Liberals voting yea.

● (2315)

Chris Warkentin: Mr. Speaker, Conservatives agree to apply the vote, with Conservatives voting against.

*Business of Supply**[Translation]*

Yves Perron: Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois is pleased to agree to apply the vote and very pleased that this will be the last vote. The Bloc Québécois will be voting in favour.

Alexandre Boulerice: Mr. Speaker, the NDP agrees to apply the vote, and New Democrats will be voting emphatically in favour.

[English]

Elizabeth May: Mr. Speaker, not to quibble, but I doubt it is the last time, although definitely the last time tonight. The Greens do agree to apply the vote and will be voting yes.

[Translation]

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

(Division No. 22)

YEAS

Members

Acan	Al Soud
Ali	Alty
Anand	Anandasangaree
Auguste	Bains
Baker	Bardeesy
Barsalou-Duval	Battiste
Beaulieu	Beech
Belanger (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River)	Bendayan
Bittle	Blair
Blanchet	Blanchette-Joncas
Blois	Bonin
Boulerice	Brière
Brunelle-Duceppe	Carr
Casey	Chagger
Champagne	Champoux
Chang	Chartrand
Chatel	Chen
Chenette	Chi
Church	Clark
Connors	Cormier
Coteau	Dabrusin
Dandurand	Danko
Davies (Vancouver Kingsway)	DeBellefeuille
Deschênes	Deschênes-Thériault
Desrochers	Dhaliwal
Dhillon	Diab
Duclos	Duguid
Dzerowicz	Earle
Ehsassi	El-Khoury
Erskine-Smith	Eyolfson
Fancy-Landry	Fanjoy
Fergus	Fisher
Fonseca	Fortier
Fortin	Fragiskatos
Fraser	Freeland
Fry	Fuhr
Gaheer	Gainey
Garon	Gasparro
Gaudreau	Gazan
Gerretsen	Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)
Gould	Grant
Greaves	Guay
Gull-Masty	Hajdu
Hanley	Harrison
Hepfner	Hirtle
Hodgson	Hogan
Housefather	Hussen

Iacono	Idlout
Jaczek	Johns
Joseph	Kayabaga
Kelloway	Khalid
Klassen	Koutrakis
Kwan	Lalonde
Lambropoulos	Lamoureux
Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles)	Lapointe (Sudbury)
Larouche	Lattanzio
Lauzon	Lavack
Lavoie	LeBlanc
Leitão	Lemire
Lightbound	Long
Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga)	MacDonald (Malpeque)
MacDonald (Cardigan)	MacKinnon (Gatineau)
Malette (Bay of Quinte)	Maloney
May	McGuinty
McKelvie	McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam)
McKnight	McLean (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke)
McPherson	Ménard
Mendès	Michel
Miedema	Miller
Mingarelli	Morrissey
Myles	Naqvi
Nathan	Nguyen
Noormohamed	Normandin
Ntumba	Oliphant
Olszewski	O'Rourke
Osborne	Perron
Petitpas Taylor	Powlowski
Provost	Ramsay
Rana	Robertson
Rocheftort	Romanado
Royer	Sahota
Saini	Sarai
Sari	Savard-Tremblay
Sawatzky	Schiefke
Sgro	Sheehan
Sidhu (Brampton East)	Sidhu (Brampton South)
Simard	Sodhi
Solomon	Sousa
Ste-Marie	St-Pierre
Sudds	Tesser Derksen
Thériault	Thompson
Tumbull	Valdez
van Koeverden	Vandenbeld
Villeneuve	Watchorn
Weiler	Wilkinson
Yip	Zahid
Zerucelli	Zuberi — 194

NAYS

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	Dalton
Davidson	Davies (Niagara South)
Dawson	Deltell
d'Entremont	DeRidder

Adjournment Proceedings

[English]

FINANCE

Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last week I asked the Prime Minister in this House whether he would finally show some accountability to the Canadians who are losing their jobs, struggling to pay their mortgages and turning to food banks in record numbers. I asked whether he would do his job and table a budget.

What did we get in response? We got more recycled talking points, more deflection and no plan. Canadians deserve better.

Oxford Economics has sounded the alarm: Canada is heading into a recession. They project 200,000 more job losses this year alone, with unemployment expected to rise to 7.7%. That is not just a number; it is hundreds of thousands of families facing sleepless nights, wondering how they will make ends meet. It is young people putting their dreams on hold. It is seniors watching their savings evaporate. What is the government's response? It is a record half-trillion dollars in spending, with no clear direction, no measurable outcomes and no accountability. This is not stimulus. It is drift. It is economic mismanagement.

