



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

43rd PARLIAMENT, 2nd SESSION

---

# Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

EVIDENCE

**NUMBER 038**

Monday, June 7, 2021

---

Chair: Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia





# Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

Monday, June 7, 2021

• (1545)

[English]

**The Chair (Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.)):** I call this meeting to order.

Before we pick up where we left off, I just have a couple of very quick items to deal with.

At the last meeting, Ms. May raised a point about whether the motion that allows independent members to present amendments would allow her to speak to a motion of an independent member that is deemed inadmissible, and I said I would get that to her and members of the committee. I read the motion closely and discussed it with the legislative clerk. I don't have that interpretation and I'll mention why.

If you look at the motion, in part (b) about amendments from independent members, it says they "shall be deemed to be proposed during the said consideration", so I take that to mean during the process and following the process that every member is part of.

I don't see it as being that the minute that the amendment is sent into the clerk, the independent member can speak to it even if it's inadmissible. Also, it doesn't make sense to me because that would mean that all members would be able to speak to their inadmissible motions.

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** I have a point of order. I would prefer it, Mr. Chair, if you describe my role accurately. The motion says, independent or members of non-recognized parties.

I am not an independent member of Parliament.

**The Chair:** I apologize. I should have said—

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** I am a Green Party member of Parliament.

I had thought, Mr. Chair, that the third part of the motion is quite affirmative that each member is allowed to speak.

I understand your ruling. I'm not challenging you, and I know we are rather pressed for time, but in previous committees at which I have been appearing since this motion was first brought forward under the fiction that each committee chose to draft a motion that was identical to everyone else's motion, I've been allowed to speak to each of my amendments deemed to have been put forward.

I don't mean to trespass on your time any further if you want to finish what you were going to say, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** It says here that, during clause-by-clause, "the Chair shall allow a member who filed suggested amendments...an oppor-

tunity to make brief representations" as well. There's been no time limit really imposed on anyone, including the member from the Green Party, and the member from the Green Party makes substantive comments and is not filibustering the committee, so there's no need for enforcing the idea of brevity.

I guess, Ms. May, that means that when you do get the floor on an amendment that's admissible, there's nothing stopping you from referring back to an amendment that was inadmissible.

Anyway, I just wanted to get back to you on this. I did take it seriously and discussed it with the legislative clerk.

**Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC):** Mr. Chair, I just wanted to briefly comment on this.

I've already raised many of the points specific to the amendments that Ms. May placed earlier, which you ruled inadmissible, so I won't go to that. I will talk about the future process.

As MP May referenced, she has gone to other committees and had different experiences. I don't want to undermine anyone's credibility, whether it be yourself or the law clerk, because I do believe that we're all trying to work together in good faith. One thing I would consider, Mr. Chair, is that I know there is a committee of all the chairs of committees, and this is something that perhaps you might want to bring three, because to have inconsistent rulings where you're making a judgment call and someone else is making a judgment call....

Perhaps the different House leaders who make these motions, compelling independent or non-recognized party members such as MP May to come to this process only to find out that she's not even able to speak in favour of it or to challenge a position.... To me, it's a principle of natural justice that if a ruling is given against your amendment, you would be able to speak to it.

Just for the sake of consistency, I would encourage you, Mr. Chair, to perhaps discuss this with other chairs and perhaps discuss it with the different House leaders, so that if a motion does come forward again perhaps there can be some clarity as to the admissibility or the ability of an independent or a non-recognized party member to be able to speak to it.

I believe that fundamentally we should be able to make reference to it, and it shouldn't be up to a member to make arguments on behalf of another member's rights. Those rights and privileges are something that we all should be looking out for in these kinds of cases.

I would ask you, Mr. Chair, just in the spirit of trying to make for a better process next time, to take this to your fellow chairs and discuss it perhaps with your—

• (1550)

**The Chair:** I'll take it under advisement.

The other item is regarding an error in the French version of amendment G-8. The Senate picked this up in the prestudy.

The phrase is, in French, *pris en compte*, with no “e” on *pris*. We adopted *prises*, which is grammatically incorrect. I assume there is unanimous consent to revert to *pris*, instead of *prises*. As I say, it's a technicality.

Mr. Albas.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, before you seek unanimous consent, although I imagine you can ask for someone to do that, one of the things that I and other Conservative members have been arguing, and quite frankly, that I've also heard from MP May, is that this process has been rather—what's the word I'm looking for?—compressed. There has not been sufficient time to review and have proper discussion about these things.

Rather than have someone ask for unanimous consent and for us to deny it, right now, I'm a person who believes in good governance, but I also think there is a principle here. The Liberal members have been jamming and basically opposing any other amendments. The process, in this case, hasn't been clean. This is just another example of having to bend over backwards and to ask things that are outside the usual process because things were not followed.

Rather than asking for unanimous consent and us just saying no, I ask you to maybe leave it with us for a bit. My understanding is that we have a very long session today. Perhaps we can deal with it after we have a break, so that I can speak with my other members to see if they want to allow that.

**The Chair:** That is fine with me, after we have our break. I would find it very unusual if the Conservative Party opposed taking “es” from the French version and making it grammatically correct, but....

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, on that point, it is the right of every parliamentarian to express—

**The Chair:** Yes, it is.

**Mr. Dan Albas:**—opposition or to allow a process to go forward.

**The Chair:** Of course it is.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** If you would like to make that a political argument, I would say that would probably not be the position of the chair to be making, but I do want this committee to work well. Therefore, if you wouldn't mind following that process, we'll have that discussion.

I will say that Conservatives here have raised a number of concerns about this process. Again, whether it be having to bend over backwards to allow Mr. Bachrach's change for nine years and 366 days, because they voted down MP May's similar amendment, there have been issues here where the government seems to think it can

get what it wants when it wants it, despite the usual rules and process. Therefore, I appreciate that.

**The Chair:** You will be conferring with your members to see if we can—

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Yes, Mr. Chair. I would appreciate that. That's a big courtesy.

**The Chair:** Then we'll come back after the break and find out what the answer is.

Now we can continue. The floor is back to....

Yes, Mr. Bittle.

**Mr. Chris Bittle (St. Catharines, Lib.):** I want to respond to that very quickly.

It's ironic that Mr. Albas is saying that this matter has been compressed. This is a very short bill, yet we are many hours into this process and the Conservatives are slow-walking this bill. Having originally supported it, now they're against it. Maybe they'll support it yet again. We don't know. They're going to consult.

They're even dragging on an issue of whether to correct the French language in this bill on a minor point. To say that this is compressed is interesting, given the amount of time, including the amount of time that Mr. Albas has spent already in this meeting on a couple of very minor points.

It's interesting. It's ironic. I will stop.

In the past, I know that the members of this party have asked for unanimous consent to change a vote because they perhaps weren't paying attention. That's acceptable from the rest of the House, but it's denied in these particular cases for Mr. Albas if it will delay this process even more. It's rather unfortunate. I want to point that out. Thank you.

• (1555)

**The Chair:** Okay. Now we will resume—

**Mr. Dan Albas:** No, Mr. Chair. I'd like to respond to that, please.

**The Chair:** Okay.

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

Look, when we have a vote in the House of Commons and someone incorrectly hits yea or nay when they were supposed to vote for the opposite and then begs for the House to allow them to change it—because that's the process that's been laid out—that cuts both ways. That's applicable to all parties. That's to make sure that those members of Parliament can actually represent their constituents properly and have their vote accounted for. In a minority Parliament, I would hope that all members would realize that this is a fair process.

When it comes to raising concerns around the process, we had 72 briefs—plus—that came in afterwards. Through no fault of the legislative clerk, these things had to be translated so that all members, regardless of their language, would be able to read them in their preferred official language.

That was compromised because, Mr. Chair, we ended up having to submit amendments. Like all parties, we submitted our work, and the fact—

**Ms. Ya'ara Saks (York Centre, Lib.):** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

We're entering into the field of debate. It's really not the time or the place for this. We really do need to get to work on the process of getting through this bill. I really don't feel it is the time for this.

**The Chair:** We agreed you'd come back....

Mr. Albas, you had the floor anyway.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I have one final point I'd like to make, Mr. Chair, because Mr. Bittle did throw these barbs at Conservative members.

I would just say that if the government cannot write proper English and French in its amendments to its own bill, they have larger problems than people like me.

(On clause 14)

**The Chair:** We're now at whether clause 14 shall carry, because we've gone through all the amendments. I believe that's where we left off.

Shall clause 14 carry as amended?

**Mr. Dan Albas:** No. I'd like a recorded division, please, Mr. Chair.

(Clause 14 as amended agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

(On clause 15)

**The Chair:** We'll go now to clause 15, and Ms. May's PV-24.

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

We had similar amendments the other day, in order to ensure that we have more frequent assessment reports. As noted, we now have a number of amendments that mean that the first part of my amendment that “the Minister must prepare at least two assessment reports before 2030” will appear to have been covered.

The critical last part of this amendment is, “and at least one assessment report per year between 2030 and 2050.” This is an attempt, of course, to fortify a bill that doesn't have carbon budgets in it, so annual reports will assist in remedying that deficiency.

Thank you. Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

We have Mr. Albas.

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

I'll ask Mr. Moffet or perhaps Mr. Ngan—whoever can best answer this.

In reference to Madam May's amendment, PV-24, she did say, on the second point, “at least one assessment report per year between 2030 and 2050.”

Mr. Ngan, earlier you said that the information that would be presented sometimes takes 18 months to gather. Could you tell me how that fits into this amendment?

**Mr. Vincent Ngan (Director General, Horizontal Policy, Engagement and Coordination, Department of the Environment):** Thank you for the question.

This question actually pertains to whether the bill should include, on an annual basis, the issuance of an assessment report. The importance of this would be, as Mr. Albas indicated, that due to the collection and the provision of data from Statistics Canada as well as from stakeholders, there's usually 18 months between that particular year and the year we could actually assemble the national inventory report.

That being said, I think it is important to take into account the following facts. In terms of Bill C-12, which is the net-zero emissions accountability act, currently there is the annual projections report that provides information to Canadians as well as shares internationally whether Canada is on track with a particular greenhouse gas emissions target. Of course, for the past few years, the reporting has been on 2030. Every year, the national inventory report, although with an 18-month data lag, also identified the state of play in terms of Canada's emissions level.

I want to reassure Canadians. If they want to know, with a particular milestone, that we are on track, based on empirical data from past years' emissions levels, those reports will be able to provide a very clear picture.

I will leave it to the committee to determine whether that amendment is appropriate or necessary. I think that will be my answer.

● (1600)

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Could I ask one other brief question in regard to that?

You mentioned that much of the same information is reported through other reports. Could you let the listeners tuning in at home know what is done already? Would this be more or less similar information supplied, or would this be something new?

**Mr. Vincent Ngan:** Thank you for the question.

Canada, like any other country, must comply with the UNFCCC methodology and reporting requirements. The information definitely is very consistent year after year, and it is consistent with international practices. Canada would not be venturing into developing its own methodology that is inconsistent with reporting requirements set by the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

The assessment report, as well as the progress report here, stipulates in legislation the same methodology and requirements to ensure consistency and transparency. I agree with you that it's very consistent and also that there is greater clarity in terms of the types of reports and in terms of the progress that the Bill C-12 process entrenches in legislation.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** This is my last question.

When we do report to UNFCCC on our yearly updates, that information is also public. Is that correct?

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

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

I appreciate Mr. Ngan weighing in on that.

**The Chair:** The vote is called on PV-24.

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

**The Chair:** We will go now to G-12.

Ms. Saks.

**Ms. Ya'ara Saks:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, colleagues.

Mr. Chair, I'm happy to introduce a motion to modify subclause 15(2) of the Canadian net-zero emissions accountability act.

This motion ensures that the assessment reports will include additional information, something we've heard much about, such as a summary of Canada's most recent official GHG emissions inventory known as the NIR; information submitted by Canada under its international commitments on climate change; and an assessment of the co-operative measures, whether they be with the provinces or other governments, and how they contribute to Canada's efforts to achieve its targets. This motion strengthens the act by consolidating, in its assessment reports, information already contained in Canada's other reports related to GHG emissions.

• (1605)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Albas.

