



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 103

PUBLIC PART ONLY - PARTIE PUBLIQUE SEULEMENT

Thursday, April 11, 2024

Chair: Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia



Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

Thursday, April 11, 2024

• (1600)

[Translation]

The Chair (Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.)): We are continuing our study of the motion moved by Ms. Collins.

Ms. Collins, you have the floor.

[English]

Ms. Laurel Collins (Victoria, NDP): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Today, I'm moving a motion that would call on the CEOs of the biggest oil companies in Canada to come to committee to talk about the fact that they are raking in record profits and that their emissions are going up and Canadians are being gouged at the pumps.

We need to hold these wealthy CEOs accountable. It is not fair that everyday Canadians are paying the price of the climate crisis. We've seen devastating wildfires, extreme flooding and the heat domes that killed hundreds of people in British Columbia, mainly low-income seniors, people living in low-income housing and people with disabilities.

People are paying the cost of the climate crisis, but these companies are profiting off of it. We need to hold these companies accountable, and asking nicely is not working. Companies, including the ones that are part of the Pathways Alliance, have made commitments but then failed or pulled back on those commitments publicly.

Rich Kruger, who is named in the motion, recently said that he isn't going to prioritize reducing emissions. He's prioritizing making more profit. This is at a time when Suncor is already making record-breaking profits.

While Canadians are struggling to make ends meet, these companies are acting in ways that are completely unfair. The government has a responsibility to hold them accountable and to have the backs of Canadians rather than wealthy CEOs.

I'm going to put it to the committee. I know there are a number of friendly amendments, which I welcome. I hope that everyone can support bringing these CEOs to committee to answer questions.

The Chair: Thank you.

I have Mr. Leslie.

Mr. Branden Leslie (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

If we have time at the end of the debate on this motion, I just want to indicate that I have another motion to move.

The Chair: Okay, sure.

Madam Pauzé.

[Translation]

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): I think it's a friendly amendment.

• (1605)

The Chair: Okay.

Ms. Monique Pauzé: At point (b), which begins with “Canadians across the country are facing a cost-of-living crisis”, I propose replacing the words “forcing many families to choose between putting food on the table and keeping their house warm” with the words “and are having difficulty paying for their basic needs”.

I think Canadians will decide to go to one grocery store rather than another. They make their own choices. That includes the idea that they're having trouble paying for basic needs.

The Chair: So you want to strike out everything after the comma and remove the rest of the sentence.

Is that correct?

Ms. Monique Pauzé: Yes, I want to remove “forcing many families to choose between putting food on the table and keeping their house warm”.

The Chair: Okay.

Then you want to add “and are having difficulty”—

Ms. Monique Pauzé: “and are having difficulty paying for their basic needs”.

The Chair: “paying for their basic needs”.

Okay.

Ms. Monique Pauzé: I believe the clerk has received the text of the amendment.

The Chair: So you sent it in writing. Perfect.

Ms. Collins, you have the floor.

[English]

Ms. Laurel Collins: This change captures the same meaning to me and is just different wording. I'm hoping that we could pass this by unanimous consent.

[Translation]

The Chair: Is there unanimous consent to adopt Ms. Pauzé's friendly amendment to Ms. Collins' motion?

I see that everyone is in agreement.

Mr. van Koeverden.

[English]

Mr. Adam van Koeverden (Milton, Lib.): I have a simple addition as an amendment. It's to add Shell Canada president Susannah Pierce.

It would read, "Susannah Pierce, Shell Canada president and country chair and vice president of emerging energy solutions" in the list of people who will—

The Chair: Will we add her after Enbridge?

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: She would be added to the list. Typically they're done alphabetically.

The Chair: Could you read that again?

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: It would read, "Susannah Pierce, Shell Canada president and country chair and vice president of emerging energy solutions".

The Chair: We're adding Shell.

Ms. Laurel Collins: Again, I think this is in the spirit of the motion, and I welcome this amendment. I'm hoping we can pass it by unanimous consent.

The Chair: Is everyone good with this amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: I assume we agree with the motion unanimously.