Let us be clear. Full-time workers, people who are doing everything right, are now lining up at food banks. Mortgage defaults are rising. Small businesses are closing their doors, yet the government continues to spend as if there were no consequences, as if the money were endless and as if Canadians would not be left to pick up the tab. This is not only about dollars and cents; it is about trust, it is about leadership and it is about the future of our country.

Let me point out that this is the first time in our lifetimes, except during the pandemic, when Parliament was not sitting, that Canadians have not seen a spring budget. Canadians are not asking for miracles. They are asking for a plan, a real plan, one that restores fiscal discipline, supports job creation and ensures that every dollar spent delivers results. The heart of the question is the need for the government to account for its intentions and to be measured by the outcomes, both financially and by delivery.

Spending other people's money seems to be quite easy for the government, but accountability, not so much. It is not as if the government members were new to the numbers. This is a legacy government, in power for a decade now. They presented a costed programming of their promises during the election, and \$60-billion planned deficits seem to be the norm now. This means that Canadians will be, at minimum, a quarter-trillion dollars more in debt before the next election, and that will mean higher debt payments and taxes that could go to services but will be diverted to international bankers. There is nothing to see here, indeed.

Diotte	Doherty
Duncan	Epp
Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster—Meadow Lake)	Falk (Provencher)
Gallant	Généreux
Genois	Gill (Calgary Skyview)
Gill (Brampton West)	Gill (Calgary McKnight)
Gill (Windsor West)	Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)
Gladu	Godin
Goodridge	Gourde
Groseau	Guglielmin
Gunn	Hallan
Hardy	Ho
Hoback	Holman
Jackson	Jansen
Jeneroux	Jivani
Kelly	Khanna
Kibble	Kirkland
Kmiec	Konanz
Kram	Kramp-Neuman
Kronis	Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot)
Kuruc (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek)	Kusie
Lake	Lantsman
Lawrence	Lawton
Lefebvre	Leslie
Lewis (Essex)	Lewis (Haldimand—Norfolk)
Lloyd	Lobb
Ma	Mahal
Majumdar	Malette (Kapusking—Timmins—Mushkegowuk)
Mantle	Martel
Mazier	McCauley
McKenzie	McLean (Calgary Centre)
Melillo	Menegakis
Moore	Morin
Morrison	Motz
Muys	Nater
Patzer	Paul-Hus
Redekopp	Reid
Rempel Garner	Reynolds
Richards	Roberts
Rood	Ross
Rowe	Ruff
Scheer	Schmale
Seebach	Shipley
Small	Steinley
Stevenson	Strahl
Strauss	Stubbs
Thomas	Tochor
Tolmie	Uppal
Van Popta	Vien
Viersen	Vis
Wagantall	Warkentin
Wagh	Williamson
Zimmer— 141	

PAIRED

Members

Carney	Dancho
Dowdall	Guilbeault
Joly	Plamondon— 6

The Speaker: I declare the motion carried.
(Bill read the third time and passed)

ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

Adjournment Proceedings

It marks the end of any illusion Canadians may have had that the current Prime Minister will be any different from the last, who spent a decade diluting Canada's democratic norms and spending taxpayer dollars as if there were no consequences, no associated inflation, no reduced productivity, no strain on our trade relations and no recognition from our allies that Canada is becoming less reliable, with food costs and housing costs soaring. This is what is known in international finance as "managed decline", where citizens' well-being is gradually withdrawn from them and their efforts become someone else's gains.

The Prime Minister must do his job. He must table a budget that reflects the seriousness of this moment. He must show Canadians that he understands the gravity of the situation and that he is willing to act, not just talk. If he will not do this, then Canadians will be left to conclude what many already suspect: that they were sold a bill of goods in the last election, that the Prime Minister has no plan and that, like his predecessor, he wants to spend taxpayer dollars with no accountability.

Canadians deserve to see the plan. When will the Prime Minister deliver?

● (2320)

Annie Koutrakis (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Jobs and Families, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for Calgary Centre for his interest in employment for Canadians. Labour market change is happening at a dizzying pace. Government, businesses and workers are navigating new challenges and opportunities.

Fortunately, Canada has everything it needs to succeed, including a very deep pool of talent. Our government is committed to protecting and supporting workers in this period of uncertainty and change in our labour market. We have the most highly skilled workforce in the world. It is why Canada will keep its economy strong and vibrant. However, a huge wave of retirements is leaving important sectors facing critical labour shortages.

[Translation]

An estimated 600,000 tradespeople will retire by 2031. Add to that the anticipated creation of 400,000 jobs by the end of the decade, and we can see that this is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity for an entire generation. Of course, there is no one-size-fits-all solution. That said, young people are an underutilized resource and are the key to Canada's future prosperity.

