



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

43rd PARLIAMENT, 2nd SESSION

---

# Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

EVIDENCE

**NUMBER 037**

Wednesday, June 2, 2021

---

Chair: Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia





## Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

Wednesday, June 2, 2021

• (1635)

[*English*]

**The Chair (Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.)):** I will call this meeting to order. It's nice to see you all again, colleagues.

Before we get right into the clause-by-clause discussion, I just want to mention that we have with us today, Mr. Millar from the Department of Finance; Mr. Moffet from the Department of the Environment; and Mr. Vincent Ngan, director general, horizontal policy, engagement and coordination, Department of the Environment.

Also, I would like to take a moment to mention that you may, as members of this committee, have received an invitation to participate in a meeting on COP26. It's taking place on June 10 between 4 p.m. and 6 p.m. GMT.

What does GMT mean? What kind of time is that?

**The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Angela Crandall):** That's Greenwich Mean Time.

**The Chair:** That's 11 a.m. to 1 p.m. eastern time.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ):** Mr. Chair, I am sorry to interrupt you, but there is no interpretation.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Do you have it now, Madam Pauzé?

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** No, there is none. Could you say a little something in English so that we can see what's happening?

[*English*]

**The Chair:** We seem to be having trouble with interpretation. Could somebody give me a thumbs-up?

I see somebody waving a hand.

Are we good now?

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** We have the interpretation now.

Thank you.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Okay, great.

I don't know if you heard any of this, Madam Pauzé, but we have with us Mr. Ngan from Environment and Climate Change Canada.

Also, members of the committee may have received an invitation to participate at a meeting on COP26 on June 10 between 4 p.m. and 6 p.m. Greenwich Mean Time, which is 11 a.m. to 1 p.m. eastern time. If you wish to participate, please contact the clerk, and she will provide the details for you.

On the good news front, we are able to do a three-hour meeting today. I'm not sure if we can get anything tomorrow, but we do have three hours today. I will break at around six o'clock, maybe a bit before, for 10 minutes. Then we can carry on with the second half of the meeting. The meeting will end at 7:35.

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Mr. Chair, could I just slide in a small request to be sent that invitation for the meeting on COP26?

**The Chair:** My understanding was that everyone already received it.

Madam Clerk, can you make sure that Ms. May gets the invitation?

**The Clerk:** Definitely.

(On clause 11)

**The Chair:** We were at PV-19, which means that, Ms. May, you are up.

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This one I'll give a bit of an explanation for. I have so many amendments.

I want to reference for members of the committee the amendment you've already passed that was brought forward by the government. It's amendment G-3, which includes the following: "Each greenhouse gas emissions target must represent a progression beyond the previous one." My amendment is not only consistent; it buttresses this and frames it properly in the fact that we already have committed in the Paris Agreement to a principle that's called ratcheting up. In other words, any country may replace its nationally determined contribution at any time, but only to ratchet up.

I'm hoping that Raj Saini will see the benefit of making sure that we amend clause 11. We would add, "that is consistent with the purpose of this Act and with the commitment to ratchet up targets" within the meaning of "the Paris Agreement, done in Paris on December 12, 2015." Again, it's just placing in the proper context how much we are already committed to, and in some additional amendments to Bill C-12, we reiterate commitments that we have made to only ratchet up.

I hope that this amendment will meet with your approval.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** We have Madam Pauzé and Mr. Albas.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Pauzé, the floor is yours.

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would like to lend my support to the amendment made by the member from the Green Party. In fact, amendment G-3, which was passed, also mentioned ratcheting up the targets. So I imagine that everyone will support amendment PV-19.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Mr. Albas.

**Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC):** Mr. Chair, I would like to ask the officials two questions.

One is certainly in regard to PV-19. The language that PV-19 entertains is the word "ratchet". Is there anything in the definitions section? MP May had mentioned the progression element, that it was added in previously. Could you just explain, first of all, if there is any legal text within Bill C-12, under the definitions, for the word "ratchet"? How would that interface with progression?

• (1640)

**Mr. John Moffet (Assistant Deputy Minister, Environmental Protection Branch, Department of the Environment):** I think I can answer that.

The term isn't used elsewhere in the act, as Ms. May has explained. It's a term that's used in the Paris Agreement, and her amendment references the Paris Agreement. My assumption would be that the term would be interpreted as it is used in the Paris Agreement.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Is there a legal term [*Technical difficulty—Editor*] agreement where it defines [*Technical difficulty—Editor*] understanding of the term?

**Mr. John Moffet:** I think it's just a common understanding that parties are expected to, over time, increase the stringency of their commitments.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Okay.

My second question is for Mr. Ngan, and I'll be very quick about this.

Horizontal policy.... Is there someone in your department who has vertical policy?

**Mr. Vincent Ngan (Director General, Horizontal Policy, Engagement and Coordination, Department of the Environment):** No, we don't.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** It's just an interesting term.

Thanks.

**The Chair:** Seeing no further hands, I'll call the vote.

Madam Clerk, would you do a roll-call vote on PV-19.

(Amendment negated: nays 10; yeas 1)

**The Chair:** We'll go now to clause 11 as a whole.

Does anyone want to speak to that?

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Yes, I will, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Albas.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, we've had a number of discussions about the various clauses, in this case, clause 11. We've been putting forward a number of different amendments that unfortunately were not included in this particular section of the bill, and as such, Conservatives will be voting against this clause. Certainly there's a lot to be said about whether or not the minister should have sole responsibility when it comes to emissions, a reduction plan, etc., but Conservatives do believe there needs to be more focus on a cabinet-wide or a whole-of-government approach, and will be voting against this clause.

I hope that makes it clear how we will be voting, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Seeing no other hands, I will call the vote.

(Clause 11 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

(On clause 12)

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** We now move to clause 12, and we start with amendment CPC-11 from the Conservative Party.

Mr. Albas, do you want to introduce your amendment?

[*English*]

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Yes, I would like to put it forward, Mr. Chair, and give some explanation.

As I spoke of in previous amendments, the designated minister in this case is the Minister of Environment and Climate Change. Obviously, Bill C-12 does allow some flexibility where the Governor in Council can designate someone else.

It regards clause 12, where it says "Other ministers":

When establishing or amending an emissions reduction plan, the Minister must do so in consultation with the other federal ministers having duties and functions relating to the measures that may be taken to achieve that target.

In this one, there is a little bit more balance because, as we know, the Minister of Environment and Climate Change certainly does have influence in the cabinet, but not sole responsibility. As I've said before, one of the criticisms I often hear from constituents is that our government operates in silos, where sometimes one department, such as Natural Resources, may not be aware of what's happening in the others.

For example, just the other day, in one of the other committees, the Minister of Natural Resources was asked about whether or not he was aware of the lawsuit against the government in regard to its plastics policy. The minister was not aware of that.

To make sure there's better collaboration, while the clause itself does talk about speaking with other ministers, it is rather vague in regard to which other ministers. It does seem, because of the vagueness, that the minister gets to decide who is consulted, how in-depth, and whether or not that leads to a more positive outcome.

That's why CPC-11 requests that Bill C-12, in clause 12, be amended by replacing line 16 on page 5 with the following:

When advising the Governor in Council on the establishment or amendment of an emissions reduc-

Again, I think this would create a much better approach, where it is still the minister who does the consultations, but he or she, in a future iteration, whether it be this government or another, would then be bringing that to the Governor in Council. The Governor in Council can then discuss and make sure those silos are being broken down.

I don't believe that by simply writing words down we're going to see absolutely all the silos in government break down. Life is too large and too complex. I think government strives to deal with all of that, but that isn't always the case. I think, wherever possible, common sense and a willingness to acknowledge things as they are would, with this particular amendment, lead to a better outcome because the Governor in Council would be able to hear those consultations. They would be able to question and educate themselves, ask questions of the responsible minister, and we would see, at the end of the day, a far better understanding of what is being proposed when it comes to achieving the target.

Let's be mindful that the Government of Canada is a very large organization. Obviously, we want to make sure that an all-hands-on-deck approach is taken by the Government of Canada. The best way to do that is to have a thorough discussion and not end up in a situation where key ministers may not be consulted, may be unaware of particular actions taken by the government, or, as in the example I gave earlier of Minister O'Regan, be taken unawares about an action taken against the government.

I hope this would be a common sense proposal that all members would be able to think of. Yes, I am looking at Mr. Bittle, hoping that this time I can sway him to this side. It looks like he is giving it consideration.

Mr. Chair, I will release the floor and hopefully, by that point, Mr. Bittle will have had time to think about the approach and perhaps support it.

I'd ask all honourable members to consider supporting this particular amendment, which is CPC-11.

Thank you.

• (1645)

**The Chair:** I see no other hands, so I'll call the vote.

(Amendment negatived: nays, 7; yeas, 4)

• (1650)

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** We will now discuss clause 12 as a whole.

Does anyone want to speak to it?

Seeing no further hands, I will call the vote

[*English*]

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair—

**The Chair:** Mr. Albas, I called the vote.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Yes.

Quickly, again, I did say a mouthful in the last intervention on the amendment, but just to be abundantly clear, we don't believe the approach taken in Bill C-12 balances adequately—

**The Chair:** I understand.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** —the need to break down those silos.

Mr. Chair, I do have the floor.

**The Chair:** Actually, I called the vote.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, I did put my hand up.

**The Chair:** I gave enough time. I didn't see your hand.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, I would just ask—

**The Chair:** I think it was a bit late.

Okay, Mr. Albas. This time, go ahead.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** The next time I look and there's no hand and I call the vote, I have to, otherwise members will be mad at me.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, on that point, though, this is a virtual meeting. We started just recently. I appreciate that there will be....

The principles of the Parliament—

**The Chair:** Go ahead this time.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Yes. Thank you.

In terms of raising one's hand, if you'd like, I will start yelling out, just to make sure we don't have this situation again.

**The Chair:** No, I can see the hand. When it's up, I see the hand, but after, when I call the vote, it's because there hasn't been a hand for a while.

Everyone will be on the trigger or a little faster on the pedal, or whatever, but go ahead now, please.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Again, Conservatives believe this particular clause does not balance the need to have proper consultation and proper buy-in by cabinet. Thus, we'll be voting no.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

There aren't any hands, so we'll continue with the vote that was called.

(Clause 12 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

(On clause 13)

**The Chair:** We'll go to clause 13 and amendment BQ-13.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Pauzé, do you want to speak to your amendment?

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** I would first like to tell you that the Bloc Québécois amendment has two parts, (a) and (b). Part (a) of our amendment establishes that the Minister cannot amend targets. Since amendment G-3 was passed, with the wording: "each greenhouse gas emissions target must represent a progression beyond the previous one", there is no longer any point in removing the word "amending".

I would add, however, that you told us with pride that amendment G-3 draws its inspiration from what was done in countries such as New Zealand, Norway and the United Kingdom. I would just like us to remember that those countries use 1990 as the reference year, while Canada is using 2005. Canada is disregarding 15 years of pollution. Basically, those other countries are much more ambitious. Canada may be setting a weak target and a low bar: the amendment just says that it "must represent a progression beyond the previous one". That amendment may not be completely useless, but in my opinion, it doesn't mean a whole lot. So I am not going to move forward with part (a).

However, part (b) of amendment BQ-13 removes a reference to the advisory body. There is actually no reason to refer to that body in the section on public participation. We must try to clearly distinguish between public participation and the role of that body. This is important. In the same spirit, the advisory body does not have to represent the public. The public has 338 elected representatives, their members of Parliament, in other words, us. The advisory body's role is something else. It's a committee of scientists, as we see it, at least.

Clause 13, as it presently stands, puts the advisory body, the provinces, the Indigenous peoples and the interested persons on the same level. In our opinion, an emissions reduction plan is not a matter for public consultation. The advisory body must deal with it. However, we will be proposing subsequent amendments that deal with public participation, Indigenous peoples, the provinces and all

the organizations. We will be proposing amendments, each one of which is consequential to the others.