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

I appreciate MP Saks's putting forward her amendment. I have just a few questions for Mr. Ngan or perhaps Mr. Moffet, whoever deems themselves most capable of responding to it.

Let's just start with paragraph (a), "a summary of Canada's most recent official greenhouse gas emissions inventory and information, relevant to the report, that Canada submitted under its international commitments with respect to climate change". This is very similar information to what we discussed about Canada sending its report to the UNFCCC. Is that correct?

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

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Would this be on an annual basis or would this simply be when the minister deems it?

**Mr. Vincent Ngan:** The assessment report is actually produced according to the schedule of the reporting cycle. The emissions level for a particular milestone year would actually not be fully available until 18 months later. Therefore, the assessment report will actually be required when the national inventory for that particular year becomes available. There is a specific timeline to make sure that, with the release of the national inventory report for that year, the assessment report will also be released in a timely manner.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** This dovetails with what is already envisioned in the original version of Bill C-12. There's no extra work, other than just to embed the extra information into the minister's report. Is that correct?

**Mr. Vincent Ngan:** That is correct, Mr. Albas. The reporting frequency has not been changed, but greater specification and transparency have been included through this amendment.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** This might be a better question for Mr. Moffet.

Part (b) of MP Saks' amendment, again that's G-12, says it would add, after line 29 on page 6, the following:

(c.1) an assessment of how the key cooperative measures or agreements with provinces or other governments in Canada described in the relevant emissions reduction plan contributed to Canada's efforts to achieve the national greenhouse gas emissions target for that year;

This amendment refers to "cooperative measures or agreements".

Mr. Moffet, could you please explain what is meant by that? I don't believe that's defined in the bill.

**Mr. John Moffet (Assistant Deputy Minister, Environmental Protection Branch, Department of the Environment):** That's correct; it's not. The bill will be interpreted broadly if a plan does not need to include such a co-operative agreement, but it may include a co-operative agreement. What this says is that, as Mr. Ngan has explained, the assessment report basically asks, once we get to a target year, how we did. This would require that, among other information, there be information about any such agreements and whether they were effective or not. It doesn't require that there be such agreements, but if there are, then this ensures the reporting is as comprehensive as possible.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** When you say "key cooperative measures or agreements", does that mean the government, through the minister, gets to choose which provinces or territories this might refer to and only the ones they want to report on?

**Mr. John Moffet:** You're asking a legal question. I can say, in a general sense, that this does provide some discretion to the minister to determine which co-operative measures are key. I don't think it would allow the minister to ignore measures with some provinces and to privilege others. The federal government, as you likely know, does have countless measures, some incredibly small with respect to incredibly minor details.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** One of the things we've heard, which is also something stakeholders have raised with me privately, is that they're not always sure whether or not this particular bill has any kind of jurisdiction over provincial actions. This simply recognizes that if there is an agreement with a particular province on a particular measure, there can be reporting on that, but again, it's at the discretion of the minister. Is that correct?

• (1610)

**Mr. John Moffet:** That's correct. This in no way infringes on provincial jurisdiction or requires provinces to do anything.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Usually when we include the term "provinces", it's a very broad term that includes the provinces and territories. Is that not the case?

**Mr. John Moffet:** That's correct, but the reference to other governments could be interpreted to include municipalities. We have agreements with municipalities. It can also be interpreted to include agreements with indigenous governments.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** That was going to be.... You kind of jumped ahead. I'm glad that you're a bit ahead of me, because it shows that someone is on the ball here.

To ask again, though, does this not give the minister a bit of an arbitrary power to decide to report on provinces, territories, indigenous governments or municipalities that it is politically in alignment with or is in more of a co-operative stance with? Does giving such discretion to a minister not politicize the bill?

**Mr. Vincent Ngan:** Mr. Albas, if it's okay, I can provide an example of how key measures can be derived.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Sure. Please go ahead.

**Mr. Vincent Ngan:** As you know, in 2016 the pan-Canadian framework on clean growth and climate change was adopted. It is based on consensus among federal, provincial and territorial governments. Since then, the Government of Canada has been working with the provinces and territories to report on progress on a yearly basis. Over the past four years, we have developed and agreed to, on a consensus basis, measures in the pan-Canadian framework for reporting on progress and measures on key initiatives put in place by the provinces and territories that they would like to showcase.

In a nutshell, of course, we would not be able to provide an exhaustive list of all the measures from the provinces and territories. Pragmatically, it is not doable. That being said, from a key measures perspective, there is already a document, based on consensus, from the provinces and territories where information can be extracted. These are definitely measures that the provinces and territories deem as key to put forward, and they report on them on an annual basis.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I'm glad you raised the pan-Canadian framework, because that's exactly what I had in mind when I was considering MP Saks's amendment. Saskatchewan did not join in with the consensus in Vancouver in 2016.

Have you been reporting on provincial actions of provinces that have elected not to participate in the framework?

**Mr. Vincent Ngan:** All 13 jurisdictions that participated in the pan-Canadian framework have been reporting for the past three years, despite the fact that one jurisdiction has elected not to join. That said, the key measures of Saskatchewan have been reported on an annual basis as part of the measures, along with those of the 12 other jurisdictions.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Okay. I believe Ontario came into compliance later on, but there doesn't seem to be.... The pan-Canadian framework is an example that could be used with regard to this amendment. Is this amendment necessary? The pan-Canadian framework is already reported on.

**Mr. Vincent Ngan:** I think the answer goes back to the very beginning of the question, that is, whether there is discretion by the minister to cherry-pick what measure is deemed as key. Given that there is already annual reporting based on consensus among the provinces and territories, the key measures that will be reported

through the assessment report will be drawn from that consensus vehicle, therefore minimizing any probability or optics that the minister is cherry-picking.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, I'll finish my intervention today by thanking both officials for clarifying things for me. I know these questions can be difficult, because I struggle with them when stakeholders ask me whether or not this law applies to things under provincial jurisdiction. It wasn't entirely clear.

The government obviously felt that Bill C-12 needed this amendment. Otherwise, they wouldn't be putting it forward. That being said, I believe that by allowing the minister—instead of having a whole-of-government approach—to arbitrarily pick which key examples will be selected.... Maybe this isn't such a bad thing. Maybe showing some positive examples could be good. However, it could be a punitive tool whereby you showcase provincial or territorial governments that are aligned with the government of the day, or municipalities it will perhaps want to recruit new candidates from to put them on a bit of a pedestal so the candidates can have a good news story. I think that having one minister make these decisions, rather than having a whole-of-government approach, doesn't make a lot of sense. As we know, much of the reporting is already being done right now through the pan-Canadian framework, and there is regular reporting.

This is too arbitrary and, again, doesn't necessarily add to the bill, so the Conservatives will be voting against it. However, if any of my Conservative colleagues want to ask a question or raise a concern, they should, because we do think that provinces are a key area here. We would like to see further reporting on the summaries of what provinces are doing, but not in an arbitrary, politically driven process.

• (1615)

**The Chair:** Okay, the vote is called.

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

**The Chair:** The amendment G-12 passes.

We're now at CPC-14.

Mr. Albas.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp (Saskatoon West, CPC):** I'd like to move that one, Mr. Chair.

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

Mr. Redekopp, go ahead.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Thanks.

I'm going to move CPC-14, and I'll just read it into the record here. It's that Bill C-12, in clause 15, be amended by adding, after line 21 on page 6, the following:

(a.1) a summary of the measures undertaken by the governments of the provinces to contribute to Canada's efforts to achieve the national greenhouse gas emissions target for that year and of their impacts on those efforts;

This kind of carries on with what we were just speaking about, and I think it expands upon it quite nicely.

The government has already proposed in G-11, and just now in G-12, that we would add some key co-operative measures or agreements with the provinces. It's very critical that we have provincial buy-in to the plan. That's why I'd like to propose this amendment, to deepen this a little bit more.

Ultimately, the vast majority of the reductions that are going to occur in Canada are going to come from measures that are under provincial jurisdiction. It's the provinces that control our natural resources and our electrical grids, and they also regulate a large portion of the transportation industry. We absolutely need the provinces on board or this isn't going to work.

Now, unlike the Liberals and the NDP, which have tended to be more combative with the provincial governments in Canada, Conservatives believe that we need to work together with the provinces. For example, under Liberals, we've seen lawsuits, such as the carbon tax lawsuit we recently saw, and it went all the way to the Supreme Court. It tied up a lot of time and energy and created some animosity between governments. We don't want to do that. We want to be more co-operative.

Also, I think it's the people on the ground who know what they need to do to reduce emissions. They don't need Ottawa to tell them what to do. In Saskatchewan, for example, our environment has always been a very high priority, because our agricultural-based economy depends on a healthy environment.

I'll give you an example. For many years, I was involved in an agricultural company based in Saskatoon that brought a new innovation to farming, and it brought this new farming technique right into the mainstream. That technique was called "zero tillage". In a nutshell, it's essentially allowing stubble to stand over the winter and then using an air seeder and air drill to seed directly into the stubble. Farmers are able to retain carbon in the ground and minimize fuel use by reducing the number of passes they have to take over the ground.

In Saskatchewan, when it comes to the environment, our farmers were doing what they should long before being told what they have to do.

We've heard testimony after testimony from pulse farmers, cattlemen, CAPP and the Chamber of Commerce about the need for provincial co-operation. I know that the federal government should work with the provinces, but the reality is that this act says very little about the provinces. In fact, it seems to me that it goes out of its way to avoid talking about the provinces. It seems that the government is being very careful to create a situation where it can work in isolation if it feels that it needs to. My fear, too, is that if we don't achieve our targets as set out in the legislation, then we're setting it up for finger pointing, where the federal government can accuse the provinces of not doing their part, because they weren't a part of this initially.

I believe that we need to modify this legislation and bring the provinces into this discussion in a more formal way. Instead of generating laws and fighting each other in court, the federal and provincial governments should be working together. This legislation should set the foundation for the provinces and the federal gov-

ernment to work together. It should set things up for a co-operative arrangement where everybody is pulling in the same direction.

I'll just end with a reference back to Ecojustice, from their joint submission to the committee. I believe it's one of the ones we didn't have a chance to hear from in testimony, but their submission called for regional and provincial jurisdiction to be respected. This amendment does exactly that.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (1620)

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

Mr. Albas.

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

I have just a couple of things I want to detail. Again, for those who are watching at home who may not have seen some of the previous amendments we have made, we think that, rather than giving all the ability to one minister, having some of the plans voted on by cabinet so that everyone can kind of break down silos and get a whole-of-government approach would make for a better bill.

We also believe that when Canadians think of their responsibility toward climate change, they think, "What is my government doing?", whether it be federal, provincial or territorial.

Again, I just want to reinforce that the use of the term "provinces" here is a general term, so those in Nunavut, those in the Northwest Territories and those in Yukon can count themselves included in this particular amendment.

This is unlike the case of the previous amendment, in which the government—in that case, the individual minister designated, the Minister of Environment and Climate Change—got to decide which provinces to feature. That's not an all-hands-on-deck approach, Mr. Chair.

Canada is built on federalism, such that we have a field house of different methods. In Quebec we have a cap-and-trade system being used. British Columbia obviously has its own carbon tax, and in other provinces, such as Ontario, they use a combination; they regulate their emissions from industrial bases and there is the federal carbon tax.

Mr. Chair, there are different approaches being undertaken by different governments. A great example would be the tier regulations in Alberta, the structure of which is very different from perhaps that of the output-based pricing system.



This particular amendment would allow for a snapshot, a summary of the situation in all provinces and not just in the ones the government or an individual minister favours. There would be a summary of those so that people could be educated as to what their federal leadership was doing as well as their provincial leadership. This does not in any way, shape or form disrupt or intervene in provincial jurisdiction, so for the Bloc Québécois—we have a representative from the Bloc here—if that is a concern, certainly this is just a summary. I'm sure the Bloc member would agree that if we are to communicate that all governments are taking the threat of climate change seriously, there does need to be a place where people can look for it. Again, it should not be done on an arbitrary basis as described in the previous motion.

I would encourage all members to vote in favour of this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I think Canada can do more. Part of that is being fair and including everyone so that people will be better able to hold all levels of government—provincial, territorial or federal—to account on our climate change path.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

The vote is called.

