



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities

TRAN • NUMBER 026 • 2nd SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Tuesday, May 13, 2014

—
Chair

Mr. Larry Miller

Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities

Tuesday, May 13, 2014

•(0845)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Larry Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC)): I call our meeting to order.

I'd like to thank all of our witnesses here today from the department.

I believe, Mr. Roussel, you're going to open up, then we'll go to Mr. Brazeau or Ms. Pham.

Do you have a point of order, Mr. Watson?

Mr. Jeff Watson (Essex, CPC): Yes, Chair.

It was my understanding that a number of other witnesses would be called, other than departmental officials. Can you comment as to what happened with respect to that? I presume there were a number of people who were invited.

The Chair: Yes, I believe it was four witnesses—I can get you the names if you want—that were invited, but none of them could or would appear today.

Mr. Jeff Watson: Were they offered the option of a video conference as well?

The Chair: Yes, I believe so.

Mr. Jeff Watson: Okay, fair enough.

I can get the names later. That's fine. My apologies to officials.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Roussel, for 10 minutes, please.

Mr. Donald Roussel (Acting Associate Assistant Deputy Minister, Safety and Security, Department of Transport): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and distinguished members.

[Translation]

I'm pleased to appear before you today to speak about the three Transport Canada statutes that are proposed for amendment under the Budget Implementation Act.

[English]

With me today is Kash Ram, director general of motor vehicle safety; Mrs. Kim Benjamin, director of road safety programs, which is in support; and Mr. Michel Leclerc, the director of regulatory affairs coordination.

[Translation]

These proposed amendments flow from Regulatory Cooperation Council action plan commitments that were made in December

2011. Eleven of the Regulatory Cooperation Council's initial 29 initiatives under the Joint Action Plan fell under the transportation team.

To complete implementation of the Motor Vehicle Safety, Transportation of Dangerous Goods and Railway Safety action plans requires that we make these legislative amendments.

[English]

As members of this committee know, the Regulatory Cooperation Council's long-term objective is to develop systemic mechanisms that eliminate regulatory obstacles between Canada and the United States

[Translation]

Regulatory inconsistencies can cost money on both sides of the border because the need to comply with two set of regulations is simply not effective when economies are as integrated as Canada's and the United States'. The standards are often identical but expressed as divergent regulatory requirements and manufacturing and distribution costs are passed on to consumers.

[English]

Synchronizing the policy development and enactment phases of our respective regulatory processes will lead to mutually supportive and beneficial regulatory frameworks and promote economic growth, job creation and benefits to consumers and businesses.

Canadian and U.S. stakeholders consulted in the fall of 2013 expressed overwhelming positive support for the Regulatory Cooperation Council's initiative. They were particularly supportive of efforts to institutionalize cooperation and remove impediments to speedy alignment when widespread consensus existed.

Accordingly, these legislative amendments are being proposed to the Motor Vehicle Safety Act.

[Translation]

The Motor Vehicle Safety Act, along with the associated regulations and standards, is the pillar that supports the Motor Vehicle Safety Program in Canada. It regulates the manufacture and importation of motor vehicles and of new tires and equipment used to restrain children and disabled persons inside the vehicle.

The proposed amendments to the Motor Vehicle Safety Act directly support two of the Regulatory Cooperation Council work plan items, as well as the overall objectives of the initiative. These proposed amendments are designed to remove barriers and align vehicle safety regimes, where appropriate, between Canada and the U.S. They are intended to reduce red tape and increase efficiency, while enhancing the safety of Canadians.

[English]

These amendments fall into four categories: rule-making; importation; safety, which deals with compliance and enforcement; and information gathering

With respect to rule-making, modified regulation-making provisions will facilitate more efficient ongoing alignment with the U.S. and other international safety standards in those instances where the Government of Canada determines it is appropriate. These proposed changes will allow the Canada motor vehicle safety regime to keep pace with emerging technology in a more efficient manner.

Changes to the importation provisions will allow the importation of vehicles and equipment where it is deemed that the U.S. safety standard achieves the safety outcome required in Canada. They will also remove other importation irritants while continuing to protect the safety of the public.

● (0850)

[Translation]

Changes to the compliance and enforcement provisions will more closely align the Canadian and U.S. regimes, while continuing to protect and serve Canadians.

[English]

By improving the ability of Transport Canada to obtain and distribute information related to vehicle safety, it will help keep Canadians informed of issues related to vehicle safety and will enable the government to make better informed policy and regulatory decisions.

[Translation]

These proposed changes to the Motor Vehicle Safety Act will ensure the safety of vehicles sold to Canadians in a manner that recognizes the integrated nature of the North American auto market. They will reduce industry compliance burdens where appropriate, and respect public expectations of similar safety oversight regimes.

Let us now move on to the two other acts, which are

[English]

the Railway Safety Act and the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act, 1992.

[Translation]

The amendments to the Railway Safety Act and the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act, 1992, are identical and modernize legislative provisions that date back to the earlier 1980s, prior to the Canadian government's adoption of the first-ever federal regulatory policy in 1986.

[English]

Members will know that the current versions of the 1986 policy, the cabinet directive on regulatory management, still requires that notice be given of proposed regulations in the *Canada Gazette*, part I, before they are finally enacted, even in a case where the enabling legislation is silent on the matter. In light of this, it makes sense to apply the same cabinet directive standards as those applied to most other federal regulations with respect to prepublication.

Thank you very much. We would be happy to answer your questions.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Roussel.

Ms. Pham, for 10 minutes, please.

Ms. Thao Pham (Assistant Deputy Minister, Federal Montreal Bridges, Department of Transport): Good morning, Mr. Chair, and committee members.

My name is Thao Pham. I'm the assistant deputy minister for the federal Montreal bridges with Infrastructure Canada. Joining me this morning are Marc Brazeau, director general of the new bridge for the St. Lawrence with Infrastructure Canada, and Nicholas Wilkshire, who is the senior counsel with Justice Canada.

Thank you for the opportunity to give you an overview of the new bridge for the St. Lawrence act. As you probably know, based on an engineering expert report that was produced in 2010, the existing Champlain Bridge in Montreal was found to be at the end of its useful life. Following the recommendations of a pre-feasibility study, the Government of Canada announced on October 5, 2011, that it will replace the existing bridge. In December 2013 the Government of Canada announced that the construction of the new bridge for the St. Lawrence will be accelerated and the new bridge will be in service in 2018.

The Government of Canada also announced that the bridge will be built through a public-private partnership. A business case showed that a public-private partnership approach will deliver better value for money for taxpayers and will guarantee that the project is delivered on time and on budget.

In the context of the accelerated timeline for the new bridge, this act will ensure that the authorities required for the implementation of all aspects of the bridge are in place. The new bridge for the St. Lawrence act will provide as much legal certainty as possible in order to avoid delays due to different legal interpretations, or the potential charge of premiums by bidders to account for areas of uncertainty.

● (0855)

[Translation]

In short, the main objective of the New Bridge for the St. Lawrence Act is to provide the certainty and approvals required so that the project can be completed without delays.

[English]

The key legislative provisions of this proposed act include the following.

First, the act will designate the minister to be appointed by the Governor in Council to be the minister responsible for the administration of this act. The act will also declare the new bridge for the St. Lawrence River project to be for the general advantage of Canada, thereby making it a federal structure. Given the fact that the new bridge for the St. Lawrence will be an intraprovincial bridge, this project could be considered as provincial work. This clause therefore ensures that the Government of Canada has the jurisdiction and control over the bridge, as opposed to the province, which could otherwise have jurisdiction over a provincial work.

The act will also authorize the minister responsible to enter into any agreement relating to the bridge or related work with any person or with the Government of Quebec or any political subdivision of that government, for example, the municipalities within the Quebec province. Examples of these agreements include relocation of public utilities, exchange of information, and all of the collaboration necessary for the preparation work.

The act will provide the minister responsible with the authority to fix tolls and collect tolls on the new bridge through regulations. The act will provide the Minister of Public Works and Government Services with the authority to enter into an agreement with a third party, in this case a private partner, as the operator for the design, construction, and operation of the bridge.

It is the intention to get all of the approvals for this project. However, given that we don't yet know all of the possible permits that might be required, there is a clause in this act that provides the Governor in Council authority to exempt the project from some federal permits if it is deemed in the public interest to do so. In that case, the exemption would have to be done on a case-by-case basis. So it would be an ad hoc exemption.

Finally, the act exempts the project from the application of the User Fees Act and the Bridges Act. The intention of these exemptions is again to avoid legal uncertainties and duplication with respect to which legislation might apply to the new bridge.

Although the Bridges Act will not apply to this project, the public-private partnership agreement will contain very specific and stringent clauses and high performance standards with respect to the commissioning and inspection of the new bridge. With respect to the User Fees Act, given the unique feature of this project, it was determined that the fixing of tolls would be done through ministerial regulations.

That concludes my presentation, Mr. Chair. We would be more than happy to answer your questions.

Thank you.

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

I just wanted to remind the witnesses that section 309 of our procedural guide states:

The obligation of a witness to answer all questions put by the committee must be balanced against the role that public servants play in providing confidential advice to their Ministers. The role of the public servant has traditionally been viewed in relation to the implementation and administration of government policy, rather than the determination of what that policy should be.

With that, Mr. Sullivan, you have seven minutes.

Mr. Mike Sullivan (York South—Weston, NDP): Thank you to the witnesses.