I move amendment BQ-13, part (b), and I invite you to vote for it in order to clearly distinguish the two roles.

• (1655)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Pauzé.

Before we move to a vote, I will give Mr. Albas the floor.

But I must advise you, Ms. Pauzé, that if your amendment passes, we cannot deal with amendment PV-20, because the two amend the same line.

[*English*]

**Mr. Brad Redekopp (Saskatoon West, CPC):** Mr. Chair, can I interrupt you for a second? Your boom is up.

**The Chair:** Oh, right, Mr. Redekopp.

[*Translation*]

Before we go to Mr. Albas, I just want to advise committee members, that, if amendment BQ-13 passes, we cannot deal with amendment PV-20, because the two amend the same line.

Mr. Albas, the floor is yours.

[*English*]

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, as you know, I want to see a good process here. I've already raised some challenges just in terms of the condensed timeline, the fact we didn't hear from a number of witnesses, and the fact we didn't have our briefs fully translated in time for clause-by-clause. We received a few in just the last few days.

I believe in having a strong process. I really also do believe that it's important for members, once they've gone through all the work, to be able to write an amendment after going through those briefs, hearing from constituents and hearing testimony directly from the witnesses. Going through the process of creating an amendment, taking it to the law clerk and having it sent to the clerk is a lot of work, and I know that a lot of MPs, as well as their staff, work very hard to do that.

The question I would have, Mr. Chair, and this would probably go to the legislative clerk, is this: First of all, can MP Pauzé only put forward half an amendment as presented, or does an amendment or subamendment have to be entertained in order for that to happen? Could I get some clarity on that just in terms of good process, Mr. Chair?

**The Chair:** We can ask the clerk, but I asked the same question.

Madam Pauzé did not introduce part (a), so she doesn't need to get unanimous consent to withdraw it. She basically is just proposing part (b) of the amendment. That's my understanding, but if you want to ask the legislative clerk, then maybe Madam Thivierge could also pipe in on this one.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Madam Thivierge.

**Ms. Émilie Thivierge:** Yes, Madam Pauzé is allowed to change her amendment. Any member who moves an amendment can decide what he or she is moving. Before moving it, she mentioned that she was not going to move part (a), but only part (b). She was allowed to do this.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Okay, thank you for that, Mr. Chair.

Maybe it was just the translation. When Madam Pauzé framed it, she actually framed the whole amendment. Maybe she can speak to it again, briefly, though, of course. We don't want to take up more time than necessary.

Is it just for the single word that she's proposing the change? If that's the case, I'd like to hear it. Is she just changing one word by this amendment?

● (1700)

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Ms. Pauzé, you have the floor.

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** In amendment BQ-13, part (b), we are removing the reference to the net-zero advisory body. In our view, the body is not intended to be for consultation. It should not be an organization that represents the public. As we see it, it is a committee of scientists, experts and those qualified in all aspects of climate change.

Having that body described in clause 13, which is about public participation, creates confusion. The two types of participation must be separate. Public participation includes everyone, all organizations representing civil society. We, the 338 elected members of Parliament, are part of that public participation, because we represent the public. That is the distinction we make between the advisory body and public participation.

We will be proposing amendments to clause 20, but clause 13 deals with public participation. We don't want the advisory body to be part of the public participation.

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. Redekopp.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** I have a really quick question. This amendment will say, "That Bill C-12, in clause 13, be amended (b) by replacing"....

Is there going to be a (b) in there, and is that a problem? Is that okay, or should the first item in there be (a)? Does that matter? Maybe the clerk could advise me on that.

**The Chair:** Yes, please advise us.

**Ms. Émilie Thivierge:** No, the (b) won't be in the bill itself. Only "Canada" will be there; (b) is only the lead-in that says where the word should be put in the bill.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Seeing no hands up, we'll go to a vote on BQ-13.

We are voting on (b) only. Let's make that clear. You've made it clear, Mr. Redekopp.

And again, if BQ-13 is adopted, PV-20 cannot be moved.

(Amendment negated: nays 10; yeas 1)

**Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.):** Chair, you're muted.

**The Chair:** I'm sorry. I was speaking with the legislative clerk.

I just have to consult with the clerk about something and I'll be right back.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Okay.

● (1705)

**The Chair:** Colleagues, sorry about that.

We're on CPC-12.

[Translation]

We are actually at amendment PV-20, aren't we?

[English]

Madam Clerk, is that it?

**Mr. Dan Albas:** No.

[Translation]

**The Chair:** I'm sorry.

[English]

We're on CPC-12. I'm just a little confused with my papers here. We just did BQ-13.

Go ahead, Mr. Albas.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Thank you.

I'm really glad that we actually got to have Madam Pauzé speak in regard to clause 13. Clause 13 is very important to me simply because it does talk about public participation. I think that many members here may anticipate what I'm going to say based on other things, but there is a slightly different element to my commentary.

As you know, Mr. Chair, Conservatives have repeatedly said that we believe that climate change is a huge challenge and a collective action issue that needs the Government of Canada to have all hands on deck. That is for sure.

We also know that different parts of the country will be affected differently, which is why we put forward a number of different amendments that allow for greater nuance and clarity on some of the impacts of government policy. We expect that this part of the bill will be very important for two parts.

Number one is that, obviously, public participation is important. Being such a large and diverse country, it's important that there be a flexible instrument to make sure that the government, through the minister in this case, can consult widely and from a great deal of voices, including indigenous, which I think is incredibly important. Many first nations in the Prairies, as well as in the real west—as I refer to British Columbia—have struck revenue deals for their natural resource development and should be able to say through their member of Parliament—and that's where I give credence to Madam Pauzé for acknowledging that members of Parliament also should be considered by the minister—but also hear directly from them or from different communities.

Obviously, each community is slightly different, has different needs and concerns and will be struck differently by different government policies, both provincially and federally. I think it's very important to have.

I'll go to my amendment exactly, Mr. Chair, because I know that's something you would like to know. Perhaps Madam Pauzé might want to support this motion because, again, we're trying to make clause 13 better.

Everyone knows I've been talking about all hands on deck and let's have the Governor in Council rather than an individual minister. That is true, but right in here, I would say at (b), replace, in the English version, line 27 on page 5 with the following:

“and interested persons including any expert the Governor in Council”

Why that's important right now is that we do know that the designated minister on this act by default is Minister Wilkinson as the Minister of Environment and Climate Change. He's already struck an advisory panel of experts, but do you know what, Mr. Chair? We don't believe that the experts that are cited by one minister offer the balance and diversity that this great country offers.

We want to ensure that the Governor in Council can actually draw upon experts as well, because there may be a case where one minister has certain information and another minister brings forward other information that is contrary to what maybe the Minister of the Environment presents to cabinet. There needs to be some independence where they can bring in an expert of their own to cite concerns or to verify the expert testimony that the Minister of the Environment has heard.

Conservatives do believe in public participation. We also do believe, though, that no one minister is going to have the Rolodex of expertise to be able to reliably answer every question that might be raised by the Governor in Council as they execute their duties in order to meet the challenge of climate change. The Governor in Council may have access to expertise that perhaps the Minister of the Environment and Climate Change did not envisage in his—or maybe in the future, her—original memorandum of understanding to cabinet.

Conservatives believe that there needs to be a wider opening for other ministers to bring forward their own thoughts and to have the Governor in Council then seek expert opinion beyond just that Rolodex of one individual minister.

With that, I hope I can get the support. I'm also looking at Mr. Saini, because I know he's a reasonable person and he's constantly asking for data.

• (1710)

That's an important component here. There may be data that a particular expert is unaware of, and that's where having other ministers being able to bring that data, bring that expertise, to the Governor in Council is better for decision-making. That's where I'm hoping I will be able to edge him closer to supporting this position.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Ms. Pauzé, you have the floor.

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** I was very interested in the comments by my colleague, Mr. Albas. I wanted to tell him that, basically, the objective is to give more powers to the Minister of the Environment. We also feel that the fight against climate change requires horizontal responsibilities, in which all departments must be involved.

We used as a model Quebec's new climate legislation, as it gives more powers to the Minister of the Environment. Furthermore, if we had all voted in favour of Ms. May's amendments PV-11, we would have facilitated that horizontal responsibility. That's what has to be done. That's what the countries that have succeeded in their energy transition have done.

That's why I am going to vote against your amendment, Mr. Albas, though I love you dearly.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Pauzé.

Any further comments?

So I will call the vote on amendment CPC-12.

[*English*]

(Amendment negatived: nays 7; yeas 4)

**The Chair:** We now go to PV-20.

I would just like to mention that this is the first of several Green Party amendments seeking the same goal: to change the name of the advisory body to expert advisory body. Members of the committee should keep this in mind when debating and voting on these amendments in order to be coherent throughout the bill.

Ms. May, you have the floor.

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you for the preamble.

The numbers of my amendments don't flow from this one. I will be quiet for some time after this one before getting back to the matter of an advisory panel.



Before we proceed to the ritual slaughter of my amendments, I'll just recap.

So far, attempts to do the things that most witnesses asked us to do.... We had the Climate Action Network, a coalition that includes most of the environmental law groups in Canada. Advice came in a written brief from the Tsleil-Waututh first nation because, of course, we didn't have time for them to testify in person. We've lost the chance for a 2025 milestone year or to put the target from the Paris Agreement of 1.5 into the purpose of the act or base the bill on science or to operate using carbon budgets.

This is an opportunity to bring Bill C-12 into line with most of the climate accountability acts around the world in one respect. All those things that I just mentioned are what you typically find in other climate accountability legislation around the world.

The one witness we did have time to hear from on this point was Professor Corinne Le Quéré from the University of East Anglia Law School. When I asked her about it, she pointed out that certainly all the laws she knew of incorporated those elements that I just described, which we already voted down. They do tend to have this element in common: that the advice that comes to government in setting their plans and targets comes from experts. It's heavily experts of climate science and expertise as well, for instance, in renewable energy and other technologies.

I'll give a quick recap because Professor Corinne Le Quéré's expertise was primarily with the French climate accountability legislation. I'll just let members know because we didn't hear about other laws. I think it's a large deficiency in developing a knowledge base for reviewing this bill.

Certainly, in Pakistan, which has climate accountability legislation, and in Denmark, the advisory bodies are specifically experts and are defined in the act. New Zealand includes something called a Climate Change Commission, which is independent and gives expert advice. Costa Rica calls theirs the Scientific Council on Climate Change. The U.K. calls it, of course, the Climate Change Committee. It is highly respected. South Korea calls theirs the Committee on Green Growth and it is independent and housed within the prime minister's office and not in any one ministry.

In this, by describing it as an expert advisory body, the chair is quite right. Subsequent amendments I will put forward describe how this expert advisory committee would work and how it would be composed.

I'll just take a moment to say we will come to NDP-4, which basically modifies the word "advice" with the word "independent". I think that attempts to create the false impression that by the time the Liberals and NDP vote for NDP-4, we will have created an independent commission that's aligned with the way other countries around the world have devised and designed their climate accountability legislation. We will not have done so, because the committee will still be made up of political appointees. It's only their advice that will be described as independent, whereas the committee structure will not be.

Again, to have anything like the rigour of other countries' legislation, we should have made other amendments before this moment. Certainly, the advisory committee to provide independent advice

needs to be an independent advisory committee made up of experts, as opposed to the model we have here in a multi-stakeholder group.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (1715)

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Ms. Pauzé, you have the floor.

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** The Bloc Québécois is going to vote in favour of Ms. May's amendment, although we feel, as our later amendments will show, that some important words are missing, including the word "independent". The members must be independent.

There's also the word "advisory". For us, the body is not advisory. Ms. Le Quéré talked about that. The body will consult all industry, environmental, civil society and Indigenous groups, but it is not advisory. It will have to formulate recommendations after having held all those consultations.

