



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 074

Thursday, September 21, 2023

Chair: Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia



Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

Thursday, September 21, 2023

• (1100)

[*Translation*]

The Chair (Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.)): Good morning, everyone.

There are so many new faces that I'm not sure I'm actually at the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development.

Mrs. Sophie Chatel (Pontiac, Lib.): It's green finance.

The Chair: Yes.

We do have a number of new people joining us who are substituting for permanent members of the committee.

I'd like to welcome, first of all, Mr. Ali, who is joining us online and is replacing Mr. Weiler. I would also like to welcome Mr. Kmiec, who is replacing Mr. Leslie; Ms. Zarrillo, who is replacing Mr. Bachrach, who is replacing Ms. Collins; Mr. Aldag, who is replacing Mr. Longfield; and Ms. Chatel, who is replacing Ms. Thompson.

That said, I'm not sure whether we can now proceed to the election of the vice-chair or whether we should wait until the list from the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs is officially tabled. I'm informed that we can proceed to the election of the vice-chair.

To do so, I will give the floor to our clerk.

Do you want in, Mr. Kram?

[*English*]

Mr. Michael Kram (Regina—Wascana, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would like to nominate my colleague Dan Mazier to be... That's unless someone else was lined up.

An hon. member: [*Inaudible—Editor*]

Mr. Michael Kram: Okay. All right. It sounds like we might be unanimous on this decision then, but I would like to nominate Dan Mazier for the position of vice-chair of the committee.

An hon. member: Hear, hear!

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Natalie Jeanneault): I'll just do my script. Pursuant to Standing Order 106(2), the first vice-chair must be a member of the government party. I am now prepared to receive motions for first vice-chair, which you have done.

It has been moved by Mr. Kram that Mr. Mazier be elected as first vice-chair of the committee. Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy (Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill, Lib.): I'm sorry. Could you please repeat what you said in the preamble to that?

The Chair: I think you said the “government” side, but they can't be a member of the government. They have to be a member of the official opposition.

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy: Thank you.

I was happy to have you on our side, Dan, but I didn't think that's what you....

The Clerk: I'm sorry about that. It's the template.

Would you like me to restart?

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy: No.

The Chair: We just wanted to make sure it was understood.

The Clerk: Okay. Perfect.

Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

(Motion agreed to)

The Clerk: I declare Mr. Mazier duly elected first vice-chair of the committee.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

The Chair: Congratulations, Mr. Mazier. I look forward to working with you on the subcommittee.

[*Translation*]

We will continue to discuss the motion proposed by Mr. Bachrach, but first I would like to go back to the invitation we received to visit a recycling plant in Montreal. It would be during a break week; I don't know the exact date. If the committee wants to travel, it has to make a budget request and obtain the approval of a particular committee. I'm prepared to do that if it's the will of the committee. However, I've canvassed the committee, and the committee doesn't seem to have much interest in travelling to Montreal to visit a recycling plant. Having said that, I could be wrong.

There are two options, actually. The first option is for the committee to request a budget to travel. The second option is for committee members who wish to use their points to travel to Montreal to visit the recycling plant.

I'll open it up for discussion.

Personally, Ms. Pauzé, I am going to go, because I live in Montreal.

I don't know what the committee thinks or wants to do.

Mr. Deltell, you have the floor.

• (1105)

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I would like to welcome all the new members of the committee, especially the member for Pontiac, a member from Quebec; I say that out of good-natured regionalism.

I'd like to welcome you, Ms. Chatel, to this committee. You'll find that we generally work very well together.

As for the invitation to travel, Montreal is an hour and a half or two hours from here. You can get there by train or by bus. So it's not really a problem, I think, for our colleagues in British Columbia or elsewhere. Of course, for Quebeckers, going to Montreal is not a problem.

Now, I just want to say that we're absolutely determined, if the committee so decides, to visit the oil spill site in northern Alberta. We talked about it a lot last spring. Our ambition was to go there and use the opportunity to travel across Canada at the same time, but upon reflection, I think that we were perhaps a little too ambitious.

In any case, I would just like to make sure that this trip to Montreal won't hurt our chances of getting funding to visit the site of the oil spill and meet with the indigenous community there. It's very important for us to do this, out of respect for the people who have suffered from this situation and to experience the same reality as they have.

We understand that flights in that area are not very frequent. We're well aware of that. That said, one of our roles as members of Parliament is to see how people across Canada experience their daily reality. Even if, by chance, we had to take a lot of flights to get there and there were costs involved, even though I'm a very strong fiscal Conservative, and I feel that every expense is suspect and that there are no small savings, I believe that, in this case, it would be our role, our duty and our responsibility to do so. We need to go where the problems are and meet directly with Canadians who are experiencing problems like the one last spring.

I just want to make sure that this event in Montreal, although it looks very interesting, doesn't undermine our budget capacity to travel to Alberta later to see first-hand the impact that this oil spill a few months ago has had on indigenous communities.

Thank you.

The Chair: Unless I'm mistaken, we submitted a budget request for a trip to Fort Chipewyan, Alberta, and it was denied in June, I believe.

Are you asking us to make a new request to travel to Alberta?

Mr. Gérard Deltell: We can discuss this later with all our colleagues. I don't want to impose our intentions on my colleagues, but I think that, last spring, everyone wanted to go.

I think the reason our request was turned down—and it's a very valid reason—is that it involved a lot of travel. It was a full week's travel from coast to coast, so it's understandable that the bill would have been rather high.

Now, once we've visited a water facility in an urban area like Montreal, I think the work is done. However, it's our job to go and see an indigenous community that has suffered the despicable effects of an oil spill.

The Chair: I understand that, but since such a request has already been refused, I'm trying to determine whether you want us to make a new request. I believe I received a letter from the Liaison Committee, which gave us a new deadline for new travel requests. Does the committee want us to try a second time to get funding to go to Alberta?

Mr. Gérard Deltell: I have a point of clarification, Mr. Chair.

As I understand it, that request was denied because it was part of a series of trips. It wasn't just a round trip between Ottawa and Alberta.

The Chair: It's true that we had submitted a fairly complete itinerary, but my guess is that it wasn't the reason for the refusal. However, I can't comment on that, since I'm not part of the discussions between the whips.

Here's the question: Does the committee wish to make a request to go only to Alberta to visit the Kearl tailings pond site and then go up to Fort Chipewyan, and submit that request before the deadline that has been suggested to us, which I don't know?

• (1110)

Mr. Gérard Deltell: What's the deadline?

The Chair: The letter was received the day before yesterday, I think, but we'll have to check that.

[English]

Next is Ms. Taylor Roy and then Mr. van Koeverden.

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy: I agree with Mr. Deltell that we should go and visit that site. I think if we just put that one in specifically, we'd have a better chance. I understand the rationale for going to, obviously, this particular site, Kearl Lake and Fort Chip, but on the Montreal recycling plant, could someone explain where that fits in to the studies we're doing or our agenda, or why—

The Chair: It doesn't. It's a one-off invitation, I believe.

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy: What is the impetus to do that now, then? I'm just curious.

The Chair: A company invited us. It's not the City of Montreal but a private company, I think.

Maybe we don't want to accept an invitation from a private company. It's not part of anything that's on the agenda of this committee.

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy: Okay. Well, I feel that the trip to Kearsal Lake and Fort Chip is much more important. You'd suggested earlier using points to get someplace. I don't know if it helps, but if we have points and we're all willing to use our points to get out to Edmonton or wherever it is, and then pay for the rest through our budget, would we have a better chance of going that way? I do think it's very important.

The Chair: We have to decide by November 10 for any new travel requests.

Let's break this down. I'd like to start by asking the committee if we want to put in a travel request to accept this invitation to a recycling plant in Montreal. I don't mind going myself, and I think, from speaking with Madame Pauzé, she was interested as well. I don't mind just driving down the highway to this recycling plant on a break week to see it myself.

Does the committee think this is important enough to put it into a budget request, or will members, if they're interested in going, go on their own points, that type of thing? That's my question.

Yes, Mr. Deltell.

Mr. Gérard Deltell: If we're talking about budget requests, I think we have to keep our chance to go to Alberta instead of Montreal.

The Chair: Keep our powder dry—yes.

Okay. That seems to be a consensus.

Mr. van Koeverden, go ahead, and then Madame Pauzé.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Adam van Koeverden (Milton, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I also agree with Mr. Deltell on the importance of managing public funds prudently. It's so important.

I also know that all committee members have a recycling centre in their region.

[*English*]

I know for sure that there's a recycling plant in Halton region that I could go to. I'm sure the one in Montreal is special, but I've never visited mine. Maybe with this new opportunity, I could go to my recycling plant. Maybe we could all go to ours, make that a commitment, and come back in February and talk about it.

[*Translation*]

As for the idea of travelling to Alberta, there's a financial cost, but also, since this is the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development, we should take into account the high cost of such a trip in terms of carbon emissions.