The purpose of the motor vehicle safety regulation changes, as you say, is to synchronize our policy with that of the U.S. We've noted that the GM recall that is continuing to be investigated in the U.S. is not being investigated here, nor is it being discussed at this committee. Can you explain why our regulations do not, when in fact there could be criminal undertakings against GM executives if in fact it is found that GM is at fault for not advising Transport Canada of these defects earlier than they did?

• (0900)

Mr. Donald Roussel: Mr. Kash will answer.

Mr. Kash Ram (Director General, Road Safety and Motor Vehicle Regulation, Department of Transport): Mr. Chair, Minister Raitt did appear before the committee of the whole last Wednesday and answered very similar questions about the department's approach with regard to General Motors of Canada. In general terms, I can say that with regard to General Motors of Canada, Transport Canada was made aware of a defect and received notice of such defect from General Motors of Canada Limited at the same time that General Motors Company, which is the parent of the Canadian entity, received their notice of defect, and that in fact the actions are occurring in pace with U.S. actions.

Thank you.

Mr. Mike Sullivan: What actions are happening in Canada that are investigatory?

Mr. Kash Ram: Well, the recall is occurring for General Motors on not just two sides of the border but for General Motors across the globe. There are many General Motors subsidiaries that are also involved in numerous recalls, as the public is aware. These recalls involve the notification of owners of GM vehicles that they'll need to bring their vehicles into dealerships for repair. The manufacturing of these replacement parts is occurring now. Notifications have gone out, and people are bringing their vehicles in to the dealerships to get these vehicles repaired.

Mr. Mike Sullivan: I'm speaking in terms of the knowledge GM had of the defect. The U.S. is conducting five separate investigations, and there are allegations that in the course of those investigations and testimony, GM knew about these defects in 2001 and did nothing about it until this year. Under our Canadian law, GM is subject to prosecution for not advising Canadians of safety defects.

What are we doing in Canada to proceed with that investigation?

Mr. Kash Ram: Minister Raitt did testify last Wednesday night on this subject and indicated that our powers extend to General Motors of Canada Limited and that we have looked into the actions of that corporate entity in Canada and that, in fact, the recall occurred in both nations at the same time. The reality with any multinational corporation is that the headquarters determine when a recall occurs and then advises—directs—its wholly owned subsidiaries worldwide. There are many GMs worldwide who were informed by the corporate entity General Motors Company in Detroit as to when the defect existed, as to when the recall was declared, and as to how the remedy to that recall would be undertaken. That is a corporate decision.

Mr. Mike Sullivan: I know that decision was taken. My question did not have to do with the decision as to the recall. My question has to do with whether Canada, as an independent sovereign nation, can hold GM to account in our—

The Chair: On a point of order, Mr. Watson.

Mr. Jeff Watson: Mr. Chair, on a point of order, I've been listening to a few of the questions. We are here on the budget implementation act. I think there's an area where it's germane with respect to how potential changes may relate to the ability to trigger a recall or other provisions like that, but we're now trying an entirely separate issue at the committee table than what the orders of the day are.

Mr. Mike Sullivan: Mr. Chair, on that point, we are in fact hearing from these witnesses that these regulation changes are to harmonize our activities with those of the U.S. If the U.S., as a result of their regulations, is able to hold GM to account for its actions in criminal ways in front of their Senate, in front of their house of Congress, in front of subcommittees, and we are not, then I want to find out why that is not being done in our regulations. So far, we don't have a straight answer as to why we are not holding GM to account, except that their head office is in Detroit.

Mr. Jeff Watson: That's a separate question.

The Chair: Just on that, Mr. Sullivan, you had your opportunity last Wednesday night, or whatever night it was, when the minister was there. Anyway, continue on the subject of the day.

Mr. Mike Sullivan: On the definition of a national safety mark, how does that change actually affect our regulations vis-à-vis the U.S. regulations and the ability of manufacturers to avoid scrutiny by not having a national safety mark?

• (0905)

Mr. Kash Ram: A national safety mark is required for Canadian-based manufacturers. The proposed amendments will move the nature of affixing that national safety mark, which is a physical mark that must be attached to each vehicle, child seat, or tire, and that requirement will be made more broad, more flexible under the proposal whereby the regulations would determine the nature of that national safety mark. It is a unique Canadian requirement. Canada is a country that imports the vast majority of the vehicles, tires, and child seats. The national safety mark is different. I can't speak to the American equivalent; I don't think there is an American equivalent. They have a certificate of compliance label. We have a certificate of compliance label for vehicles that are imported. We have a national safety mark for domestically manufactured goods.

Mr. Mike Sullivan: So this isn't about compliance with the U.S.?

Mr. Kash Ram: It's not.

Mr. Mike Sullivan: If a manufacturer chooses not to install a national safety mark, is that okay?

Mr. Kash Ram: A domestic manufacturer must do that.

Mr. Mike Sullivan: They must. Okay.

Mr. Kash Ram: Yes, they must. The domestic manufacturer must apply for a national safety mark. The case file is reviewed, and that manufacturer is provided the authority to fix that national safety mark on the goods that it produces in Canada. If that company does not provide such evidence, such a case file for review, that company would not be able to sell its products in Canada.

Mr. Mike Sullivan: These regulations don't seem to actually say that, the ones that are being changed, but it's part of the old regulations.

Something that doesn't appear in these changed regulations is the issue of side guards on highway tractor-trailer units. There have been calls by Canadians and by many individuals to regulate the use of side guards to protect personal safety, to protect individuals. Why is that missing from the changes to the regulations?

Mr. Kash Ram: If there were a case to mandate side guards on trailers that are pulled by tractor units or on straight trucks, that would be considered a regulation or a safety standard, so it is out of scope for a legislative vehicle.

The Chair: Your time has expired, Mr. Sullivan.

Mr. McGuinty, for seven minutes.

Mr. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.): Good morning, everyone. Thank you for being here.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to get on the record that the witness that we put forward was Minister Lebel, who did not show here today, for whatever reason. For any Canadians watching, he did not show here to defend these changes.

Therefore, I will ask what I can of our good public servants, public officials, who, as you rightly point out, cannot speak for politicians. The politicians should be here, Mr. Chairman. The minister should be here to defend these changes, but let's see what we can get from the witnesses. How about that?

The Chair: That is probably good.

Mr. David McGuinty: Great.

The Chair: We do have to recognize that Minister Lebel had very short notice on this. I know he's in a cabinet meeting right now.

Carry on.

Mr. David McGuinty: I hear you. I can think of nothing more important, Mr. Chairman, than the minister being here to defend these changes.

Folks, these changes are going to change the way in which we give notice to Canadians about regulations dealing with rail safety. Is that right?

Mr. Donald Roussel: Yes.

Mr. David McGuinty: Right now any Canadian who wants to find out, for example, what's happening with respect to engineering standards for railway construction, road crossings, railway work, safety and security in crossing tracks, non-railway operations affecting railway safety, safety records and safety management systems.... Right now, under the existing regulatory structure, 90 days' notice is given to Canadians—private sector, public sector, NGOs, civil society, labour unions—about any changes in these areas. Is that correct?

Mr. Donald Roussel: It can vary, 30, 60, 90 days, depending on the gazetting processes.

Mr. David McGuinty: Going forward, that's not going to be the case anymore, is it?

Mr. Donald Roussel: No, that's not correct. It depends on the elements that we're dealing with.

• (0910)

Mr. David McGuinty: Will I get access, as a Canadian citizen, 90 days before any regulatory changes that are proposed to safety management systems?

Mr. Donald Roussel: SMS is definitely part of regulatory processes.

Mr. David McGuinty: What does that mean, sir? Am I going to get 90 days' notice?

Mr. Donald Roussel: Yes, you would get notice for SMS regulations.

Mr. David McGuinty: What are the changes here that are happening?

Mr. Donald Roussel: I'll give the floor to Mr. Leclerc, who will give you some details of what we're talking about.

Mr. David McGuinty: Very quickly, Mr. Leclerc, because we have only seven-minute rounds.

Mr. Michel Leclerc (Director, Regulatory Affairs Coordination, Department of Transport): Okay.

Actually, the cabinet directive on regulatory management already requires prepublication of regulations in the *Canada Gazette*, part I. The reason for eliminating this requirement is that one already exists in cabinet policy.

Canadians would still receive notice of proposed regulations when cabinet directs that regulations that are particularly significant are proposed for enactment.

Mr. David McGuinty: Okay, let's just parse through the words here.

You say there's a cabinet directive that already compels the publication of these regulations. Is that right?

Mr. Michel Leclerc: That's correct.

Mr. David McGuinty: But is it at the discretion of cabinet?

Mr. Michel Leclerc: It's at the discretion of cabinet.

Mr. David McGuinty: So right now it's not discretionary, is it?

Mr. Michel Leclerc: It's not.

Mr. David McGuinty: So we should be very, very clear here and honest about what's going on.

Right now we have mandatory disclosure up to 90 days before regulations are passed, so Canadians from any walk of life can find out what's going on in rail safety. Now we're saying that it will be up to cabinet, aren't we?

Mr. Michel Leclerc: It will not be entirely.

Mr. David McGuinty: It will not be entirely?

Mr. Michel Leclerc: It will not be, because the other elements of the cabinet directive that one has to take into account are the mandatory consultations, and those are documented in the regulatory impact analysis statement that accompanies every regulation. Before a regulation is actually proposed for formal enactment, there are ample consultations with people, and if it's deemed that the issue is very significant, as would be some of the rail crossings—

Mr. David McGuinty: Who makes the decision as to when it is deemed one way or the other?