An hon. member: No.

The Chair: Do you want to debate it or can we go to the vote?

An hon. member: Can we go to the vote?

The Chair: We'll go to the vote.

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

The Chair: Mr. Leslie.

Mr. Branden Leslie: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Given that we're in committee business, it seems an appropriate time to—

The Chair: We're not in camera. I just wanted to remind everyone.

Mr. Branden Leslie: We are in committee business though, and I'm able to move—

The Chair: Yes, you're good, but we're not in camera.

Mr. Branden Leslie: That's okay.

Mr. Chair, I would like to move the following motion:

Given that:

- a. On Thursday, November 9, 2023, Derek Hermanutz, Director General, Economic Analysis Directorate, for Environment and Climate Change

Canada, stated at committee: "I think we're probably in a world where we could say with some rough analysis that up to one-third, potentially, of the emission reductions that we're projecting to 2030 would come from carbon pricing";

b. On Monday, April 8, 2024, Environment and Climate Change Canada provided the committee with an 18-page document titled "Environment Canada's Provincial CGE (ECPRO) Model", in response to a document production order; and

c) On Tuesday, April 9, 2024, the committee ordered "the production of the model and data from Environment and Climate Change Canada that demonstrate that carbon pollution pricing will contribute as much as one-third of Canada's emission reductions including all (i) parameters, (ii) assumptions, and (iii) variables, (iv) economic modelling, (v) and emissions reduction modelling";

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(1)(a) the Committee requests Environment Minister Steven Guilbeault and officials from Environment and Climate Change Canada to testify on the Liberal government's carbon pricing emissions model(s) analyses, and economic modelling for no less than two hours by Friday, May 24, 2024.

I assume the minister would actually be quite happy to come before this committee to further explain by that period in time. Before May 24 we will have received—

• (1610)

The Chair: Your motion says May 2.

Oh, sorry. Go ahead.

Mr. Branden Leslie: Mr. Chair, again, I feel that the minister will have plenty of time. The committee will be fully briefed on the full modelling and analyses, which was requested and approved by this committee at Tuesday's meeting. I don't know whether or not, by that period, there will be agreement from the Prime Minister to hold a meeting with all of the premiers regarding their views on the carbon taxes, as agreed to by the House of Commons just last night. Perhaps we could even have it on the same day and have a fulsome understanding from the minister and departmental officials of exactly what the modelling indicates. We have seen contrary numbers come recently from independent organizations saying it could be, likely, under 10% of emissions reductions that could be stemming from the carbon tax. We have a lot of potentials and maybes coming from the department of it being one-third.

Again, to go back to the original information that was provided by ECCC—a document that was not written by ECCC and is not supposed to speak on behalf of Environment and Climate Change Canada or the minister about the modelling and the economic and emissions assumptions that have been used—I assume that members of all parties are willing to have the minister here. I know he's supposed to be coming on the main estimates. Obviously, that is on a much broader topic, but I think it's important to have the minister and his supporting officials here to speak directly to the data we will have received by then; to show us the numbers and economic considerations that have been taken by the department in terms of what this tax could be doing and is doing to Canadian businesses, families and farmers; and to put that against what emissions reductions we have seen over recent years and what is anticipated to be seen.

Ultimately, let Canadians decide transparently whether or not they think that paying the carbon tax on everything they buy in their day-to-day life is ultimately worth it and that the emissions that are supposed to be coming down are coming down. I encourage all my colleagues to quickly pass this motion and have the minister rightfully join this committee to help us understand where the 30% came from.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. van Koeverden.

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

Thanks to my colleague for bringing up this important issue.

I actually welcome an opportunity to hear from more experts. Our minister has worked in environmental activism, but I don't believe he's ever claimed to be a paleoclimatologist or an economist. However, there is a letter signed by over 200 Canadian economists indicating that our carbon pricing system is effective. It's effective for two reasons: one, because it drives down emissions, and two, because it supports affordability with the Canada carbon rebate, so I actually support a much broader look at this. To date I haven't heard one Canadian economist suggest that carbon pricing doesn't work. It's a very well-proven market-based instrument.