[*English*]

We all travel a lot. We all get on planes a lot. We all know that we could do less. I try to drive here occasionally. I try to take the train occasionally. Some members go back to Alberta often.

Tom, it might be easy for you to visit Alberta. I love Alberta. I love visiting.

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): I live in Alberta. I don't visit.

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: I know, but visiting an indigenous community outside of your riding might be simpler for you in terms of the carbon costs as well as the financial costs borne by the public purse. For you they're different than they are for Mr. Deltell and me. All I'm saying is that if there's an opportunity to visit somewhere closer, or we can take a train together, for example, that would be better.

[*Translation*]

Given the nature of this committee, it's prudent to look at the impact of our carbon emissions on the environment.

The Chair: Okay.

Ms. Pauzé, you have the floor.

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): I admit that, if one prevented the other, I would agree with Mr. Deltell.

• (1115)

The Chair: We won't know that.

Ms. Monique Pauzé: That's right. We will favour one or the other.

That said, the recycling plant is in Montreal, and I'm in Montreal.

I have the invitation in front of me. It says that this plant “is a shining example of what's possible with post-consumer and ocean-bound plastics”, thanks to Canadian innovation. We would have an overview of “techniques being used to put Canada’s sustainability plans into action”. It also says: “During the tour, you will see the process of turning used: electronic devices, drinking water bottles and clothes hangers into recycled plastics”.

As far as I'm concerned, my participation will cost nothing. In any case, this invitation is for the Friday of the break week. I think that's kind of what we were talking about yesterday, Mr. Chair.

So I don't think one necessarily precludes the other, unless you're telling me that if we can't all go to Montreal, no one will.

The Chair: What Mr. Deltell raised is that he fears that if we make a request for the entire committee to visit this recycling plant in Montreal, our budget request to travel to Alberta will be less likely to be approved and will be set aside, on the pretext that we have already been given money to visit the recycling plant in Montreal, and that one trip is enough.

So there seems to be a consensus. However, I wonder if the Ethics Commissioner allows committees to accept an invitation to visit a plant and have lunch served to them. It's become so complicated now. We'd have to check that out. For the time being, assuming we can accept this invitation, the consensus seems to be, as I understand it, that we don't want to make a formal request to the Liaison Committee to go to Montreal. We would use our MP budgets to go individually, but at the same time be together. Instead, we would make a formal request to the Liaison Committee to travel to Alberta when the time comes. That seems to be the consensus.

Ms. Monique Pauzé: Yes.

Mr. Gérard Deltell: I think that's the consensus we need to reach as well. I do want to point out two things.

Earlier, Mr. Chair, you said that, based on your experience and intuition, the very high bill for all the planned trips wasn't necessarily the reason why our request was turned down. You have much more experience than I do here in the House of Commons and in politics. However, I must admit that, in this case, I would be a bit surprised and disappointed if, by some misfortune, the committee didn't want us to go. We've talked about that a lot here. It's an issue that has resonated with us all. We all remember the testimony of the grand chief and the representatives of the indigenous communities who came here. We all wanted to go and see them to understand what they had gone through. It's all well and good to have conversations here, in the House and on Zoom, but there's nothing like going there to meet people and experience their daily reality, especially when the time comes to travel.

That's my first comment.

Now I would like to go back to what Mr. van Koeverden said. I would also like to congratulate him on his French. I sincerely thank him.

[*English*]

It's to raise the point that, as the environmental committee, we have to be careful when we travel. I do agree 100% with you, and this is sometimes what I think when I see the minister travelling all around the world, but my other point is that I think it's part of the job to go there, especially for this issue. When we talk about the oil spill that happened, it hurt those people directly. It's part of our job to do this.

I'm not a flying guy, by the way. I love airplanes. I love the history of airplanes, but I don't like to fly. More than ever, I would say, like a lot of people, I am very concerned about the environmental footprint when we travel. On the other hand, if I do travel, this will be very efficient, and it's part of my job. I don't think I've travelled.... I think I travelled just before the pandemic situation, maybe on one or two flights but nothing more. It's not because I am cheap, but because I'm careful of that more and more, like everybody.

If there is a trip that we should do, if there is something that we have to do, it's to go there. Keep in mind that, when it's useful or it's important, there's no problem with that.

• (1120)

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Okay.

We'll prepare a budget request to go to Alberta to visit the tailings pond and the community of Fort Chipewyan.

Is everybody in agreement?

I'd really like us to pick up where we left off last Tuesday with debate on the motion. I would also remind you that this meeting is not in camera.

That's all I wanted to discuss with you.

Ms. Taylor Roy, do you have a question?

[*English*]

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy: I appreciate what Mr. Deltell said. If there's any way we could perhaps reduce the number of people who need to travel, it might be good.

[*Translation*]

I agree that it's very important, but I think the first travel request was for too many people.

[*English*]

I think what Mr. van Koeverden said was right in that we should try to minimize our impacts. Perhaps we can reduce the number of people somehow in the request that we make.

The Chair: We did in the first request.

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy: I think there were still 12 people or something. There were a lot of people, if I remember.

The Chair: We'll check.

We have analysts and everything. In terms of committee members, we were not—

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy: Even with the analysts, etc., and all the people...can we just make it the minimum that we need to do this properly?

Thank you.

The Chair: We'll do that. Absolutely.

Where were we? I think we were debating Mr. Bachrach's motion, which I think you all have in front of you. Here is where we were. We had agreed to invite the Minister of Energy and Minerals, Brian Jean, and we agreed to strike out the Alberta Energy Regulator.

We were at Mr. Kram, Mr. Deltell, Mr. Leslie, Mr. Falk, who's not here, and Mr. Bachrach, who's not here at the moment.

Mr. Dan Mazier: You can add me.

The Chair: Of course.

Go ahead, Mr. Kram.

Mr. Michael Kram: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I'm pleased to see how well the committee has come to a consensus so far this morning. Let's see if we can have that momentum continue.

I would like to move an amendment to the motion that is on the floor. My amendment is to delete all text prior to the words "That, pursuant to Standing Order 108(2)". I will be—

The Chair: Can you repeat that?

It's everything before. I got it.

Mr. Michael Kram: It's to delete all text prior to the words, "That, pursuant to Standing Order 108(2)". It's basically to delete the preamble.

I will distribute paper copies in both official languages now.

Basically, preambles are not necessary for committee motions. If they are not necessary, one has to ask if they are adding any value or are beneficial in any way. I would argue it could actually be seen as being counterproductive in this case. If you look at the preamble, it reads, "15 million hectares of forest have burnt". It then singles out one particular company and one particular province.

I would not want to prejudice the appearance of representatives from any one company or any one province. If we want to have these people come to the committee and answer questions, it should be done in a manner that is in good faith and not prejudging any of their actions or any of their motives prior to their appearance.

In the spirit of not politicizing this motion any more than is necessary, I would like to see the preamble removed in its entirety, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: That's it.

• (1125)

Mr. Michael Kram: That's the motion. I believe it's coming around right now.

The Chair: Okay. Let me just check on that procedurally with the clerk.

We'll start a new speaking list on the amendment. Who would like to speak to it? We'll continue with Mr. Deltell and go to Mr. Leslie once we get through this amendment.

Ms. Taylor Roy, go ahead.

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy: Thank you.

I understand the point made. I think, as long as the motion includes sufficient information, that's fine from my perspective.

The one thing that has been taken out of the motion right now is the explanation as to why we want the Honourable Brian Jean to appear. I think if we're going to remove all of the preamble, we should rewrite a bit of this because, right now, it indicates that both CEO Rich Kruger and the Minister of Energy and Minerals, the Honourable Brian Jean, are to explain why their companies are abandoning their climate target, which doesn't make any sense.

The Chair: I agree a hundred per cent.

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy: I think we have to move the reference to the Minister of Energy and Minerals, the Honourable Brian Jean, to the second part, which is basically to put his name in place of the Alberta Energy Regulator, to explain why there's a moratorium.

The Chair: We'll get to that after we vote on this amendment.

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy: I think that's part, though, of making the preamble disappear. It's to ensure we do that.

Mr. Dan Mazier (Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa, CPC): We will address that in other amendments.

The Chair: Let's stick to whether we're okay with getting rid of the preamble. Then we'll come back to the point that Ms. Taylor Roy raised.

Is there anyone else on getting rid of the preamble? Does anyone object to getting rid of the preamble?

(Amendment agreed to)

The Chair: Now we're left with the main part of the motion, and the next speaker is Mr. Deltell. Right now, it's Mr. Deltell who has the floor. He can do what he wants with that.

I saw two hands go up. I saw Mr. Bachrach and Mr. Kmiec.

Do you want to be on the speakers list? Okay.

Mr. Deltell, the floor is yours.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Deltell: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Obviously, this is an issue that affects everyone, and we're well aware of that. We're certainly concerned about the fact that the Standing Committee on Natural Resources is doing exactly the same thing. There is duplication, and we have concerns about that.