Mr. Michel Leclerc: It's cabinet.

Mr. David McGuinty: I see.

Let's just get it on the record, Mr. Chairman, for Canadians who are watching. This is another power grab by cabinet, which wants to make sure that it controls what Canadians see or do not see within a 30- or 90-day window before a regulation is passed.

Let's move on, if we can, to the bridge question.

Madam Pham, you gave a good, very quick synopsis. Pre-feasibility, you said, was done. In 2011 they announced a new bridge. In 2013 construction was accelerated. In 2018—you repeated today what the minister repeated the last time he bothered to show up here—the bridge will be in service. It'll be ready to roll, says Minister Lebel, by 2018.

Now that's a very, very tall order and story for Canadians to believe. We don't even have a private sector partner yet on this bridge, do we?

Ms. Thao Pham: Mr. Chair, the procurement process started with the announcement in December 2013, a couple of months ago.

Mr. David McGuinty: Do we have a private sector partner today?

Ms. Thao Pham: We are in the process of selecting the private partner.

Mr. David McGuinty: When will we have a private sector partner?

Ms. Thao Pham: We will have a private partner selected in the spring of 2015.

Mr. David McGuinty: That will be in a year from now, in 2015. We're being told that the bridge is going to be built at a cost of \$3 billion to \$5 billion and it is going to be operational by 2018. Is that right?

Ms. Thao Pham: Mr. Chair, that is correct.

We also want to make sure that the procurement process has all of the integrity elements included in it. As you all know, this project is a project in the order of \$3 billion to \$5 billion, so we want to make sure that the bidders and the procurement process include all of the integrity framework, and therefore—

Mr. David McGuinty: As you should.

I feel for you, Ms. Pham, because in 2006 when this government took power, they were forewarned in all the briefing documents that were transferred to PMO, PCO, and each respective industry that this bridge was a big problem. In fact, in 2011, they were given a secret briefing note that said the bridge “was in 'poor condition' and required 'comprehensive strengthening and other repairs' to avoid jeopardizing public safety.”

You're telling us you're going to build a \$3 billion to \$5 billion bridge in three years after a private sector partner is chosen. Can you tell us whether you have done any analysis or examination of the distributive effects? That is, once this government puts a toll on this bridge, which is the busiest bridge in Canada and one of the most important for our economy, what will the effects be? What analysis have you done to show the effects on other bridges, on public transit, and on other roadways in the Montreal area?

• (0915)

Ms. Thao Pham: Mr. Chairman, the answer to that question is that we did preliminary analysis that was part of the business case, and it was shown that there might be some diversion, but given that we still have data gaps, we are in the process of obtaining more information. We do have traffic counters on the bridge to ensure that we have as accurate as possible the projections in terms of traffic diversion.

Mr. David McGuinty: Ms. Pham, I asked the minister that question. He refused to give me an analysis. Thank you very much for that.

The Chair: Mr. McGuinty, your time has expired.

Mr. David McGuinty: We'll come back to that, Mr. Chair, I hope.

The Chair: Mr. Watson, you have seven minutes.

Mr. Jeff Watson: Thank you to our officials for appearing today as we look into clauses in the budget implementation act, Bill C-31, that apply to matters of substance to this committee, the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities.

The Canada-U.S. Regulatory Cooperation Council is an initiative created out of the beyond the border agreement between our Prime Minister and President Obama back in 2011. The goal, obviously, of the RCC, which has, I believe, 29 different regulatory cooperation initiatives under the council, has been to engage not only government but also business and other stakeholders in ways to improve harmonization on matters that would be largely administrative in nature, some regulatory in nature, to achieve enhanced economic cooperation and competitiveness and to do so in a way that doesn't sacrifice safety. I think the public has to understand that this is also the important goal here.

I understand, from the industry's perspective—I come out of the auto industry; I worked on the assembly line at Chrysler prior to being elected to Parliament—Canada represents about 9% of the North American vehicle market. Regulatory differences or unique standards, be they in fuel economy or other areas, require corporate decisions about whether products can be offered in a particular market, whether or not they're likely to abate the cost of these changes in different segments of the North American market, or whether or not they have an entire North American market to abate the cost of regulatory forced improvements in their production.

First, from the government's perspective, why should we be concerned with harmonization of safety standards? Second, is it only to align with U.S. standards, or are there cases where the U.S. should be aligning with our standards? Third, is the U.S. considering any type of similar regulatory change to allow their system to be nimbler, for the same purpose that we're seeking?

Mr. Donald Roussel: Mr. Chairman, I will talk generally about rule harmonization and the challenges we have overall.

In all domains—it's not just transportation of dangerous goods by rail; it's also in the marine world and in the aviation world—we try to have the highest possible level of standards. In both the marine and aviation domains, we're dealing with international organizations, the International Maritime Organization and the ICAO, the latter located in Montreal. With these organizations, we have the chance to develop international standards that are adopted across numerous nations. The IMO has 169 members.

When it comes to TDG, transportation of dangerous goods, and rail, we are in the context of North American standards, and it requires a significant amount of dialogue with the U.S., in particular. On a continuous basis, we try to influence the U.S. regulators, but bear in mind that we're dealing with quite a giant and we need significant support at the highest level. The RCC does that particular work for us.

Working with our counterparts on both sides of the border on specific items of harmonization helps us level the types of requirements that we get and also looks at best practices on both sides of the border. They have been fairly beneficial so far, and we'd like to continue with these aspects.

• (0920)

Mr. Jeff Watson: On the question of the problematic DOT-111 cars, the minister has issued direction under her authorities under the act—or there has been, I should say, direction issued under the authorities currently in the act. But this is not a matter that would bypass the *Canada Gazette*, part I, would it? The phase-out of DOT-111s or their use, particularly of the 5,000 tanker cars that are insufficient for any use for the transportation of dangerous goods; when it comes to making a permanent regulation related to that, that's not an issue that's going to bypass *Canada Gazette*, part I. That's a matter that would.... That's not a minor change, if you will.

Is that a fair assessment, Mr. Roussel?

Mr. Donald Roussel: Yes, that's a fair assessment when we're dealing with major regulatory changes that get significant impact financially but also on the operations and safety of the overall regime. The type of amendment that we're looking at is sometimes administrative in nature, or where we have a significant level of consensus, Mr. Chairman, that has been achieved among the industry, the stakeholders, and the officials. We're not looking at having something of large magnitude that will use the flexibility we're looking at here.

Mr. Jeff Watson: By way of a real world example, you suggested that this prepublication regime has been applied in other areas outside of the transportation of dangerous goods, for example. Do you have other examples of how this directive has actually been able to cut through, on the one side, and determine what are minor issues and what are not? Do we have any examples in other areas outside of the transportation of dangerous goods where this directive has been functioning to separate what's minor from major?

Mr. Donald Roussel: Yes. For example, in the House, we have the Standing Joint Committee for the Scrutiny of Regulations. We do have significant requests from that committee. Those are either adjustments to the English, the French, or they request us to go back into the policy intent. Many of those regulations are already passed through the House. It's a matter of getting them out as rapidly as possible to respond to this.

Mr. Jeff Watson: Rather than taking six months to correct the French text, to align it better with the English, or vice versa, this type of an application now will allow that to be expedited by bypassing *Canada Gazette*, part I and going right to *Canada Gazette*, part II.

Mr. Donald Roussel: Yes, and in other elements that are more critical which deal with emergency situations where we want to make fast corrections, we have flexibility and an emergency directive, of course, but sometimes we have to address elements that are related to the regulations themselves. Significant consultations do take place with the proponent, but we want to act as rapidly as possible. This is the point that is at stake here.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Roussel.

Mr. Braid, for seven minutes.

Mr. Peter Braid (Kitchener—Waterloo, CPC): Thank you to the representatives for being here today.

I have some questions for the team with respect to the Champlain Bridge.

Ms. Pham, are you part of a dedicated team on this file?

Ms. Thao Pham: There is a dedicated integrated team working on this file. The team is composed of expert professionals from Transport Canada with experience in bridges. We also have experts from PPP Canada, with expertise in the market and bringing together the P3 experience. We have colleagues from Public Works and Government Services Canada as part of the team as well. They bring experience and expertise on the procurement process, ensuring that we do have a fair, open, and transparent process for this project. Also, we have a dedicated team of legal counsel from Justice Canada.

The team was brought together in January. We are working full-time on this project.

● (0925)

Mr. Peter Braid: Would you agree that the team has all the required representatives, departmental representatives, all the required resources, to get this project done?

Ms. Thao Pham: The team has come together over the last couple of months. Indeed, we are working very well together. We have reached many milestones already. The first one is in the procurement process. The first stage is the request for qualifications. That is the first major step in moving forward with the procurement in the selection of the winning bidder. That step has been achieved. We have received submissions from international and Canadian builders. We are in the process of assessing those submissions. The next stage will be to prepare the request for a proposal and to move forward with that in the summer.

I think that having a dedicated team of four departments coming together and working full-time on this project has been extremely helpful in moving the project forward and meeting timelines.

Mr. Peter Braid: Thank you for that update and that status report.

It's unfortunate that there appears to be a lack of optimism on the other side of the table with respect to the status of this particular project.