Although we feel that the amendment we will be putting forward later puts some order back in all this, I am still going to vote in favour of Ms. May's amendment and we will be able to improve it with our own.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Albas, the floor is yours.

[*English*]

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Sorry, Mr. Chair. I was waiting for the translation. There is a bit of a delay. I would get you to just consider that fact when you call for a voice vote—

**The Chair:** Yes, I should.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** —or a roll call, I should say.

Mr. Chair, I do think there are a lot of issues. The Conservatives will not be voting in favour of MP May's amendment. As I said, our attempt in the previous amendment to have experts brought into the Governor in Council process we believe allows for a better process that way, rather than just relying.... Again, we're just going to have to disagree on that, but we believe that structurally, it does deal with a lot of the concerns that the advisory board would only be subject to one minister and their inner circle.

We've been disappointed that the minister, contrary to his initial speech at second reading on this bill.... I did ask him about the advisory panel, and he said he would work with all parties, and then he decided to pre-empt and put his so-called advisory panel forward. There are still questions in my mind from his testimony before us at the estimates. He says that he wants to work with all parties and then he puts forward a group that I would say is controversial, just in terms of viewpoints.

We've seen many say that they don't believe there's any future whatsoever for oil and gas. I also would say that even the Canadian Institute for Climate Choices put out a report showing that there are over 60 different pathways that it has modelled out for net zero, and there are different scenarios. There could be vibrant oil and gas, but there have to be certain investments made in negative emission technologies, and so on.

There's so much going on in this space that I think, again, to not allow a broader process where different ministers at the cabinet table can draw in those experts, as was put forward in CPC-12, means that we are missing the boat and not receiving the expertise that this whole country offers. One minister in their Rolodex—I can see why that is not working for Madam May. I appreciate Madam Paupé's intervention to explain it a little bit further. It does seem that unfortunately....

I'm glad to see that other members of the opposition are looking to debate this because the government as well as the NDP have been very much silent on some of these things. I think that these proposals do deserve some debate, so that we have a better understanding and so that the people at home who are watching can judge for themselves who is acting and who's bringing forward real ideas to make this bill better.

Thank you.

• (1720)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Albas.

Mr. Bachrach.

**Mr. Taylor Bachrach (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP):** Mr. Chair, on Mr. Albas's last comment, I'd be happy to contribute more comments if, perhaps, he would think about contributing fewer. That way we could proceed through the bill in a little bit more of an efficient fashion.

To speak directly to the amendment in front of us, the NDP doesn't have major issues with the current name of the advisory body, the Net-Zero Advisory Body. I'm somewhat agnostic as to what it's named. I believe that the more important test is its composition and the definition of that composition. We will soon have an amendment, NDP-5, that will be coming forward. It speaks directly to the composition and does use the word "expertise", which I believe encompasses the spirit of Ms. May's amendment. I'll speak to that amendment when it comes up in the order.

I will note that the language for that amendment is adapted directly from the New Zealand and U.K. legislation and their definitions of their advisory bodies.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Bachrach.

Seeing no more hands, I call the vote.

(Amendment negated: nays 10; yeas 1)

**The Chair:** Would anyone like to speak to whether we should adopt clause 13?

Mr. Albas.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, certainly I do want to briefly comment on Mr. Bachrach's comments, as well as on the clause itself.

I would simply say that all members of Parliament here have the same voice if they choose to use it, maybe with the exception of MP May, since we know she was brought here against her will, but I'll let her fight that battle. I also would simply say that the Conservative Party has brought forward a series of amendments to try to improve the legislation, and we stand by them. We also believe that debate should occur.

Many times I have voiced concern that we have arbitrarily disallowed certain amendments, such as when Elizabeth May wanted to talk about carbon budgets. It was something I heard very clearly in testimony, and it was ruled out of order. Mr. Chair, I hold nothing personal, and I hope you hold nothing personal on that, but I do believe that we are all here to raise our voices.

If Mr. Bachrach is opposed to one of my amendments, I do not take any offence to that, but I also think we should have some debate over some of these things. As you know, Mr. Chair, once legislation gets put in, it often doesn't get changed for several years or even decades. This bill has a scope as far out as 2050, so there are decades in here.

I believe it's important for me to speak up for my constituents, for my colleagues who have heard from their constituents and from the testimony that we've heard, and respect that other members may have different ideas, but they should be talked about and discussed, not silently shot down while silently sitting back.

Again, that's Mr. Bachrach's choice. If I've offended him in any way by being boisterous in the need for us to actually have a thorough process rather than a rushed one, I understand, but I will put our 19 amendments up to the NDP's amendments, and I will defend those ones because I do respect the electors who elected him, and I would hope that he would do the same for my electors, with the same outlook.

Now, in regard to the clause itself, it's no secret that the Conservatives have time and time again said that we want to have an all-hands-on-deck approach. It's unfortunate. We wanted to include that the Governor in Council would not only be key to this but would also be able to draw upon experts outside of the advisory panel, which so far has been set up to be at the whim of one minister. Again, those closer to the minister, or perhaps his staff—or her staff in future iterations—can be appointed and again serve, I believe, at the pleasure of the minister, given that the terms of reference can be changed at any time by the minister.

I think hearing from Canadians is important. I think listening to indigenous leaders as well as indigenous members, to hear their traditional knowledge, is important. However, I also believe that the Governor in Council should have the right to bring on other experts outside of the minister to be able to build [*Technical difficulty—Editor*]. As Mr. Saini has said here many times, he likes to hear data, and he likes to see that done. I will say that having access to a greater number of experts who are outside the Rolodex of one minister and his staff, I think is important.

I will leave it there. If I did offend any member, I apologize in advance. However, I think it's very important that in this bill, one that my constituents have said they would like to see some amendments to.... I believe that we are stronger by hearing some of the voices, perhaps through this truncated, or I would say rushed, job of a committee hearing process.

Again, please don't take offence at that, Mr. Chair. You just do the will of the committee. However, I think we could have done better in this regard. I think part of my raising those voices over and over in this is to bear in mind that perhaps if members don't want to hear from me so much, and you had a proper process, then my discussions would only be on the product itself, and not necessarily the process-oriented questions and concerns.

• (1725)

Thank you.

• (1730)

**The Chair:** Mr. Redekopp.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Mr. Chair, I have a question for Mr. Moffet.

I'm trying to understand something. We have referred a lot to the Paris Agreement as forming one of our international obligations that this has to respect. I suppose I could have asked this question at other times too, but it speaks to, in this case, public participation.

Do the participation and the impacts received for this cause or compel the government to do anything with respect to the Paris Agreement? In other words, do the decisions, input and information that come from this process compel the government or influence it when it makes commitments, for example, revising its commitments to the Paris accord, or is that completely separate from this and these are two completely separate issues?

**Mr. John Moffet:** That's an interesting question. This section talks about the input the minister needs to consider or enable when developing a target. The bill would make the 2030 target the country's nationally determined commitment. The Paris Agreement doesn't have an explicit set of requirements beyond 2030, however. I think in practice there will be a link between the public participation that would be enabled through clause 13 and any further evolution of Canada's nationally determined commitment under Paris. However, beyond 2030, unless the Paris Agreement is amended, this public participation will focus on our future targets and plans.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Okay. Thank you.

**The Chair:** I don't see any other hands up. The vote is called.

Go ahead, Madam Clerk.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** I am sorry.

**The Chair:** Unfortunately, it's too late now, Ms. Pauzé.

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** I understand.

**The Chair:** If I let you speak, I must also let Mr. Albas speak and he is a little late. I have to treat everyone the same way.

[*English*]

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I promise I won't.

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** I am really sorry, Ms. Pauzé, but we have to move to the vote.

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** It's all about procedure, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** In that case, are we talking about something else?

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** So I have the right to comment. That's fine.

Let's call the vote on clause 13, but some amendments deal with creating a clause 13.1.

**The Chair:** We have some other amendments, if I'm not mistaken. We will deal with the additions to clause 13 later.

The question was also raised on Monday, I believe.

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** Okay. I apologize.

**The Chair:** Is that correct, Ms. Thivierge?

**Ms. Émilie Thivierge:** Yes. Exactly.

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** I am sorry.

**The Chair:** We are now voting on clause 13.

The amendment is negated.

It's Ms. May's turn now.

**Ms. Émilie Thivierge:** Mr. Chair?

**The Chair:** Did I make a mistake, Ms. Thivierge?

**Ms. Émilie Thivierge:** Yes. The clause was agreed to.

**The Chair:** Did I not say that the clause was agreed to?

**Ms. Émilie Thivierge:** You said that the clause had been negated.

I just wanted to make that clear.

**The Chair:** My apologies.

• (1735)

[*English*]

**Mr. Taylor Bachrach:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Yes, Mr. Bachrach.

**Mr. Taylor Bachrach:** When you were calling the result, you said "the amendment", and I believe it was clause 13.

**The Chair:** It was the clause, yes.

**Mr. Taylor Bachrach:** Was it clause 13 we were voting on? I just want to clarify.

**The Chair:** Is there unanimous consent to overlook my errors and to consider clause 13 carried?

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Yes.

(Clause 13 agreed to)

**The Chair:** Now we go to Ms. May, who wants to present amendment PV-21.

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Of course, members will be, I'm sure, intimately familiar with the impact of the motion you passed, which is why I'm compelled to be here, which means that this motion has been deemed moved by the mysterious hand of somebody on committee, unmentioned.

This is a different issue. This is the first time this committee is dealing with an amendment that seeks to make the Minister of Environment and the Government of Canada actually accountable as opposed to embarrassed.

Currently the only clause of the bill that deals with accountability is clause 16, titled, "Failure to Achieve Target". Under clause 16, a minister who concludes that Canada has missed a target will explain why and describe the actions it will take to remedy the matter. I think members will recall—almost humourously, because there was a widespread difficulty in pronouncing "justiciability"—when we had Professor Wright from the University of Calgary testifying before us. I thought he was charming on the question of justiciability, but the question is, can we actually require that the minister face some consequences and the government face consequences for missing a target?

As the chair has mentioned, this is essentially a separate clause. It's numbered clause 13.1, and the magic word in it is "must". This amendment would ensure that "the Minister must achieve all the national greenhouse gas emissions targets set under sections 6 and 7." How would you do that? What's the implication? I'm sure some of us in this room—I'm sure many of us—are actually lawyers and will know that saying "must" can create some administrative law remedies. This has also been put forward in evidence to committee, particularly, I recall, by West Coast Environmental Law, but I've been chastised by other people in the Climate Action Network that when we say West Coast Environmental Law, we're implicating a wider range of groups. It just happens that Andrew Gage was the lawyer who testified before us.

When you say "must", you can actually create an administrative law duty to meet a requirement, which could create administrative law remedies. The question I put to Professor Wright was whether that would help. He said it would. We'll come back to this when we get to my amendment PV-35, which gets into some of the details of how the administrative law remedy would work before the Federal Court of Canada. For now, I put it to you that this is the one place we have an opportunity to say that when the minister says the law will create accountability, he or she will mean, in future, that we're actually trying to be accountable as opposed to having a bumper sticker for an election campaign that says we now have climate accountability legislation.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. May.

Mr. Redekopp.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Mr. Chair, I have a couple of questions on this one, again for Mr. Moffet.

Would this be enforceable? I don't see any penalties, unless those are coming later and I might have missed them. Is this enforceable?

That's my first question for you. I have another one as well.

**The Chair:** Mr. Moffet.

**Mr. John Moffet:** I think the answer to that is that I'm going to, respectfully, suggest that the committee reflect on the testimony of the various witnesses who testified about this issue.