A new path forward requires bold action to earn the trust of young people so that they know their career aspirations will be fulfilled.

It is also important to remember that young people are entering a labour market that bears little resemblance to the one their parents and grandparents knew. This ever-changing market requires us to do whatever it takes to equip young people with the skills and experience they need to succeed.

[English]

Young people are navigating an employment landscape that is very different from past generations. Because we cannot build houses without skilled carpenters, plumbers, electricians or any of

the other Red Seal trades, we also have to make sure that individuals facing additional barriers have access to the supports needed to access education and training. For Canada to be a G7 leader, our workers must have access to training, retraining and upskilling. That is why the Government of Canada is supporting a comprehensive array of programming.

For example, this year alone, the Government of Canada aims to support over 150,000 opportunities for youth through the youth employment and skills strategy program, Canada summer jobs, the Canada service corps, the supports for student learning program and the student work placement program.

We are making targeted investments under the Canadian apprenticeship strategy, targeting the skilled trades workforce's most pressing needs. Nearly \$1 billion annually in apprenticeship support goes toward making trades training more affordable, through loans, grants and contributions, tax credits and EI benefits.

[Translation]

In order to welcome recruits such as young people and newcomers to the workforce, the Future Skills Centre has collaborated with more than 2,900 organizations from 20 sectors from coast to coast to coast and helped 103,000 Canadians access skills training in order to get a job.

● (2325)

[English]

We will advance new opportunities, transform into a one economy agenda and invest to ensure that Canadians have the skills they need to fill in-demand jobs.

Greg McLean: Well, Mr. Speaker, so it continues. Even the decline of the House and the parliamentary norms that were once expected by Canadians continues. The member across the way had notice of exactly what my question was about tonight; it was about the budget. We have repeated this several times in the House, and that was the question. She delivered her own speech based on narratives around labour and where the Liberals are going. That was not at all what the question was.

Let me address that. We do need a budget in the House. We need something that actually shows Canadians what they can expect going forward. If we do not continue to respect the norms of this House and deliver the democratic minimums that have been expected in Canada for decades now, such as budgets, so that Canadians can see what is going on in the House of Commons, let me say to my colleagues on the other side of the House that if they are not part of the solution, they continue to be part of the problem. They might think they are a new government, but if they are going to act like the old government, they are going to continue.

When is the government going to give us a budget?

[Translation]

Annie Koutrakis: Mr. Speaker, His Majesty King Charles III recently said in Parliament that “Canada has what the world needs”. This includes Canadian workers. Canada's future success depends on the skills of its skilled trades workforce. That is why the Government of Canada is investing nearly \$1 billion annually in apprenticeship support.

[English]

Great programs support our boundless ambition to create a skilled workforce for the future. They ensure there will be new jobs and exciting opportunities for Canadian workers.

I want to assure the member opposite that the Government of Canada will always support Canadian workers and their families. We invest those funds because we believe passionately that skills training is key to unlocking Canada's economic potential and a road to a prosperous future.

I will end by saying there will be a budget in the fall.

FINANCE

Mel Arnold (Kamloops—Shuswap—Central Rockies, CPC): Mr. Speaker, as I stated on June 9 in this chamber, Canadians from Field, B.C. in the Rockies to the ranch lands of Kamloops tell me that family budgets are being destroyed by Liberal inflationary spending. The Prime Minister said that he wants to be held accountable for what Canadians pay at the grocery store. It is more than what people are paying at the grocery store that he will be held accountable for. It is how many people are lining up at food banks because they cannot afford to go to a grocery store. How many cannot afford a home because it just does not fit in their budget? Grocery prices driven up by the Liberals' inflationary spending, along with doubled housing costs, make it impossible for families and small businesses to meet their budgets, budgets they must meet or face bankruptcy.

When I look at what is happening in the 45th Parliament, I can only see how much it resembles the last Parliament, one frozen by Liberal corruption and the refusal to answer to the will of the majority of the House, with a government that allowed hundreds of millions of dollars to go out the door to its Liberal friends with no accountability.

The similarities continued this week as the majority of the House passed a Conservative motion demanding that the Liberals get back the \$64 million they handed to GC Strategies, the ArriveCAN scam people, for doing nothing. Not one Liberal voted for accountability as 165 Liberals voted against getting Canadians their money back from the ArriveCAN scam. The Liberals have been directed by the House to, within 100 days, get the taxpayers' money back. It is our money, my money and the money of every taxpayer in Canada. The government owes that to Canadians, but it will not do it, because it is the same group of ministers who are just fine with the corruption as long as it benefits them and their rich friends.