I would like to move an amendment in both official languages.

[*English*]

It is to replace the words, "invite Suncor CEO Rich Kruger" with "invite Suncor Energy Incorporated".

[*Translation*]

We are well aware that company CEOs have extremely tight schedules and are no doubt very busy. That could result in delays that would be in nobody's best interest. That's why it would be better to invite the company itself.

The Chair: Okay. If I understand correctly, you want to take out three words.

Mr. Gérard Deltell: I have a hard copy that can be given to committee members.

The Chair: You want to take out the words "CEO" and "Rich Kruger".

Mr. Gérard Deltell: I would remind you that, last week, the tabling of this motion took us all by surprise.

We've done our homework and we have a copy, in both official languages, of the amendments we intend to propose today, out of respect for our colleagues and the work we do in committee. The goal is to ensure that we're serving the interests of all Canadians. We're here because of them and the mandate they gave us.

The Chair: So you'll distribute the hard copies.

[*English*]

Mr. Deltell is suggesting that we replace the words “invite Suncor CEO Rich Kruger” with the words “invite Suncor Energy Inc.”

Let's debate that.

I have Mr. Aldag.

Mr. John Aldag (Cloverdale—Langley City, Lib.): I personally don't think we should be supporting this amendment. It was definitely and clearly CEO Rich Kruger who made these very clear statements on the direction that he wants to take Suncor in, which is completely opposed to the direction that the organization has gone in for many years, if not decades, as leaders in green energy in Canada. I think we need to hear directly from CEO Rich Kruger.

I would like to speak to another amendment, but I will do that after we dispense with this one.

• (1130)

The Chair: Okay. Who else would like to speak to this amendment?

Mr. Bachrach is next.

Mr. Taylor Bachrach (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): I think the CEO is in a unique position to speak to the company's overall direction. My concern would be that, if the company chooses to send a communications person, for instance, or a public relations person, we're not going to get the kind of substantive interaction that I believe the committee wants. My preference is to invite the CEO.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Okay.

Can we go to the vote now?

Do you want a recorded vote?

Some hon. members: Yes.

The Chair: Okay.

(Amendment negated: nays 7; yeas 4)

[*English*]

The Chair: We'll keep going down the list.

We have Mr. Leslie, which today is Mr. Kmiec.

Mr. Tom Kmiec (Calgary Shepard, CPC): I am happy to sub in for Mr. Leslie, but I can't speak for him.

I wanted to move an amendment to replace the words “to explain why their companies are abandoning their climate targets that had been previously laid out in the face of a climate emergency” with the following: “to testify on their environmental plans and targets”.

The Chair: We'll talk about this, but there's no “their”. It's Suncor.

Are you okay with changing “their” to “its”?

Mr. Tom Kmiec: It's because it's not “his” companies.

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy: We can just say “Suncor”. Suncor is....

The Chair: Invite Suncor to explain why—

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I'm sticking to the amendment the way that I proposed it. I have an explanation for why.

The Chair: Okay. Sure.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Do you want me to wait until...?

The Chair: No, you can speak to it.

Did you say that you have copies?

Mr. Tom Kmiec: They were going to send them out digitally, so it can be sent around to the committee unless they have a paper copy of it back there.

The Chair: There are no paper copies. Can we send it out digitally?

We do have paper copies.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Let me know, Chair, when you would like me to start explaining it.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Pauzé: Mr. Chair, could we get the latest version of the motion? Last time, I moved an amendment to delete a number of things, and it was passed.

The Chair: I think it was sent. You should have it.

[*English*]

Go ahead, Mr. Kmiec.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Right now, the way the motion reads doesn't make any sense to me, which I think is part of what Ms. Taylor Roy.... It reads that the Minister of Energy and Minerals in Alberta owns companies. He doesn't own any of the companies. It doesn't make any sense.

Also, in reviewing the transcript for the debate at this committee—the part of it that was public—this is the wrong minister. I understand that there was concern about the pause that's been done on renewable energy development, but it's the wrong minister. He's not even the one responsible.

In fact, I have the order in council that was passed, and it's Minister Nathan Neudorf. That's the one who is responsible for the AUC, the Alberta Utilities Commission. That minister is the who is responsible.

There's an explanation. I'm going to read part of it into the record because I want to make sure that everybody understands why this needs to be struck out and why it would be much better to invite somebody else, because right now this motion just doesn't make sense.

This is from the Lieutenant Governor in Council in the Province of Alberta. Again, this is in August 2023. This was recommended by the Minister of Affordability and Utilities, Minister Nathan Neudorf. Here's the order in council, which:

- (a) orders the Alberta Utilities Commission to inquire into and report to the Minister of Affordability and Utilities on the ongoing economic, orderly and efficient development and operation, in the public interest, of electricity generation in Alberta, in accordance with the terms of reference in the attached Schedule, and
- (b) determines that the Alberta Utilities Commission has the same power with respect to ordering by whom and to whom its costs and other costs of, or incidental to, the inquiry described in clause (a) are to be paid as the Commission has with respect to its hearings and other proceedings.

When the pause was announced, Minister Nathan Neudorf then instructed the AUC to conduct hearings. There's an inquiry being conducted.

There's a long preamble, but I won't read the preamble into the record so don't worry about that. It piqued my interest. That's why I'm here at a committee that I don't usually sit on.

[Translation]

If people want to pick a fight, then I'll read it.

[English]

It instructs the following in the terms of reference for the Alberta Utilities Commission:

[The AUC] shall inquire into the following matters for the purposes of gathering and providing information to government:

- Considerations on development of power plants on specific types or classes of agricultural or environmental land;
- Considerations of the impact of power plant development on Alberta's pristine viewscapes;
- Considerations of implementing mandatory reclamation security requirements for power plants;
- Considerations for development of power plants on lands held by the Crown in Right of Alberta;
- Considerations of the impact the increasing growth of renewables has to both generation supply mix and electricity system reliability.

It goes on to say, "In conducting the inquiry, the AUC shall hear from interested parties." It then says, by March 29, 2024, it must submit a report, so it's not a stop. It's just a pause.

• (1135)

The Chair: Could you summarize what...? That's a lot of words.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: You have the wrong person. That's the starting point of why I'm here.

The Chair: Okay. I understand that.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Mr. Chair, I haven't even finished.

The Chair: Go ahead. Keep going.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: That's the first part of it. You have the wrong person in this. I think the original intent was to speak about this part of it. There's a whole Renewable Electricity Act in Alberta. The targets are legislated. There's no way around it, and the legislation has not been changed because the assembly did not meet. This is the legislation. It's all in here. It was passed by the Legislative Assembly of Alberta. There's no requirement.

There are really three points to this. The minister owns it. You have the wrong person to be calling before the committee. I also don't understand why you only have one CEO from an oil and gas company. You should invite all of them. That's, I believe, what the natural resources committee did. I believe it was actually an amendment from the government side to invite other energy executives as well, but I don't understand why you don't have Gibson, Tourmaline and Imperial—especially Imperial because they're headquartered in my riding. You should invite them to appear before the committee. You are duplicating the work of the natural resources committee, but I'll leave that to the government side and its allies to determine whether that's wise or not in the use of resources among the different parliamentary committees.

Right now, as it stands, it just doesn't make sense. The net-zero emissions targets that Alberta has are legislated. They're by 2050, and they have to be met because they're in legislation. In fact, Alberta is going to have decommissioned all of its coal power plants by next year, which is six or seven years ahead of schedule. It's happening. We're decarbonizing the entire electricity network.

I'll also remind you that everything I read in this OIC, order in council, is exclusive provincial jurisdiction. It's exclusive. It has nothing to do with any other province or the federal government. The provinces—and I hope my Bloc colleagues will appreciate this—are coequal levels of government. My government in Alberta doesn't owe any of us here a *reddition de comptes*. It doesn't have to explain why it's determined to do something that's an exclusive area of provincial jurisdiction. I just wanted to mention that. I know the Quebecers will perfectly understand what I'm trying to say.

In the case of our province, we are far ahead of everybody else in having more clean energy megawatts in our province. I think 75% of investments in 2022 by private companies were invested in Alberta, and that is on the record. That is publicly available information out there, so we are leading the way. We have targets that we are supposed to have 15% of our renewable energy by 2022. Again, it's in this act right here. It says 15%. I think we're at 17% or 18%, according to our systems operator. We're supposed to be at 20% by 2025 and at 26% by 2028.

This order in council was necessary from this particular minister because the targets are legislated. This is why trying to strike it out and make it more generic to environmental plans and targets.... Plans are not good enough. You need the targets. That way they can explain the legislation and the legislative framework that exists, if that's the will of the committee.