(Amendment negatived: nays 7; yeas 4)

• (1625)

**The Chair:** We are on amendment CPC-15. Who is presenting that?

**Mr. Dan Albas:** That would be me, Mr. Chair. Do I have the floor?

**The Chair:** Yes, absolutely.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Colleagues, appreciate that this is something I asked a number of different groups because, as we know thanks to Madam Pauzé, electrification is going to be an important step.

Our current electrical grid, as we know, is not sufficient. Even the uptake that people expect for electric vehicles, as was said during Madam Pauzé's study on electric vehicles, would require the equivalent of 7.5 Site Cs. Obviously, that's just the aggregate amount of energy. There could be many different sources for it, such as nuclear or hydro. There are so many new ways that people are utilizing electricity, from various renewables to high-efficiency natural gas.

Quite honestly, Mr. Chair, the need for this bill to reference the state of Canada's electrical grid is important. This is something that I'm asked about by constituents on a regular basis. They say, with all these new electric cars—and we all drive in at five o'clock or 5:30—when we all plug them in, how will that work? That's a great question, and one that provincial and territorial governments are going to have to wrestle with as we move forward with some of these adoptions of new technology and a new emphasis on things like electric vehicles. Obviously there have been some investments that we've seen in hydrogen, and that's a plus, but there are going to be increasing questions about electrical loads.

I asked a number of different groups who responded very positively that it would be helpful to have this. As you know, Mr. Chair, when you cross an interprovincial boundary or an international boundary, it is under the federal government's jurisdiction.

I'll read out the amendment, which is that Bill C-12 in clause 15 be amended by adding, after line 29 on page 6, the following:

(c.1) an assessment of electric grids in Canada and the steps needed to ensure that they can manage an increase in electricity demand due to transportation electrification;

Mr. Chair, we heard from the Canadian Electricity Association, and in their brief, they said they support the aim of Bill C-12 and believe that a clear and focused plan is essential for Canada's ability to achieve net zero by 2050, and that holding ourselves collectively accountable for meeting targets is important, but those targets must be matched with focused policy so that we can achieve them.

As I said earlier, one of the areas we are going to be looking to achieve in is further electrification. This would offer an update so that people can understand the grid. Again, it does not interfere with any provincial jurisdiction. What it does do, though, is create a summary, so that for the average citizen—all of our constituents—if they asked you the question, you could refer to that and give them an up-to-date answer.

This is part of good governance. This information is already publicly available to some extent, but nothing that I'm aware of actually includes it in a Government of Canada report. This would allow for greater transparency, which is one of the stated goals of Bill C-12.

I would ask all honourable members to support the amendment, because we need to have a greater understanding of the state of our electrical grid. I think this would be welcomed by groups like the Canadian Electricity Association, knowing that this is going to be an area that a lot of money—a lot of potentially private investment as well as public investment—is going to be needed for us to achieve our goals of electrifying the transportation network and making Canada a greener and more environmentally friendly country as a whole.

Again, I would ask all honourable members to support this particular amendment. It's an easy one for the Liberals to support, because I think this is one of those good governance provisions that we all can rally behind.

Again, just to make sure that Madam Michaud knows I'm thinking of the Bloc and of their constant quest to make Quebec as strong a province as possible, this would not interfere with that. Hydro-Quebec is a very respected organization and does a lot of good work, both interprovincially as well as internationally. I would hope that the Bloc members would be supportive of that.

• (1630)

I know that I referenced Site C. I just would say to MP Bachrach that obviously the provincial government is supportive of Site C, but I hope that by utilizing Site C he did not mean that he would somehow tie himself to be voting in favour of 7.5 more Site Cs. It was just an example that I was using.

I hope to get every committee member to support this particular amendment to Bill C-12 today, Mr. Chair.

Thank you very much.

**The Chair:** Mr. Redekopp.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Thanks, Mr. Chair.

I just want to comment a little further on this with some personal examples. In my prior life, I was an accountant. I guess I still am technically an accountant. I worked for many years, as I said, at a manufacturing company, and we measured a lot of things. It has been said previously in this committee that you manage what you measure.

A lot of what's we have discussed so far about this legislation has been focused on what we're doing to reduce greenhouse gases, and rightly so. The nice thing about this amendment is that it kind of forces us to look at balancing some of the pieces of this puzzle. If we focus on just one thing, we may miss some important details on other things. This is one of those very critical pieces of the puzzle.

We can, to use a simple example, force all of our vehicles to be electric, but if we don't have the charging capacity to deal with that, then we're actually not getting to where we want to go. That's what I like about this. It allows us to take a bit of a more balanced approach to some of the metrics we are watching, making sure that while we might achieve goals on this side of the fence, we've also achieved goals on the other side of the fence so that this whole thing is going to work when it's done. If we don't look at the whole picture, we could end up with something that isn't doable or functional at the end of the day. Ultimately that would let Canadians down, and they wouldn't be able to do the things they need to do if we do this wrong.

I have another example, just to further reinforce this. I live in a condo building in downtown Saskatoon. We have a three- or four-floor parkade. At the moment, we have just a couple of electric vehicles plugging into the power that's in that building. As more and more electric cars start showing up in our particular parkade, that's going to start causing stress to the electrical power grid that's coming into the building. I think it's fair to say that, at some point, we're going to have to add another trunk line coming into the building in order to handle the capacity there. If you look around—

**The Chair:** Does the amendment deal with this, or is that something you should maybe bring to the attention of...?

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** I think the point is about measuring what we're talking about in an electric grid, so yes, I think it's exactly what we're dealing with.

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** My point is that the electric grid in Saskatoon runs down the back alley of my building and other buildings. If you look outside of my building, you'll see multiple other multi-storey buildings that are all going to have the same issue. It's not just a simple matter of running another power line into the building. We're actually going to have to add an entire trunk line down the back alley to service all of these buildings. You can multiply that out by multiple times.

That's why I think this is an especially critical point to look at. If we do not get this right, then we won't be able to achieve the results on the other side—or we may achieve the results to a certain point, and then the whole house of cards will fall apart because we didn't deal with this one issue. That's why I'm saying I think this is a particularly good point to look at, because it really helps us to see the balanced picture. As I said, you manage what you measure, and I think it's important that we measure this and manage it properly.

Thanks, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Mr. Albas.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I have just one additional point. I'll try to keep it as brief as possible.

The federal government has made investments in Muskrat Falls, for example, because we know that is a key feature in that province's future. If you don't have energy, then it's difficult to industrialize in a way that is efficient and that can also reduce emissions. I know there are problems with that project, but that is all the more reason, to my mind, we should be giving a summary of our electrical grid.

Again, from Muskrat Falls to Site C to much of SaskPower's infrastructure, what we haven't discussed are the lines. Someone said to me that if Tesla came to Canada today—if he were alive—he would note that much of the technology we rely on for the transmission of power, whether between communities, within communities, between provinces or between countries, is very old. In fact, members have made many references to how they would like to see things like a smart grid that would be able to deal with many of the concerns about people plugging in their vehicles all at the same time.

There are ways we can deal with these things, Mr. Chair, but unfortunately if we just leave this as an issue, then we're going to see a patchwork. Quite honestly, Mr. Chair, I don't know about you, but in my riding people just refer to the government. They don't refer to the provincial government or the federal government. I know that's a distinction that we make, and we must make, because we believe—

• (1635)

**The Chair:** My constituents seem to know the difference. I'm just saying—

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, are you saying that there is an intelligence level difference?

**The Chair:** No, not at all.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I don't think that's a fair statement to make, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** I think everyone understands that there are different levels of government.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, I'd like just to finish, if you wouldn't mind.

**The Chair:** Sure. Yes.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Okay. Thank you very much.

Perhaps I was a little agitated, Mr. Chair, because it seemed that you were saying that somehow your constituents are a little different from mine.

**The Chair:** No.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I would say that most citizens right now, especially during COVID, are trying to make their lives work as best they can with all the different things that are going on.

I will tell you, because I share an office in Summerland with an MLA, a member of the Legislative Assembly, Dan Ashton, that we often have people who come in and don't know who they're supposed to speak to. Are they supposed to speak to their MLA or their MP? That's where we see this a lot, Mr. Chair.

Again, this is an area where we could give people that information in one summary, so I hope that all members will vote in favour of this. This is a good and particular amendment. This won't be difficult in terms of time.

I guess I could ask a question of the government representatives here, but you know what? I think I've made a pretty good case, Mr. Chair, so rather than prolonging this, I think I'll just let people vote for it.

**The Chair:** Okay. We'll call the vote.

(Amendment negatived: nays 6, yeas 5)

**The Chair:** Unfortunately, Mr. Albas, it doesn't pass.

Shall clause 15 carry?

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, I'd like to speak a little bit to—

**The Chair:** Yes, of course.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, we've seen a number of suggestions brought to this table—or this virtual table—and unfortunately, the government, supported by the NDP, has voted against every single one of them.

I want to relay my thanks to Madam Michaud for her support on the last motion. I think her Province of Quebec—

**The Chair:** I'm sorry, Mr. Albas. I neglected to say that it's clause 15 as amended.

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

Again, the only amendments that were accepted by this committee were the ones coming from the government. Let's be mindful, Mr. Chair. It seems that they are continuing the path they have taken with the NDP.

Again, I don't want to belabour the point, because I think Mr. Bachrach has done an able job on other issues with this committee. I just find it strange because a lot of the information that is here, or the amendments that have come forward, really don't expand the nature of the bill or make it more accountable. In fact, in some cases, the bill allows the minister to have sole discretion as to which provinces, which territories, which first nations and which municipalities seem to be aligned with the government and can use this as a political communications tool.

I would just say that we tried, as Conservatives, to put forward amendments that we felt would make the bill better. One was in ref-

erence to including a summary of all provinces. As I said earlier, when people come into my joint office in Summerland, and even to some extent in Westbank, where I also have an office at the Westbank Towne Centre, they don't always know the difference between us. They just want to share their opinion on what government should be doing. Sometimes they come in with different needs.

It's important, first of all, that there should be a proper summary, where a minister doesn't get to check that. Our particular amendment would have done that. Also, then, there's just the growing consciousness of the need for action on climate change and more interest that people have on how they can do that—purchasing an electric car, for example, or some sort of variation of an electric vehicle. I hear that the F-150 Lightning is impressing a lot of people. Maybe it will impress people in my riding. I haven't heard that yet, but people have been asking about the status of our electrical grid and its ability to deal with this. I am sure, Mr. Chair, that some of the witnesses I asked about this felt that would have been a good change to clause 15.

Clause 15 as it stands right now, as amended, I feel is not the best clause that could go forward. Conservatives will be voting against this particular provision. We think it's a bit of a shame, Mr. Chair, because there was an offer to work together to spotlight all provinces and territories as they try to meet their climate targets, which is incredibly important. If we do not have all provinces and territories working towards this, what will end up happening, Mr. Chair, is that the federal government, with its own jurisdiction, will not be enough.

In most provincial jurisdictions, you have housing policies such as building codes. You also have transportation. You also have energy systems and their regulation. If we cannot give people a snapshot of how their provinces are doing.... This particular clause, as amended, will not do that. In fact, like I said, it allows the minister to isolate or only report on the provinces, municipalities or indigenous first nations communities that best....

Conservatives will be voting a big no against this, Mr. Chair. Again, like I said, it's a shame. We came to this table with amendments, feeling that we were offering things that were not very political—not political at all—but actually were things that would help build better understanding and better governance for this country. Without information, Mr. Chair, without having these things in front of people, people can't judge whether or not their government is being effective. That could be provincial or that could be federal. This particular clause as amended unfortunately does not leap over the bar. I think we could have done better.

As we go forward with other amendments, Mr. Chair, I hope that perhaps the government or perhaps the NDP will change their minds and we'll see maybe some creativity or maybe some willingness to be flexible, to allow for other voices and for amendments to come to the bill, or else this is really just going to be a bill that has just the bare democratic mandate.

That's important to have in our system, but it's not the only way that the government could choose. It could choose to be a little more open and to work with all parties. That's something that Minister Wilkinson has said time and time again.

• (1640)

Unfortunately, Mr. Chair, with all the times that the minister said he wanted to work in good faith with all parties on the back end, it seems that isn't the case in this bill...in this clause as amended today.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you. The vote has been called.