The Prime Minister hired back the same old crowd of ministers who helped Justin Trudeau blow through budgets that did not bal-

Adjournment Proceedings

ance themselves. Now he refuses to even present a budget to explain how he plans to spend half a trillion in taxpayer dollars.

When I asked on June 9 if the Liberal government would table a budget and reverse its inflationary policies so Canadians can afford to put food on the table, I was asking on behalf of the good people of Kamloops—Shuswap—Central Rockies, who deserve an honest and respectful answer. They want to know how their taxpayer dollars are going to be spent because they are the ones footing the bill. They work hard for their paycheques, only to have them taken away by a government that refuses to account for how taxpayer money is being spent.

Why will the Prime Minister not come clean and admit that he does not really have a plan, other than spending other people's money so he and his rich friends can get richer on the backs of hard-working Canadians?

● (2330)

Ryan Turnbull (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance and National Revenue and to the Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to be here tonight at 11:30 to answer the member's question, and it was great to see us all vote together in this chamber to pass the main estimates tonight. I note that the members opposite have supported a number of pieces of legislation in this House just this week. It is great to see us working together on behalf of Canadians. It is also great to be back in government on behalf of Canadians. My condolences to the members opposite for returning to their rightful place on the opposition benches.

Canadians expect us to take bold actions that will drive economic growth, create good-paying jobs and ensure that all Canadians benefit from Canada's incredible talent and ingenuity, our strong free trade agreements already in place and our unique and vast wealth and prosperity. That is exactly what we are doing, and we are doing it with strength, purpose and agility.

Adjournment Proceedings

First, we introduced a middle-class tax cut, a hugely significant investment in Canadians that will put more money in their pockets. There are 22 million Canadians across this country who will get a tax break. Conservatives can complain about that, but that is delivering for Canadians. Second, we will help to further bring down costs for Canadians, especially young people. I take to heart that young people in my riding have said it is hard to purchase their first home. We are removing the GST for first-time homebuyers on new homes valued at \$1 million and saving them up to \$50,000. We are also lowering the GST for first-time homebuyers on new homes valued between \$1 million and \$1.5 million. Third, we are honouring a commitment we made. It should very much please the Conservative Party of Canada that we have removed the consumer carbon price from law, effective as of April 1 of this year, as part of our plan to refocus federal carbon pollution pricing standards.

We will do all of these things while keeping our industrial carbon tax in place so that Canada can remain aligned with global best practices and continue to build a competitive and more sustainable economy. These three measures send a strong and clear signal to Canadians right across the country that we will remain focused. Our top priority will be them as we build the biggest and fastest-growing economy in the G7.

Speaking of priorities, I recognize the federal budget is a critically important financial and democratic document. That said, it is precisely why budget 2025 must be delivered in a logical sequence that takes national and international priorities into account. As Canada forges a new relationship with the United States based on respect and common interest, we must remain hyperfocused on reinforcing Canada's strength at home, safeguarding our workers and businesses, and defending their interests. These discussions are ongoing and vitally important for our shared future. They are also vitally important as we see investments in our defence spending and reaching our NATO target this year. I welcomed the great announcement the Prime Minister made.

Of course, in the midst of all of these changes internationally, it is prudent of us to take the time we need to prepare a budget properly. We need the detailed analyses, policy checks and meticulous preparations that budgets always entail. That is, in my view, the proper process for developing a budget. Budgets are not types of documents that should be rushed. I hear my colleagues heckling me. I welcome that because it eggs me on, makes me feel good and actually makes me want to talk even more. We will definitely deliver a budget this fall.

• (2335)

Mel Arnold: Mr. Speaker, that answer speaks to the arrogance of the government that just continues from one Parliament to another, with the same members on that side of the House and the same people in the ministers' chairs. It just does not change.

The parliamentary secretary talked about reducing the GST for first-time homebuyers, but it is only on new homes. It is going to be less than 5% of the market, if people can afford a down payment. It is now taking 25 years for young people to save a down payment when it only used to take 25 years to pay for a home. That is what the Liberal government has cost Canadians over the last 10 years.

The parliamentary secretary also spoke about removing the carbon tax. The Liberals have only removed the consumer carbon tax and have not said a word about removing the industrial carbon tax, which consumers end up paying in the long run—

The Deputy Speaker: The hon. parliamentary secretary.

Ryan Turnbull: Mr. Speaker, it is great to rise again to rebut the remarks of the member opposite.