As I understand it, the original timeframe to conclude the Champlain Bridge was actually 2021. Our government has moved that forward, from 2021 to 2018. How have we managed to accelerate that timeframe?

Ms. Thao Pham: The first stage is that there was time put in the planning period. We have been working very closely with our top consultant in the engineering area, and also the legal consultants as well. In terms of advancing that timeline, we did spend a lot of time in terms of planning the next stages. Therefore, we're now rolling out those stages. It is of course an accelerated timeline, but based on the advice of our P3 partners and also the PPP Canada experts, they have determined that the timeline we're working under is very accelerated and ambitious but it is doable.

Mr. Peter Braid: Ms. Pham, you mentioned the P3 aspect of this, and I want to inquire about this component as well.

Why is the project being procured as a P3, and what are the advantages of that?

Ms. Thao Pham: Mr. Chair, we did an assessment, comparing the traditional method with respect to the P3 methodology. The studies and the analysis have shown that the P3 would generate better value for Canadian taxpayers. We are expected to have cost savings in the order of 5%, to I think it is 18% of the project costs.

The P3 advantage, first of all, is that because the private partner will enter into a contractual agreement with the government, there will be very strict and stringent clauses and conditions with respect to meeting the timeline and the budget as well. Otherwise, there will be penalties for the private partner. Therefore, there is an incentive for the private partner to meet that timeline.

The other thing is that for an infrastructure of this scale and magnitude, the P3 will also give us the advantage of ensuring that at the end of the concession period, and throughout that period, the maintenance and operation of the major infrastructure will meet high standards; otherwise, there will be penalties. The Government of Canada can withhold payments as well. Therefore, having a private partner build, maintain, and operate an infrastructure of this scale is certainly an advantage in terms of making sure that at the end of the contractual period the infrastructure is given back to the government in very good shape.

Mr. Peter Braid: Thank you.

The proposed act in Bill C-31 deems the new bridge to be “for the general advantage of Canada”.

Could you please explain that term and why it's of general advantage to Canada?

• (0930)

Ms. Thao Pham: Mr. Chair, the Champlain Bridge and the new bridge for the St. Lawrence is the only instance in Canada where the federal government owns a bridge that is located within a province—an intraprovincial bridge. Given the fact that normally an infrastructure of this type would belong to the provincial government, we want to ensure in this case that in building the bridge and in accelerating the construction of the bridge, we do have the authority and control over the bridge so that we can go ahead without any delays, given that we want to have a new bridge in operation in 2018.

Mr. Peter Braid: You also indicated in your presentation that the various provisions in the act will provide for “legal certainty”.

Could you elaborate on that? Could you perhaps give an example of a legal uncertainty, if you will, that will be avoided?

Ms. Thao Pham: Certainly. I will speak generally and then ask my colleagues Marc Brazeau and Nicholas Wilkshire to add to my answer.

The first example is that normally ministers do have authority to enter into agreements within their purview. In this case, for the minister responsible for the bridge we have included provisions to ensure that there is absolutely no doubt that the minister has the authority to enter into agreements with various parties, such as the province, municipalities, and other organizations, to ensure that we have all of the agreements in place to prepare all of the work necessary for the construction of the bridge. Again this provides certainty.

There are other examples as well with respect to the authority for the Minister of Public Works and Government Services to award contracts. Then again, given the fact that the Minister of Public Works has the authority under the Department of Public Works and Government Services Act, but given that this project is built as a bridge, there might be interpretation that it does not constitute a public work per se under the other act.

Those are the areas in which this bill would provide clarity.

Marc.

The Chair: Mr. Braid, you're out of time, but Mr. Wilkshire, do you want to comment?

Mr. Nicholas Wilkshire (Legal Counsel, Department of Transport): I would just add that given that there are two ministers involved, this would clarify any uncertainty as to which minister has which authority. Essentially, the Minister of Infrastructure—the minister designated—would have authority for virtually all aspects of the act, except for the actual P3 agreement, which will rest with the Minister of Public Works.

The Chair: Thank you.

Ms. Morin, you have five minutes.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Isabelle Morin (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, NDP): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I am particularly interested in the Railway Safety Act and the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act of 1992.

Mr. Roussel, section 50(1) of the Railway Safety Act currently sets out that regulations shall be published at least 90 days before their proposed effective date. For the residents in my riding, I want to specify that these regulations are for the standards for building rail facilities, deductibles for roads, exemptions for railway works, safety, security, crossings, activities other than railway operations that could compromise rail safety, information custody and retention, as well as safety management systems.

The Budget Implementation Act is aimed at removing this 90-day period, set out in section 50(1). By the way, it is quite strange to see this kind of provision in a budget implementation act.

Earlier, my Liberal colleague was able to get you to say that the act will give the minister more discretionary authority. You said it was in case of emergency, in cases such as the tragedy in Lac-Mégantic. However, the Minister of Transport currently has the authority to impose emergency measures under the Railway Safety Act and to adopt protective measures under the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act, 1992.

What will this change? Why does the minister need even more discretion when there are already provisions in place to allow him to take emergency measures?

• (0935)

Mr. Donald Roussel: Thank you for the question.

In these elements, it is clearly stated that elements linked to [*English*]

cabinet directive on streamlining regulation.

[*Translation*]

There will be official publications. These are minor amendments, as we have explained.

Ms. Isabelle Morin: Is it indicated somewhere that these are minor amendments? In the Budget Implementation Act, nothing indicates that these are minor changes. Is it once again up to the minister to decide what is minor and what is not?

Mr. Donald Roussel: After consultations with industry and primary stakeholders, there can already be consensus on minor elements.

Ms. Isabelle Morin: However, it is up to the minister to judge whether or not there is a consensus. Nothing obliges her to do so.

Mr. Donald Roussel: There is, however, an internal process to determine whether or not there is truly a consensus and to identify the level of risk that we are taking by publishing—

Ms. Isabelle Morin: How can citizens know if there is an internal consensus?

Mr. Donald Roussel: We have an internal consultation process with industry and with citizens. We work with the Canadian Federation of Municipalities.

Ms. Isabelle Morin: What do these consultations with citizens consist of? You say that you have put in place a process for consultation with citizens. If citizens from my riding wish to participate in this process, what does that mean?

Mr. Donald Roussel: We have several partners, such as the Canadian Federation of Municipalities and the Railway Association of Canada. In the case of changes that we are making or actions that we wish to take, we generally work with all of these individuals.

Ms. Isabelle Morin: Currently, anyone who wishes to make a comment to the Minister of Transport, can do so. After these changes are made, will this measure still exist?

Mr. Donald Roussel: All citizens can write to the minister. In fact they do so every day.

Ms. Isabelle Morin: Yes, but they will no longer do so to react to something that was published in *Canada Gazette*. That right is being taken away from citizens.

Mr. Donald Roussel: We are not taking away a right from citizens, because they will still be able to write and indicate that they disagree.

Ms. Isabelle Morin: Currently, a draft regulation must be published in the *Canada Gazette* at least 90 days before the regulation comes into force. This gives sufficient notice for a citizen to react to the plan. There will no longer be this 90-day period; the regulation will be published directly in Part II of the *Canada Gazette*, is that correct?

Mr. Donald Roussel: Mr. Leclerc will give you more details.

Mr. Michel Leclerc: In answer to your question, I will say that the regulatory process provides for the publication of a draft regulation. Only in exceptional cases will regulations be exempted from prepublication.

Ms. Isabelle Morin: Is it the minister who decides what constitutes an exceptional case?

Mr. Michel Leclerc: That is decided according to criteria established by cabinet.

Ms. Isabelle Morin: By cabinet. All right.

Mr. Michel Leclerc: There is one thing I would like to add. These changes are being made in the context of new agreements for regulatory collaboration between Canada and the United States. The current regime is as follows: in the United States, stakeholders are consulted, then a regulation is adopted; in Canada, stakeholders are consulted, a regulation is adopted, and then these regulations are not

Ms. Isabelle Morin: I apologize for interrupting you, Mr. Leclerc but I do not have much time.

If there is harmonization with the United States, then why has Canada not decided to adopt the regulation on automatic braking systems? Some witnesses told us that in the United States it is mandatory for railways to bypass cities and take safer routes. Why has Canada not adopted these kinds of regulations if there is a harmonization process with our neighbours to the south? Other laws and regulations have been passed in the south that we have decided not to adopt here. Why? Is there a two-tiered system? We adopt whatever suits Canada, and we do not adopt whatever does not suit our minister?

Mr. Michel Leclerc: Under the new agreements, Canada and the United States will be working on very specific items that are advantageous for Canadian stakeholders and consumers—

Ms. Isabelle Morin: Would the automatic braking system—

[English]

The Chair: Ms. Morin, I'm sorry, but you're out of time.

You may finish your answer, Mr. Leclerc.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Leclerc: I was going to say that the draft regulations both countries will be working on will deal specifically with initiatives that are highly likely to lead to positive outcomes from an economic and a safety perspective.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Komarnicki is next.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate the opportunity.

Thank you, witnesses, for enlightening us on some of the legislation.

I noted the basic issue relating to the notice period of up to 90 days. I think I heard you say that the proposed changes are at the discretion of cabinet but only if they are deemed very significant, so there are some pre-conditions.

Before a matter gets to cabinet, are there processes in place that would allow not only for consultation with the various stakeholders, but are there also processes within the different departments that look at all the various options that eventually bring the matter before cabinet with recommendations or what should or shouldn't be done?