As Ms. May just explained, this goes to the question of justiciability. One could not literally make a minister of the environment, on his or her own, reduce emissions. The question is what the consequences will be, and I think it would be appropriate to think about some of the advice that was given about whether or not that can be done and also to consider this amendment in the context of other amendments that Ms. May has proposed. I think—and I may be inappropriately putting words in your mouth—they are best read as a package.

• (1740)

**The Chair:** Does that answer your question, Mr. Redekopp?

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Yes, because my next question was going to be.... You can't hold the minister accountable, which is, obviously, what we just discussed. I think that's the challenge in this. Who exactly are we trying to hold accountable, and what would the remedies be if they didn't do it?

Yes, I think that answers my question.

**Mr. John Moffet:** Sorry, I just want to be clear. My apologies if I said you could not hold the minister accountable. You can absolutely hold the minister accountable. The question is this: Can the minister be required on her or his own to reduce emissions? No, of course not. Then, the question is this: What is the legal recourse against the minister if the targets are not met? As Ms. May explained, some witnesses have suggested how that might play out.

**The Chair:** Ms. May.

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** Mr. Chair, further to what John Moffet was just saying, I don't recall any witnesses saying that this amendment would not work. The only witnesses that we had from law school and law professor backgrounds said that this would work.

The remedy is something called an order in the nature of mandamus. It's a Court of Chancery remedy that's available in administrative law. I describe it, in terms of the process, more fully when we get to PV-35.

**The Chair:** You'll explain how that would work when we get to PV-35. Thank you.

I see no hands, so shall PV-21 carry?

(Amendment negatived: nays 10; yeas 1 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** We go now to BQ-14.

Before we get to Madam Pauzé, I'd like to mention that this is the first of several BQ amendments seeking the same goal, to change the name of the advisory body to independent expert committee.

Members of the committee should keep this in mind when debating and voting on these amendments in order to be coherent throughout the bill.

Madam Pauzé.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** The amendment is very simple. We want the Minister to be required to take the recommendations of an expert committee into account.

Further on, we will actually be proposing that it be an independent expert committee, but we also simply want the Minister to consult with the committee and take its recommendations into account.

**The Chair:** Okay. That's pretty clear.

Any further comments?

Mr. Albas, the floor is yours.

[*English*]

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, I would simply say that there are a number of suggestions that have been brought by MP May and MP Pauzé.

We are not going to be supporting this particular amendment. Again, this seems to be focusing on where it's just the minister in regard to the committee. I believe there should be more on this front in upcoming amendments from us and to change the nature of the advisory committee itself, but we will not be supporting this amendment.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Could you take your hand down, Mr. Albas? Thanks.

I see no other hands, so shall BQ-14 carry?

(Amendment negated: nays 10; yeas 1 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

● (1745)

**The Chair:** We'll now ask Mr. Saini to propose, if he wishes to, amendment G-9.

**Mr. Raj Saini (Kitchener Centre, Lib.):** Yes, Chair. Thank you very much.

I'm happy to introduce an amendment to add a new clause 13.1 to the Canadian net-zero emissions accountability act. This new provision requires that the Minister of the Environment must publish a "what we heard" report on the results of the consultations carried out under clause 13. The government typically publishes "what we heard" reports so everyone can see the feedback of others and can continue to meaningfully participate in the discussion as it evolves.

This amendment would make this step a requirement and thus further enhance transparency and accessibility under the Canadian net-zero emissions accountability act.

**The Chair:** Mr. Albas.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, I certainly appreciate MP Saini's amendment. It gives an opportunity to talk a little bit about the importance of both transparency and accountability.

I do know that there have been many criticisms levelled against this government, by both my party and other parties, regarding its lack of transparency. It is certainly not showing that it is open by default, as it promised in 2015, with promises for things like changes to the Access to Information Act that even the Information Commissioner criticized as actually being not helpful and even, in some cases, regressive.

That has not changed. It's actually only gotten worse since COVID-19. Many reporters as well as civil society members have criticized how the government's snail's pace on access to information has gotten even slower, as if those snails were put in the freezer. It takes a lot more to see any positivity.

Mr. Saini is trying to do a good thing here by trying to make the minister more transparent, specifically on public participation.

As we said earlier, Conservatives support public participation. We think it is incredibly important that in a country as large and diverse as Canada there be a mechanism whereby the minister can consult. We do think, though, that there should be some strengthening there, of course, of an all-hands-on-deck approach.

Given the fact that we believe there could be more transparency in what we hear from the minister, we are willing to support this amendment. As I said earlier in my comments to MP Bachrach, we've come prepared with a number of amendments that we believe would make the bill better. We have been listening to all members of Parliament, irrespective of their party, making sure that they are heard and also that their ideas, whether we agree with them or not, are debated. This is so that people who are watching at home can know that in a minority Parliament, we are all doing our jobs to scrutinize government legislation and to bring ideas that are perhaps new to the conversation.

MP May said earlier that she believed a number of groups wanted to see the idea of carbon budgets brought into it, something that was not allowed by the committee. I do think that we could have allowed that process. Maybe I'll let that now be water under the bridge and refer again to the amendment before us.

I will be supporting this amendment, simply because we do think that the consultations and the "what we heard" reports are essentially beneficial. Those are things the government should be doing. To have that enshrined in law makes sense. Maybe my colleagues have questions or other aspects they wish to raise, but we will be supporting MP Saini in regard to this.

I thank him for bringing forward an amendment that actually increases the transparency of the government, because it has been so woeful to date on so many different aspects. I even remember when, before he became the Liberal leader, in his capacity as an MP, Justin Trudeau tabled legislation to improve access to information. He was criticized later on for not actually implementing those ideas as Prime Minister. To see a little humility from the government side is a good thing. We will be supporting the amendment as presented.

• (1750)

**The Chair:** I think you made Mr. Saini very happy.

We'll go to Mr. Redekopp.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Mr. Chair, as my colleague Mr. Albas just mentioned, this government has been rather slow at being transparent.

To Mr. Bachrach, it's nice to see that you actually got at least a little something from your deal. This is a positive that I like.

I have one question, though, for Mr. Moffet on this.

I noticed there's nothing in this amendment that speaks to the time frame. It talks about publishing a report, yes, but it doesn't give any sort of time frame. I'm not sure it's necessary.

Mr. Moffet, with the way this is written, and given standard practice in the department, what is a reasonable expectation for me as a parliamentarian for when this report would happen? Would it be one month after, six months after, or in one year, two years, five years? What is standard practice? Could you also comment on whether there should be, and it would be helpful to have, some sort of time frame in this amendment?

**Mr. John Moffet:** If you don't mind, I'd like to refer that question to my colleague Mr. Ngan, whose organization in the department has led the consultations on the previous NDCs and has some experience in both leading the consultations and providing reports to Canadians about what we heard.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Yes, certainly.

**The Chair:** Mr. Ngan.

**Mr. Vincent Ngan:** I'm happy to answer the question.

Under clause 13, on public participation, the advisory body must also undertake consultations with governments of the provinces and territories and with indigenous peoples, and engage any experts who are deemed necessary and appropriate. Therefore, we see that the scope can be very broad.

The normal practice would be around three to six months following the consultation so that information can be compiled, put together, translated and made available and accessible on the Internet. Of course, this is normal practice and not necessarily a hard and fast rule.

I hope that's useful.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Thank you.

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Ms. Pauzé, the floor is yours.

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** I would say that amendment G-9 is rather inconsequential, but we're going to support it. So I am taking the same position as Mr. Albas and Mr. Redekopp. I say that it is inconsequential just because it gives no time frame. So I invite the Conservatives to vote for amendments BQ-15, which sets a time frame by asking for an annual progress report. We would then have a specific time frame, because a report will have to be produced each year.

I will also support the amendment for the transparency reasons that Mr. Albas described. Clearly, the public must be given the key information that will allow them to make choices and correctly assess where the country is in its fight against climate change.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Albas, the floor is yours.

[English]

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Ngan, to my colleague's question, would it be reasonable to amend this to include some language saying that no later than a year after the consultation has been initiated the report should be published on the appropriate website?

• (1755)

**Mr. Vincent Ngan:** In terms of the public engagement, if it is conducted by the advisory body, they will be including that information on an annual basis. Whether it is appropriate or not to include a timeline will be decided by this committee. From our end, there are normal practices. Once it's done, information will be made available, subject to compiling, meeting bilingual requirements and accessibility on the Internet.

To answer your question, Mr. Albas, on whether the request is reasonable, I would turn to the committee to decide.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** That's great.

Therefore, Mr. Chair, I'm going to move a subamendment. Just at the end, where it has "section 13", instead of a period we will just put a comma and add "and that the report be published no later than 12 months after the consultation period begins."

**The Chair:** Can you send that wording to the clerk?

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Absolutely. Just give me a second.

**The Chair:** Madam Clerk, do you then send it to all the members of the committee including Ms. May? How does that work? I think this is the first time we've actually put one in writing.

**The Clerk:** I believe it will be in only one language. I don't believe—

**The Chair:** That's okay, because we'll read it and the interpreters can interpret.

**The Clerk:** That's excellent, so as soon as I get it, I will send it to the P9 account of everyone present in the meeting.

**The Chair:** Mr. Albas, your hand is up, but you've already spoken to it. Is that right?

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Yes, I've spoken to it, but I was doing what you asked me to. I'll put my hand down, but I was just doing what you requested.

**The Chair:** Right. Okay.

**The Clerk:** It will just take me a minute to prepare the email.

**The Chair:** Okay.

I have a proposal. Why don't we break until 6:05, and when we come back we will deal with Mr. Albas' subamendment?

**Mr. Dan Albas:** That's probably a wise decision.

**The Chair:** Let's do that. I'll just pause the meeting. We'll come back at 6:05 and pick up from here. Thanks.

• (1755) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (1805)

**The Chair:** It's 6:05 p.m. Everyone has the subamendment.

Does anyone else want to speak to this?

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Can I ask that we make sure everyone has had a chance to look at it, Mr. Chair?

**The Chair:** Sure.

Mr. Bachrach.

**Mr. Taylor Bachrach:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thanks, Mr. Albas, for bringing this forward.

I think this potentially creates an unintended situation, because there's no definition of when the consultation process must begin. You could run into a situation whereby the minister begins the consultation six months before setting the target, in which case the minister would not have to publish the report until six months after the target was set. I think everyone on this committee would agree that it's reasonable for the minister to publish the report at least concurrently with the setting of the target, since that's what the consultation informs.

I'll be voting against it for that reason. I support the sentiment. I think most Canadians would expect that if consultations take place leading to the setting of a target, and a report is required to be published, then that report would be published at least concurrently with the setting of that target.

**The Chair:** Mr. Redekopp.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Mr. Chair, I really like this amendment. I thank my colleague for proposing it. I don't think there's any risk that the government wouldn't publish a report or that they would wait until the deadline to do it. I don't think that's an issue.

My view on this, and the reason I think this is good, is that it eliminates a loophole for the government to use. If a future government decided they didn't want to publish a report for whatever reason, this clause doesn't compel them to do it in any time frame. It essentially creates a loophole for them to not release the report in a timely manner. I think one year is a very reasonable time. As we heard from Mr. Ngan, three to six months is typical.

I don't think it's an onerous limitation in any way. In my mind, it just removes that loophole at the end and precludes any government from not producing the report. That's why I like this.

**The Chair:** Mr. Bachrach.

**Mr. Taylor Bachrach:** Mr. Chair, I think Mr. Redekopp makes a fine point. The challenge is that we haven't set out any other param-

eters around this consultation. We haven't directed the minister to begin the consultation a certain number of months prior. We haven't set out a certain length for the consultation. We've simply said in clause 13, "When setting or amending a national greenhouse gas emissions target or establishing or amending an emissions reduction plan, the Minister must" accept submissions from stakeholders. Unless we have detail around the duration of the consultation, and the start time and date of the consultation, by setting an end date of 12 months, I believe, after the consultation begins, if the consultation is relatively short, that could be a long period of time. It creates the potential for government to take all of that 12 months, when indeed most people would expect it to release the report much sooner.