Our government has worked tirelessly for 10 years to help Canadians afford a home, but also to increase supply. We have done all kinds of work. We have decreased mortgage insurance. We have waived GST on new rental construction. We have helped with the national housing strategy and the rapid housing initiative to build new supply.

I have six examples of projects in my riding that have gotten done as a result of those investments, which are key, and hundreds of new affordable housing units in our riding. Now we are adding more. There is also a tax-free savings account for Canadians so that young families can save up, tax-free, to purchase their first home. There is a whole package of measures.

Obviously, I am running out of time.

However, we will continue to build the homes that Canadians need and help young families get into those homes.

HOUSING

Tamara Jansen (Cloverdale—Langley City, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the housing minister claims to have the most robust housing agenda in the history of the House, but Canadians have heard this story before. The man making that claim was also the mayor of Vancouver during one of the most disgraceful chapters in Canadian housing history. Under his watch, Vancouver became a global hot spot for money laundering, shady real estate deals and housing speculation. Drug cartel money flowed freely through casinos and into luxury condos. Homes were not being built for families. They were being used as safe deposit boxes for dirty money. Where was he? He was not taking action. He was not standing up for working Canadians. He turned a blind eye.

When researchers exposed what was happening, when members of Vancouver's own Chinese community raised the alarm, he did not listen. He dismissed the findings. He smeared the critics. He chose to protect the developers, the insiders and the money men. He let the crisis grow, and hard-working families paid the price. That is not just failure; that is a complete lack of integrity.

Now that same man wants us to trust him to solve Canada's housing crisis. He is not a man who builds trust. He is a man who abandons it and the people who depend on it every time. Not only that, but the Liberal programs that the minister now defends simply do not work. They do not look good on paper, and they certainly do not work in practice. Just ask the families trying to get their first home. Ask the single moms stuck in rentals that drain every last dime.

Those programs did not even base affordable housing on what people actually earn. Instead, they used market rents during a housing crisis, which was sky-high, and just knocked off a few dollars. This means that in Vancouver or Toronto, if the market rent is, say, \$3,000, they would call \$2,400 affordable. However, for the people who actually need help, that is not affordable at all. It is not affordable for low-income seniors, not for young families trying to start out and not for immigrants working two jobs to make ends meet. Calling something affordable does not make it true.

The minister knows full well that these programs do not create truly affordable housing. He is a clever man and a wealthy man. He owns multiple properties. Would he ever build housing based on what low-income Canadians can actually afford? Of course not, he would not make the big returns. That is the real issue here. These programs are not built to fix the problem. They are built to protect the insiders, to keep the system working for people like him while everyone else is left behind: the single moms, the seniors and the working-class Canadians who just want a fair shot and get nothing. Forgive us, Mr. Speaker, if we do not believe him, because this is not about slogans. It is about people, real people who have been failed again and again by those who are supposed to lead.

The minister can stand up and repeat his talking points all he wants, but Canadians have lived through the reality. They see the truth clearly now. The few homes being built are not truly affordable. The numbers do not match the promises. Most importantly, the trust that Canadians once had in their leaders is gone. This is not going to be the most robust housing agenda in Canadian history. It is going to be more smoke and mirrors. The government has failed to build homes and failed to protect the people who need them most.

This former mayor failed Vancouver. He turned a blind eye while a housing crisis exploded and working families were pushed out. There is no reason to believe he will do any better on a national scale. In fact, there is every reason to believe it will be far worse under his direction. If he could not fix the housing crisis for one city, why on earth would Canadians trust him with the entire country?

• (2340)

Jennifer McKelvie (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Housing and Infrastructure, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we agree that Canadians deserve safe and affordable housing that meets their needs. That is why the Government of Canada has put together an ambitious housing plan that will take bold action to unlock private investment, cut red tape and lower the cost of homebuilding across the country.

We are committed to doubling the current rate of construction to 500,000 homes per year. We know rising construction costs, labour

Adjournment Proceedings

shortages and the increasing cost of materials are barriers to building. That is why we are changing how we build and are creating “build Canada homes”. This new, lean, mission-driven federal entity will accelerate the development of new affordable housing. It will invest in the growth of the prefabricated and modular housing industry and will provide significant financing to affordable home builders. “Build Canada homes” will catalyze a new housing industry using Canadian innovation, Canadian workers and Canadian lumber to build homes by Canadians for Canadians.

We are also supporting first-time homebuyers with targeted financial measures by eliminating the goods and services tax, GST, on homes valued at or under \$1 million, and by reducing the GST for homes up to \$1.5 million. We are lowering upfront costs and therefore making it more affordable for young Canadians to enter the housing market. Combined with tools like the tax-free first home savings account, we are making it easier to save for a down payment and achieve the dream of home ownership.