● (0940)

Mr. Michel Leclerc: Under the federal regulatory process, departments, at the outset, when they're getting ready to do a regulation, go through what's called a triage of the proposal. During that process they examine the environmental, economic, and social impacts. On the basis of pre-established criteria, that indicates to the regulatory department the extent to which the cost benefit should be done. For example, it identifies the major areas of risk.

It also determines the level of significance of the regulations. If you had a very low-impact regulation, and the example we heard before is if, for example, the Standing Joint Committee for the Scrutiny of Regulations identified an inconsistency between the English and the French, if that kind of amendment comes forward, there's little point in prepublishing it for 90 days for a mandatory prepublication period since it's really corrective in nature. Whereas, we talked about the example of the DOT-111 cars; that is definitely a significant regulation and one that would be republished.

The length of time it would be republished in the future, under the cabinet directive, would be determined by the significance of the proposal. In fact, cabinet could elect to republish something for more than 90 days. They could say that they want this out there for six months, and they want people to really have a good look at this.

But not all regulations are equal. Many of them are merely administrative in nature. People wouldn't even look at them twice in the *Canada Gazette*, part I, but there are criteria to determine that in the regulatory process.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: There really are two sides to this equation. There are ones that are more housekeeping and perfunctory, where it would be obvious that you want to proceed with the change and there's consensus generally in that area and you wouldn't want to go through this whole process. On the other end of the extreme, there may be safety concerns, emergency-type concerns that are pre-established, I would say, through several independent routes that would recommend to cabinet to say, in this instance, they may want to modify that and deal with it because it is significant, it does have safety concerns, it does have impact, not only on public safety but on some emergency situations.

Mr. Michel Leclerc: Correct.

Mr. Chair, one of the things that we don't see when we remove this provision is that the Minister of Transport, for example, can recommend one of two things to the Governor in Council. She can recommend that something be exempted from prepublication, but at the same time, she can recommend that it be prepublished. If she deems it significant from a safety and security standpoint or for any other reason, she has the option of recommending that, but in the end, it's at cabinet's discretion whether something is prepublished. The greater the significance, the more likely it is that something will be prepublished.

I just wanted to add something else, Mr. Chair. The vast majority of enabling federal legislation does not have mandatory prepublication as part of its provision. We still have prepublication when the case is appropriate.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: It seems to me that even if it's not prepublished it's not a question of whether there hasn't been some extensive consultation. I would expect that before it gets to the cabinet stage, there actually is due diligence that it is done in terms of communication with the pertinent stakeholders, the people who are involved directly with the issue, and I suppose to some extent, the general public's reaction, to come forward with some basis for the recommendation that is made or some conditional points that are met. Would you agree?

• (0945)

Mr. Michel Leclerc: There are.

There are, in fact, the standing consultation committees on both sides of the border, where we're often dealing with the same issues. The department will put out notices sometimes in newspapers, sometimes in the *Canada Gazette*, part I, that it is launching a process to study regulations. There are formal consultations that have to occur. They have to be documented. Our Treasury Board Secretariat analysts are very stringent when they screen the material we send them for approval by the Governor in Council.

It's very important for ministers to understand what the pros and cons of each regulatory initiative are. They want to know who's for it, who's against it. We would not succeed in getting a regulation enacted by the Governor in Council if we didn't pass all these tests beforehand. The regulatory process is intrinsically very challenging.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: Thank you.

The Chair: You're out of time now, Mr. Komarnicki.

We'll move to Mr. Dubé, five minutes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Matthew Dubé (Chambly—Borduas, NDP): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Obviously I am going to speak about the Champlain Bridge because my riding borders highway 10. It is a main artery. Given the increase in population and urban sprawl in the Greater Montreal area, traffic problems are not going to lessen over the coming years. This is a serious problem that needs attending to.

We were told that the opposition members are not being very optimistic. Unfortunately it is the people, the public, who are not feeling very optimistic. In fact, Minister Lebel and the federal government go into their areas and impose a project that they do not feel they have been adequately consulted on. I am thinking here of elected municipal members, the Government of Quebec and the business sector.

In terms of consultation with the Quebec government, both for the new one and the previous one, the situation does not appear to have improved. It is apparently very problematic. A study published last week referred to effects on traffic in the region, on other bridges that do not all fall under federal responsibility. These will be quite serious impacts, especially if you take into account the factors I mentioned earlier. One of those factors is the increase in the population in our area, in the Chambly basin.

The report is quite practical; it provides real numbers. In response to a question from one of my colleagues, you said you still only had preliminary results, of a kind.

Have you seen this report from the Quebec government? If not, have you had discussions with the people concerned about the best way to manage the situation at the regional level?

Bridge-related issues should not be dealt with in a vacuum, but rather within a regional context. Unfortunately it does not appear that the latter is being considered at this point.

Ms. Thao Pham: There are two parts to your question.

In terms of the first part, I would like to point out that to date there have been 200 meetings with various partners, including representatives of the Quebec government, the municipalities, the cities of Brossard, Longueuil and Montreal, as well as with private partners such as the chambers of commerce. We continue to hold these meetings on a weekly basis. With respect to the Government of Quebec, we have had about one hundred meetings that our colleagues from the Quebec Ministry of Transport, the Agence métropolitaine de transport and the Société québécoise des infrastructures participated in. So there has been an exchange of information from the very beginning and we will continue in that fashion.

In terms of your question about the study that was published in newspapers this week, we were never made aware of an official report about this having been published by the Quebec Ministry of Transport. I can, however, assure you that we are working closely with the Quebec Ministry of Transport and the Agence métropolitaine de transport on the exchange of data for the purposes of projections.

As I indicated earlier, according to the data at the time, it was estimated that traffic on the Champlain Bridge would vary from 40,000 to 60,000 vehicles per day. However, these are not exact data. What we did was based on that data. We installed counters and stations in order to truly assess the current state of traffic on the bridge. That means we can refine projections about regional traffic with our partners—

● (0950)

Mr. Matthew Dubé: I apologize for interrupting you but my time is limited.

It is all very well to assess current traffic on the Champlain Bridge, however what is important is to understand regional effects. That is what people are concerned about. Some of my constituents work in Montreal. If the federal government comes into our riding and upsets regional dynamics, given how this will affect other bridges, there is going to be a serious traffic problem.

Besides assessing traffic on the Champlain Bridge, do you intend on determining how tolls will affect other bridges that are not necessarily under your authority? Has that been a part of your discussions?

I have heard a lot about meetings that have taken place. Of course, I believe what you are telling us but if there have been so many meetings, how do you explain the degree of dissatisfaction amongst the stakeholders? Neither the business sector nor elected officials appear to be satisfied with your department's receptiveness, unfortunately.

Ms. Thao Pham: In terms of traffic projections, we are collecting more specific data on the Champlain Bridge, but we are also going to be dealing with regional planning with all our partners.

In terms of collaboration with the stakeholders, I can give you facts such as the number of meetings we have held and the way in which the discussions have evolved. We also have several agreements with the cities and the province. There has been progress in that regard. We also held open houses on environmental assessment approximately a year and a half ago, which provided citizens with an opportunity to see how the project was progressing. Furthermore, our website contains a considerable amount of information. Several public presentations have taken place.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you.

Ms. Young, for five minutes.

Ms. Wai Young (Vancouver South, CPC): Thank you very much for being here today.

This is for the sake of the general public, and I don't want to be going on about it, but there still seems to be some question out there because of the questions that we had earlier around this whole

change in the regulatory process and dealing with the regulatory cooperation. Again, if you could go back to the average person on the street, should they be concerned that these regulatory changes are going to adversely impact in any way the safety of Canadians?

Mr. Donald Roussel: Mr. Chairman, I will ask both Mr. Kash on the motor vehicle side and Mr. Leclerc on the TDG and rail side to give a short answer on this matter.

Mr. Kash Ram: The Regulatory Cooperation Council was set up by the two heads of state, Mr. Harper and Mr. Obama, as you know, in early 2011. It has borne a lot of fruit. It has been reported on in budget 2014, specifically with regard to the alignment of auto standards between Canada and the U.S. That was a good endorsement, I think, of the work we've done in concert with our U.S. colleagues.

The idea is to work on sharing projects where it makes sense, where there's mutual intent, to jointly develop new standards and take them through to fruition. In other areas where each side looks at the other and sees something that it would like to pursue, then that side can unilaterally try to align with the other side.

A good example would be the auto theft immobilization systems, which has been an existing standard in Canada since 2007. The U.S. examined our standard, found that they would like to emulate us, and about a year ago they in fact proposed a regulation to harmonize with the Canadian standard. They have also indicated an interest in the Canadian rear underdrive standard for the trailers that are drawn by tractor units. They have indicated a significant interest in looking at our due diligence and potentially aligning with us. They have mentioned a few other areas as well.

I would say that there's no impact on safety. Each country has its sovereign ability under the RCC, as announced by the Prime Minister and the President a few years ago, to align where it makes sense. But in areas where there are unique domestic requirements, each country will continue to pursue standards and develop those standards for the domestic needs.

Ms. Wai Young: So you're saying, in your professional capacity, that in fact you think the safety standards are moving upwards; things are becoming more safe and that's why we are doing these regulatory changes, to increase safety and align that to better cooperation.

● (0955)

Mr. Kash Ram: Yes, that's very well put.