Again, there are long documents publicly available online on why this is being done. It's so that they can meet those targets. Right now, large investments are happening on agricultural land. Something like 16,000 hectares of pristine agricultural land are going to be turned over into power plants. That is an issue in rural municipalities. The rural municipalities in Alberta have raised this issue now repeatedly over many months, and they're the ones leading the charge in wanting a review, because they want to make sure that farmers, producers and ranchers are getting fair payments. They also want to make sure that....

They fought for a long time to make sure that oil and gas companies were treating subsurface rights and subsurface access in a right, fair fashion. That's not happening right now because the rules are actually different for these two. Before, you had farmers fighting oil and gas companies over the types of graded roads they'd be able to put on their properties to access a well. Now these types of roads are coming back for clean energy development, and they're having the same fights all over again, because the rules are different, which is why this order in council was deemed necessary by the provincial government.

Again, that's a provincial rule. I think this amendment is infinitely reasonable. As I say, there is an inquiry under way right now by a provincial regulator—public—and it's going to report back by the end of March. That's why I think this amendment is necessary. It will clean up this motion, I think, and vastly improve it as it stands right now.

I have other amendments I'd like to propose afterwards, as well.

• (1140)

[*Translation*]

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

Ms. Monique Pauzé: I must say that Mr. Kmiec was speaking very quickly. That was a big job for the interpreter, but she was very good.

I think Mr. Kmiec raises some interesting points, but there's a fine line. We're trying to strike a balance between respecting a province's jurisdiction and the oil companies' current attitude toward the climate crisis.

I see the value in asking the oil companies to come and testify because they've all quietly backed down on their climate targets. We know that; everyone knows that; there's proof. That's why this motion is important. Is there a way to expand the motion to get CEOs of several oil companies to come and testify? I don't know, but I think it would be worthwhile. Obviously we have to respect the constitutional jurisdictions of Quebec and the provinces, though.

I'm a little confused, Mr. Chair. I'll let a few more people speak, but I'll probably ask for a break in a few minutes.

The Chair: Sure.

If I understand correctly, you're saying that Alberta has regulations and Alberta is responsible for setting targets. However, there's a contradiction because the CEOs are saying they disagree. That's more or less what you're saying. There's a contradiction in what Mr. Kruger is saying. He knows the Province has set legal targets, but

he says he doesn't agree with those targets. Is that the contradiction you're talking about?

Ms. Monique Pauzé: No, that's not the contradiction I meant. I'm trying to strike a balance. We have to respect provincial jurisdiction—Alberta's, in this case—but we also need to meet with the oil companies and tell them they've backed down on their climate targets. Carbon Tracker actually did a study on that.

The Chair: This is a step backwards in terms of provincial regulations.

Ms. Monique Pauzé: I'd like them to come and tell us why they're moving backwards right when Canada's burning and we have to meet the Paris Agreement targets. That's why it would be helpful to hear from them here, at the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development, and at the Standing Committee on Natural Resources. That committee won't focus on the Paris Agreement, but this one will, so it's worth going ahead with this motion, but I want it to be done in a way that respects the jurisdiction of Quebec and the provinces.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Aldag, you have the floor.

[*English*]

Mr. John Aldag: No, I was just trying to get on the list to speak to other amendments, when you get to that.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Okay.

Then I'll give the floor to Mr. Deltell.

• (1145)

Mr. Gérard Deltell: I think Mr. Kmiec put his finger precisely on the problem that affects everyone here.

First, the Standing Committee on Natural Resources is doing exactly the same review, so we're duplicating what's already being done.

Furthermore, we Conservatives are sticklers for jurisdiction. I think the federal government has enough on its plate without barging into areas of provincial responsibility. This particular issue falls squarely under provincial jurisdiction. As a Quebecker, I cannot accept this. I know I have a lot of my Alberta colleagues harbour the same kind of nationalist pride about their province. That's great, because that's what makes our country so wonderful. However, respecting provincial areas of jurisdiction means that attempts to encroach on them is not in the interest of the nation or of Canadians.

Personally, I find it a real shame that the federal government has barged into areas of provincial responsibility many times over the past eight years. For example, the federal government gave itself the power to veto Quebec's hydro projects. Unfortunately, the Bloc Québécois voted in favour of that. The federal government also gave itself the right to put a price on carbon, even in provinces that have their own system, such as Quebec, which has a carbon exchange. Unfortunately, the Bloc Québécois is okay with that. Never mind the Liberals' tax 2.0, a coast-to-coast tax that the Bloc Québécois supports.

We actually need to look to the provinces for inspiration. When provinces take smart, methodical, coordinated action to develop their energy potential, that serves as inspiration, especially for renewable resources and the environment.

We all remember that, in the 1940s and 1950s, the Government of Quebec was very proactive about developing the province's hydro resources. One thing it did was triple the output of the Beauharnois plant. It also built two major generating stations, Bersimis-1 and Bersimis-2, in the middle of the forest in 1953 and 1956. In addition, it assessed the exceptional energy potential of the Outardes and Manicouagan rivers in the 1950s to green-light this green energy source way back in 1958. Last but not least, it got the Carillon plant under way. In the 1940s and 1950s, Quebec made a lot of progress on hydro power and green energy. Quebec is reaping the benefits to this day, and so is Canada. There's a reason Quebec's premier was at the UN, in New York, yesterday and the day before.

Let me point out that other provinces have also been at the forefront when it comes to the environment. Many people seem to forget that.

Does anyone know which province was the first to have a minister of the environment? It was Alberta. In 1971.

Does anyone know which province was the first to force large emitters to pay a carbon price? It was Alberta.

Does anyone know which province was the first to introduce a rigorous environmental assessment process for major projects? It was Alberta.

Does anyone know which province has the largest solar and wind energy developments? It's Alberta.

Mr. Chair, there is no denying—

[*English*]

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Deltell: —we have all those facts.

The Chair: Excuse me, Mr. Deltell, but Mr. van Koeverden has a point of order.

[*English*]

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: Thanks.

While we're all benefiting from my colleague's eloquence, I don't think that it's on the topic of the motion. I'd like to stick to debating the context of the motion so that we can get to it, agree or disagree, and vote.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Mr. Deltell, I think you've strayed a bit from the substance of the motion to trumpet the actions of various provincial governments. I would ask you to stick to the motion.

Do you have anything else to say about the motion?

Mr. Gérard Deltell: I'm very proud to have talked about Canada's great environmental accomplishments.

The Chair: Great, thank you.

Ms. Taylor Roy, you have the floor.

[*English*]

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I agree that we have to respect provincial jurisdictions. However, as with the price on pollution, we saw that the courts said the federal government has jurisdiction. I believe that we are not disrespecting provincial jurisdiction by working with provinces to understand their motivations. We are not overruling them. We are simply asking the minister—and perhaps we should change it to Mr. Nathan Neudorf—to come and explain the rationale for the decision here.

I hope that Madame Pausé, as well, will realize that we're in a climate emergency and that, while we want to respect provincial jurisdiction, greenhouse gases do not actually look at provincial borders. They cross provincial borders. They cross national borders.

There's a clear indication being given by both Suncor and the provincial government that they are making decisions that do not help us address the climate crisis. Although Mr. Kmiec has given a very good explanation, I think it would be more fitting for the minister who put this order in council in place to explain it to us. I don't think that goes against provincial jurisdiction, but the very fact that you mentioned that the order in council had to be put in place because it went against the legislation that was already in place with those targets—

• (1150)

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I don't mean to interrupt, Chair, but this flows from it. The legislation gives you the right to—

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy: I understand, but the need for the order in council shows that we have to look back to the legislation. It's not in accordance with that legislation. We need to understand why they are doing this.

Quite frankly, with all due respect to you, I would rather hear from the minister who made this decision and have him on the record. I think we're doing our job as an environment committee to protect our environment and to make sure that we as a country are working together to fight climate change and to meet our goals.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. van Koeverden.

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

With great respect to my friend and colleague Mr. Kmiec, I agree that we 100% need to respect provincial jurisdiction, but in this case, Premier Smith actually disagrees that this is entirely provincial jurisdiction. She said that the reason they are putting a moratorium on renewable energy projects is that.... I will quote. One of the reasons they've put a moratorium on this is that "the feds are preventing development of backup generation for renewable energy like natural gas", which is not a renewable energy

I think he recognizes that you have your hand up.

The federal government does have a role to play here. If she would like to build natural gas preferentially over wind, solar, hydro and nuclear, that may be her prerogative, but as my colleague just said, emissions do not respect provincial boundaries. In 2005, in Ontario, we had five operating coal and coke power plants. A Liberal government ran on a promise to close those down. In 2006, we had 80 smog days in Ontario, and since then we've had less than four. It's because we don't have coal plants anymore.

You said that Alberta's a leader in renewable energy. They absolutely are—because of their progress, but not because of their position. It's because of their rate of acceleration, but not for their current position. Alberta generates their electricity with 90% of their grid coming from coal and coke currently, so we're getting there with Alberta. They have a goal to be off of coal and coke by next spring. However, currently 90% of that grid is electrified using coal and coke.