In addition to these measures, we are making historic investments in new housing all across Canada. We are investing in purpose-built rental supply through the apartment construction loan program, and we are launching the Canada rental protection fund to help community housing providers acquire housing, preserve existing rental stock and keep rent stable over the long term.

In addition, we are strengthening investments in community housing through the affordable housing fund, which is helping to build and repair thousands of deeply affordable homes across the country. We have also launched the co-operative housing development program, which is the largest investment to build new co-op housing in the last 30 years.

This is how we deliver for Canadians. This is how we build resilience. This is how we build Canada strong.

Tamara Jansen: Mr. Speaker, the housing minister is not starting with a clean slate. His record in Vancouver is well known. As investigative journalist Sam Cooper documented in his book *Wilful Blindness*, his city hall was part of what he calls the Vancouver model, where laundered crime money, foreign cartels and offshore investment fuelled skyrocketing housing prices while honest families were locked out.

Adjournment Proceedings

Now he claims to lead the most robust housing agenda in history. With that track record, I am sorry, but Canadians do not believe it. Ten years of Liberal broken promises and only 309 homes to show for millions in investment. They can spin all they like, but credibility matters. He should build trust first, because right now, his reputation precedes him. Why would Canadians believe a word he says?

● (2345)

Jennifer McKelvie: Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada recognizes that every person in Canada deserves a place to call home. That is why we have launched an ambitious plan to unlock private investment, cut red tape and build housing at a scale and speed this country has not seen in decades. That is what we brought to Canadians in April. That is what we were elected to do.

We are working together with all our partners to use every tool available to get the job done. From concept to construction, the

Government of Canada is increasing the pace of homebuilding to build the homes we need and lower costs for Canadians. Under the ministry of housing and infrastructure and our minister's leadership, and through "build Canada homes" and other federal investments, such as the affordable housing fund and the co-operative housing development program, we are building up Canada's housing supply like never before and building Canada strong.

[*Translation*]

The Deputy Speaker: The motion that the House do now adjourn is deemed to have been adopted. Accordingly, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at 2 p.m. pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 11:46 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Tuesday, June 17, 2025

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS		Bonin	1169
Information Commissioner		Ramsay	1170
The Speaker	1157	Deltell	1170
Commissioner of Lobbying		Barsalou-Duval	1171
The Speaker	1157	Privilege	
Veterans Ombudsman		Alleged Misleading Minister Testimony in Committee of the Whole	
Casey	1157	Lamoureux	1171
Income Tax Act		Business of Supply	
Johns	1157	Opposition Motion—Sale of Gas-Powered Vehicles	
Bill C-211. Introduction and first reading	1157	Motion	1172
(Motions deemed adopted, bill read the first time and printed)	1157	Lobb	1172
Petitions		O'Rourke	1173
World Health Organization		Larouche	1173
Gallant	1157	Davidson	1174
Foreign Affairs		Gallant	1174
Johns	1158	Lamoureux	1175
Questions on the Order Paper		Larouche	1176
Lamoureux	1158	Falk (Provencher)	1176
		Sgro	1176
		Gladu	1178
		Barsalou-Duval	1178
		Fergus	1178
		Weiler	1178
		Gladu	1180
		Barsalou-Duval	1180
		Fergus	1180
		Davies (Niagara South)	1180
		Barsalou-Duval	1181
		Gerretsen	1182
		Epp	1182
		Ruff	1182
		Gerretsen	1184
		Simard	1184
		Stevenson	1184
		Dzerowicz	1184
		Diotte	1186
		Larouche	1186
		Hogan	1186
		Gerretsen	1186
		Davidson	1188
		Simard	1188
		Groleau	1188
		Lamoureux	1190
		Larouche	1190
		Hardy	1190
		Kirkland	1190
		Lavack	1192
		Doherty	1192
GOVERNMENT ORDERS			
Business of Supply			
Opposition Motion—Sale of Gas-Powered Vehicles			
Lantsman	1158		
Motion	1158		
Lamoureux	1160		
Barsalou-Duval	1160		
Dowdall	1160		
Johns	1160		
Seeback	1161		
Hogan	1162		
Larouche	1162		
Steinley	1163		
Grant	1163		
Doherty	1165		
Deschênes	1165		
Kayabaga	1166		
Gill (Windsor West)	1166		
Chagger	1166		
Barsalou-Duval	1166		
Diotte	1166		
Lamoureux	1166		
Simard	1167		
Lavack	1168		
Deltell	1168		
Weiler	1168		
Falk (Provencher)	1168		

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Overcoming Global Challenges