As I said before, I don't think it's necessary. Most Canadians, I believe, and certainly members of this committee, would expect that if the minister is compelled to release a report on consultations leading up to a decision, that report would be released either prior to the decision being announced or concurrently with that decision being announced.

I'll leave it at that. I see that Mr. Albas has his hand up as well.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Yes, thank you.

I certainly appreciate the discussion that's going on today, because we really want to make sure this bill is improved to the maximum extent it can be.

I will start with how it specifically says "no later". If the minister decides he or she wants to do a consultation, and again, clause 13 reads, "the Minister must, in the manner that the Minister considers it appropriate," that again gives us great flexibility.

I don't believe this is a cumbersome issue. What it does, though, is deal with the loophole of the ball being in the government's—or, in this case, the minister's—court, such that they could open up a consultation and then literally just say they're continuing to consult, continuing to consult, continuing to consult. That, I think, is what Mr. Saini's amendment is about. It's about saying the minister shall submit a report.

If you give the average college or university student complete leeway as to when they can turn in an assignment, they often will push it back as far as possible. This probably isn't good for anyone, considering that the government has a duty and a responsibility, I believe, to those who participate in it.

I would like to ask the officials a question with regard to this.

Is there anything in this amendment that would make it troublesome?

The way I read the original clause 13, and again proposed clause 13.1, "by any other means that the Minister considers appropriate" seems to mean that the minister can have considerable flexibility when opening up a consultation.

Is that not the case?

**The Chair:** Mr. Albas.

• (1810)

**The Chair:** Is that for Mr. Moffet?

No, it's for Mr. Ngan.

**Mr. Vincent Ngan:** The question regarding the timeliness of the release of the report goes to how long the consultation would be. It is likely that a consultation would take more than a year. Therefore, the report could be released before the consultation was completed. There is another scenario in which the consultation would take only three months. Therefore, the report would be released approximately three to six months after the consultation ended.

My perspective of that would be that generally, information would be made available as soon as reasonably and operationally possible. Therefore, from a legislative perspective, there are pros and cons to having that timeline. This would be my opinion and advice at this point.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Further though, the question would be on the term “appropriate”.

Could the minister not simply say, “I'm going to do a consultation specifically with the provinces” and that would be considered part of that?

The minister could also say, “I'd like to do a consultation with indigenous people” or “I want to do a Canada-wide consultation with every citizen through the website.”

I don't believe all of these consultations need to be wound up. I think if the minister makes it appropriate that he would like to see a consultation done with a particular body or a group of citizens, then there would be flexibility in the bill through this amendment. Would there not?

**Mr. Vincent Ngan:** I agree with you.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Okay. I thank the officials for saying that and for their expertise.

I look forward to supporting the amendment. I do think, Mr. Chair, that one thing we've heard about is increasing transparency and accountability. This certainly would include that.

Again, we're not being overly prescriptive here. We're not saying anything beyond the framework of what we heard and what we are hearing again that this does not need to be too elaborate. It just means looking at other reports that the Government of Canada does on a regular basis outlining what it has heard.

**The Chair:** Mr. Redekopp.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Mr. Chair, I do agree with what my colleague just said. I won't rehash that.

I just want, again, to highlight the fact that to me, this is all about removing a loophole. Considering what Mr. Ngan said, it's not inconceivable that a future government—you Liberal members of the committee might picture yourselves as opposition members someday—could very much consult for years and never actually produce a report. I think this does compel the government. It removes a loophole essentially. I just want to reinforce the fact that this is really what that would be doing.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Seeing no further hands, I'm calling the vote on Mr. Albas' subamendment.

(Subamendment negatived: nays 6; yeas 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

• (1815)

**The Chair:** The subamendment is defeated. We now have the amendment before us.

Mr. Albas.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, while I am disappointed that the members, the majority of the committee, still want to...I'm a democratic person and I do believe the will of the committee has been expressed.

I do think that we should still support this amendment, because at the end of the day, by having government giving this to members of Parliament, to indigenous communities, and to a wide variety of different stakeholders that operate in the space who would be interested or who are just interested citizens, I think it would be in their interests to be able to know that they were heard, that they were listened to, and that it was documented by the government in some way, shape or form and they could see it on a website.

What I would say, though, is that unfortunately there seems to be a penchant here where Liberal members, and unfortunately the NDP, seem to be opposing any suggestion for any improvements other than the ones that they have seemingly pre-approved. That's unfortunate. I think we all can agree that any piece of legislation can probably be made better, particularly if we look and if we ask questions.

Clearly, the previous amendment, which I'm just going to vaguely refer to, the amendment to Mr. Saini's amendment, would have allowed some flexibility, because the minister would have been able to deal with that where appropriate. Many consultations can happen. You can have multi-year consultations with the provinces, but then you can just say that this is what we've heard from these provinces and we hope to hear from other ones.

**The Chair:** The territories too?

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Yes. Again, in any legislation, Mr. Chair, if you put down provinces, territories are automatically assumed. I am glad you raised that, because I think the territories often are not referred to enough. I certainly appreciate that observation, Mr. Chair.

I would simply wrap up here. It's really important to go further than just saying that we're going to be transparent. We heard in 2015 Liberals campaigning on a very aggressive promise to increase transparency, yet that didn't happen, despite the Prime Minister's own private member's bill and all of the initiatives that were included with that. This government, really, introduced legislation that the Information Commissioner didn't find met that basic bar of what they promised before getting elected, and ever since then, Mr. Chair, we've seen less and less.



I think Mr. Redekopp hit upon something here. I'm glad that he is paying attention and asking questions and sharing his mind, because that's what I believe this process should be, and he identified what I believe can be exploited. I would just remind all members that governments do come and go, and it's parliamentarians and the Canadian public who may not receive the information in a timely way. I think that's unfortunate.

I do hope that we can see this pass. I do hope that the government decides that when it comes to being transparent it's going to take another path than the one it has taken on things like access to information. I hope it proactively discloses these reports in a timely manner. It's unfortunate, though, that this committee has decided not to add a time period to that, because I do think that governments, like those university students, work best when they know they have to have their work in on time.

**The Chair:** Okay. Great.

Seeing no other hands, I call the vote on amendment G-9.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(On clause 14)

• (1820)

**The Chair:** We go now to BQ-15, which relates to clause 14.

I have to note the following. The vote on BQ-15 applies to BQ-16 and BQ-17, as they are linked by the notion of an annual progress report. If BQ-15 is adopted, PV-22, G-10, CPC-13, G-11 and PV-23 cannot be moved, as they amend the same line. If BQ-15 is defeated, BQ-30 becomes moot—

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** Excuse me, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** You have no interpretation, right?

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** No, it's not that. Amendment BQ-15 applies to clause 14, not to clause 13. The amendment is not about the consultations, but about the progress report. That's not the same thing.

**The Chair:** We have just finished—

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** I'm sorry, we are talking about amendment BQ-15.

**The Chair:** Exactly. We are talking about amendment BQ-15, which deals with clause 14.

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** Yes, that's right.

**The Chair:** We had finished with clause 13.

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** Yes, that's true.

[*English*]

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, I'm sorry. Maybe I'm the confused one here, so I don't mind if you tell me that I'm wrong, but I believe we agreed to the amendment of Mr. Saini. I don't believe we voted on clause 13 as amended.

**The Chair:** We had already voted on clause 13.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Oh. His was new clause 13.1.

**The Chair:** That's right.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Just so that I have it straight, this exists outside clause 13.

**The Chair:** Yes. It's new clause 13.1.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** By adopting the amendment, we don't need to do a further one, because there was no clause 13.1 in the original legislation.

**The Chair:** Right.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Thank you for explaining that, Mr. Chair. I'm sorry to cause any confusion.

**The Chair:** Madam Pauzé, does that answer your question as well?

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** Yes, I am with you.

Amendment BQ-15 will be introduced and debated, correct?

**The Chair:** Yes, you can introduce it, but I wanted to read some notes before you do so.

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** Okay.

**The Chair:** I hope I am entitled to do this. Perhaps I should leave it for you.

Ms. Thivierge, can I read some notes before Ms. Pauzé introduces her amendment?

[*English*]

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Could you restart, Mr. Chair, so that we all can hear? I was still thinking about the previous one.

**The Chair:** I'm coming back to you.

Sorry, colleagues, we just have to print something. I believe that there's a bit of a mix-up here. It will only take a second, and we'll get back to it. Just please bear with me.

Colleagues, I apologize. These are the inconveniences of a Zoom Parliament.

We're at BQ-15, and there's a slight change. Just like in a court of law, forget everything I said about BQ-15.

I will make a few comments before I ask Madam Pauzé to present her amendment.

If BQ-15 is adopted, PV-22, G-10, CPC-13, G-11 and PV-23 cannot be moved, as they amend the same line. Also, if BQ-15 is defeated, BQ-16, BQ-17, BQ-30 become moot as it would be inconsistent with the decision made on BQ-15 not to include the annual progress report in the bill.

• (1825)

**Mr. Raj Saini:** Chair, I'm sorry to interrupt. You went too fast.

Can you say all those things again, please?

**The Chair:** Sure. As a matter of fact, I can.

If BQ-15 is adopted—and Madam Pauzé will present BQ-15 in one moment—PV-22, G-10, CPC-13, G-11 and PV-23 cannot be moved as they amend the same line. Also, if BQ-15 is defeated, BQ-16, BQ-17 and BQ-30 become moot as it would be inconsistent with the decision made on BQ-15 not to include the annual progress report in the bill.

I'm sure we'll come back to this in time, but I'll now invite Madam Pauzé to table BQ-15, if she wishes to.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** I certainly do want to, Mr. Chair, except that I do not agree with your decision to include amendment BQ-30 in the list, because it refers to the Commissioner of the Environment. However, amendment BQ-15, which deals with clause 14, refers to the Minister. It's not the same thing.

• (1830)

**The Chair:** Let's take a moment to check.

You are good at following all this.

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** Thank you, that's nice.

**The Chair:** Ms. Pauzé, you are right, but there is a little hitch.

You can introduce amendment BQ-30, but you are going to have to amend it, because it mentions the annual progress report.

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** That's right. I will take out the word “annual”.

**The Chair:** So amendment BQ-30 is not automatically out of order, but it will have to be amended.

You can now introduce amendment BQ-15.

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** Mr. Albas has his hand up.

Is it a procedural issue?

**The Chair:** You don't have to—

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** I'm sorry, I am not the chair.

**The Chair:** Mr. Albas, is it procedural issue?

[*English*]

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Yes. It's brief. BQ-15 would change the clause, but I don't think it would take CPC-13 out of consideration, because [*Technical difficulty—Editor*] part of a report. Could you look into that?

**The Chair:** Let me ask the clerk.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** The clerk told me that, unfortunately, you're not correct on that. If you wish, I can have her explain it. It's because CPC-13 has some of the same lines, apparently.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, I think it could still be included. Perhaps we'll let the committee debate Madam Pauzé's amendment and then I can make my case at that point.

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** If the committee decides to pass it, I'll have to make that argument. I do think the bill could be strengthened when it comes to reporting on a summary of Canada's greenhouse gas

emissions released or removed from the atmosphere because of non-anthropogenic factors.

**The Chair:** Okay, but this is what the clerk is telling me.

Go ahead, Madam Pauzé.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Earlier, we were talking about a report on the consultations. But a more important report is the one that will describe the progress and will contain data on the measures and the real reductions. Then, that report will have to be evaluated, in the same spirit, by an independent authority.

Amendment BQ-15 seeks to amend the provisions about the progress report in order to make it into an annual report. The wording of the bill provides for a genuine evaluation only two years after each milestone year. We have not discussed this yet, but we are of the opinion that the interval is clearly inadequate. The government already receives data on Canadian emissions on an annual basis. It can therefore report on them annually.