(Clause 15 as amended agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

(Clause 16 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

(On clause 17)

• (1645)

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, I have a question that I want to ask the officials.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, please.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** In regard to clause...and I believe we're on clause 17.

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

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, for the confirmation of that. I want to make sure we're not wasting anyone's time.

I would ask the question of either Mr. Ngan or Mr. Moffet.

It says, under "Publication of target":

The Minister may publish the national greenhouse gas emissions target for the milestone year to which an emissions reduction plan relates before that plan is tabled in each House of Parliament.

On the question, we've had a number of different amendments that have come through. Do any of those amendments change anything that is in here. or what information is presented in this clause?

**Mr. Vincent Ngan:** The answer is no. The amendments specified information of the progress report and the assessment report, and this one is about an emissions reduction plan as well as a target. There is no impact, directly or indirectly, to this particular clause.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** All right. I'd like to thank Mr. Ngan for that intervention.

If you want to go to a vote...unless there's another member who has a question.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Mr. Redekopp.

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

Essentially, if I read this right, the minister can publish the target before informing Parliament. As a parliamentarian, should that be a concern of ours?

I would maybe ask that of Mr. Moffet.

Is that usual practice, that things get published and then after the fact reported to Parliament, or is it better that things are reported to Parliament first? Could you comment on that?

**Mr. John Moffet:** I can't comment as to whether that's a good thing or not. That's for you to determine.

It's not unusual for this to happen.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Okay, it may just be because I haven't seen much yet. I've only been here for two years, so I've not seen enough to know.

I thank you for that answer.

**The Chair:** The vote is called.

(Clause 17 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

(On clause 18)

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** We're now at clause 18. Unfortunately, I'm told that amendment BQ-16 is out of order, since the committee has already ruled on amendment BQ-15. I must admit that I don't have that amendment in front of me. However, the committee voted against the idea of including an annual progress report. If we were to pass amendment BQ-16 now, there would be a contradiction. We won't be able to move amendment BQ-16 or vote on it.

The issue at this point is whether to pass clause 18.

Ms. Michaud, you have the floor.

• (1650)

**Ms. Kristina Michaud (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, BQ):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Just before we vote on clause 18, I want to say that I understand that amendment BQ-16 is null and void because the committee decided to reject the idea of making the progress report an annual report, even though the government receives the data on greenhouse gas emissions in Canada each year.

It would have been possible to do so. However, I understand that the amendment is null and void. I just want to say that I agree with what Mr. Albas stated earlier. I find it deplorable that the government is voting against all the Bloc Québécois and Green Party amendments, which are there to improve Bill C-12. The government said that it was open to the idea of working with the opposition members. We understand that this isn't the case.

I gather that the same thing will happen with amendment BQ-17. We'll see when we get to the other clause.

**The Chair:** Okay. We'll get to that in a moment.

[*English*]

Mr. Albas, go ahead.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I'm sorry, Mr. Chair, but there seems to be an issue with interpretation. It's lagging a bit more than usual.

Please accommodate members when that happens, if you could.

**The Chair:** Yes, of course.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I appreciate that, Mr. Chair.

In regard to the intervention by Madam Michaud, it's also the Conservatives. We had 19 amendments that we've brought forward—

**Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.):** On a point of order, was the vote not called?

**Mr. Dan Albas:** He gave me the floor.

**The Chair:** I'm sorry, but just a second. I was talking with the legislative clerk.

Mr. Longfield.

**Mr. Lloyd Longfield:** I'm raising a point of order. You called the vote. This isn't a time for debate.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, you gave me the floor.

**The Chair:** To be honest, I can't remember if I called the vote.

Is it a point of order? It sounds like a point of debate.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Yes, Mr. Chair, but you recognized me, and there may have been some interpretation lag. To preserve all rights of members here, if someone puts their hand up.... I did raise my voice earlier, flagging to you that I wished to speak to it.

**The Chair:** Just hold on a second, please, Mr. Albas.

I don't think I called the vote, to be honest with you, or if I did I wasn't clear enough.

Are you debating clause 18?

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Okay. Go ahead and debate it.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, as I said earlier, I believe members deserve to be able to have an up or down. I realize that you have ruled on consequentialness, so I'm certainly not going to be putting forward a challenge at this point because you are correct. When we said no to earlier Bloc amendments, that basically made these consequential amendments not possible or else we would end up with a mishmash of a bill.

That being said, I just want to add my voice to Madam Michaud's, and she, by the way, has shown a fair bit of decorum here. It's not always, I would imagine, a fun process when you're told on the floor that something you have worked very hard for won't be allowed to be debated and perhaps that's something we need to look at.

I also have to point out, Mr. Chair, that perhaps before you call the vote for future ones, you might want to ask to see if there are any other speakers first. I'm not telling you what to do. I'm just simply suggesting that with the translation and the fact that we're virtual and it can't always be relied on, it's helpful to make sure that all members who want to be able to have their say can say it.

Now let's get back to the actual issue of clause 18.

18(1) The Minister must cause each emissions reduction plan to be tabled in each House of Parliament on any of the first 15 days on which that House is sitting after the day on which the plan is established.

Again, Mr. Chair, I will just simply say that Conservatives are opposed to this bill. We will be voting against this, but I really hope

that other members do not just simply call a point of order and try to squeeze other members out, because I don't believe, in this case, Mr. Chair, there was a clear indication that you could move forward.

Maybe, again, Mr. Chair, by asking to see if any other speakers would want to go forward, then when we hit that point.... I promise you, Mr. Chair, we will end up with a better outcome rather than having points of order and then long stalls as you try to seek in the transcripts as to whether or not you called it.

It's a very difficult position, being a virtual chair, so I applaud you in your efforts to try to make sure that it's a fair process for everyone. I can understand how some MPs may be a bit frustrated, but again, we all have to adhere to the translation services and have the official languages requirements met.

Thank you.

• (1655)

**The Chair:** Mr. Redekopp, can you take your hand down?

Mr. Albas, if members know they want to speak to something, it's even easier than when it's not virtual. You just have to press the little yellow—

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, I had my hand up, and I even called out earlier.

**The Chair:** I understand. I'm not talking about that. I'm talking in general. I will leave it to members to take the initiative to put their hands up if they want to speak to something. There's plenty of time, and I let enough time go by. Then when I don't see a hand, I call the vote.

Anyway, Mr. Redekopp—

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Again, Mr. Chair, there was no translation. The translation—

**The Chair:** I understand.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** —was lagging and—

**Mr. Chris Bittle:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Albas does not have the floor and is just interrupting.

**The Chair:** However—

**Mr. Dan Albas:** We have to have a fair process.

**The Chair:** Yes, but even without the translation, you know pretty much, generally, if you want to say something.

So—

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, I have to protest. I'm not challenging you in any way, but there has to be a process that we all agree to. I'm fine with—

**Mr. Chris Bittle:** Again, I have a point of order.

Mr. Chair, Mr. Albas just keeps interrupting. He's a stickler for the rules, but he doesn't—

**The Chair:** We're going to go to Mr. Redekopp now.

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

Just to help you maybe a little bit with this point.... I'm a full believer and a strong believer that we need our two official languages. In fact, I'm learning French as we speak, although I haven't quite graduated to the point where I can listen to French. I have to listen to the English channel.

Maybe just for your reference—because you are far more advanced in French than I am—I will mention that there is always a pause. Sometimes I know you get a little excited and want to carry on with it, but sometimes it's not obvious that the speaker has quit speaking, so if somebody wants to put up their hand, they have to wait for the last of the translation and go, “Oh, that person's done. I'd better put my hand up.”

I appreciate your comment to get our hands up sooner. I appreciate that, and I will try to do that, but also bear in mind that there is a second there.

**The Chair:** Bear in mind also that if there is pause and if there's a problem with translation, you won't hear me call the vote, so we're back to the same problem.

I do give enough time, and I will give enough time.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** I appreciate that.

**The Chair:** Anyway, is that what you wanted to speak about or no?

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Yes, that's it.

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair—

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

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I will apologize to you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Bittle is exactly right. I didn't have my hand up. Also, with regard to his point of order, I believe you didn't recognize him, so what I would simply suggest, Mr. Chair, is that the lag in this case was about five seconds, not the usual two or three seconds. I did have my hand up. I was prepared to speak to it, Mr. Chair, and unfortunately, because the translation didn't come in, that's a problem.

I think the onus—

**The Chair:** Going forward, I'll give enough time, but at some point, people have to be proactive.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, if you don't mind my finishing my statement, and then I'm happy to hear what you have to say.

To say that the onus is on the individual member, when we simply.... When I had my hand up, and when I voiced earlier that I wanted to speak, I can't understand how it could be done any differently.

• (1700)

**The Chair:** I'm not referring to your last intervention. I'm saying that going forward the onus is on the member, if they want to speak, to put their hand up. That's all I'm saying.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I would just hope though, Mr. Chair, that we would avoid these kinds of problems—

**The Chair:** Okay, can we move on?

**Mr. Dan Albas:** —by listening to one another. However, I appreciate that this is a difficult thing to chair when you have it virtual.

**The Chair:** The vote is called, and no one seems to want to speak to it.

(Clause 18 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

(On clause 19)

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** We'll now move on to clause 19.

Ms. Michaud, the same logic applies to amendment BQ-17. Given the committee's decision on amendment BQ-15, there's a lack of consistency. Amendment BQ-17 becomes null and void.

We'll now vote on clause 19. Would anyone like to comment on clause 19?

Ms. Michaud, you have the floor.

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm taking note of the fact that the same logic applies.

I want to tell you that, starting from clause 20, my colleague Ms. Pauzé will be taking over.

**The Chair:** That's fine. Thank you.

We'll now vote on clause 19.

(Clause 19 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

(On clause 20)

**The Chair:** We'll now move on to clause 20. I'm pleased to ask Ms. May to move her amendment, PV-25.

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

**The Chair:** Before you speak, I must inform you that, if amendment PV-25 is passed, amendments BQ-18 and NDP-14 will become null and void. We won't be able to vote on those amendments.

Ms. May, you have the floor.

[*English*]

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

I have to say that this is the most dispiriting process of clause-by-clause that I've experienced in many years. Usually amendments are actually considered, people actually debate them and there is a good-faith process. I'm going to make a short statement and then I'm going to ask, because I cannot remove my own amendments, in the interest of time and in an effort to have this bill get to the Senate, where perhaps there will be a good-faith effort to amend it....

I condemn this government for what it has done: for telling people like me, who believed in good faith that there would be an actual appetite for change to improve the bill and who accepted it and prepared amendments, only to show up here and watch Liberals stay mute, the NDP stay mute and march through their amendments, passing them in force, and not listening and not caring about the possibility that other amendments might work.

I urge you to change your conduct. I urge you to consider Madam Pauzé's amendments.

Because I don't have the power to remove my own amendments, I will remove my amendments if you will do the job for me, Mr. Chair, in the interest of time and under protest against the process this committee has entered into—not the committee but the backroom deal that no amendments shall pass unless they're Liberal or NDP and do nothing but tweak the bill with small improvements. I don't want to stand in the way of getting this thing done, and I now ask the chair to support the Bloc amendments and remove PV-25, PV-26, PV-27, PV-28, PV-29, PV-30 and PV-31.

Shame on you.

• (1705)

**The Chair:** I'll have to check with the clerk on that, Ms. May.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** We're going to pause for a second, Mr. Albas.

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

**The Chair:** This is interesting.

Ms. May, your amendment is deemed moved by the fact of having sent it to the clerk. If you want to withdraw amendment PV-25, you would have to ask for unanimous consent.

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** Mr. Chair, it has been the case that in the past in other committees when I suggested that the amendment that is deemed moved can be deemed by the chair to have been removed, I've never heard before that it required unanimous consent. I think Mr. Albas's suggestion earlier that the various backroom people who've engineered this motion that I have to observe in every committee....

In this case, since it would be all in one go, because these are all amendments that relate to the process of the advisory committee becoming independent and expert, again, it would certainly save the committee a lot of time if you accept my word for it that you can deem these amendments removed—PV-25, PV-26, PV-27, PV-28, PV-29, PV-30 and PV-31—rather than seeking unanimous consent each time, but that's for you to determine.

I will wait for PV-32 before taking the floor again.