McPherson 1192

Canada Day Celebrations

Saini 1192

Emmy Fecteau

Groleau 1193

Vaccinations

Fry 1193

Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong

Gladu 1193

National Public Service Week

Fergus 1193

Canadian Energy Sector

Goodridge 1193

Rural Economic Development

Fancy-Landry 1194

Buzz Hargrove

Gill (Windsor West) 1194

Jimmy Lai

Brunelle-Duceppe 1194

100th Anniversary of Commissioners

Fisher 1194

The Economy

McLean (Calgary Centre) 1195

Community Yard Sale in Scarborough Centre—Don Valley East

Zahid 1195

Gas-Powered Vehicles

Viersen 1195

Community Grandioses Awards

Deschênes-Thériault 1195

Gas-Powered Vehicles

McKenzie 1196

Jean-Yves Guindon

Lauzon 1196

ORAL QUESTIONS

Automotive Industry

Warkentin 1196

Dabrusin 1196

Warkentin 1196

Champagne 1196

Thomas 1196

Dabrusin 1197

Thomas 1197

Dabrusin 1197

Berthold 1197

Champagne 1197

Berthold 1197

Dabrusin 1197

Government Priorities

Normandin 1197

Gull-Masty 1198

Normandin 1198

MacKinnon 1198

The Environment

Bonin 1198

Dabrusin 1198

Automotive Industry

Khanna 1198

Champagne 1198

Baldinelli 1198

Bardeesy 1198

Borrelli 1199

Freeland 1199

Gill (Windsor West) 1199

Freeland 1199

Gunn 1199

Dabrusin 1199

Jackson 1199

Champagne 1199

Hardy 1199

Dabrusin 1200

Intergovernmental Relations

Barsalou-Duval 1200

MacKinnon 1200

Barsalou-Duval 1200

MacKinnon 1200

Housing

Kusie 1200

MacKinnon 1200

Genuis 1200

MacKinnon 1200

Genuis 1200

MacKinnon 1201

Vien 1201

MacKinnon 1201

Vien 1201

MacKinnon 1201

Justice

Sidhu (Brampton South) 1201

Fraser 1201

Vis 1201

Fraser 1201

Vis 1202

Fraser 1202

Mahal 1202

Sahota 1202

Moore 1202

Sahota 1202

Paul-Hus 1202

Fraser	1202	Beaulieu	1211
Brock	1203	Bexte	1212
Anandasangaree	1203	Lamoureux	1212
Brock	1203	Stevenson	1212
Sahota	1203	Guglielmin	1212
Guglielmin	1203	Danko	1214
Sahota	1203	Davies (Niagara South)	1214
Baber	1203	Blanchette-Joncas	1214
Sahota	1203	Lamoureux	1214
Canadian Identity and Culture		Noormohamed	1214
Ntumba	1203	Epp	1216
Guilbeault	1203	Garon	1216
Housing		Lamoureux	1217
Rood	1204	Gill (Windsor West)	1217
Robertson	1204	Deltell	1217
Rood	1204	Lamoureux	1219
Robertson	1204	Blanchette-Joncas	1219
Au	1204	Godin	1219
Robertson	1204	Leslie	1219
Foreign Affairs		Lamoureux	1221
Chang	1204	Beaulieu	1221
McGuinty	1204	Doherty	1221
Housing		Scheer	1222
Kuruc	1204	Lamoureux	1223
Robertson	1205	Blanchette-Joncas	1223
The Environment		Goodridge	1224
McPherson	1205	Bains	1224
Freeland	1205	Gallant	1225
International Development		Gladu	1225
May	1205	Lamoureux	1226
Sarai	1205	Beaulieu	1226
Presence in Gallery		Auguste	1226
The Speaker	1205	Kronis	1228
Departmental Plans, 2025-26		Garon	1228
Ali	1205	Ntumba	1228
Resignation of Member		Dalton	1228
Kurek	1205	Cody	1228
		Lamoureux	1230
		Beaulieu	1230
		Goodridge	1231
		Small	1231
		Lamoureux	1232
		Dalton	1232
		Gallant	1232
		Beaulieu	1232
		Gladu	1233
		Division on motion deferred	1235
GOVERNMENT ORDERS		Main Estimates, 2025-2026	
Business of Supply		Concurrence in Vote 1—Department of Canadian Heritage	
Opposition Motion—Sale of Gas-Powered Vehicles		Michel (for the President of the Treasury Board)	1235
Motion	1206	Motion No. 1	1235
Lamoureux	1206	Osborne	1235
Doherty	1208	Gallant	1237
Beaulieu	1209	Garon	1237
Bains	1209	Lamoureux	1237
Steinley	1209	Gladu	1237
Garon	1209		
Falk (Provencher)	1210		
Mazier	1210		
Hirtle	1211		