Moreover, if you look a little further ahead, you will see that amendment G-11 somewhat confirms that. Unfortunately, in our opinion, the government's intention lacks rigour and transparency, because a summary of an inventory is not a report, just like an objective is not a target. That does not even count any snags in collecting data on greenhouse gas emissions [*Technical difficulties*]. It should be reported on as often as possible. We need an annual report.

Our amendment even gives the Minister two years after the act comes into force to start implementing the action plan. If you are following us properly, you will see that our other amendments provide for the Minister's annual report to be subsequently evaluated by the Commissioner. I repeat, this is important. Otherwise, the Minister would do his own evaluation. That is why it's important for us that the Commissioner evaluate the report, as we will be proposing a little later. The Commissioner is an independent authority, so Quebecers and Canadians will have the right information on Canada's progress in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. That makes for transparency. The public needs to know these things. That is what democracy is.

Let me quote someone whom you know, Mr. Chair, and whom a number of other members may also know. He was a great premier and a great democrat. His name was René Lévesque:

The task of real democrats is to ensure that the people are evermore up-to-date, educated and informed on their own interests.

For us, the report must always be subject to observations and comments from outside the bosom of the department. In this, I concur with some amendments by my colleague Mr. Albas. A minister evaluating his own work? I'm sorry, but that's not on.

Let me also quote a passage from the brief that David Gooderham and Jennifer Nathan submitted to the committee:

An essential feature of an effective framework is that it requires the government to disclose in a timely way [for us, that means annually] key information to Canadian citizens so that constituents (many of whom are parents of children who, in thirty years, will be burdened with the situation we bequeath to them) have the essential information they need to properly assess the efficacy of promised new climate measures. An informed electorate is the foundation of a Parliamentary democracy.

That is the spirit in which we introduced amendment BQ-15. We did so in a spirit of democracy and transparency. However, I am tempted to tell you that I am very well aware what will happen with the amendment.

• (1835)

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. Redekopp.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Mr. Chair, before I ask my question, I'd like you to confirm something for me so that I know I'm on the right track.

If we were to adopt this amendment to subclauses 14(1) and 14(2), it would replace subclause 14(1) and paragraphs 14(2)(a), (b) and (c) so that paragraphs 14(2)(a), (b) and (c) would disappear and be replaced by subclauses 14(1) and 14(2).

Am I reading this correctly?

**The Chair:** I'll let the legislative clerk answer that.

**Ms. Émilie Thivierge:** Yes, that's correct.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Thank you.

My question is for Madam Pauzé.

Basically, this is removing the "content of report" section, or what is currently subclause 14(2) with paragraphs (a), (b) and (c). In my view, having a little more detail on what is required in the content of the report is important. I think it provides some guidance to government.

I'm curious as to the reasoning of Madam Pauzé on why she would remove the more detailed description of what's required in the content of the report, and instead replace it with, I assume, subclause 14(2) in her amendment. There are no real specifics there; it's quite general. What is the reasoning for deleting the "content of report" details?

• (1840)

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Ms. Pauzé, you have the floor to respond.

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** I think we have another amendment on this. I'm trying to find it.

Proposed subclause 14(2) in this amendment states:

(2) The report must include information on greenhouse gas emissions for the year and any proposed changes to the emissions reduction plan.

So first, there will be an emissions reduction plan, which will have to be detailed, in order to know where we are going and whether we are going to meet the targets. Then, the report will contain information on this plan, including any proposed amendments. The report will have to take that into account and explain to us, in a transparent manner, what we are going to do with this plan.

[English]

**The Chair:** Does that answer your question, Mr. Redekopp? Okay.

Seeing no other hands, I call the vote on BQ-15.

(Amendment negated: nays 10; yeas 1)

**The Chair:** We go now to PV-22.

Ms. May.

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** Mr. Chair, this amendment goes to the issue of progress reports. I want to note for the committee the requirement in calendar 2023 for a major international review of progress by all nations. That certainly is already in place.

I note also, and want to make the point, that Green Party amendment 22 is completely consistent with the one that comes up next, Chris's amendment G-10, around progress reports. But where Chris's amendment stops, this amendment from the Green Party continues on the point of annual progress reports between 2030 and 2050.

Again, we're completely consistent that in the Green Party amendment there be at least two progress reports before 2030. That is covered off and consistent with what the Paris Agreement requires of us and with Chris Bittle's amendment for the government that comes up next. But we don't have anything for annual progress reports.

I just want to flag, and I've mentioned before, the international record and the elements accepted globally of best practices around climate accountability legislation. As I put it to the minister when we had our opportunity to question him, the Government of Canada has consciously decided not to pursue the best practices around the world.

For a quick review of those, the website of the Canadian Institute for Climate Choices, which was created by the Government of Canada with a number of experts, sets out what are considered the best practices from around the world on climate legislation. In relation to progress reports, they say, "Typically, climate accountability frameworks mandate that an independent body table yearly progress reports...."

With that support from the Canadian Institute for Climate Choices, not that they've explicitly looked at my amendment, but it's so well known what best practices are that it's quite astonishing the Government of Canada has chosen to avoid best practices in almost every area. Here's a chance to amend this and ensure that we get an annual progress report between 2030 and 2050.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. May.

I don't see any other hands. Therefore, I call the vote on PV-22.

(Amendment negated: nays 10; yeas 1 [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

• (1845)

**The Chair:** The amendment is defeated.

We'll go now to G-10.

Mr. Bittle.

**Mr. Chris Bittle (St. Catharines, Lib.):** Mr. Chair, I think this one might pique Mr. Albas' interest.

I'm proposing to add new subsections 14(1.1) and (1.2).

First, proposed subsection 14(1.1) requires the Minister of the Environment, in consultation with other federal ministers, to prepare progress reports on 2030 by the end of 2023, another by the end of 2025 and another by the end of 2027.

Second, proposed subsection 14(1.2) requires the 2025 progress report to include an assessment of the 2030 GHG emissions target and requires the Minister of the Environment to consider amending the 2030 target.

These amendments increase the accountability for 2030.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Would anyone else like to speak to G-10?

Mr. Albas.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Thank you.

MP Bittle has been successful in drawing my interest. I guess that is success for him, if that's a metric on his tally sheet.

However, the officials, particularly Mr. Moffet, might be able to help us out here.

Amendment G-10 would add additional progress reports for 2030 to be done in 2023, 2025 and 2027. In fact, an earlier amendment, NDP-3, would require all progress reports on 2030 to include progress on the 2026 interim objective.

Remember, Mr. Chair, there were a lot of questions about whether "interim" was properly defined, and there's no definition in the bill to say what the objective would be.

To me, it doesn't make a lot of sense for a progress report that happens after 2026, say, for example, 2027, to report on the progress to a year that's already passed.

I'd ask Mr. Moffet how can the 2027 progress report report on the progress made so far on a 2026 target. Could he maybe explain how the two regimes have been set up here?

**The Chair:** Mr. Moffet.

**Mr. John Moffet:** Maybe I'll refer to Mr. Ngan, but I think the short answer is that it takes us at least a year after a given date to determine what actually happened in that year so that we would in fact be able to report on the interim objective in each of these reports.

Vince, do you want to add to that?

**Mr. Vincent Ngan:** That is correct.

On top of that, we have to be mindful that for every year on top of the progress report, there are three different reports that the government will be issuing in compliance with UNFCCC reporting requirements on an annual basis that would take stock in terms of our projection towards the 2030 target.

Also, there's the national inventory report that takes into account, 18 months ago, the actual emissions from Canada's key sectors and provinces and territories.

Then the third one would be on a biennial basis. We submit to the UNFCCC the progress towards our target, and also, every four years, a national communication.

Therefore, with all the reporting instruments, we should be able to cover the 2026 interim objective in a timely manner.

• (1850)

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Just so I understand clearly, Mr. Chair, shouldn't the 2027 report be saying whether we met the 2026 objective and not reporting about the progress that was made?

**The Chair:** Who would like to answer that?

Could you repeat the question?

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Sure, Mr. Chair.

Shouldn't the 2027 report say whether we met the 2026 objective and not just report on progress?

**The Chair:** It's an interesting question.

Would Mr. Moffet or Mr. Ngan like to take that?

**Mr. John Moffet:** I have two thoughts.

One, as my colleague Mr. Ngan indicated, the lag in collecting the data, doing the modelling and providing the analysis can take up to 18 months. The ability to determine whether the interim objective has been met would depend on the timing of the subsequent report.

Also, as an official, if I was asked to report on progress, that would include, to the extent the information was available, an indication of whether or not we had achieved a target, an objective or a policy goal that had passed in the previous couple of years.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** It's quite possible, then, that the data, which could take up to 18 months to properly measure, may not add any meaningful effect to the 2027 progress report. Is that what you're saying?

**Mr. John Moffet:** That's not what I'm saying. I'm saying the data might not enable us to provide a definitive report on whether or not the interim objective has been met. The report will add value in the sense that it will give Canadians a good sense of how things are progressing.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I'll go back. You say it takes 18 months to acquire the data from the previous year, so to me there seems to be a six-month gap there for timing this. It sounds like, yes, there may be some details in there that could be raised with the public, but to me it doesn't seem that it would be a meaningful report, then. Usually some particulars would be found in that report and people could count on them. In this case we don't know what they can count on because we don't know what the facts will be or whether the data will even be readily available for the report in 2027.

**Mr. Vincent Ngan:** If I may, I'll quickly respond to Mr. Albas' point.

The progress report is about our progress towards the 2030 target and will talk about how the measures will be projected to achieve the 2030 target. Of course, when data are available, we can talk about interim objectives. What is being accounted for is that this would offer an opportunity to have a more detailed look into whether we're still on track for 2030 or not, and do the course correction accordingly. The merit is [*Technical difficulty—Editor*] forward on whether the target will be met or not and the likelihood of this.

The report that looks back is the assessment report, which is a different instrument under the accountability framework.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Will it be as meaningful, though, as other progress reports, as laid out in Bill C-12, if you don't have the data that Mr. Moffet referred to?

**Mr. Vincent Ngan:** It will be meaningful for 2030.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** For 2030, I agree with that. My question is different, though. You have an interim assessment in 2026 and now we're talking about adding one in 2027. Will the 2027 report be able to show the same types of information you would see in the other progress reports?

**Mr. Vincent Ngan:** The national inventory report for the following year will be able to identify whether the 2026 interim objective will be met or not when the data becomes fully available.

• (1855)

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I do appreciate, Mr. Ngan and Mr. Moffet, that you're trying to answer my question. I don't think the regime, as encompassed here, whether it be in NDP-3.... I know Mr. Bachrach worked very hard to present his amendment on that and was successful in getting it through, but I don't think his amendment and Mr. Bittle's amendment jibe and that it would be a meaningful report. Again, if it says 18 months, to me it would make sense to kick the progress report back to allow for the information to be there and be truly meaningful.

**The Chair:** Mr. Bachrach.

**Mr. Taylor Bachrach:** Mr. Chair, I take Mr. Albas' point. The amendment that's coming up, NDP-3, speaks to the progress reports prior to 2030, referencing the 2026 interim objective for [*Technical difficulty—Editor*] 2023 and 2025. That's forward looking, because those are prior to that year. For 2027, it would be backward looking, and I don't think that detracts from Mr. Bittle's amendment here. It just means that instead of looking forward, you're retroactively looking at whether we were successful at hitting that interim objective.

The real strength of Mr. Bittle's amendment is that we have three progress reports. The NDP was very clear in debate that we supported these additional accountability measures in the lead-up to 2030, which is the most important decade, as many of the scientists have told us. We have three progress reports in the lead-up, and we also have a reassessment of the 2030 target in 2025. That's going to be very important in case there is emerging science which suggests that our 2030 target is missing the mark.