**The Chair:** Okay, just a second. You'll have to excuse me. This is a bit of uncharted territory.

Ms. May, both of the legislative clerks have never heard of this notion of the chair withdrawing the motions for you. What I've been told is that you can ask for unanimous consent to remove the five amendments.

Could you repeat it? I think it's PV-25 through to PV-30...or is PV-31 in there too?

• (1710)

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** I will repeat again: It comes to seven amendments that I am removing in one go.

If you want to seek unanimous consent, then I would be asking for all of my amendments that relate to what is now a not independent, appointed-by-the-minister multi-stakeholder committee.... My attempts are not identical, by any means, but sufficiently similar to the Bloc Québécois' attempts, that I would prefer, in order to save time and help this committee along, that Madam Pauzé's amendments be accepted.

However, my amendments are from PV-25 through PV-31 inclusive. That's seven amendments.

**The Chair:** Thanks.

My request to the committee is on whether there is unanimous consent to remove seven Green Party amendments, PV-25 to PV-31.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** No.

**The Chair:** Okay—

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, I have had my hand up for—

**The Chair:** When you ask for unanimous consent, there is no debate, but go ahead now.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, I was going to say how we proceed with this. As I said earlier, there is a process that we have done, and you may want to take this feedback to other committee chairs to make sure that if this does happen again in another case. Perhaps there could be a motion so that it can be changed and ratified.

I believe we can have a very brief discussion on each one, but I think it's important for people to feel heard. There were many people who came forward who expressed their support for something like Madam May's amendments, and I think that she deserves an up or down....

We will not tie that process up, but I think it's important for this committee to be able to stand and be accountable to the Canadian public in this, because many people who came to the committee asked for much of what Ms. May said.

I may disagree with elements of it, but I believe in accountability and I believe that people need to be heard. That would be the best way for us to carry forward in this case.

**The Chair:** Okay.

We are still on amendment PV-25.

Is this a point of order?

[Translation]

Is this a point of order, Ms. Pauzé?

**Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ):** Yes, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** You have the floor.

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** If I remember correctly, last week, I decided not to move amendment BQ-10 in an effort to support amendment BQ-11. I dropped it. However, I don't recall that we needed unanimous consent.

**The Chair:** The reason is that you sit on the committee as a member of a recognized party in the House. The Green Party isn't recognized in the same way. That's the difference.

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** Okay.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** We are at Ms. May's amendment.

Ms. May, do you want to speak to it, or do you just want to remain silent and let others speak to it?

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** I think I've been very clear.

**The Chair:** You have, yes.

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** I wish to have all seven amendments withdrawn.

My previous experience in other committees is, once I suggest that, they were deemed moved and then they're deemed not moved by the same imaginary hand.

I appreciate Mr. Albas's support, but the amendments being put to a vote for Madam Pauzé.... Maybe some of them will pass. Just to disprove for those who might be watching, what we are witnessing here, which is a very anti-democratic decision in advance to fail to actually consider amendments. That's not what clause-by-clause is supposed to be like.

Mr. Chair, if you can help me here, my Green Party amendments, PV-25 to PV-31, should just be removed from the package.

• (1715)

**The Chair:** I'm trying to help. I've been told by the legislative clerks—

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** I think the legislative clerks.... I'm surprised by their ruling. I'll put it that way.

**The Chair:** Two legislative clerks have told me this.

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** I'm surprised by their ruling.

**The Chair:** I understand but—

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** I do not wish to speak to any of these amendments, and I urge you not to vote on them. I urge you to set them aside and move on.

**The Chair:** Mr. Bachrach, do you want to speak to PV-25, or do you have a point of order?

**Mr. Taylor Bachrach (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP):** I'm wondering if I could ask for clarification, Mr. Chair.

Along the lines of what Ms. May has mentioned, could you indicate to us if it would be in order for a member of the committee to bring forward a motion that would remove those amendments from consideration?

**The Chair:** I don't think so, but let me check.

Actually, colleagues, we have the extra hour today.

Madam Clerk, did we start at 3:44?

**The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Angela Crandall):** Yes, we started at 3:44.

**The Chair:** That would take us to 6:44, and I had meant to have a break at an hour and a half. Why don't we take a break?

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** Mr. Chair, before you do, I miscounted. I have eight amendments. I want to speak to PV-32, but PV-33 is also about the panel.

**The Chair:** You want eight amendments taken out. I've noted that, Ms. May.

Why don't we just take a 10-minute break, and come back at 5:28.

By then, I might have more information.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, I'll just keep my hand up.

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

• (1715) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (1725)

**The Chair:** Okay. It's 5:28 p.m.

This is what I'm told, and it makes sense to me. Once an amendment is moved, in the case of independent members like the Green Party here....

There is a distinction between Ms. May's amendments and everyone else's. For an amendment to get to the floor of the committee, members of parties on the committee have to move the motion. If they decide not to move the motion, we would just continue past it. In Ms. May's case, as a Green Party representative who is not a permanent member of the committee, the minute she sends in her amendment to the clerk it is deemed moved. When an amendment is deemed moved, it is deemed to belong to the committee. That means the chair can't appropriate the power to just remove an amendment. It requires unanimous consent. That was denied, in this case.

As I see it, the way we proceed is this: Ms. May does not have to speak in support of her amendments, and others can speak about it or not speak about it, but we have to vote on these amendments. Obviously, Ms. May is doing this in the interest of time so that we can move through them quickly. That's how I see it.

Mr. Albas, are you speaking to PV-25 or is this a point of order or clarification?

**Mr. Dan Albas:** It's a little bit of both.

First, Mr. Chair, thank you for the break. I had the ability to go back and speak with some of my members. As you might remember, you had asked specifically about G-8, I believe.

**The Chair:** Yes.



• (1730)

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I was hoping to see if we could maybe resolve that. I would just need a little help and guidance from you or the clerk, or perhaps the legislative clerk, on where exactly the error is on G-8.

**The Chair:** Can we get to that after we deal with PV-25?

**Mr. Dan Albas:** All right. Then let me just spin over to PV-25.

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, I certainly concur with your assessment. Once something has been moved, it becomes the committee's and it no longer can simply be withdrawn unless there's unanimous consent. As I said earlier, it's not my intention to do anything other than to allow those witnesses and truly those Canadians who believe in much of what has been placed here to simply....

I will read this out, and perhaps the Liberals and the NDP, all parties, can stand and be counted on each one. Then we can proceed in that regard.

Again, PV-25 amends Bill C-12 in clause 20 by replacing lines 6 to 8 on page 8 with the following:

20(1) There is established an expert advisory body whose mandate is to provide the Minister with expert advice with respect to achieving emissions reductions that are consistent with the conclusion drawn in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's special report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C of the need to achieve net-zero emissions by 2050, including expert

Mr. Chair, maybe I will make a quick ask here of either Mr. Moffet or Mr. Ngan.

I believe the main thrust of this amendment is not just the adoption of the 1.5°C but the term “expert”. Right now, the way the advisory board is set up, it's not necessarily derived just on expertise. Is that the case?

**Mr. John Moffet:** The expert body that exists does not... It is something that the minister has set up. What we're talking about now is what would need to be established under the act.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** What the minister has set up is different from what is here in PV-25, clearly.

**Mr. John Moffet:** The minister will have to establish an advisory body. What that body will constitute will be determined after the act is passed.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Okay. Thank you, Mr. Moffet.

Out of respect for the process, Mr. Chair, unless anyone else wants to go, you can maybe seek a roll call.

**The Chair:** Please take your hand down now, Mr. Albas.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** There you go.

**The Chair:** The vote is called on PV-25.

(Amendment negatived: nays 10; yeas 1)

**The Chair:** Now we move to BQ-18.

Madam Pauzé, I think, is going to be presenting it.

[Translation]

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

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

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** First, I want to thank Ms. May, who did everything in her power to try to convince everyone in order to speed things up in the committee. Unfortunately, it didn't work. However, I want to thank her. I feel compelled to do so because she prepared a number of arguments and amendments, but they won't be taken into account.

With respect to amendment BQ-18, we're proposing to change “advisory body” to “an independent expert committee.” Perhaps this was the difference between our amendment and the Green Party's amendment. Also, the change that we were proposing to line 15 no longer applies. By voting for amendment G-3, you decided that there wouldn't be any target.

We want to replace “advisory body” with “independent expert committee” in order to clearly establish the committee's role, which basically isn't to conduct consultations, but to advise the minister. This must be included in the legislation.

For us, it wasn't just about the net-zero emissions issue. We're saying that the committee should advise the minister on how to reach the 2030 target, which still hasn't been quantified, and not just the 2050 target.

I want to remind you that the United Kingdom is an example to follow in terms of climate governance. Corinne Le Quéré was among the experts from the United Kingdom who appeared before the committee. She told us that the United Kingdom had been the most successful country in terms of reaching climate targets and that it had the best established climate governance. The United Kingdom has seen its emissions fall by 28% since 2010, while Canada's emissions have risen.

Another example is France. Ms. Le Quéré also told us about the High Council on Climate and other similar independent bodies that provide a mechanism to ensure that the voices of experts in the field are heard. They provide the rationale and the legitimacy to propose ambitious measures, since they're experts. As Ms. Le Quéré said, strong climate governance, in France and in other places, helps the government to achieve its goals.

The experts in the United Kingdom consider that five elements are key to the success of any climate legislation and that together they provide several benefits to democracy. The first is the full independence of a committee made up primarily of experts. This is what the witnesses came to tell us. If we were listening, we understood this. This prevents confusion between the role of expert and the job of consulting everyone. This condition is met in just about any successful climate legislation.

The word “experts” is covered in more detail in an amendment that I'll move later. However, it would be good to see the committee in the bill as having this key characteristic. When the independence of the committee is ensured, a balance is achieved. On the one hand, there's an ongoing policy generated through the co-operation of the highest levels of science, economics, applied policy, and decision-making. On the other hand, there's respect for the political reality on the ground.

In short, based on what the witnesses came to tell us, we know that they recommended an independent expert committee.

• (1735)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Pauzé.

Before we proceed to the vote, I want to tell the committee members that, if amendment BQ-18 is passed, amendment NDP-4 will become null and void.

Mr. Albas, you have the floor.

[*English*]

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. Again, there was a bit of a lag there. I certainly appreciate the opportunity to speak on this and to ask a few questions.

First of all, I'd like thank Madam Pauzé for giving a full explanation of what the legislation is trying to do.

I'd like to ask Mr. Moffet.... I believe you'd be the best person to answer the question.

Again, if you look at subclause 20(1) on the establishment and mandate of an advisory body, it doesn't mention the word “independent”. What would the change be if BQ-18 was adopted to include in this subsection, “There is established an independent expert committee whose mandate is to provide the Minister with advice”?

• (1740)

**Mr. John Moffet:** I'm not sure that there's significant change as a result. It would emphasize the independent nature of the committee, but the committee as described is something that is established under law. Its performance and advice cannot be dictated by the minister, the government or Parliament.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Does it change...?

The next subclause—again, if I'm going a little too far ahead, that's fine; we can address it later—says:

(2) The Minister may determine and amend the terms of reference of the advisory body.

That, to me, seems to say that the minister can, given his mandate, do whatever he wants. Does adding the word “independent” really change any of that? Usually when something's independent, the minister just can't switch the terms of reference around.

**Mr. John Moffet:** I'm not sure I agree with that. The independence of a committee relates to its ability to conduct studies and provide whatever information and advice it collectively deems appropriate. A committee always has terms of reference.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Let me ask this so that I'm abundantly clear: By adding the word “independent”, as Madam Pauzé has done, does that change the committee whatsoever?

**Mr. John Moffet:** I think the objective of the amendment is to emphasize that there is an expectation that the committee's advice will be independent.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** However, does it actually do anything that's different from subclause 20(1) as it's read in Bill C-12 currently?

**Mr. John Moffet:** Again, you're essentially asking a legal question. I don't think there's anything in subclause 20(1) that indicates that the committee's advice will not be independent, and there's certainly nothing in the bill that indicates that the minister can influence or dictate what advice the committee provides.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I think the terms of reference can change what kind of advice the minister wants to hear—by just changing the terms of reference—but that's debate on another area.

Mr. Chair, I will just hang back and listen to see what other members have to ask about Madam Pauzé's amendment. Thank you.