Ms. Wai Young: Have you ever seen instances where the alignment or the cooperation has decreased safety?

Mr. Kash Ram: I've never seen that. The reality is the expectations of the public continue to increase. The public wishes to have safer and safer vehicles, child seats, tires, and so on.

As an example, the number of fatalities on Canadian roads in recent years has been about 2,000 fatalities a year. That's a lot, and we'd like to get that down further, but the reality is the number of fatalities going back 40 years was three times that and the population of Canada was half what it is today. What has contributed to that in large part is that cars are safer. Cars are required to meet more and more standards. Yes, it's harder to build cars. It's a challenge to be an auto manufacturer, but what the auto manufacturers want first and foremost is alignment, simplification of their lives, to be able to build the same vehicles for both countries.

Ms. Wai Young: That is why we're here today, to look at some regulatory changes to make that alignment easier and to increase the safety for the Canadian public. Is that correct?

Mr. Kash Ram: Yes, to provide tools to government to be able to align faster, such that those standards are aligned for new standards and remain aligned as the standards evolve over time. That way the manufacturer can continue to make vehicles for both markets with minimal misalignment. Misalignment is an issue. If you have a different requirement in one market versus the other, then you're making different vehicles certified to two different markets. That's red tape on industry and that increases cost to the consumer as well.

Ms. Wai Young: But it's not simply a cost to consumer issue, it's a safety issue and we are increasing safety.

Mr. Kash Ram: Safety is paramount for our department.

Ms. Wai Young: Mr. Chair, how much more time do I have?

The Chair: Seven seconds, so we'll let Mr. Ram finish his answer.

Ms. Wai Young: We'll let Mr. Ram finish then. Thank you.

Mr. Kash Ram: Safety is our first priority. I can say with full confidence that we have carried out our obligation to the Canadian consumer, to the Canadian public, and the record on the road proves it.

Ms. Wai Young: Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Toet, you have five minutes.

Mr. Lawrence Toet (Elmwood—Transcona, CPC): Thanks to our witnesses this morning.

I was very intrigued, Mr. Leclerc, by one comment that you made in response to Mr. Komarnicki's questioning. You said that the "vast majority" of government legislation is not subject to prepublication today. Could you expand on that for us?

Mr. Michel Leclerc: Yes.

Mr. Chair, it's true that the vast majority of federal legislation that enables the making of regulations does not contain a mandatory prepublication requirement. The practice existed to a greater extent before the first federal regulatory policy enacted in 1986 by the Mulroney government. At that point, the government decided to create a mandatory prepublication requirement for the federal regulatory process, in addition to increasing the amount of analysis required before any regulatory action was created.

The tendency has been in more recent years to rely on the cabinet directive in order to determine when it's most appropriate to prepublish proposed regulatory projects.

Mr. Lawrence Toet: You also mentioned that there are pre-established criteria for the application of the mandatory prepublication as outlined in the cabinet directive, so this isn't just something that you go forward with willy-nilly. There is actually a process.

You said that you would be asked specific questions as to the process that you had gone through, the stakeholders you had consulted, and what the feedback had been from the multiple stakeholders. So there really is an opportunity for input, especially on the basis of the stakeholders, before any of this would come forward.

Mr. Michel Leclerc: Absolutely.

The other thing, too, is that we must not presume that notice in the *Canada Gazette*, part I, is actually consultation. It is merely a notice that the government proposes to take action. The real consultation takes place before the fact through formal committees and through notices in newspapers. Let's not forget that the government always has the option of giving notice through mechanisms other than the *Canada Gazette*, part I, if it chooses to do so, and it often does.

Mr. Lawrence Toet: Yes. As you say, the prepublication aspect of the *Gazette* is not really meant to be the consultative process even today, really; it's a notice that something is coming forward. The consultation needs to happen before that. You're not going to put forward legislation that you've done no consultation on.

Mr. Michel Leclerc: That's correct. Nowhere is it more true than in the case of an RCC regulatory project, because under the model being proposed by the RCC, stakeholders on both sides of the border would meet simultaneously with regulators on both sides of the border and jointly create the regulations that will be aligned ultimately and enacted through their respective executive regulation-making authorities.

At the point at which you're on the verge of making regulations, all of these stakeholders would have already talked. They would already know what's in the regulations. They might even have helped write them.

•(1000)

Mr. Lawrence Toet: Mr. Leclerc, Mr. Ram had the opportunity to talk regarding safety on the motor vehicle side, and I know the same question was asked of you by Ms. Young. I'm wondering if you could respond to that.

On the transportation of dangerous goods and the safety for Canadian citizens, the aim of the regulatory alignment is again to bring further safety to the standards and also you're working with both sides of the border to increase safety and there's no slide-back in this process.

Mr. Michel Leclerc: Yes, that's absolutely true, because what happens with alignment is that you get a higher and higher level of standards for safety and security, but you get it in a more cost-effective, cost-efficient way. It's more safety for less money.

Mr. Lawrence Toet: Did you do any analysis on that? You talked about more safety for less money. Did you do an analysis on the aligning of our regulations? Is there a cost-effectiveness component to it that was analyzed in this process?

Mr. Michel Leclerc: We didn't do a cost analysis, but in the fall of 2013 the RCC secretariat in the Privy Council Office consulted stakeholders across a wide spectrum of industries. Based on the response of stakeholders on the popularity of the RCC alignment initiative, what they've been telling us is that to the extent we can align, that makes it easier for them to do business on both sides of the border.

Because the Canadian and U.S. economies are extremely integrated, any misalignment actually translates into costs, and as Mr. Ram said, that's passed on to consumers. If you have very high standards on both sides of the border but they're delivered more cheaply and more effectively, that's good for everyone.

The Chair: I'm going to have to cut you off there, Mr. Toet.

We move to Mr. Sullivan, for five minutes.

Mr. Mike Sullivan: Continuing in that same vein, who are the stakeholders?

Mr. Michel Leclerc: Regarding the stakeholders, it depends on the industry.

Mr. Mike Sullivan: Rail safety.

Mr. Michel Leclerc: Well, if you're talking about rail safety, the Advisory Council on Rail Safety is made up of multiple players. It's made up of the municipalities, transportation companies, and rail companies, obviously—CN, CP, and VIA. I mentioned municipalities and people who transport goods and people on the rail lines. Those would all be considered stakeholders.

Mr. Mike Sullivan: The general public and the parliamentarians are not stakeholders in that.

Mr. Michel Leclerc: Well, they would probably, I guess, learn things, Mr. Chair, through their fellow members of Parliament and the minister.

Mr. Mike Sullivan: But there's no process to do that—

Mr. Michel Leclerc: To formally consult parliamentarians?

Mr. Mike Sullivan:—except through publication in the *Canada Gazette*, with a 90-day comment period.

Mr. Michel Leclerc: It depends. I don't know how many people are reading the *Canada Gazette*, part I.

Mr. Mike Sullivan: Well, we are.

Mr. Chair, moving on to the joint Regulatory Cooperation Council, the joint action plan in terms of rail safety had one line. It said, "Align rail safety standards and establish a joint mechanism to conduct periodic review of regulations."

How does removing things from publication in the *Canada Gazette* do that?

Mr. Michel Leclerc: Mr. Chair, as I mentioned earlier, when you have two groups of stakeholders and two regulators on both sides of the border coming to agreement very early in the regulatory process on an acceptable set of standards, and when you get to the point where you might have given notice for people who didn't know about it, there are very few people who don't know about it at that stage. So, it's more effective, if cabinet deems it more effective, to go ahead with formal enactment.

Mr. Mike Sullivan: But this is just for the Canadian side. This isn't aligning with the U.S. There's no.... Is there a prepublication requirement in the U.S. that's not there that we're aligning with? What is the driving force? Is it just to give more power to the minister, or is it really to align some regulation?

Mr. Michel Leclerc: I can't speak for the U.S. process, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Mike Sullivan: Okay, that's what I wanted to know, that this doesn't have to do with aligning ourselves with the U.S.

In the containment of dangerous goods, the joint action plan suggests that we will work to better align U.S. and Canadian standards on the containment of dangerous goods. Clearly we're having some difficulty with that because the U.S. is moving at a different speed than we are and in different directions.

How does this great new change in legislation affect that?

● (1005)

Mr. Michel Leclerc: Well, Mr. Chair, the *Canada Gazette* process is a process of giving notice. Everything else about our respective regulatory processes—the testing, economic analysis, and review of risks—continues to happen. Nothing else changes. This is really talking about eliminating where it is justified, according to cabinet's criteria, the notice in the *Canada Gazette*, part I.

Mr. Mike Sullivan: Will cabinet's criteria be published for us to review?

Mr. Michel Leclerc: They are actually in the cabinet directive on regulatory management.

Mr. Mike Sullivan: Is that available to be read by any parliamentarian?

Mr. Michel Leclerc: Absolutely.

Mr. Mike Sullivan: Okay. With regard to how urgent a rail safety matter is, is that freely readable in that cabinet directive? You mentioned earlier that some things would be more urgent than others, and therefore would require more time.

Mr. Michel Leclerc: Well, Mr. Chair, I don't think we're making this amendment to deal with urgencies specifically. The minister has emergency powers. We just issued an emergency directive to VIA Rail, for example. This is not to expedite the regulatory process where it shouldn't be expedited. This is just giving cabinet the option of forgoing notice in the *Canada Gazette*, part I, when there's really no justifiable reason for doing so any more.