That's an ambitious target. I respect that. However, putting a moratorium on new renewable energy projects in the province is going to stifle that goal. I have an interest in the respiratory health of Albertans. I have an interest in reducing the amount of energy grid in Canada that's supplied by coal and coke. It was a huge thing for Ontario to get off. Now Ontario's natural gas is the only non-renewable energy source that provides energy to the grid, and it's only 70%. Quebec is by far the best in the country, with 94% from hydro and only 6% from the rest. Ontario uses mostly nuclear. Ontario, B.C. and Quebec are the leaders in this because of our position, not because of our rate of acceleration—

An hon. member: [*Inaudible—Editor*]

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: Yes.

The Chair: Please, let's have no back-and-forth.

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: I'm done. I reject the premise that this is entirely a provincial jurisdiction, and so does Premier Smith.

The Chair: Okay.

Go ahead, Madame Chatel.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Sophie Chatel: Good morning, colleagues.

I just want to tell you how honoured I am to sit on this committee. Obviously, we're facing a climate crisis that will have an impact on us, on our children and on their children. This crisis is a reality not only in Canada, but around the world. This committee and its discussions are of critical importance. I am therefore very happy to be able to contribute by working together with you all as a team.

Speaking of teams, I think we all agree with Ms. Taylor Roy that the climate crisis and pollution do not recognize borders. That means this isn't just a federal government issue, nor is it just a provincial and municipal government issue, nor is it just a citizen issue; everybody has to be in this together. We have to talk to each other. That means we have to invite the right people to this committee. I look forward to hearing my Conservative colleagues' other amendments.

Thank you, and I'm so pleased to be working with you on this fine committee.

• (1155)

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Chatel. It's a pleasure to have you here this morning.

Mr. Kmiec, you have the floor.

[*English*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Thank you, Chair.

I'm going to disagree, obviously, because one sentence in a statement made by the premier doesn't prove it. The parliamentary secretary is wrong on that. The premier has been very clear that she believes that federal attempts to legislate utilities in our province and our targets are unconstitutional. They are unconstitutional now. They will be unconstitutional in the future.

You can't say you respect provincial jurisdictions and then try to encroach on them through the back door, sideways or by any other means possible.

The Supreme Court—

An hon. member: [*Inaudible—Editor*]

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I'm getting to that now, because I have it right here. I'll even read it into the record, if you interrupt me again. As for the reference regarding the Greenhouse Gas Pollution Pricing Act, it was a 6-3 decision, Chair, as you know. It was a 6-3 decision. Those are the best kinds: 5-4 and 6-3.

You know the best laws are made in dissenting opinions. That's what a lot of lawyers have always told me. I am not burdened with a legal education, thankfully, but that's what they've always told me. In those decisions, the three dissenting judges, with different opinions, explained why. It was because they thought it would be a Trojan Horse and that, in the future, the government would again make the claim that the environment is a shared jurisdiction and, therefore, because it is, you can then get into the business of the provinces through that back door. This is the back door now.

Now utilities will be legislated by the federal government making a claim that, because carbon travels in the atmosphere across provincial jurisdictions.... Of course, I agree with that. That makes absolute, common sense. However, in this one that we're talking about, the original intent of this motion, I think, was to call a specific CEO for his public statements.

I'm all for it. Go and do it. In fact, you should call more of them, which is why the natural resources committee's motion adding the words, I believe, "to call other energy executives" was a smart idea. You should call as many of them as you wish to before this committee. Call all of them if you want to, one after another. That's totally up to you.

However, on this particular point—provincial jurisdiction—again, my amendment is very simple. I'm just trying to make the motion make sense grammatically, I hope. English is a third language, so I'm trying here. I'm trying to make it grammatically correct.

The Minister of Energy and Minerals is wrong. The minister doesn't own any companies. He's not the one responsible for the moratorium that has been called. There are good technical reasons for doing it. If you want, I actually have the technical report for it, which I could read into the record. That will all depend on how the rest of this debate goes before we proceed to a vote.

I will mention that the AUC, the Alberta Utilities Commission, said only 13 projects have been put on hold. That's the totality of projects that are affected by the temporary pause. It's not a stop; it's a pause. There is no disagreement between the OIC—the cabinet order that was issued—and the legislation. The OIC was issued so that the government can fulfill its legislative obligations, which the legislature passed and the legislation forces them to do.

The OIC was made under the Alberta Utilities Commission Act, and it is a direction. It's a directive now to the regulator to proceed with an inquiry so that, especially in these rural communities.... I have the statement from the Rural Municipalities of Alberta on exactly what their issues are with how the regulations are spelled out right now.

That's what I'm trying to address in my amendment. That's what I'm trying to fix here. It's so that we can proceed with something whereby they could come in and explain the environmental targets and their plans. You can't talk about environmental plans without talking about the targets. They go hand in hand together.

The last thing I was going to mention here, because even the AUC and the government recognize in the public statements they made.... I'm going to read this part. It reads:

While Alberta has already reduced electricity emissions by 53% from 2005 to 2021, our province does not have enough non-emitting base load electricity, like hydro or nuclear. Wind and solar are intermittent sources that do not provide consistent power to keep our grid reliable during our cold winter months.

It goes on to mention that Alberta has, based on regulations, a target "to have a net-zero grid by 2035", and then they have legislative targets for carbon neutrality by 2050. Those have not changed. Those are all still there, which is why you should have them come in and talk about the targets and the plan, so that it's all consistent as an entire image and an entire profile that you get. We're far ahead.

Alberta has been very clear. It considers the federal attempts to get involved in our provincial jurisdictions unconstitutional. We should all be trying to defend our provinces.

• (1200)

The Chair: I don't have any more speakers on the amendment.

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: I was on the list for a while. Did I drop off, or did we switch lists because—

The Chair: You're on the list, but I didn't know it was on the amendment of Mr. Kmiec.

You're on the list for when we get back to talking about the motion. Do you want to speak to the amendment?

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: Perhaps I could just add that Mr. Kmiec is joining our committee partway through this illustrious discussion. He's correct that some of the grammar might not make sense. It's probably an artifact of previous amendments. Cleaning that up I think is a separate issue from the question of who we're inviting and why. It's that question that I really think we should be focused in on.

I'm agnostic when it comes to whether we include a long preamble, but I do think it would benefit our invited guests if they knew what topic they were being invited to discuss. Perhaps somewhere in conjunction with their names in the invitation there could be a short summary of the topic.

My preference, perhaps straying a little bit from the specific amendment that we're debating, is that we invite Suncor CEO Rich Kruger regarding his company's turn away from climate ambition to focus on profits; and invite Alberta's Minister of Energy and Minerals, Brian Jean, regarding his government's moratorium on renewable energy projects. I take Mr. Kmiec's....

Now I'm just making all the points I was going to make previously, Mr. Chair, but you're so generous.

The Chair: You're not proposing an amendment right now—are you?

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: Maybe I'm leading up to one.

An hon. member: [*Inaudible—Editor*]

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: No, I'm not. I'm just—

The Chair: I was just thinking that procedurally we should deal with this, and then we can come back to it.

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: Fair enough—as long as I'm on the speaking list.

The Chair: Yes. You're on the speakers list now and later.

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: Wonderful.

An hon. member: Can we vote?

The Chair: I have Madame Pauzé, so we can't vote.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Pauzé: To be clear, I'm going to vote against the amendment because it distorts the meaning of the motion. What we want to know is why these companies are backing down from their objectives, among other things. That's my position on the amendment.

I would also like us to take a break, please.

The Chair: Okay, we'll take a break, and then we'll go to Mr. Deltell.

• (1200) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1215)

[English]

The Chair: Let's resume where we were.

Mr. Deltell, you were on the list.

[Translation]

Mr. Gérard Deltell: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

To show our good faith, I'd like to thank the parliamentary secretary and congratulate him on his earlier remarks about Quebec being a hydro power leader. He's absolutely right, and we're very proud of that tradition. I would also like to remind everyone that that's exactly what I was saying earlier. I was just going over the history of hydro in Quebec, and the parliamentary secretary felt that I was straying from the subject, but, as it turns out, I was endorsing what he was about to say a few moments later.

So, not only are we taking inspiration from each other, but we're also working well together because we all recognize that climate change is a serious issue and that we need concrete, realistic, responsible solutions as soon as possible. We all have different ways to achieve these objectives, but we all want the same thing.

The Chair: I've reached the end of the list of people who wanted to speak to the amendment. I think we're ready to vote. I assume members want a recorded vote.

[English]

Mr. Dan Mazier: This is with the part about testifying on the environmental plans, then. Is that right?

The Chair: We're dealing with Mr. Kmiec's, yes. We're dealing with that one, with this amendment. Then we'll go on, and if you have an amendment to present, you can.

Mr. Dan Mazier: Okay.