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

Mr. Redekopp.

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

One of the things that I heard Madam Pauzé say—and hopefully this was correct—is that she wants to strengthen this area to compel the minister and not just.... I can't quite remember the words that she used. However, essentially, the idea is that this would strengthen it to make the committee more powerful towards the minister and maybe force some things to happen.

I guess maybe, Mr. Moffet, you could answer this question: Does the amendment, in your view, compel anything of the minister, or does it just, more or less, clarify some things in the existing legislation?

**Mr. John Moffet:** I don't think the amendment changes the minister's obligations in any way.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** It's mostly just a tweaking of the words, then. It's not really changing the meaning of this section. Is that what you're saying?

**Mr. John Moffet:** That's correct.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Mr. Albas asked about “independent”, but I guess I'm going to ask about “expert”. Does that change anything either?

**Mr. John Moffet:** I'm seeing that Madam Pauzé wants to jump in here.

I think the answer to that likely depends on other amendments that would determine what is meant by “expert”. In other words, an expert in what?

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** That was my next question. It needs to be defined somewhere what exactly “expert” means.

What you're saying is that we need to define “expert” if we're going to have it in here and that may or may not change the intent of the legislation. Am I understanding that correctly?

• (1745)

**Mr. John Moffet:** Yes.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** In other words, “expert” isn't defined at the moment. Is that correct?

**Mr. John Moffet:** It's not defined by this amendment, per se.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** I'll leave it at that for now, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Madam Pauzé.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** Yes, Mr. Moffet just sort of answered Mr. Redekopp's question. The amendments form a whole. We are proposing amendments, but there will be follow-up to those amendments. A little further on, we will see what the role of the independent expert committee is.

Where I disagree less with Mr. Moffet is on the difference. He doesn't think it makes a big difference, but it makes a big difference for us because the bill talks about an advisory body. This organization will consult with the general public, organizations and industry members. However, for us, it isn't just about consultations. The expert panel will consult, but then it will analyze them and advise the minister. The two roles are very different.

This is what the witnesses told us; you have to distinguish between the two roles, the advisory role to the minister and the consultation role. That's what the amendment is intended to do, and I think it adds a lot to clause 20 and really strengthens it.

**The Chair:** Mr. Albas, you have the floor.

[*English*]

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

Perhaps I have failed to do this over the time we've spent together at clause-by-clause. Hopefully, I can ask for the indulgence of Madam Pauzé.

I clearly understand (a) and I've asked Mr. Moffet for his views on (a).

In regard to your changes to (b), by replacing line 13 on page 8 with the following.... It really is just activities “related to achieving the targets set under subsection 7(2)”. Can I ask why you feel that is a better fit than what is currently envisioned in the bill, where it states, “activities related to achieving net-zero emissions”?

Could you tell us the difference, please?

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Is the question for Ms. Pauzé?

[*English*]

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Yes.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** What we need to look at is the link to amendment BQ-23.

Amendment BQ-23 will make it possible to determine the areas of expertise of the experts who will serve on the committee.

The bill talks about an advisory body that provides advice on meeting targets, but also conducts consultations. We don't want that. We want the committee to consult, to make up its mind, and then say: here is my advice to the minister. Amendment BQ-23 will determine who the experts will be. As for amendment BQ-20, if I'm not mistaken, it will determine the role of the expert committee.

What's difficult is not seeing this as a whole.

A little further on, the role of the independent expert committee is defined, and a little more further on, there is a definition of who the experts are. Of course, as long as we don't have a definition, it's a bit complicated to do.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

[*English*]

**Mr. Dan Albas:** The question I would then have, Mr. Moffet, is based on what Madam Pauzé said, because when I read subclause 7(2) in the bill, it states:

(2) The Minister must set the national greenhouse gas emissions target for 2030 within six months of the day on which this Act comes into force.

What is the difference between what Madam Pauzé wants to do, and what the government has already put in Bill C-12, or this one that's already been made in an amendment, and I'm operating off the old copy?

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

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Yes, I think Mr. Moffet seems to be well versed in it.

**Mr. John Moffet:** I'm sorry, but I don't understand your question.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** It basically talks about “activities related to achieving the target set under subsection 7(2)”, but it actually talks about net-zero emissions. The original subclause 20(1) says “achieving net-zero emissions”.

What effectively changes here by Madam Pauzé's amendment?

• (1750)

**Mr. John Moffet:** This specific amendment establishes an independent expert committee. Madam Pauzé has also referred to other amendments that would provide more detail and specification about the nature of the advice that the committee must provide.

The basic architecture of the bill, of course, is that the committee must provide advice on an ongoing basis on how to achieve net zero, and the minister must set five-year targets. In doing so, the minister must account for the ongoing input of the committee, so everything that is done is done with a view to achieving net zero.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Thank you, Mr. Moffet. I was talking more about part (b) of BQ-18 rather than part (a).

Mr. Chair, maybe it's just me that's having the issue of understanding exactly what this is meant to do, and what would change under BQ-18.

I will just leave it at that.

**The Chair:** Mr. Redekopp, please go ahead.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Can I take a swing at this one? The point is relatively simple. In part (b), BQ-18 is changing it to “subsection 7(2)”. In the original.... I believe it was amended by G-3, as it only refers to 2030.

This is where I'm confused, because it doesn't refer to all the targets. It just refers to 2030. If I'm reading this right, this would not apply to 2035, 2040, 2045 or 2050.

I'm not sure who can comment on that, but that's the confusion we have here.

[*Translation*]

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

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** I wanted to respond to Mr. Albas.

I'm not presenting part (b) because when we adopted amendment G-3, we decided that there would be no numerical target in the legislation, despite the commitments of the Minister of Canadian Heritage and despite the commitments of the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, when he appeared before the committee to introduce Bill C-12.

Despite all that, the alliance of the Liberal Party and the NDP ensured that there was no numerical target. As a result, part (b) of amendment BQ-18, which deals with the target established under subsection 7(2), becomes obsolete, since there is no target.

**The Chair:** Okay.

The floor is yours, Mr. Albas.

[*English*]

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I'm sorry, Mr. Chair, but I have to clarify.

Did Madam Pauzé only move part (a) of BQ-18 and not part (b)?

I know she has chosen to do that before. I want to make sure I understand what I'm voting on. Is it just part (a) by itself that she's proposing as an amendment, or is it parts (a) and (b) of BQ-18?

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Ms. Pauzé, do you want to clarify that?

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** Yes, Mr. Chair.

Basically, I'm presenting only part (a), for the reasons I mentioned, namely, that part (b) cannot mention a target when the committee has chosen not to ask for a numerical target.

**The Chair:** Okay, we understand.

We are voting, in fact, on part (a) only.

Ms. Thivierge, can we proceed in this manner?

**Ms. Émilie Thivierge (Legislative Clerk):** Yes, we can certainly do that.

**The Chair:** So that's what we're voting on.

Madam Clerk, it will be a recorded division.

**The Clerk:** Yes, and it will be on amendment BQ-18.

**The Chair:** Actually, it will only deal with part (a) of amendment BQ-18.

[*English*]

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

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** I would ask the committee members to go back to amendment G-8, part (b.1). I'll give you a few seconds to find the amendment.

• (1755)

[*English*]

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I have it on page 42 in the English copy.

**The Chair:** Yes. It's on page 42. Thank you, Mr. Albas. That helps.

[*Translation*]

On page 42, in the right column, part (b.1) reads as follows:

changements climatiques ont été prises en compte dans le plan;

There's a grammar mistake. In fact, the word “prises” should be in the masculine to agree with “engagements internationaux”, which is in the masculine plural. So the letters “e” and “s” at the end of the word need to be removed.

I am asking for unanimous consent to remove these two letters from the word “prises”, so that it reads as follows:

changements climatiques ont été pris en compte dans le plan;

[*English*]

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Yes. I think that's reasonable, Mr. Chair.

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Okay. So I have unanimous consent? Perfect.

I'm a little bit upset with Ms. Pauzé for not catching this mistake. Normally, she finds all the glitches.

This makes it a little easier for us. We'll continue.

[*English*]

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Let's not discourage her.

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** We'll now move on to amendment NDP-4.

Before I give Mr. Bachrach time to present amendment NDP-4, I should clarify, based on the note, that if amendment NDP-4 is defeated, amendment G-14 becomes moot. There would be an inconsistency.

Mr. Bachrach, you have the floor.

[*English*]

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

I'm pleased to bring forward this amendment on behalf of Ms. Collins. I believe it's fairly self-explanatory. There are pieces that I will highlight. This amendment speaks to the role of the net-zero advisory body.

The first piece I would bring to the committee's attention is the word "independent" under subclause 20(1), "to provide the Minister with independent advice". I believe this speaks to some of the conversation we've had in today's meeting around the independence of the committee.

Secondly, this amendment seeks to specify that the advisory body will provide advice respecting "greenhouse gas emissions targets" as well as "greenhouse gas emissions reduction plans".

Lastly, it adds a line about engagement activities being part of the advisory body's mandate.

I believe the rest is fairly self-explanatory. I'll yield the floor.

**The Chair:** Mr. Albas.

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

I certainly appreciate Mr. Bachrach's holding a lot of duty on this in terms of taking someone else's amendments forward. It's never easy to parachute into a process, but he has done very well thus far.

I'm just going to ask questions of Mr. Moffet again.

Mr. Moffet, you said earlier that the word "independent" didn't have a legal term, and that the committee itself was already quasi-independent just because it's a committee that operates on its own. When we had witnesses come to this committee—and I'm sure you listened to much of the testimony—many of them were citing jurisdictions such as the United Kingdom, which has an independent body that operates. Is this the same thing as what they have in the U.K.?

**Mr. John Moffet:** There are a couple of things.

First of all, I didn't suggest that the term "independent" has no legal meaning. I think I was trying to say that the committee established under section 20 is authorized to provide advice without influence from the minister. This amendment would emphasize that function.

The second part of your question was around the United Kingdom. I think it's worth noting that in fact the U.K. statute, the Climate Change Act 2008, does not actually use either of the terms "independent" or "expert" in establishing its committee. Its committee has been established that way and has functioned that way.

I think what we see in the bill, and in particular as potentially clarified through this amendment, is that the advisory body to be established under this bill would have a function largely similar to what has been in the United Kingdom for the past number of years.

• (1800)

**Mr. Dan Albas:** If their climate change accountability legislation does not refer to "independent", why is there such a vast disparity, Mr. Moffet, between what witnesses have been calling for and what the government has presented in Bill C-12? Does adding Madam Collins's amendment harmonize it or do you think that is already there without this amendment?

**Mr. John Moffet:** I'm not sure what the question was. You were asking why there is a disparity?

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Yes.

**Mr. John Moffet:** I think that's an issue for—

**Mr. Dan Albas:** You made the statement that the legislation in the U.K. did not include the term "independent", yet we had witness after witness come and say that this is not the U.K. Why is there the disparity between what people were asking for and this particular bill?

**Mr. John Moffet:** I think you're asking me to speculate about what was on witnesses' minds. I'm not here to do that.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** You've raised a question in my mind just simply by saying that the legislation doesn't include the term "independent". I'm just wondering what the big difference is. I would hope that you as an expert for the government would be able to answer the question.

**Mr. John Moffet:** What's the difference between what?

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I mean between what the U.K. has and what is presented here in Bill C-12, because I want to know whether or not the amendment Madam Collins has moved actually moves closer to a model like that.

**Mr. John Moffet:** It emphasizes the independent role of the committee.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Okay, but again, you said that "independent" is not mentioned in the U.K. legislation. Does that mean it doesn't move us any closer to that?

**Mr. John Moffet:** I think you're asking me to speculate on the way the committee will function under this legislation.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I would imagine that you would have an understanding of how the committee will operate.

**Mr. John Moffet:** Mr. Chair, I think that the line of questioning is inappropriate for officials.

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Mr. Chair, Mr. Moffet was perfectly okay with inappropriate interventions in the last meeting. However, I do respect him and I do value his service. If he doesn't want to answer the question just because maybe the government has said we don't want to raise any distinctions between us and the U.K., I will just say, Mr. Chair—

**Mr. John Moffet:** Mr. Chair, I resent that and ask the member to withdraw his comment.

**The Chair:** Okay. I'm going to stop this now.

**Mr. John Moffet:** I am under no instructions of that nature. I am providing you with factual advice. My last intervention in the last committee was to correct a legal interpretation that you were giving the committee.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I'm not a lawyer, so I can't give a legal one—

**The Chair:** Okay, we're going to move on.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** —but I am actually going to debate now, Mr. Chair. I've asked my questions.