Mr. Mike Sullivan: How will we determine whether there's no justifiable reason?

Mr. Michel Leclerc: That would be determined by cabinet on the basis of the criteria in the cabinet directive.

Mr. Mike Sullivan: Another piece in the joint action plan on regulatory cooperation is greenhouse gas emissions and pollution from locomotives. Is there anything in what we've done so far to harmonize our regulations with those of the U.S.? Ours are much laxer than the U.S. regulations are in this regard.

Mr. Michel Leclerc: Mr. Chair, that particular initiative is actually one where Canada is aligning with the U.S. standard, I believe. I can't speak to the specific initiative, or any of the initiatives for that matter, since I'm not working in those programs. But it may well be that under the appropriate enabling legislation there is no requirement to prepublish, as is the case in most federal statutes.

The Chair: Mr. Sullivan, you're out of time.

Mr. McGuinty, for five minutes.

Mr. David McGuinty: There are a couple of things, Mr. Chair. A number of assertions have been made by the witnesses in response to Conservative questioning that are a little bit astonishing.

Mr. Ram, you're quoted as saying that safety is your first priority. I believe you mean that. The problem is that when Canadians look at the numbers, in the public accounts, 2012-13, road safety has been cut 5.5%; marine safety has been cut 25%; aviation has been cut 11%; VIA Rail has been cut 15%. That's an astonishing statement. I believe you have to say what you have to say, but the government isn't putting its money where its mouth is.

Mr. Leclerc, you repeat ad nauseam that this is just a technical amendment, that the vast majority of regulations do not require prepublication. If I were to stop any municipal leader or city councillor in a municipality where trains run through with dozens, if not hundreds, of cars with dangerous goods on the back of them, and I told them that we were making these amendments because it was about a technical amendment to bring things up to speed with others, I think, in response to your claim that the majority of regulations don't require prepublication, most people would answer with the question, "So what?"

We've seen a 31,000% increase in oil by rail. We could have a million barrels a day of excess capacity by 2024 if every pipeline in Canada is used to the fullest extent. That's all going on rail, or perhaps even by truck.

Ms. Pham, if I could go to your last testimony on the bridge, what will the toll be, per car, to use that bridge on a daily basis?

Ms. Thao Pham: The toll rate has not been set yet. We are still looking at scenarios. We're also looking at the toll rates that are used around the greater Montreal area. That's part of the study right now, Mr. Chair.

Mr. David McGuinty: How many cars do you expect to be on the bridge on a daily basis?

Ms. Thao Pham: We are assessing that information right now. I can ask Mr. Brazeau to—

•(1010)

Mr. David McGuinty: It's okay. You either have the answer or you don't. I understand; you're in the middle of assessing that.

One of the Conservative MPs asked the question, how have we managed to accelerate that timeframe? Let's just take a look at the timeframe.

You started a team in January 2014. The government has known since its election in 2006 that there's a serious problem. It took five years for the government to announce there would be a new bridge. During that time they found the time to go find a former CFL

football player, put him in the Senate, then bring him to the bridge, have him announce his candidacy for a local seat, promise \$120 million to fix the bridge, and then when he lost his seat, put him back in the Senate.

There have been games played with this bridge now for five, six, seven years.

You're in a tough spot. I understand and respect that. You pulled together a team on January 1. You really can't tell us what the flow will be, what the rate will be, what the distributive effects will be on other bridges, on transit, on roadways, can you? You're not in a position to tell us that, yet you are still running to market for a \$3 billion to \$5 billion public-private partnership.

Isn't that putting the cart before the horse? Why don't we have these numbers done first?

Ms. Thao Pham: Mr. Chair, we do have information. It is preliminary. It's part of the business case, and the business case provided sufficient information for the government to move ahead with the project as a public-private partnership. In the process, given the fact that we want the private bidder for this project to be the best possible value for money—

Mr. David McGuinty: That's understood. Is the RFP written? Is the request for proposal finished and out in the marketplace yet?

Ms. Thao Pham: It is being written.

Mr. David McGuinty: It's being written. So it's not even done yet.

Ms. Thao Pham: It is being written. The team is working full-time.

Mr. David McGuinty: When will it be on the market? When will bidders be bidding?

Ms. Thao Pham: In July 2014, so in a couple of months. We have now achieved the first stage, which is the request for qualification.

Mr. David McGuinty: What was the last major bridge built in Canada, and how much did it cost?

Ms. Thao Pham: I will have to turn to Marc Brazeau for that.

Mr. Marc Brazeau (Director General, New Bridge for the St. Lawrence, Department of Transport): The Port Mann Bridge in Vancouver opened in December 2012. With regard to the cost of that, by memory.... I'd have to get back to you.

Mr. David McGuinty: How long did it take to build?

Mr. Marc Brazeau: It was supposed to be a PPP contract let out in 2008. During a financial crisis, that didn't materialize. It turned into a designed build, so it was let out around 2008. It was about five years of construction.

The Chair: Mr. McGuinty, you're out of time.

Mr. David McGuinty: This is my last question, Mr. Chairman.

Is it half the size of the bridge in Montreal?

The Chair: You can answer that if you care to.

Mr. Marc Brazeau: I'll do it very quickly.

The bridge itself is a little bit smaller, but the highway corridor is much longer. It is a 37-kilometre highway corridor versus ours, which is three kilometres of highway. That's why there's a time difference. We are looking at four construction seasons for the new bridge for the St. Lawrence, so 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018.

The Chair: Okay, thank you.

We'll now move to Mr. Komarnicki, for five minutes.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: I'm always astonished that there's a great degree of misalignment on regulations. It's obviously a point of frustration for anyone who needs to comply. Then there's the cost. You mentioned that. I haven't heard anybody indicate what you've heard in terms of public reaction to misalignments.

Would anybody care to comment on that before I move to another subject?

Mr. Donald Roussel: Well, the RCC initiative is one that comes from the stakeholders themselves: from the industry, the people who are manufacturing those products, from the people who use those products, also, the general public who try to bring products from Canada to the United States, for example, car seats or other pieces of equipment. Even your barbecue tank could be subject to that harmonization, when we were talking about the containment on the TDG side. So it's of great concern, as Mr. Leclerc mentioned, in a very integrated market. Our continuous effort to harmonize on all fronts is something that is present on a day-to-day basis. We want to reiterate that safety is our top priority and we want to continue to give due process for consultations with the different stakeholders in the general public.

• (1015)

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: One of the other proposed changes, which is in a different topic area, was exempting Transport Canada investigators from having to testify at civil trials unless so directed by the minister. I would like to get some background information as to why it might be that people who are involved in a civil trial might want Transport Canada investigators to testify, and there must be some balancing of interests. Again, if the direction must come from the minister, I'd also like to know if there are some objective standards around that decision-making process.

I'm not sure who would like to tackle that, but give me some background information, some context on why you think it's necessary and what kind of balancing of interest there might be. Is there some objectivity in terms of decisions that ultimately might be made by the minister?

Mr. Donald Roussel: Mr. Chairman, I'll ask Mr. Kash to start on the subject, and if we need help, we have our general counsel in the back.

Mr. Kash Ram: Mr. Chair, it occurs quite often that, given that motor vehicles are consumer products and there are collisions, there are civil cases, there are litigants involved, individual A versus individual B taking each other to court. It occurs fairly often that they rely on employees of government to serve as free witnesses, free technical resources.

These are most often cases where there's really nothing to be gained for the public good. These are just two litigants who are

taking each other to court. There isn't a technical aspect. There's nothing that could benefit the general public. Given that it's in their private interest, we feel it's appropriate that they depend on the private sector, on consultants and the engineering firms that could supply them with such advice, as opposed to using free advice from public servants. Now, there are situations where there is a public interest to be served, in which case the minister would want the public servant to testify, and we would do so.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: Okay, having said that—and you're saying there's a differentiation between private interests and public interests—now give me some examples of where it may fall in the public interest category. How might you make that decision in any given case? I appreciate there may be some balancing involved, but maybe you could answer that.

Mr. Kash Ram: Where it pertains to what we adjudicate—the law, the regulations, and the standards—and where it could benefit the public by raising awareness of the safety requirements and safety standards, or where it could inform us in the alignment, amendment, or consideration of new safety standards, I think that's a case where we would be pleased to testify. On the other hand, quite often what we'll see is one party suing the other party and it's clearly a case of driver error, of poor driving, and there's really nothing to be gained. There's nothing pertaining to the vehicle, which is what we regulate, so there's very little reason for us to become involved. Still, one litigant might claim that the fault lies with the vehicle, where we know quite clearly that there are certain other issues involved, such as impairment of the driver.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: It's pretty narrow in that case, because you could find a public interest quite easily, I would think, in a lot of respects.

If the private litigants elected to investigate an official, it would seem that there are some simple rules and laws that apply in terms of the subpoena, which says you must come. How does this legislation affect that?

Mr. Kash Ram: It would not. If a judge did require that the public servant appear under subpoena, then we would comply.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Watson.

Mr. Jeff Watson: It was explained earlier to this committee through various interventions that there's a significant and lengthy process that's followed when it comes to changing regulations. There is important risk analysis that's done, cost analyst, consultations with stakeholders, even before you draft a suggested regulatory change. The formal regulatory process itself is a lengthy process. For the public's knowledge here, from this analysis and consultation phase through to a final regulation coming into force, how long is a process like that typically?