I won't be supporting it for that reason. I think the 2026 reference... Obviously, those three progress reports deal with much more than the 2026 interim objective. They also include.... We're pre-empting our discussion, because the content of those reports, I believe, is going to be covered by amendments that are coming up very shortly. Those reports also deal with our progress towards 2030, which is an important milestone year.

I'll leave it at that, Mr. Chair, and turn the floor back to you.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Albas.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Yes, just briefly, I certainly appreciate MP Bachrach's intervention. Earlier we had a debate over including the importance of time limits. One of the concerns was from the Liberals, and I believe from him, and the reason they didn't support it was that the times didn't jibe, that they may preclude and cut off information from being posted.

This is where I see in the regime that perhaps there are some cracks here in what Mr. Bittle has put forward. I do recognize that MP Bachrach believes that his motion will improve upon that, but to me this doesn't seem to be a framework that has been fully thought through, and the information that people may be receiving may not be complete.

Therefore, the question is, why do it in that way? Why not have different times? I think this is a political agreement that has been made to make everyone appear that they have a win rather than actually improving the legislation. That being said, I will let other members share their views.

**The Chair:** Mr. Redekopp.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Actually, I just answered my own question, so I don't need to ask it.

**The Chair:** Good.

Seeing no other hands, I call the vote.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** The amendment carries. We're now on CPC-13.

Mr. Albas.

• (1900)

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, again, we've sincerely listened to the testimony and consulted with various stakeholders and individuals on our own time outside the committee process. One area that I do think could be greatly improved... This will be a discussion at COP26 in Glasgow as there is more discussion about non-anthropogenic sequestration, as well as emissions, etc. This is something that I'm sure many members may, from their own experience in their constituencies... This has come up to me in my capacity as the shadow minister of the environment and climate change, where constituents have called MPs and asked for some particular information, for example, Canada's sequestration through natural means. There are duelling reports between the Minister of Environment and Climate Change and the Minister of Natural Resources. They don't line up. The information and the years that are collected are not presented in the same formats. It makes it incredibly difficult for people to have an assessment.

Let's get to the rationale for it here. It's that Canada has a unique geography. As the second-largest land mass, we have, from coast to coast, incredible natural habitat that we believe needs to be conserved. I know that the previous Harper government made large commitments and did a lot on conservation. I've heard many stakeholders say that was good work, and I've seen this government make commitments. That work is still in progress, according to the minister. But again, we don't see it reported like they do in the United States every year, an actual report that underlines in one report what the...

Again, this is what, essentially, my amendment would do. It proposes that Bill C-12, in clause 14, be amended by adding after line 2 on page 6 the following:

(a.1) a summary of Canada's greenhouse gas emissions released into or removed from the atmosphere because of non-anthropogenic factors;

This would tell us if Canada is doing better in protecting, in showing that trusteeship of these wonderful lands, whether they be grasslands in the Prairies, whether they be wetlands in various provinces or whether they be the tundra. There are many, many things that the government does right now, but it does not report in a single report those emissions and those sequestrations so that the average Canadian can pull that out or call their member of Parliament and their member of Parliament can go right to that report and give it to them.

As I've said, this is something that is going to become more and more under the attention of the upcoming Glasgow COP26, as they start to discuss. This is more about giving the information so that Canadians can know, in a simple form, where the pluses and the minuses are, whether or not those assets that are largely, I believe, both provincial and federal Crown lands, those forests, tundra, grasslands and wetlands are being preserved, and what the status of it is. I do think that this is an important step, because the science is out there. It is being done. It could be compiled in an easy-to-access way. This is something that, internationally, is going to receive more and more focus. We should be anticipating that so we can actually come to the table and actually be able to talk with up-to-date information.

I believe that this is an area that the average Canadian citizen would do well from. This is something that the Minister of Foreign

Affairs, the Minister of Environment and probably even the Prime Minister would need to be briefed on. We would be able to make better policy decisions, I believe, by the collection and the reporting in a common structure.

I would just ask all honourable members to look at this. It is a very balanced amendment. It talks about a basic reporting structure for, again, emissions released into or removed from the atmosphere. This would give the opportunity for conservationists, as well as the layperson, to get that information in a timely way. It's something that I believe government already has, and it could do a lot more by simply presenting it in a common format.

• (1905)

I will leave that there. Hopefully, it will get some support. I do know that every party has made conservation commitments. This is more about having those numbers at our fingertips so that we can better communicate to our constituents about this.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Mr. Moffet, do you have your hand up?

**Mr. John Moffet:** Yes, I do, if you don't mind, Mr. Chair.

This may be inappropriate, but I think it's important to note that this amendment from a wording perspective will not accomplish what Mr. Albas suggests it would. The terms "anthropogenic" and "non-anthropogenic" have clear meanings in the international climate change community. Anthropogenic means emissions and removals that are caused by or for which human activity takes responsibility. When we are obliged to report on anthropogenic sequestration, we are absolutely accounting for the trusteeship that you refer to. Non-anthropogenic means activities that occur with no human influence whatsoever.

**The Chair:** Thank you for that clarification.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, I believe we're also looking at definitions later on. We would include a definition so that people would know exactly what we're speaking to.

Again, Canada's land mass is the second largest in the world, and we don't report in a common structure about this. On non-anthropogenic, Mr. Moffet may be of the opinion that it is not a factor that we should be looking at. I think there is a greater public need—

**The Chair:** I think I'm going to cut off debate between members and the witness—

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, I'm not debating.

**The Chair:** No, I'm not saying you are.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I'm simply raising my points to the public.

**The Chair:** I think we'll move on.

Madam Paupé.

[Translation]

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** For example, would this amendment determine if the promised two billion trees can capture CO<sub>2</sub>?

Perhaps Mr. Moffet will have to answer this question. His answer will help me decide how I'll vote.

[English]

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Moffet.

**Mr. John Moffet:** No, this would not cover that. That would already be covered under our obligation to report anthropogenic sequestration. Planting a tree is a human activity, which then results in the sequestration, which we already report on pursuant to UNFCCC guidelines respecting so-called LULUCF, or land use, land use change and forestry. That information is actually reported on, on a regular basis and in a standardized form, in our reports to the United Nations.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Again, Mr. Chair, I just want to make it abundantly clear that I'm talking about assets like non-managed forests. I'm talking about natural climate-based solutions—or not solutions, already existing nature, and reporting on that through this bill.

Mr. Moffet described it as maybe being inappropriate. I wouldn't say inappropriate. I would simply say that it's a little surprising, but that's where we have discussions like this. I would like to hear from Mr. Moffet, because I'm not referring to two billion trees. That's clearly anthropogenic. I'm talking about a report, for the purposes of this bill, that is specifically a summary of Canada's greenhouse gas emissions released into or removed from the atmosphere because of non-anthropogenic factors. I'm speaking about non-managed forests.

**Mr. John Moffet:** That's an important clarification. The focus of this bill is on government accountability to change emissions, increase sequestration and reduce emissions, in other words, to take policy action to change what occurs. Things that occur outside of human influence are not subject to the accountability, to the focus of this bill, which is for us to take responsibility for emissions and to reduce them.

• (1910)

**The Chair:** With regard to forest fires, for example, we're not really responsible for forest fires that release carbon.

Is that correct, Mr. Moffet?

**Mr. John Moffet:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Mr. Albas or Mr. Redekopp.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Who would you like to go first? Mr. Redekopp?

**The Chair:** No. I think your hand was up first.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Look, we've heard a number of times in the testimony at this committee that what you measure matters. Right now, the Canadian public and members of Parliament don't have it at their fingertips. I

know, because I've received those requests. We end up having to send them two very different reports that are not structured, and the average citizen probably can't invest a tremendous amount of time in it.

This is science that is already happening. These are conversations where....

Again, Canada has the second-largest land mass. Why wouldn't we be able to put in this information so that we actually get that public knowledge about Canada's non-anthropogenic factors? I would think that this is not outside the scope of the bill. You've ruled that it's admissible. This is information that I think Canadians want. We've had multiple witnesses agree that it is important.

I would say that if you don't report on things, then it doesn't really matter. For the life of me, I disagree with that. I think that, as an elected official, my constituents expect us to act in trusteeship of our natural environment. There is an interrelation between climate change and the natural system. I think that this is entirely within the scope.

I respect that Mr. Moffet perhaps thought that I was speaking about something else earlier, but I really hope that by my clarifying with Mr. Moffet that other members would show support for this initiative.

I do know that Canadians want this information, and that this is a part.... We cannot simply say, "No, that information isn't important. That's not part of this equation." It is a part of the equation. It may not necessarily be the central focus of the bill, but it is certainly a public good to have delivered. I would certainly hope that all members would see the forest for the trees and vote in favour of this being included.

It's not onerous for the government. It is something that can be made available.

The Americans report on this. Why is it that the American public has better knowledge about their lands when, here in Canada, where we like to pride ourselves on our pristine environment, we don't do so?

I believe in standing with my values, Mr. Chair. I hope that all members here would see this as being a good-faith, public interest argument and would support this.

**The Chair:** Let's see whether they do or not.

Mr. Redekopp.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Mr. Chair, to push that a little bit further, I think it's very relevant information to have that, and this is why. If all of a sudden we found out, through measurements, that the unmanaged forest—to pick on them—were sequestering, say, 50 megatonnes more carbon per year than expected, that has a huge impact on the plans that the government needs to make. It could save us from doing a lot of things that we don't need to do, if the earth is naturally doing it. That's just hypothetical, but the point is that if we don't know, then we don't know.

We're making very big commitments, spending a lot of money and making some major shifts in what we need to do as people on this planet. If we don't understand what's happening naturally, we may be making the wrong decisions.

It can go the other way too. We might find that we have to do more because the unmanaged forests are producing more GHGs than we think, or whatever. To me, this is very, very important, because it's a significant piece of the puzzle. If we don't know what that is, then we're making decisions with only partial information.

I think the important goal here is that we have all of the information in front of us so that we can make the best decisions possible for our Canadian people.

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Ms. Pauzé, you have the floor.

• (1915)

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** I must admit that I don't find the amendment very clear. That's why, for some time now, I haven't been able to decide if I support it or if I oppose it. I have a question for the person who proposed the amendment, Mr. Albas.

What is the point of talking about non-human emissions in public policy? This data may be interesting for science, but what is its relevance to public policy? We know very well that climate change is caused by human activities. That is what we must act on. As I understand it, the bill deals with emissions generated by human activities.

So, what does this amendment mean in the context of public policy on the environment?

**The Chair:** I would imagine that if, because of climate change, there are more forest fires, that will contribute to the increase in greenhouse gas emissions, then we will need stricter targets. That's just a guess; I don't know.

[English]

Mr. Albas.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, that's a very practical example. Even in the government's own consultation piece on selling credits, it does say that it will allow for anthropogenic, so human-caused, tree planting to be considered, but it doesn't make a requirement if it burns down within a hundred years. There is a relation.

Again, as Canadians, we pride ourselves on our natural environment, yet we don't report on it in the same way that other countries do. What you measure matters. I would simply say that your practical point there, Mr. Chair, is really important.

The minister has said that he wants to have 25% of Canada's land mass under some form of conservation federally by 2025. That does not encompass all of the grasslands. It does not encompass all of the non-managed forests. If we're looking only at the human side, we are forgetting that the earth is a natural ecosystem that exists [Technical difficulty—Editor] anthropogenic. It exists and should be reported on.

This is a good governance mechanism here. This is simply a summary, respecting that often these lands are under provincial ju-

risdiction. I do think that if these things are measured and reported on to Canadians, there will be a greater appreciation for that.