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Again, if Mr. Moffet feels that any of my interventions were off-putting, I apologize for that. It's not my role necessarily to do anything other than to ask questions. Unfortunately, from that intervention, I didn't get what I wanted.

**The Chair:** Anyway—

**Mr. John Moffet:** You made a comment about my ability rather than a question.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Sir, I withdraw any comments about your ability. In fact, I praised your service—

**The Chair:** Okay, that's good.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** —but I also would ask, Mr. Chair, that when I have the floor, that even witnesses respect that.

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I'm going to move on, Mr. Chair. To the point, it seems to me, that the NDP, coupled with the Liberals, have suggested that adding the term “independent” will make this independent, yet the vast majority of people who came forward to committee have said the bar the government has set—not Mr. Moffet, to be fair—in Bill C-12 does not meet what they believe is required to be similar to the U.K. legislation.

I believe in a made-in-Canada approach, so I am simply going to be voting against this. I believe that a Conservative government would do much better. If this becomes law, we're going to have to work with the advisory board towards the goals that are laid out by law.

It is not necessarily realistic that every single person who came and discussed the U.K. was wrong and that there was no practical difference between what the Government of Canada has proposed in its legislation here, and what Mr. Bachrach is adding the term “independent” to. I think that's just not credible at this time.

I appreciate again, Mr. Chair...because if I was getting under anyone's skin, that's not my premise for being here. My premise for being here is to ask questions and then raise concerns about the approach moving forward. I think I've done that.

• (1805)

**The Chair:** Okay, we have Madam Pauzé.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** My analysis is sort of similar to that of Mr. Albas. However, the Bloc Québécois will vote in favour of this amendment.

Mr. Chair, you said earlier that I usually found errors in French. I will therefore mention the following passage from the NDP amendment:

la mission est de fournir au ministre des conseils indépendants

This has nothing to do with independent experts. It's a play on words.

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** I would be tempted to ask Mr. Bachrach, jokingly, to try to insert the word “experts” in there.

I think it was Mr. Moffet who said that this amendment highlights what's already there. We don't think it moves things forward. It doesn't make it more binding. It just highlights what's already there in the bill.

That is why we will vote in favour of the amendment. However, I want to reiterate that independent advisors are not independent ex-

perts, and providing advice is not making recommendations. That's different.

**The Chair:** Okay, great.

I would just like to repeat that if amendment NDP-4 is defeated, amendment G-14 becomes moot.

Seeing no more raised hands, we will proceed to the vote, Madam Clerk.

[*English*]

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

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** We'll now go to amendment CPC-16.

Mr. Albas, I assume you're going to present it?

[*English*]

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** I'll move that one, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** We have Mr. Redekopp, then.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Thanks.

I'm going to move CPC-16, that Bill C-12, in clause 20, be amended by replacing line 14 on page 8 with the following:

(2) The Governor in Council may, on the advice of the Minister, determine and amend the terms of

Mr. Albas has kind of struck out on some of these, so I'm going to take a swing at this as well.

We have highlighted over and over why it's important to have a whole-of-government approach when it comes to this legislation, and not just a single minister in charge of this. We've heard from witnesses. There have been briefs. Even the Prime Minister himself said that a whole-of government approach is necessary. However, this Liberal-NDP agreement continues to argue for this one-man show.

Let's see how the one-man show has worked out for Canada.

On April 21, 2021, there was a news article published in The New York Times called, “Trudeau was a Global Climate Hero. Now Canada Risks Falling Behind”. It says, “Between [the] election in 2015 and 2019, Canada's greenhouse gas emissions increased...despite decreases in other rich nations during the same period”. It goes on to say, “If Canada lags too far behind the United States...it could face repercussions” and, “It'll be quite obvious to the world who's really serious about climate change and who's taking half measures”.

This government's one-man show approach is leaving Canada open to trade reprisals from the U.S. If we fall too far behind, then we're going to potentially have U.S. carbon tariffs on goods crossing the border. There are lots of problems here.

This example of trade, for example, shows that we need to have input from other ministers, such as finance, international trade, agriculture and many others. CPC-16 is an amendment that would make important changes to make this stronger.

This is what the Tsleil-Waututh Nation from British Columbia told this committee in a brief, and I'll end with this, Mr. Chair.

Our experience shows us that the government of Canada remains structurally siloed, rather than positioned to respond holistically to the climate crisis, limiting the federal government's ability to address this overarching and complex issue. Tsleil-Waututh Nation's engagement with Canada demonstrates potential for a whole-of-government approach, adds value by working towards this end, and contributes a necessary, rights-based Indigenous perspective. Our concerns and recommendations often require cross fertilization between varying ministries, such as [Environment and Climate Change Canada], Department of Fisheries and Oceans...and Transport Canada. The climate change challenge requires us to work together for decades to come—and we must start now.

Thank you.

• (1810)

**The Chair:** Seeing no hands, the vote is called.

(Amendment negatived: nays 7; yeas 4)

**The Chair:** We now go to PV-26. It's Ms. May's amendment, but based on our previous conversation at committee, I don't believe she'll be speaking to it.

Am I correct, Ms. May?

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** Yes.

I sent you a few other examples of where chairs have removed my amendments at my request, but I respect that the clerk of this committee has taken a different interpretation.

**The Chair:** Okay, I will look into that.

I'm sorry. I'm not checking my emails. I'm very much just trying to stay on top of this process.

You won't be speaking to the amendment, but Mr. Albas will.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Yes.

Briefly, PV-26 says that Bill C-12, in clause 20, is amended by replacing line 15 on page 8 with the following:

reference of the expert advisory body.

**The Chair:** Okay, I don't see any hands up. Therefore, the vote is called.

(Amendment negatived: nays 10; yeas 1)

**The Chair:** We go now to BQ-19. I will just note that if BQ-19 is adopted, G-13 cannot be moved, as they amend the same line.

Madam Pauzé.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** Amendment BQ-19 would be consistent with what we were talking about earlier about the independent expert committee. I would remind you that it's important for us to get the role, mission and make-up of the committee right. Right now, we're using the government's definitions, which haven't changed.

I won't propose the amendment because it would ultimately serve no purpose.

• (1815)

**The Chair:** Okay.

Mr. Albas, your hand is raised, but there is no amendment to debate.

[*English*]

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Are we not debating BQ-19?

**The Chair:** No, because Madame Pauzé did not table it.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** All right. I'm sorry. I just wanted to make sure I'm on the right page.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** For G-13, we go to Mr. Baker.

**Mr. Yvan Baker (Etobicoke Centre, Lib.):** I was not going to move this one, but I can move it. Let me see.

Mr. Chair, I am introducing this amendment to add new language to subclause 20(2) of the Canadian net-zero emissions accountability act to require the Minister of the Environment to publish the advisory body's terms of reference and amendments made to them. This strengthens the act by increasing transparency in the process.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Albas.

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

I certainly appreciate MP Baker for moving this amendment. As I've said a number of times, Conservatives believe that climate change is a real threat that must be dealt with. Bill C-12 is one step towards some of the goals towards that, Mr. Chair. We did come to this committee with 19 amendments that we feel would improve the legislation, despite not supporting it at second reading. Those reasons are well documented.

I will say, though, that we came prepared to support other parties to make sure that the bill was improved where we felt there was a reasonable amendment that was clear and that was in the public interest. This meets the criteria, so like we did with Mr. Saini's amendment, we will support this because we do believe that the public needs to have more transparency when it comes to the work of this government and the work of the advisory body.

I'm going to just round it out by saying that Conservatives will support reasonable amendments. It's unfortunate that other parties such as the government and the NDP have chosen, it seems, to ignore anyone else's ideas but their own, but that's something I can't help, Mr. Chair. We, as the Conservative Party, believe that if a good idea comes forward, it should be supported.

Maybe that's enough to say on this, Mr. Chair. I'll let other members speak to it.

**The Chair:** Mr. Redekopp.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** I just want to clarify one quick thing. When Mr. Baker introduced this, I believe he said clause 22. I'm reading it and it's clause 20. If you could just please clarify—

**The Chair:** I have clause 20 as well.

**Mr. Yvan Baker:** It's subclause 20(2).

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Okay, maybe that's why I was confused.

**The Chair:** On G-13, I don't see any hands up. The vote is called.

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

• (1820)

**The Chair:** It's unanimous. That's great.

On BQ-20, we have Madame Pauzé.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** I'm going to ask to change “comité d'experts indépendant”, which was not adopted, to “comité consultatif”, since that's the term that was chosen. Unless NDP-4 has changed that a bit.

In any event, it is the “Groupe consultatif pour la carbonneutralité”. That's what should be changed in amendment BQ-20.

May I present my amendment, Mr. Chair?

**The Chair:** Yes, you may.

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** As I said when I introduced amendment BQ-18, there is a whole. Here, we are talking about the mandate of the famous advisory committee. We are adding important clarifications about the mandate of this committee, details that are essential and complementary to the mandate that would be given by the minister.

It was agreed that the mandate in Bill C-12 are quite imprecise and changeable at will.

That's why we want to add some important clarifications. We want to make clear that the committee must have access to the information and analytical resources of the federal government. We need to make it easier for it to do its job and to access data and information so that it can be efficient and function optimally.

I told you earlier about the five elements that experts in the United Kingdom consider critical to the success of any climate legislation. Earlier, you voted against one of those elements, but I'm trying again with others.

Together, these elements are beneficial to the exercise. We are talking about the full independence of the committee, which you don't want. We're talking about the fact that the committee has to have a consistent budget that flows from its mission; it has to produce an annual report on the status of the targets. It's a question of democracy. Citizens need to know where we're going.

Other elements mentioned by the U.K. experts include the fact that the committee must receive a mandatory response from the government for each report it tables. It has to be involved in setting the carbon budget. So we're talking about targets that are set well in advance. Finally, it must also provide advice, and providing advice

is not the same as making recommendations. I said this earlier about amendment NDP-4.

We see how important words are. The “interim ... objective”, as the NDP called for, is not a target. A “summary of [the] ... most recent ... inventory” is not a report. These are words that weaken the bill, but they are the ones that were chosen.

Our amendment clearly sets out what is expected of this committee. Currently, clause 20 is worded far too flexibly. The minister has an entire department at his disposal and several competent officials to advise him. However, the committee in question must be—I repeat—independent. It isn't being asked to provide independent advice, but rather to be independent. It must have a mission and mandate that is directly applicable to the purpose of Bill C-12. Every element of this amendment supports that need.

I would, of course, expect government members to keep their word about their repeated desire to improve the bill and, as Mr. Albas and Ms. May have noted, to work with “the” opposition parties. Collaborative approaches may speed up the process, but I want to remind NDP members of their strong positions, repeated in the House and before our committee by Ms. Collins.

We must be consistent in our political action. The government has been criticized for saying one thing and the opposite. I am asking the committee member, who no doubt recognizes himself, to support this amendment, which is consistent with what his party has said it wants in this bill. He has said it to his constituents, he has said it to the public, and he has said it in speeches in the House. I would like to know that this member isn't repeating the behaviour that he himself has criticized the government for.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Pauzé.

Mr. Redekopp, you have the floor.

[*English*]

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Mr. Chair, I just want to clarify this. The wording in this is “independent expert committee”. I believe Madam Pauzé modified that wording as she introduced this motion. Could I just have what the revised wording is going to be and in what locations it is, just so I'm clear on what we're voting on?

• (1825)

**The Chair:** Basically, as I understand it, Madam Pauzé has introduced a subamendment to her amendment.

[*Translation*]

You're changing the wording of your amendment a little bit? Is that right, Ms. Pauzé?

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** Yes, because the term “independent expert committee” wasn't used. I don't know if the term “advisory body” in Bill C-12 or the “Net-Zero Advisory Body”, in NDP-4, were chosen.

Is “Net-Zero Advisory Group” the new name for this committee? What will it be called? I know that the name “independent expert committee” wasn't chosen. I'm sure of that.