Ntumba	1238
McKelvie	1238
Blanchette-Joncas	1238
Bexte	1238
Lamoureux	1239
Cody	1240
Garon	1240
Dawson	1240
Perron	1241
Lamoureux	1242
Garon	1242
Dalton	1242
Garon	1242
Lamoureux	1244
Goodridge	1244
Osborne	1244
Brunelle-Duceppe	1245
Perron	1245
Deschênes-Thériault	1246
Gladu	1246
Brunelle-Duceppe	1247
Lamoureux	1247
Romanado	1247
Long	1248
Falk (Provencher)	1248
Garon	1249
Brunelle-Duceppe	1249
Bains	1249
Falk (Provencher)	1250
Deschênes-Thériault	1250
Brunelle-Duceppe	1250
Dalton	1251
Zimmer	1251
Deschênes-Thériault	1252
Perron	1252
Epp	1253
Reynolds	1253
Long	1254
Brunelle-Duceppe	1254
Gladu	1255
Deschênes-Thériault	1255
Lamoureux	1255
Stevenson	1257
Perron	1257
Deschênes-Thériault	1258
Roberts	1258
Gill (Windsor West)	1258
Brunelle-Duceppe	1258
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)	1258
Fancy-Landry	1260
Garon	1260
Viersen	1260
Desrochers	1260
Kronis	1260
Lavoie	1262
Perron	1262
Cody	1262

Fancy-Landry	1263
Lawton	1264
MacDonald (Cardigan)	1265
Epp	1265

Business of Supply

Opposition Motion—Sale of Gas-Powered Vehicles	
Motion	1265
Motion negatived	1266

Main Estimates, 2025-26

Concurrence in Vote 1—Canadian Heritage	
Motion No. 1	1267
(Motion No. 1 agreed to)	1267

Concurrence in Vote 1—Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation	
Ali	1267
Motion No. 2	1267
(Motion No. 2 agree to)	1267

Concurrence in Vote 1—Citizenship and Immigration	
Ali	1267
Motion No. 3	1267
(Motion No. 3 agreed to)	1267

Concurrence in Vote 1—Office of the Secretary to the Governor General	
Ali	1267
Motion No. 4	1267
(Motion No. 4 agreed to)	1267

Concurrence in Vote 1—Leaders' Debates Commission	
Ali	1267
Motion No. 5	1267
(Motion No. 5 agreed to)	1267
Motion for concurrence	1267
Motion agreed to	1269
Bill C-6. First reading	1269
(Motion deemed adopted and bill read the first time)	1269
Second reading	1269
Motion agreed to	1270
(Bill read the second time and the House went into committee of the whole thereon, Tom Kmiec in the chair)	1270
(On clause 2)	1270
Kusie	1270
Ali	1270
(Clause 2 agreed to)	1271
(Clause 3 agreed to)	1271
(Clause 4 agreed to)	1271
(Clause 5 agreed to)	1271
(Schedule 1 agreed to)	1271
(Schedule 2 agreed to)	1271
(Clause 1 agreed to)	1271
(Preamble agreed to)	1271
(Title agreed to)	1271
(Bill agreed to)	1271
(Bill reported)	1271
Motion for concurrence	1271

Motion agreed to	1273	(Preamble agreed to)	1278
Third reading	1273	(Title agreed to).....	1278
Motion agreed to	1274	(Bill agreed to).....	1278
(Bill read the third time and passed)	1274	(Bill reported).....	1278
Supplementary Estimates (A), 2025-26		Motion for concurrence.....	1278
Ali	1274	Motion agreed to	1279
Motion for concurrence	1274	Third reading	1279
Motion agreed to	1276	Motion agreed to	1281
Bill C-7. First reading	1276	(Bill read the third time and passed)	1281
(Motions deemed adopted and bill read the first time) ...	1276		
Second reading	1276		
Motion agreed to	1277		
(Bill read the second time and the House went into committee of the whole thereon, Tom Kmiec in the chair).....	1277	ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS	
(On clause 2)	1277	Finance	
Kusie.....	1277	McLean (Calgary Centre)	1281
Ali	1277	Koutrakis	1282
(Clause 2 agreed to)	1277	Finance	
(Clause 3 agreed to)	1278	Arnold	1283
(Clause 4 agreed to)	1278	Turnbull.....	1283
(Schedule agreed to).....	1278	Housing	
(Clause 1 agreed to)	1278	Jansen.....	1284
		McKelvie	1285

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>