As you said, Mr. Chair, if people see that there is an increase in the amount of emissions and there isn't the regular sequestration, that may trigger further scientific inquiries. Again, the central thesis of science—and I know Mr. Saini will respect this—is to start with a fruitful question. Having this summary would send a signal to the scientific community. Why are we seeing the trend line going in the wrong direction? Are government policies aligned in the right ways? This is a non-partisan attempt to take existing information and put it into that so that it can trigger more of those fruitful questions, whether you be a scientist or just an average Canadian.

I hope that answers Madam Pauzé's question.

**The Chair:** Along the lines of asking a fruitful question, the vote is called.

(Amendment negatived: nays 7; yeas 4 [See Minutes of Proceedings])

**The Chair:** The amendment is defeated.

We now go to amendment G-11. I'm told that if G-11 is adopted, PV-23 cannot be moved since they amend the same line.

Who's going to be presenting—

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** But I'll still be allowed to present it. Is that correct, Mr. Chair? I just want to flag that.

• (1920)

**The Chair:** I don't know. Let me look into that.

**Ms. Ya'ara Saks (York Centre, Lib.):** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate the time to present my amendment.

I'm pleased to introduce an amendment to modify subclause 14(2). This amendment aims to strengthen the bill by requiring progress reports to contain, among other things, Canada's most recently published GHG emissions projections for the next milestone year and a summary of Canada's most recent official GHG emissions inventory.

We want to ensure that progress reports will include the additional information we've heard from stakeholders. We want to ensure that the details and measures taken by non-federal actors are also accounted for with this amendment.

I do hope that it receives support from my colleagues.

**The Chair:** Mr. Albas.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'd like to thank MP Saks.

Again, I'm going to be asking a few questions here. Hopefully, this is not taken in any way other than inquiring.



First of all, Mr. Moffet, in regard to this particular amendment, G-11, is there anything in here that actually expands the regime envisioned in Bill C-12, or is this all information that more or less could be reported on from the minister's perspective?

**Mr. Vincent Ngan:** If I may, Mr. Albas, I can answer that question on behalf of Environment and Climate Change Canada.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Yes, of course.

**Mr. Vincent Ngan:** As we mentioned, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change requires that we submit reports on projections as well as on the national inventory of Canada's emissions on an annual basis. The amendments here would help to bring all those elements together in the progress report.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** There is nothing in Bill C-12 as it exists without this amendment that would circumvent the ability of the minister to include that information.

**Mr. Vincent Ngan:** It would help provide greater clarity in terms of what the progress report will include.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Okay, but it doesn't expand. It's prescriptive. This is just saying, "These are of the nature that we'd like to see in the report" and even then there's a lot of "if available" and "relevant to the report", etc. There seem to be a lot of ifs or conditions.

Under the current Bill C-12, though, the minister has to do certain things. This is just prescribing how he arranges those reports, more or less, and still offers flexibility. It does not actually increase the amount of knowledge that the minister has to give, other than to specify what he has to give.

Mr. Moffet, you seem to want to comment on that.

**Mr. Vincent Ngan:** Yes, Mr. Moffet. Do you want to jump in?

**Mr. John Moffet:** That's correct. It prescribes the detail. Without this, it would be up to the discretion of the minister to decide what information to provide.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Okay, so it's just prescriptive. That's all it is. Thank you for that.

Mr. Chair, the only other thing I would offer right now is that I am happy to see that the government is starting to talk about the provinces and co-operative measures or agreements with provinces, although I think there seems to be some conditionality here. We really think the government has only been working with governments when it suits it. This politicizes it. We would much rather see a summary of provincial actions rather than just necessarily the ones that the government chooses or the co-operative agreements that it comes up with.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Seeing no hands, I call the vote.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** Okay. It's defeated. This means that PV-23 cannot be debated and voted on.

It's up to the discretion of the chair. If we start spending too much time presenting amendments that cannot be debated or voted on, we're going to fall behind.

Ms. May, I will allot you 60 seconds to speak to it, but then at 60 seconds I must cut you off. If we can't respect this rule going forward—and this is for everyone—then I just won't—

• (1925)

**Ms. Émilie Thivierge:** Mr. Chair, if I may interrupt, I believe you said that G-11 was negated.

**The Chair:** Oh. I meant that it was carried. I'm sorry. It's been a long day.

**Ms. Émilie Thivierge:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Ms. May, you have 60 seconds, please. Then we have to move on.

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** I'll use the 60 seconds, Mr. Chair, to ask this committee to read its own motion by which I am compelled to be here. It says that I am to be allowed to speak to every one of my amendments. That is a rule that has been observed by chairs in other committees.

Clearly, the amendment that just carried, G-11, speaks to some of the same areas but not with the same focus relating to ensuring that there be additional measures taken with the probability of achieving goals. It's a different turn of phrase from that used in Ms. Saks' amendment.

I believe my 60 seconds are likely up. Again, if you hadn't passed this motion, I wouldn't be here. If you hadn't passed your motion, I'd have more rights to present at report stage in the House of Commons.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Okay, understood.

We'll go to NDP-3.

**Mr. Taylor Bachrach:** Mr. Chair, I believe I spoke to this amendment prior, but I'll just read it into the record for anyone who's following along online.

Ms. Collins moves to amend clause 14 of Bill C-12 by adding after line 11 on page 6 the following:

(3) Any progress report relating to 2030 must include an update on the progress that has been made towards achieving the interim greenhouse gas emissions objective for 2026.

I believe it's fairly self-explanatory. It definitely strengthens the bill to have the 2026 objective in there. This simply ensures that the progress reports, as we discussed earlier, reference progress towards that interim objective.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Redekopp.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Mr. Chair, I had to pre-emptively raise my hand so that you didn't miss me while I was trying to figure out a few things.

Is this redundant, given the previous changes we've made to the reporting? I was just looking that up. It seems as though we already covered off the interim reporting with the reports in 2023, 2025 and 2027.

Perhaps Mr. Moffet or Mr. Ngan could explain that a bit better.

**Mr. John Moffet:** I don't think it's redundant. The previous amendment added new progress reports before 2030. Without this amendment, those progress reports would report on progress towards the 2030 target. This amendment clarifies that, among other things, those reports also have to include reporting on progress towards the 2026 interim objective.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Did we not have a big discussion about exactly this point, though, and the question that they would be reporting back on that? We also had the discussion about how many months it took to get the data from 2026, etc.

Perhaps the lateness of the day is causing my brain to miss the point here.

**Mr. John Moffet:** I thought the discussion was about our ability to report definitively about attainment of the 2026 objective, whereas this amendment is clear that the requirement is to report on progress towards.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** I think in that discussion, though, we did discuss that these interim reports would be addressing the 2026 targets. Yes, we did talk a lot about [*Technical difficulty—Editor*] the final targets, or interim or whatever.

Perhaps others can shed some light on this.

**The Chair:** My system is very strange. It's showing Mr. Bachrach, but then I see Madam Pauzé.

Mr. Bachrach, I believe you were first.

● (1930)

**Mr. Taylor Bachrach:** I'll be very brief, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Redekopp is correct that we did just have this discussion, but in having that discussion, we were referencing this amendment, which hadn't yet come to the floor. I think that might be the source of the confusion. We did have quite a discussion, and voted on language that required this amendment, but this amendment had not yet come up for a vote.

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Mr. Taylor Bachrach:** I don't know if I've clarified anything, but there you have it.

**The Chair:** That makes sense.

Madam Pauzé.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** I'm not asking for clarification, but I want to remind you that an objective isn't a target. We are still going to vote in favour of the amendment, but I would like to point out that the amendment still doesn't say anything about a target.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Mr. Albas, you have the floor.

[*English*]

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Bachrach raised an interesting point, because sometimes we think that everyone who is watching right now has watched the entire presentation from our first hearing up until now.

I'm going to ask Mr. Moffet a couple of questions, and I'm sure Mr. Moffet will be relatively brief.

In regard to the interim greenhouse gas emissions objective, what would be in that? There's no definition in the bill.

**Mr. Vincent Ngan:** If I may, it would be similar to the milestone target of a specific level of emissions.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Moffet, you had said previously that it would include a number, but it would not be because it's prescribed exactly what a target is under the act. It's a very different thing, is it not?

**Mr. John Moffet:** What I explained previously, or tried to explain, was not so much that it's different in form from a target, but that a target in this bill comes with various obligations with respect to reporting, etc.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Could you explain what the obligations are under the target regime that was originally proposed in Bill C-12, and what the interim greenhouse gas emissions objectives are in terms of obligations?

**Mr. John Moffet:** With this amendment, there would be an obligation to report on progress toward the interim objective. At the time that we had the previous discussion, there was no such amendment on the table, so the objective was simply an objective without any reporting obligations.

This committee has now passed an amendment requiring that the objective be included in the plan, and requiring additional reporting toward the 2030 target. This amendment would require progress reporting toward that interim objective.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** But again, the progress report, I believe it was in G-10, would be in 2027, a year after.

Mr. Ngan, you said that not all information relevant may be in that report. Is that correct?

**Mr. Vincent Ngan:** The final numbers, looking back, will appear likely in 2028. Every year, the government would release a report on the projections, so that with the annual release of the projections, we would have a very good idea of how far or how close we are hitting the targets. Canadians will have a very good sense in terms of whether we are on track or not.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, I will make a political statement here, and then we can let this go to a vote, unless other members decide that they want to raise their own concerns.

First of all, it's very clear that the Liberals and NDP came to an agreement quite early. I'm not subject to those things. I'm not going to ask Mr. Bachrach for those things, because ultimately, he's here to present his amendment in the greatest light, and I understand that. I've tried that many times today with my own amendments.

Obviously, the impression I get is that many stakeholders, many witnesses, many people who wrote to our committee, were asking for a milestone. There was a lot of political pressure on the government and the NDP or the Bloc, and I'm sure the Greens as well. We heard from people that wanted a milestone of 2025, and instead, they're getting this. It does not sound to me that these are the same obligations that would be included there.

By adding those extra reports, people may get something that's much different, though political parties like the NDP and the Liberals will say this is a great victory. This whole process seems to have been a bit of a steamrolled compressed one. I'll leave it to the NDP to explain to its voters and to the environmental community exactly why it decided to trade off and support the Liberals instead of supporting a greater action.

That being said, the Conservatives will be voting against this. I sincerely wish that we had a bit of a different process here, because I know there are a number of other people who would want to have their views brought up. Again, 72 different people sent in their briefs, and we received them well after the period for amendments.

Mr. Chair, I will leave it at that. I certainly appreciate that there's been a lot of hard work tonight.

• (1935)

**The Chair:** Yes.

Okay. Seeing no hands, the vote is called on NDP-3.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

**The Chair:** I think everything has pretty much been said on clause 14, so I would ask for the co-operation of the committee in voting on clause 14 as amended so that we can end the meeting.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, I think it would be better for us to simply do this at the next juncture. We're already past the time, as you said.

Quite honestly, we have some concerns about the process. I know that I'm already getting on enough people's nerves here, so maybe we could leave it for another night.

**The Chair:** I guess what you're saying is that if we try to pass this at the moment, there's going to be debate. Is that what you're saying?

Okay.

On that, I did say at the outset that we would end at 7:35. It's 7:38, so I will adjourn the meeting, and we'll continue at our next meeting.

Thank you, members, for your hard work.

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** Mr. Chair, do we know when the next meeting will be?

**The Chair:** Well, I think it will end up being on Monday, but I'm trying for tomorrow night. I don't know what the chances are. It's definitely Monday but maybe tomorrow night, so I would keep your agendas open as much as possible until further notice. It's going to be difficult for tomorrow night, but we're trying.

On that, I adjourn the meeting and I wish everyone a good evening. Thank you.

---





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

---

### SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

---

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the Copyright Act. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the Copyright Act.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

---

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: <https://www.ourcommons.ca>

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

---

### PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

---

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la Loi sur le droit d'auteur. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre des communes.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la Loi sur le droit d'auteur.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

---

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante :  
<https://www.noscommunes.ca>