[English]

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Further to my question, do we need a sub-amendment or do we need a new copy? How does this work?

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Ms. Pauzé, you don't need to send it to the clerk. It's just the name that is changing.

Mr. Albas, you have the floor.

[English]

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I was just going to say, Mr. Chair, that you've recently, in other cases of subamendments, asked for members to supply those to the clerk. I was going to ask if you would require that now.

**The Chair:** No, the legislative clerk says it's not necessary. She's just changing....

**Mr. Dan Albas:** It does seem a bit arbitrary, but is it literally using the language that was found in NDP-4?

**The Chair:** I believe so.

[Translation]

Is that correct, Madam Clerk?

[English]

**Mr. Dan Albas:** That's not entirely clear.

**Ms. Émilie Thivierge:** Yes, so in French it would be “*organisme consultatif*” and in English it would be the “advisory body” must make recommendations.

**The Chair:** It's to be consistent with—

**Mr. Dan Albas:** In French it's “*le Groupe consultatif pour la carboneutralité*”, isn't it?

**Ms. Émilie Thivierge:** If we go to NDP-4, at the bottom, proposed subclause 20(1.1), you see, “*L'organisme consultatif*”. That's the wording we would be using. I think that Ms. Pauzé moved—

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I'm sorry to interrupt, Madam Clerk, but in proposed subclause 20(1) it has, “*le Groupe consultatif pour la carboneutralité*”.

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Which one is it?

[Translation]

**The Chair:** It's “Net-Zero Advisory Group”. Is that right, Ms. Thivierge?

[English]

**Ms. Émilie Thivierge:** We can use this one, yes.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Right now there are two different.... There's what is written down in proposed subclause 20(1.1) and in proposed subclause 20(1).

**Ms. Émilie Thivierge:** Yes, proposed subclause 20(1.1) refers to proposed subclause 20(1).

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Okay, but we are going to go ahead, in Madam Pauzé's amendment, with that. Are we going to vote on this, Mr. Chair, or are you going to seek unanimous consent to do that?

**The Chair:** Madam Thivierge, do we need unanimous consent for this?

**Ms. Émilie Thivierge:** No, we don't, because when Madam Pauzé moved her amendment she mentioned that she was going to change the wording. That's what she did, and she's entitled to do that.

**The Chair:** Yes, it wasn't already moved, so there's nothing else.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I think it would be cleaner with an amendment formally, and I'd be happy to do a “unanimous consent” motion to that, because I do think the process needs to be followed. If the legislative clerk says there's no process, it's just interesting that I had to type in and send in a subamendment. I just want to have a similar process for each one, Mr. Chair. That's all.

**The Chair:** Had you already moved your original amendment and were amending it?

**Mr. Dan Albas:** No. I did a subamendment to, I believe, Mr. Saini's amendment. I was asked to send it in.

**The Chair:** That's different—

• (1830)

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Okay. No, if you say that's different and that's how we're going to treat it, that's fine.

**The Chair:** —because basically, Madam Pauzé is tabling it with “*le Groupe consultatif pour la carboneutralité*”. The motion is not already there, and somebody's amending it. She's tabling it. It's not written up that way, I understand, but when she tabled it she made sure to make us understand that the way she's tabling it is with “*le Groupe consultatif pour la carboneutralité*”.

Is that correct, Madam Thivierge? Is this how it works?

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

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Mr. Dan Albas:** That wasn't clear to me, Mr. Chair.

Now I understand because you've explain it. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Okay, thank you.

**Mr. Brad Redekopp:** Just for perfect clarity, that occurs in subclause 20(3) and also down at the bottom in subclause 20(4)—in two places in this amendment.

**Ms. Émilie Thivierge:** Yes.

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

I see no hands up, so the vote is—

**Mr. Dan Albas:** Thank you for that, Mr. Chair. It helps us to know what we're voting on. I appreciate it.

**The Chair:** Thank you. It's my pleasure.

We're voting on BQ-20 now.

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

[Translation]

**The Chair:** We will now vote on clause 20 as amended.

Are there any comments from committee members?

Seeing no hands, we'll go to the vote.

[English]

**Mrs. Cathy McLeod (Kamloops—Thompson—Cariboo, CPC):** Mr. Chair—just for clarity—you said clause 21, or it was interpreted as clause 21. I believe the vote is on clause 20.

**The Chair:** Yes, it is on clause 20. I'm sorry. The words are stuck together on my paper. It's on clause 20.

We've done all these amendments. Therefore, we're voting on clause 20 as amended, not clause 21. The words are stuck together. We're voting on clause 20 as amended.

Does that answer your question, Ms. McLeod? Yes. Okay.

There are no hands up, and the vote is called.

(Clause 20 as amended agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

(On clause 21)

**The Chair:** We now go to CPC-17.

Is it Mr. Albas who's presenting it?

**Mr. Dan Albas:** I believe Mr. Jeneroux wanted to speak to this one. I will maybe follow him.

**The Chair:** Mr. Jeneroux, go ahead.

**Mr. Matt Jeneroux (Edmonton Riverbend, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This amendment comes with great fanfare, so I want to be the one to speak to it. I apologize to all the other amendments that were made by other committee members previous to this, but this really is the pinnacle amendment that I know we're all looking forward to.

Perhaps you were stopped at a grocery store this weekend by people saying, "What about CPC-17?" I apologize on behalf of all the people who pulled you aside.

This amendment is rather simple in nature. Basically, we look at the advisory body, and it has 15 members, but they're all appointed by the Minister of Environment. Now think about if you're the Minister of Environment. You're sitting back, and you've gotten through maybe member five. Maybe you've really pushed yourself and gotten to member six. Then you think, "I have to go and do this nine more times and figure out nine more members to put on this advisory body." Why not ease Minister Wilkinson's workload? Why not share the membership load with other ministers, perhaps Minister Freeland, Minister Champagne...? What Minister Wilkinson would appreciate this committee doing and saying is, "Go and spend that extra time with your kids. Spend the time with your wife. Go out on a boat. You live in Vancouver for crying out loud. Enjoy the time, Minister, and let's give that extra workload to these other three departments."

How we've worded it... We've given three positions for the Minister of Finance to submit, three positions for the Minister of Industry and then three positions for the Minister of Crown-Indigenous

Relations to submit. This still leaves Minister Wilkinson with his six members that he'll likely be able to find, but it also frees him up to do those extracurricular activities with his family. Again, I think he would send us all personal thank-you notes if we allowed him to do something like that.

If you will also recall, Mr. Chair, this was recommended by our friends at the Canadian Chamber of Commerce and CAPP, as well, to make sure it's a well-rounded and well-balanced committee.

With that, I turn it to my esteemed committee members to hopefully, again, lighten the load of Minister Wilkinson. He already has to go through the entire bill here after this. Give him these nine members for someone else to pick at the end of the day.

With that, I'll turn it back to you, Mr. Chair.

● (1835)

**The Chair:** That's very thoughtful, Mr. Jeneroux.

Mr. Albas, please go ahead.

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

I certainly appreciate Mr. Jeneroux thinking so generously of Minister Wilkinson, wanting to give him a bit more time. North Vancouver is lovely at this time of year when it isn't raining, and that's not often.

That being said, I will point out that there has been a lot of discussion about the need to have more independence of the committee.

One of the ways you can do that is by putting a bit of distance between who appoints them. When you make all the committee members... They have to receive their appointment from one minister. Again, for the purposes of this bill, by default, it designates the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, thus, why Mr. Jeneroux was fixated on helping Minister Wilkinson.

By creating several different roles, or by appointing to this advisory board, that creates more independence, because the further away... You have multiple different ministers that would make suggestions. As I've said earlier, each minister, typically, has a rolodex. Again, asking for six members, I'm sure Minister Wilkinson wouldn't have any difficulty with that as he's already come up with 15.

We should make sure we include indigenous persons by amending paragraph 21(1)(c) with "three, on the recommendation of the Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations". This is something that I will give MP McLeod 100% credit for. She asked a number of questions. We didn't have any indigenous witnesses, though my understanding is that there are some briefs alluding to it. This would ensure that indigenous persons across the country, who are known specifically to the Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations, would be able to nominate those imminent persons. They would contribute indigenous knowledge as laid out by the act in the definitions.

We have a thriving clean-tech sector that oftentimes doesn't necessarily run in lockstep with the Minister of Environment and Climate Change. In fact, the Minister of Industry probably has more discussions with clean-tech firms in places like Waterloo and other innovation centres that are just starting up. That minister would also be able to put forward other people.

There is other expertise. It's been cited that some people believe there should be economists on this. I'm sure the Minister of Finance also has, in her rolodex, very worthy persons that would be able to contribute.

We believe this is an all-hands-on-deck issue dealing with climate change. We think there would be more independence by lightening the load of Minister Wilkinson, in this case, as Mr. Jeneroux has pointed out.

As he said, we had witnesses who came to committee and asked for this. Of course, the way the Governor in Council works, as you are probably well aware, Mr. Chair, is that the Governor in Council meets but it does need a recommendation from a minister to start a discussion.

That's why we believe in naming, specifically, not just the Minister of Environment, who would get six members, but the Minister of Industry, the Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations and the Minister of Finance. We believe you would end up with a much more diverse panel. It would create a sense of more independence. As I've said, it breaks down those silos. It brings different people to the fore. It would make for a much more diverse panel. In that case, they would be more cross-disciplinary, which is important in dealing with a multi-faceted issue such as climate change.

I would ask all honourable members to contribute to making the bill stronger. This is one of the best recommendations that we've brought forward. For those who call themselves business Liberals or blue Liberals, I would hope they would say that having one minister with one perspective, through their own personal rolodex or that of their staff, is too limiting.

The bill could be seriously improved by having other ministers, who are also capable and run into these distinguished Canadians when they do their round tables and consultations, find the right people to fit this important role.

● (1840)

With that, I would ask all honourable members to consider this. Again, I think that one of the biggest challenges in our politics is that it is not so much a matter of whether an idea is good or not, but of who proposes it. That is something we see in Ottawa too much. If a Conservative raises an idea, it might be good or bad based on who is watching and vice versa. If a minister of the Crown rises with a particular idea, then the opposition might oppose it just because it's that person.

I'm really counting on the committee work we do, Mr. Chair, which is far less partisan than, let's say, the average question period. We can actually dig down into the process or into our committee. I grant it that this committee process has been rather truncated and I don't think it has led to the best outcome. One way we can actually prove me wrong is by supporting Mr. Jeneroux and his motion,

with the added benefit of a little bit more family time for Minister Wilkinson.

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

It's 6:42. We have to end at 6:44.

Mrs. McLeod, can you do this in a minute and a half?

**Mrs. Cathy McLeod:** Thank you, Chair. I certainly can.

This is CPC-17. I think this is an absolutely critical amendment. We heard from indigenous leadership just this week about how siloed the government continues to be when it is working through critical issues. This government moved the UN declaration forward. This is part and parcel of having some recommendations from the Crown-indigenous minister at the table.

My big disappointment.... I know the Bloc had put forward thoughtful amendments. The Green Party has put forward thoughtful amendments. Certainly, we've explained our amendments and put them forward in good faith. It's disappointing when it's very clear that the Liberals and the NDP have a plan, and they don't even give the courtesy of a response to why they will not support a particular amendment. In my experience, at least the government has given a one-line response, saying that they can't support this for reason X.

We're not even seeing that, so clearly we have a collusion process happening here that has excluded the Bloc, the Green Party and the Conservatives.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** We'll stop there. When we pick up on Wednesday, we have Madam Pauzé and Mr. Albas.

Thank you, colleagues, for today's meeting. We made a fair amount of progress, all things considered.

[Translation]

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

**The Chair:** On Wednesday, we'll start with you, Ms. Pauzé.

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** Thank you, but that wasn't what I wanted to talk about.

I think there are going to be five votes on Wednesday. Can we plan to start at 4:30 p.m. and finish three hours later, as we did last Wednesday?

● (1845)

**The Chair:** We are scheduled to have a three-hour meeting. As for the start time of the meeting, we will see.

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** Perfect. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, everyone.

Have a good evening. I look forward to seeing you on Wednesday afternoon. The meeting is adjourned.

---







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>