The Chair: Go ahead, please, Madam Clerk.

(Amendment negated: nays 6; yeas 4)

The Chair: We'll now go to where we left off on the list.

[Translation]

Ms. Monique Pauzé: Mr. Chair, I have other amendments to propose.

The Chair: Okay, I'll put you on the list.

[English]

Mr. Falk isn't here.

I don't know if Mr. Perkins has something to say. No...? Okay.

Mr. Bachrach, you had asked to be on the list a little while ago.

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: Thanks, Mr. Chair.

It looks like we don't have an amendment on the floor—

Mr. Shafqat Ali (Brampton Centre, Lib.): I'm here.

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: Do you want to vote?

The Chair: No. It's done now. It's done.

Go ahead.

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: As I said previously, I would be happy to amend the motion to take out the preamble detail and to specify that the two invitees would be Suncor CEO Rich Kruger and Alberta Energy and Minerals Minister Brian Jean.

I read through Minister Jean's amended letter. Notwithstanding Mr. Kmiec's remarks, and I understand that there are a number of ministers whose mandates the decision touches, I think his mandate is broad enough to be very relevant to this committee's work and study. We would specifically invite Mr. Kruger regarding his company's turn away from climate ambition to focus on profits and his quite surprising remarks.

The Chair: If you're going to present an amendment—

An hon. member: He can't amend his own.

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: That's why I didn't phrase it as an amendment, but just some—

The Chair: You're giving your opinion. Good. Maybe somebody else will run with that.

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: It's all good. I'm just making clear my thoughts and trying to build consensus in as conciliatory a way as I can, sitting here at the end of the table with both of these wonderful parties on either side.

• (1220)

The Chair: I appreciate it. That's understood.

Mr. Mazier, it's your turn.

[Translation]

Ms. Monique Pauzé: I also have a proposal.

The Chair: Your name is on the list, Ms. Pauzé. You'll have the floor after Mr. Mazier and Mr. Kmiec.

Mr. Mazier, you have the floor.

[English]

Mr. Dan Mazier: This is going to be real easy, actually. We've been talking about this quite a bit. Replace the words “the Minister of Energy and Minerals, the honourable Brian Jean” with “a representative of the Government of Alberta”.

The Chair: But we need to know... There are two things here. One is that, as we talked about before, the Minister of Energy and Minerals doesn't really fit there, because then it continues with, “to explain why their companies are”. It would have to go at the end somehow.

Mr. Dan Mazier: The whole thought process behind it was to let the Government of Alberta decide who they wanted to send. Leave it wide open and let them decide who they want to send to defend their...whoever it can be.

The Chair: You want to replace “and the Minister of Energy and Minerals, the honourable Brian Jean” with “invite Suncor CEO”.

Mr. Dan Mazier: Replace it with “a representative of the Government of Alberta”.

The Chair: Okay. That's the amendment.

Is that clear enough? Debate the amendment now.

Go ahead, Mr. Kmiec.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Very briefly, speaking of mandate letters, I have the mandate letters right here. This is why it should be a representative of the Government of Alberta. It's because you could then decide which elected representative should be brought.

However, I will note that in the mandate letter for Nathan Neudorf, the Minister of Affordability and Utilities—for whom a lot of the content of this was generated—it says:

Pushing back against any federal regulation requiring a net-zero power grid by 2035, and developing and implementing a comprehensive plan to achieve a carbon-neutral power grid by 2050 that is reliable, affordable, and utilizes small modular reactors, carbon capture, utilization and storage, and other emission-reduction technologies.

I will continue to note, because it's very material to this amendment and to the spirit of the motion, that it reads:

Reviewing the operations, policies, and mission of your agencies, including the Alberta Utilities Commission and the Alberta Electric System Operator, and recommending ways to improve their operations and align its mission with the government's goal of a carbon-neutral, reliable, and affordable power grid by 2050.

There are multiple extra points at the back end, and that's why I think you should make it broader. It's so the Alberta government can pick the representative they want to send, because maybe they will send somebody different from the cabinet to speak—

The Chair: I have a point to make. I'm sorry to interrupt you, Mr. Kmiec.

I'm told we cannot take out Mr. Brian Jean because there was an amendment that was voted on by the committee to add him. We can't go back on that.

The way I see it, this amendment is not receivable.

We're going to—

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I'm sorry, Chair. I have a point of order.

I started debate on the motion. My assumption was that you had already determined that it was in order before you ruled it out of order, so how does that work?

• (1225)

The Chair: That's a good question. I'll ask the clerk.

We're going to get back to you. I don't think it changes anything though. I don't think it changes the fact that it's not receivable, because it's not. However, we will get back to you.

• (1225)

_____ (Pause) _____

• (1225)

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: Mr. Chair, for some clarity, are we waiting on some advice on the ruling on inadmissibility?

The Chair: Yes.

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: Mr. Chair, if I could beg a favour of my colleagues, the next time we print off anything for distribution, would the clerk be able to send the full text of the motion? I have lost track of it and I think it would be helpful on one piece of paper. It's changed so many times and I—

The Chair: We have the basic motion.

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: Not everyone does.

The Chair: It's not that complicated.

You know, if somebody can submit the whole text, and maybe put the portion they're amending in red—

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: That's just if we're printing it off again—not if we're not. There's a lot of empty space on these pages.

The Chair: Mr. Kmiec, no, it's not receivable, notwithstanding the fact that I gave you the floor. It's not receivable, but if we go through the list that existed before you proposed the amendment, it so happens that you're on the list.

You could propose something leaving Brian Jean and adding other... I don't know. It's up to you.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Chair, I'll make it simple. I'll pass my time to the next member on the speaking list.

The Chair: Okay.

We will go to Madame Pauzé.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Pauzé: I wanted to move that we strike the reference to the minister, but, as I understand it, that is not a receivable amendment.

As such, I have nothing further to propose.

The Chair: If I'm not mistaken, we're back to the wording we had at the end of our meeting on Tuesday.

I don't see any other speakers.

That said, we do have a problem because we can't ask the minister to explain why his company is dropping its targets. I don't know if someone can move that we move that part about the minister.

Ms. Monique Pauzé: Mr. Chair, procedure has never been my strong suit, but I believe that, with unanimous consent, we can go back to the vote on the amendment that mentioned the Minister of Energy and Minerals. The idea is that, by accepting Mr. Mazier's proposal, we would have consensus on this motion, and that's what's important to me.

Might there be unanimous consent to redo that vote?

The Chair: We'll check, but I don't think we can do that.

Ms. Monique Pauzé: Okay.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: As long as there's unanimous consent, we can do anything.

The Chair: Yes. We're in the process of checking that.

Mr. Bachrach, the floor is yours.

[*English*]

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

There are two things. I'll just—

The Chair: I'm sorry.

Just to answer the question, we can, by unanimous consent, go back on the amendment that added Mr. Brian Jean. We can if we want.

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: Of course we can, but I don't believe we'll achieve unanimous consent, based on my understanding of the room. I was just going to propose a path forward.

First of all, I do think that an amendment to clean up the grammar, so that we're not implying that the minister has a company, is well in order. It could probably be done by unanimous consent, since we want them to have a nice, clear invitation that makes it clear why we want them to appear before the committee.

Secondly, because there are people at the table who would like to take this motion in different directions, one way to wipe the slate clean, potentially, is to vote on the motion, see where it goes, and, if it fails, propose a different motion—or we can vote on the motion, pass the motion and then propose a second motion.

• (1230)

The Chair: You're getting too far ahead of me.

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: These are the options we have. I'm just trying to help you out, Chair.

The Chair: No, I agree, and I appreciate that. It's very helpful, actually.

There's a grammatical problem here. Let's forget about who we're inviting, who thinks we should invite them or not, or who thinks we shouldn't. We cannot put “and the Minister of Energy and Minerals, the honourable Brian Jean, to explain why their companies are”. We need to put that at the end. Whether you want to invite him or not is not the point.

It should read something like this: “invite Suncor CEO Rich Kruger to explain why his company is abandoning its climate targets that had been previously laid out in the face of a climate emergency; and invite as well the Minister of Energy and Minerals, the honourable Brian Jean”. We just want to clean up the grammar.

I just need unanimous consent to clean up the grammar. If you want to take out Brian Jean, that's a whole other issue.

An hon. member: That's next.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Unfortunately, as much as I'd like to help you, I'm the only one from Alberta here. I would like to help you with

your grammar—it would lend me no amount of joy to do that—but Nathan Neudorf is the correct minister. I hope people agree that—

The Chair: That's not what we're talking about.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I know, but I'm holding it up because of that.

The Chair: You can propose that later. This is not about who the right minister is. We're just cleaning up the grammar.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Otherwise, we'll all be forced to vote on a motion that's grammatically incorrect.

The Chair: We're not voting. I'm asking for unanimous consent.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: I know. That's what I mean.