• (1020)

Mr. Donald Roussel: Mr. Chairman, it can go from a few months to numerous years. We have concrete examples of some of the projects we're trying to do that we've been in for actually decades.

Mr. Jeff Watson: For questions like you mentioned earlier, when the scrutiny of regulations committee would come forward and suggest that there are inconsistencies in the drafting of text between English and French, something like that, if we're looking for where you could cut out, if you will, or accelerate the process forward for minor types of changes like that—obviously, we wouldn't want to cut corners on potential analysis of what the impact could be or whether or not there would have to be consultations—the prepublication period could then be a sensible place, a minor change like that, where we could gain some acceleration to that. That's a fair assessment.

Now on the decision, or how this comes to cabinet—Treasury Board makes a decision with respect to this at some point—you mentioned that there's a departmental triage. There is, based on risk analysis, a determination of what is low risk versus high risk. Where does that go, then? Does that go to PCO or directly to the Treasury Board Secretariat from a department?

Mr. Donald Roussel: Mr. Chairman, it may vary depending on the actual changes, but usually it will go to Treasury Board, who impose on us the triage. This committee, of course, is also looking at SMS and many of the other elements regarding, for example, the Transportation Safety Board's recommendations. Many of those recommendations are for specific sectors of the industry for which we are working on regulations. Within those regulations, we already, for example, have a significant consensus on some of those elements and we're ready to roll out. However, it's part of a whole package and it's dealing significantly with the advancement of some of the recommendations of the Transportation Safety Board.

Mr. Jeff Watson: Before Treasury Board, that is, the elected officials, have a chance to make a determination, independent civil servants in the department, potentially at PCO and at the Treasury Board Secretariat, have had the opportunity to look at a recommendation and make a recommendation to the elected officials based on the cabinet directive about whether prepublication should or should not be done. Is that correct?

Mr. Donald Roussel: Yes, it is correct.

Mr. Jeff Watson: Then there have been several levels of scrutiny by non-partisan, independent civil servants before the elected officials get an opportunity, and could say at their discretion that the recommendation to bypass prepublication is not in the public interest. They could very well overrule the recommendation even after all that scrutiny.

Mr. Donald Roussel: Yes.

Mr. Jeff Watson: Okay.

Chair, how much time do I have left?

The Chair: You have just a little under a minute.

Mr. Jeff Watson: Chair, while I have the floor I'd like to move:

That, following its consideration of the subject matter of clauses 212 to 233 and 375 of Bill C-31, the Committee send a letter, in both official languages, to the Chair of the Standing Committee on Finance informing him that the Committee has no amendments to propose.

The Chair: Do we have discussion on the motion?

Ms. Morin?

Mr. Mike Sullivan: She had another question to ask. That's the problem. If we could defer debate on the motion until there's been another round—

The Chair: Yes, my intent, Mr. Watson, was to give Ms. Morin one question and somebody over here one question.

Is it okay with you, Mr. Watson, if we deal with this after that?

• (1025)

Mr. Jeff Watson: I appreciate the consideration. I thought while I had the floor I moved a motion that's in order.

The Chair: It's okay, but can we have those questions first, or do you want us to...?

Mr. Jeff Watson: Fair enough, Mr. Chair, as long as I can move the motion at the end of that.

The Chair: Absolutely. Consider it on the floor. You'll get the first comment on it.

Ms. Morin, ask a quick question.

[Translation]

Ms. Isabelle Morin: I would like to thank my colleague.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

My question is also about the bridge. I hope I misunderstood your answer to my colleague earlier. Can you please confirm that you are undertaking a study in order to understand what the impact on traffic in the West Island will be if there is going to be a toll on one bridge only?

The Honoré-Mercier Bridge is a problem with respect to traffic. Every day at the Saint-Pierre interchange, there are hours of traffic. It takes 20 minutes to get to downtown from the West Island, but when there is traffic, it takes an hour and a half. Having a toll on only one bridge will create a terrible situation for West Island residents.

Can you tell me if you have a plan dealing with that situation, and, if so, what is it? Could you please give me concrete and specific information on that?

Ms. Thao Pham: Mr. Chair, as I stated earlier, we have undertaken studies to support the business case that we tabled for the purposes of building a new bridge.

We continue to collect information in order to make projections. Furthermore, we are working with our partners, like the province, but also with other stakeholders, in order to get a better projection of overall traffic mobility in the Greater Montreal region.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Braid, you get the last question.

Mr. Peter Braid: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I also wanted to present the final question on this issue of tolls for the new bridge over the St. Lawrence as well.

Ms. Pham, I only have one question so it's going to be a two-part question. It's still one question, Mr. Chair, I assure you. It's a two-part question on tolls.

You mentioned you're studying other tolls that exist in the city of Montreal. Could you explain those other tolls? The second part of the question is how will the revenue raised from the tolls be used vis-à-vis the new bridge?

Ms. Thao Pham: Mr. Chairman, I will answer in general terms, and then I'll ask Mr. Brazeau to add to my answers.

The first one is looking at the toll rates in the greater Montreal area. Two autoroutes, the 25 and the 30, are toll roads. We are looking at the way the toll system is working there, and how the rate was established.

With respect to the second part of your question on revenues, the Government of Canada will retain all the risks relating to revenue. That means we will make payments to the private partner, but the private partner will not assume the risk based on volume.

With that, I'm going to turn to Marc so he can add to the answer.

Mr. Marc Brazeau: For a little bit more precision, the tolls for Highway 30 are established at \$2 right now, and \$2.84 for Highway 25.

The revenues that are raised—the mechanics are being developed right now—will likely go into the consolidated revenue fund. With the partnership agreement, the Government of Canada will have set payments that need to be made to the private sector partner. These will be established in that agreement for the next 30 years. Revenues from tolling get into the government. We pay through payment mechanisms.

The Chair: You have a point of order, Mr. McGuinty, on what?

Mr. David McGuinty: On a point of order, through you, Mr. Chair, many of us have referred to different analyses that have been conducted by this partnership around the bridge. I'm wondering if, through you, we could ask these witnesses to table the analysis that's been conducted thus far with respect to the distributive effects of the building of this new bridge, the toll system that will be imposed on this bridge, and the effects on existing bridges, existing roadways, and public transit.

I think we would all benefit from a closer examination of the analysis performed up until now, even though I think we've heard here that very little analysis appears to have been done.

The Chair: Based on what I've heard, Mr. McGuinty, I think it's a project in progress. As you say, there really isn't anything—

• (1030)

Mr. David McGuinty: Why don't we ask the witnesses?

The Chair: We can do that.

Ms. Pham, do you want to speak to that?

Ms. Thao Pham: Chair, with reference to the analysis, that information is still confidential at this stage, so we cannot make it public. It will be made public once the project agreement is signed. Rest assured, however, that we are working on refining the models. We are working with partners. As I've indicated before, the project is moving forward. We have reached many important milestones, and we will continue to do so.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Pham.

I'd like to thank all of our witnesses for being here today. I appreciate your answers and presentations. The committee does have some committee business to do, so we'll excuse you, and we'll carry on.

Thank you.

Mr. Watson, we'll go back to you.

Mr. Jeff Watson: Thank you, Chair. I will reread the motion in a moment, but on the point of risk analysis, obviously that's an important consideration. Say the Liberal member's brother were to build a gas plant in Mississauga or Oakville, then before tearing it down, it would be important to know what the risk analysis was to the community.

Having said that, I move;

That, following its consideration of the subject matter of clauses 212 to 233 and 375 of Bill C-31, the Committee send a letter, in both official languages, to the Chair of the Standing Committee on Finance informing him that the Committee has no amendments to propose.

The Chair: You've heard Mr. Watson's motion.

Mr. Sullivan.

Mr. Mike Sullivan: On division.

The Chair: I haven't asked for the vote yet, but it has been indicated by Mr. Sullivan that the motion will pass on division. Mr. McGuinty is agreeing.

(Motion agreed to on division)

The Chair: As far as committee business goes, the first report from the subcommittee is being handed out. That was a meeting we had last Thursday.

While everyone is receiving that, I just wanted to report that as per this report—

Mr. David McGuinty: Are we in camera, Mr. Chair? Don't we normally conduct committee business in private?

The Chair: We're not. Sometimes we do. Are you moving that motion?

Mr. David McGuinty: No, I'm just asking. As a matter of course, we've done it since I've been on this committee.

Please go ahead. I don't mean to interrupt you. I just thought there was an inconsistency there.

The Chair: If I don't hear a motion to move there, Mr. McGuinty....

For Thursday, the meeting on liability was recommended in the report. I know that anybody who's at that meeting will get that. We're still waiting for some responses. We've had three people decline for that day. Lloyd's, Western Canadian Shippers Coalition, and the Insurance Bureau of Canada have confirmed. We have the Canadian Transportation Agency, and during the meeting, we had confirmation from the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, or FCM.

With that, I'd entertain a motion to accept the report.

That's moved by Mr. Watson. Is there any discussion on the motion?

Mr. McGuinty, did you have a comment?

Mr. David McGuinty: Can you move the motion again, Mr. Chair?

I'm sorry, but that was too fast for me. I wasn't sure what you were saying.

Mr. Jeff Watson: I move that the subcommittee report be adopted.

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: Thank you very much.

The meeting is adjourned.

Published under the authority of the Speaker of
the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

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 Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité
du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

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.

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 du Parlement du Canada à l'adresse suivante : <http://www.parl.gc.ca>