The Chair: Yes, but then you can say, “Do you know what? It's not the right guy”, and then you propose this other fellow. You can do that.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Sure.

The Chair: We all agree to correct the grammar.

I have no speakers right now, but I have a feeling that Mr. Kmiec probably wants to propose an amendment.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Yes, Chair, and again it's going to be on the floor. I'm not going to use the rest of my papers here. It should be Minister Nathan Neudorf. This is the minister who was responsible for bringing it to cabinet. It is his responsibility. He is the minister. He was also deputy premier before, so he bears responsibility for this type of decision-making.

If you have to call a minister to explain the decision-making, he should be the one, and not a minister who is not wholly responsible for any of these regulators.

The Chair: You'd like to propose an amendment to change the words “the Minister of Energy and Minerals, the honourable Brian Jean”. You want to replace them with...?

Mr. Tom Kmiec: It would be “the Honourable Nathan Neudorf, Minister of Affordability and Utilities”.

The Chair: Okay. That's pretty clear.

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: Mr. Chair, he's trying to make the amendment.... You just ruled that it was inadmissible. Perhaps we can ask the clerk, but we're going around in circles here a little bit.

The Chair: We want to add—

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: Can I offer a potential solution, which is that Mr. Kmiec would add the minister that he's referencing to the list?

The Chair: Yes. You can't take out Mr. Jean, but you can add the other minister.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Can we say “or”, then, or does it have to say “and”, and then have two ministers?

The Chair: You could, I think. It's a different thing. You could say “or”.

Mr. Tom Kmiec: Put “or”, then.

The Chair: Okay. There we go.

Could you repeat the name of the minister?

An hon. member: It's Nathan Neudorf.

The Chair: It's Nathan Neudorf, the Minister of...?

Mr. Tom Kmiec: It's the Minister of Affordability and Utilities.

The Chair: We're going to vote on this amendment.

Mr. Kmiec is saying we should invite one or the other. Who decides, then, which one to invite? I guess it's at the discretion of the chair.

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: Speaking to the amendment, if I may, it seems unclear, first of all, who is making the decision as to which of the two individuals comes to the committee, whether it's the chair of the committee in the invitation or whether it's the Government of Alberta when they get the invitation and it says either this minister or that minister.

I think "or" just confuses matters, and I would much prefer... I think the compromise here is to have the word "and". We invite both of the ministers and then we can pose questions to both of them.

The Chair: You're amending Mr. Kmiec's amendment, changing "or" to "and".

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: That's correct.

The Chair: Let's vote on that.

You've been very helpful, Mr. Bachrach, I must say.

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: I'm trying, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Do we have unanimous consent?

(Subamendment agreed to)

The Chair: Good. We are going to change "or" to "and".

Now we're going to vote on Mr. Kmiec's amendment as amended.

(Amendment as amended agreed to)

The Chair: You see? We're good. This is great.

● (1235)

[Translation]

Ms. Monique Pauzé: Are we also going to pass the motion unanimously now?

The Chair: The amendment did pass unanimously.

Now we'll go to the motion.

[English]

It looks like we probably have unanimous consent to adopt the motion as amended.

An hon. member: No.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

An hon. member: Don't push your luck, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: We'll have a recorded vote.

(Motion as amended agreed to: yeas 7; nays: 4 [See Minutes of Proceedings])

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Perkins.

Mr. Rick Perkins (South Shore—St. Margarets, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I believe I've been subbed in and I appreciate listening to this important discussion that we've had today.

With that, I'd like to move another motion, if I could:

That the committee express its disappointment with the regulatory environment created by this government that has led to tidal power projects pulling out of Canada and acknowledges that one of the primary factors contributing to the departure of these capital investments has been recent changes that have created an intricate regulatory landscape.

I believe the clerk has a copy of the motion, and the motion is being distributed. Thank you.

For those who are not aware, obviously for me as the member of Parliament for South Shore—St. Margarets in Nova Scotia, the issue is the attempt to create renewable energy opportunities in Atlantic Canada so that we can meet the net-zero target and get off of coal by 2030, as the government has mandated. Nova Scotia is the province that generates the second-largest amount of electricity from coal. The coal comes from Colombia.

There have been a lot of attempts to deal with the power of the Bay of Fundy. If you're not familiar with the Bay of Fundy, it has the largest tides in the world, with a range of 52 feet. It rises and drops every day. The flow of the water through the Bay of Fundy is equivalent to the flow of all rivers in the world. In one day, it goes in and out of the Bay of Fundy. That being the case, there have been many projects trying to harness the tidal energy of the Bay of Fundy. Most of them have involved putting turbines on the ocean floor. Most of those did not succeed.

However, there was a recent experiment on tidal energy that had a great deal of success, but it was an experiment and it had a temporary permit. It was by a company called Sustainable Marine Energy Canada. It involved a floating turbine that was on top of the water. It's the first project that actually didn't get destroyed by the tide. Within 24 to 48 hours the power of the Bay of Fundy tide had destroyed all those turbines that were put on the ocean floor. The actual turbines were destroyed by the power of that tide, which you can actually surf on when it comes in.

A new approach was to put it on top of the water, and that succeeded. In fact, it didn't get destroyed. Not only did it not get destroyed, but it actually produced energy into the Nova Scotia power grid directly and is the first tidal project in Canada that has actually produced revenue for the company from the generation of that tidal power.

As some of you may be aware, though, when the project moved to the next stage, the process was stopped. It was stopped by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, which has a great deal of power, and not only land-based energy projects to stop pipelines because of fish in a stream or some sort of thing. This has happened many times. They actually have a lot of power. Of course everything in the ocean is a federal responsibility and, therefore, DFO has the ability and responsibility to manage the oceans. In this case, after five years of a project and \$60 million of capital invested, when the project was moving to the next step of the first successful tidal power project, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans under this Liberal government stopped it.

Now that turbine has been removed from the water and actually disassembled, and the company is leaving. That doesn't mean they're not going to try to continue to challenge these things, but to understand what's being missed here and why I think this committee needs to express its disappointment on the issue, I will say that it is estimated that by 2040, the tidal energy industry in Nova Scotia could generate \$1.7 billion for Nova Scotia's GDP. It could create 22,000 full-time jobs and generate as much as \$815 million in labour income.

More important than that, though, because of the obvious predictability of these tides, because of the moon and the rise of the sea, this zero-emission energy, which has had a successful target... Three hundred megawatts of generation, which isn't a lot relative to power, could actually power one-quarter of Nova Scotia's homes through tidal power.

Maybe it doesn't seem like a lot, but that's estimated to be just a fraction of the potential tidal energy power—clean renewable energy—of the Bay of Fundy that we all see. It is estimated that 2,500 megawatts could be generated, which means Nova Scotia could become an exporter of clean renewable energy.

• (1240)

However, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, under the Liberal government, decided that this wasn't worth pursuing and that the first successful project in the history of harnessing tidal power in the Bay of Fundy should be stopped.

As a Nova Scotian and as somebody who cares about getting our province off coal.... Our province is the second-largest generator of electricity from coal, Alberta being the first, and we've already heard from my colleague Mr. Kmiec that most of that generation in Alberta will be ending soon. That would leave Nova Scotia as the largest generator of electricity from coal. More than 50% of our electricity is generated from coal, and it's not the good old Cape Breton coal that we all used to get a lot of jobs out of in Nova Scotia. It's coal that is open-pit mined in Colombia and shipped to Nova Scotia to those coal-powered generating plants.

Our premier, Tim Houston, has been very vocal about, what I'd call, his incredulity as to why this determination was made. In fact, DFO never even told the public or the company why they refused to allow this project to go forward and just used its excessive power under the Fisheries and Oceans Act. The CEO of this company said that the department wouldn't show Sustainable Marine the evidence behind the claims that they were going to harm fish in some way.

However, they did approve every other project that went to the ocean floor, which apparently didn't harm fish. I can tell you, as a former fisheries critic for my party and as somebody who has 7,000 commercial fishermen in my riding, there's a lot of important seafood on the ocean floor—lobsters, crab and all of those things, so it's not just fish that swim—or, as we call them, pelagic fish, but it's crustaceans that move on the floor.

Therefore, if turbines were to harm the fishery, they would have harmed the fishery in the Bay of Fundy, which is quite lucrative in terms of lobster. For some reason, though, the arbitrariness of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans kicked in. The company has given enormous amounts of information on this.

Premier Tim Houston, at the time of the announcement in the spring, said, "Shame on the federal government." He posted it in a video. It was important that he speak publicly on it. This is a quote from the premier:

"You likely know from the media that the federal government is excited about reaching into your pocket and taking your money in the name of a carbon tax," he continues, "...yet when faced with real opportunities, to make meaningful positive change...like the one Sustainable Marine is creating, it's shut down."

Now, I don't know what the ultimate objective of the government is in shutting down an important power project like this. I don't know how the federal government wants Nova Scotia to get off of coal if we can't build a natural gas pipeline. In Bill C-69 they made sure we could not get one to come to Nova Scotia with good ethical Albertan natural gas to replace coal, which would reduce our carbon emissions in Nova Scotia by half. If we can't harness the power of the tides in Nova Scotia, one of the greatest untapped energy sources in the world....

Also, it's really quite ironic, given that the government has introduced Bill C-49, which started second reading this week in the House, and which gives a new mandate to the Nova Scotia Offshore Petroleum Board as well as the Newfoundland and Labrador Offshore Petroleum Board and sets in C-69-type processes for the development of offshore oil and gas in Atlantic Canada. That means none will happen, because that's the intent of Bill C-69.

Also, it imposes that same rigorous, lengthy, excessive and bureaucratic process on wind energy in the ocean. Obviously DFO will use its ability, because under Bill C-49 DFO has the ability to say no. If they think somewhere in the future, down the way, 50 years from now, they might put a marine protected area, perhaps maybe sort of in that area that you're thinking of putting wind power in, they're not going to let you do it. They have a veto power to do that. That's the kind of excessive overreach on power that the government is doing.

• (1245)

On top of that, there's the inconsistency of the government in putting its message forward saying it believes we should have clean renewable energy, yet when we have the opportunity to do it, it either uses the power of DFO to kill the project or it uses the power of imposing C-69-type bureaucratic processes on the future approval of wind and tidal power projects in Atlantic Canada.

What are we supposed to do but continue to import coal if this government says one thing and does another? It says it wants us on renewable resources, but it puts barriers in the way of actually producing and creating those renewable resources—clean zero-emission energy projects that are right here on the coast of my province, Nova Scotia.

It's incredibly disappointing, and I would ask that this committee seriously consider this motion and the trail of contradictory decisions by this government of saying one thing and doing another when it comes to Atlantic Canada and renewable resources.

I know some of my colleagues have a few things they would like to add as well, because my colleagues—on this side anyway—have shown a great deal of interest in all of the issues around Nova Scotia, certainly the ones I'm passionate about, including all of the issues around the ocean and the issues around the fishery.

It's mind-boggling that DFO would stop such a renewable resource project.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: I have Mr. van Koeverden and then Mr. Bachrach.

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: I'd just like to clarify the process. We have this notice of motion, and I understand that Mr. Perkins has now tabled it with the committee and it's on notice.

The Chair: It was on notice.

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: It was on notice before, so we have had the 48 hours and we can now debate it.

The Chair: We actually don't need it because we're technically doing future business.

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: Are we in committee business right now?

The Chair: When we discussed your motion, it was all under committee business.

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: Okay. I was just clarifying where we were in terms of—

The Chair: Technically we can debate it now, yes.

Mr. van Koeverden, go ahead

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Pauzé: A point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Yes, you have the floor.

Ms. Monique Pauzé: This is not the only motion we've received since Tuesday, so here's what I'm wondering: Is it the committee's job to send congratulations for things that are going well and censure for things that aren't? If so, that would be never-ending.

• (1250)

The Chair: If I understand correctly, we can do what we want.

Ms. Monique Pauzé: Really? Okay.

[*English*]

The Chair: Just a second. I have Mr. van Koeverden and...

It's Mr. Mazier and Mr. Kram. I'm sorry about that. I was looking at the wrong list.

Mr. Dan Mazier: I think I'll just reiterate. I'll read the motion again just so we're all clear on it.

That the committee express its disappointment with the regulatory environment created by this government that has led to tidal power projects pulling out of Canada and acknowledges that one of the primary factors contributing to the departure of these capital investments has been recent changes that have created an intricate regulatory landscape.

I would like to make an amendment to add to the end of the motion "and that the committee report to the House".

The Chair: Okay. Do we understand that's the amendment—"and that the committee report to the House?" I don't think we need that in writing.

I have Mr. Kram, and I have Mr. van Koeverden.

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: We're now on the amendment.

The Chair: Yes, right.

Are you speaking to the amendment, Mr. Perkins?

Does anyone else want to speak to the amendment? It's pretty straightforward.

Go ahead.

Mr. Rick Perkins: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I thank Mr. Mazier for the amendment. I think it's a great idea not just to express the disappointment of the committee amongst ourselves but to actually do it in a way that reports it to the House. I think it's important that all 338 members of Parliament understand the disappointment of the environment committee at the cancellation of these tidal projects in the Bay of Fundy.

I don't think there is perhaps as great an awareness as there might be among some of us in Nova Scotia about the importance of these projects and what has happened in recent months with regard to the regulatory changes and interventions by the Department of Fisheries and Oceans into tidal power projects. I think it would be helpful, because obviously tabling a motion in the House—as much as I'm sure there are many people online right now, through ParlVu, watching the great work of this committee—might provide for a slightly larger audience, as happens when things get tabled and reported back to the House, than we get here. I would appreciate the consideration by all the members here of taking that extra step in supporting this motion to also make sure that all of our colleagues and the general public in Canada are aware of the disappointment that we've had in the government's actual cancellation of renewable energy projects, especially the first energy project to ever produce electricity to power homes and generate revenue from Nova Scotia Power back to that private sector company.

Isn't that what we want?

We want to be able to harness the power not only of the tides but also of private sector capital to do these kinds of works, rather than just having them all funded by the taxpayer. Private sector capital actually found a way to successfully harness the power of the Bay of Fundy through a phenomenal new invention and a phenomenal new creation. Unfortunately, we're losing that great technology with the decision. I think the broader House needs to understand that in the context of the importance of this and in the context of trying to get to net zero in our grid in Nova Scotia. The government doesn't seem to want to help. They are putting road blocks in the way of Nova Scotia getting to it. When Tim Houston, the premier, legitimately says, "How come you're coming into Nova Scotia on July 1 and picking the pockets of our taxpayers on the carbon tax?" and will not actually—

The Chair: Excuse me. We have a point of order, Mr. Perkins.

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: If the member is interested in repeating himself for the rest of the meeting that's his prerogative. However, if there is an opportunity for other members to engage, I find it irrelevant for him to continually repeat himself.

The Chair: Okay.

We have Mr. Mazier.

On the amendment, I have only Mr. Mazier so far.

Mr. Mazier, go ahead.

• (1255)

Mr. Dan Mazier: Thank you, Chair.

I want to follow up on what my colleague Mr. Perkins was saying about the importance of reporting back to the House.

Really, if you look at the notice of motion again, it's really about how terrible the atmosphere to create these kinds of projects in Canada is now. This government has successfully scared away billions and billions and billions of dollars of capital and scared away not only the capital but also the innovation. It's taken away a whole bunch of innovation and innovative people who really wanted to make a change. This government keeps on penalizing. Every time a province wants to stand up and say, "Here, I want to try this. I want to do this," Bill C-69 zips in there and just absolutely creams them.

I know. I experienced this back in Manitoba. Back in 2016, when the government first brought in Bill C-69, I believe, and this whole carbon tax regime, we thought it was a really good idea to engage. I was a farmer at the time. I thought we would try to elongate with it.

I think it's really important that we get this motion passed and get on with the vote.

Thank you.

The Chair: Here's what I propose.

Wait—I have Mr. Deltell.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Gérard Deltell: I call the question, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Actually, that's what I was going to suggest.

[*English*]

An hon. member: I'm still on the list to talk about this.

The Chair: That was for the main motion, but we're on the amendment now. We're on the amendment to report back to the House. You're on the list for the main motion. So are Madam Pausé, Mr. Bachrach, Mr. van Koeverden and Mr. Kram.

Right now we're just voting on whether we should report to the House if ever we adopt this motion.

If we can go to a vote, then, because it's one o'clock, I would suggest that we continue this discussion on Tuesday.

(Amendment negated: nays 7; yeas 4)

The Chair: We'll continue the debate on the main motion on Tuesday. I assume we're okay with adjourning.

An hon. member: Have we adjourned?

The Chair: No, we haven't adjourned. I asked if there was unanimous consent, but there isn't.

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: I'd like to add my two cents to the main motion before we adjourn.

The Chair: You may, yes. We will return to it on Tuesday, but—

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy: I had a point of order.

The Chair: What's the point of order?

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy: My point of order was to clarify my name, because I think there are new members, and people on this committee seem to have had trouble with my name in the past. My name is actually Ms. Taylor Roy. My last name is "Taylor Roy", and I use "Ms.", not "Mrs."

Thank you.

The Chair: That's noted.

Mr. Dan Mazier: I'm next to speak on the motion, so if Mr.—

The Chair: Yes, that's true. I was just asking.... Can we make this simple by saying we're just going to...?

An hon. member: [*Inaudible—Editor*]

The Chair: Do you want to be on the list? You're on the list for Tuesday. You're right after Mr. Kram.

We'll pick up where we left off and get on with our daily parliamentary business.

Thank you very much, colleagues. 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>