Stephen Harper supported a \$65 price on pollution when he was the prime minister. Preston Manning suggested that pricing pollution is the best way to drive down emissions. Only in Canada do Conservatives oppose pricing pollution, and it's because, quite frankly, as was just demonstrated with your—

Mr. Chair, I'm sorry, but I can't hear.

If the member would like to get on the list—

The Chair: Let's listen to Mr. van Koeverden.

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: Thanks.

It would be great if the Conservatives could provide a witness, perhaps, who would like to come to the committee and testify that carbon pricing is not an effective way to drive down emissions. It would be great to hear if there were any sort of economic rationale to their slogans and their policy recommendations, which are pretty much just three-word slogans.

It also bears consideration that, just five minutes ago, the Conservatives voted down a motion to have oil executives come here and talk about their profit margins. It also bears recognizing that, on the day when they held rallies across this country to axe the tax on April 1, the Premier of Alberta increased the price of gas by more than the price on pollution did, without a rebate.

It also bears recognizing that, in Saskatchewan, Premier Moe has been asked repeatedly to reconsider his exorbitant non-rebatable provincial excise tax on gasoline. He's one of the only premiers to have not reduced it. When Premier Smith did reduce it, she brought it back up by four cents in April. The premiers are talking out of both sides of their mouth saying that the rebatable price on pollution should be axed but the non-rebatable tax they collect should not be.

It's clear to me whom the Conservatives are working for. It's big oil and gas and Conservative premiers, but not Canadians.

I welcome a broader look into this with some economists who study this, some experts that Conservative leader Pierre Poilievre called "so-called experts". They're not so-called experts. They're not Liberal experts. They're university professors, economists, paleoclimatologists and experts who study this and who know that carbon pricing works. They know how to do math—and basic math at that—and they know the difference between an economic impact and a fiscal impact, which is a challenging one for my colleagues opposite.

We've been talking about fresh water a lot, which is an important topic very close to my heart, but I entertain the opportunity to have a broader look at carbon pricing in Canada since it's something that my Conservative colleagues are completely obsessed with.

• (1615)

The Chair: Are you proposing an amendment?

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: It's debate.

The Chair: We're debating the motion.

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: Exactly. I want to hear from my other colleagues first.

The Chair: Okay. We'll go now to Mr. Longfield.

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Thanks, Mr. Chair.

I'm glad to see that we're discussing this. I was really glad, first of all, that we did receive the modelling information that was requested by the Conservatives. When I read it, I saw the formulas being used in the modelling, and I had some flashbacks of studying economics and thinking that I'm glad I don't have to do that when I'm 67 years old.

When Ms. Collins asked us to consider getting not only modelling but also more information about this, I thought that was a really good motion that we passed on her behalf, so we are getting information that we can study. I'd love to hear from more experts. I think even Boris Johnson, in Canada today, said he wished the Conservatives in Canada would take climate change seriously.

I think we could get some real study on this. I would say that we could study this for a minimum of three meetings as an amendment to the motion.

The Chair: Are you proposing an amendment?

Mr. Lloyd Longfield: That includes the invitation to the minister, but I think I'd like to propose an amendment that we do a study on the information we received for three meetings and report the results to the House.

The Chair: Where would this go? Would this be an added paragraph at the end?

Mr. Lloyd Longfield: Yes.

The Chair: Can you give us some wording?

Mr. Lloyd Longfield: We would study the information we receive for a minimum of three meetings, inviting witnesses.

The Chair: It would be, "the committee requests Environment Minister Steven Guilbeault and officials to testify on the Liberal government's".

What if we put a semicolon after May 24?

Ms. Laurel Collins: Chair, on the amendment—

Mr. Dan Mazier: Now, you're [*Inaudible—Editor*].

The Chair: I'm not, but Mr. Longfield...

I have you on the list, Ms. Collins. You're next.

Ms. Laurel Collins: Is it for the amendment or the main motion? I'd like to be on the list for the amendment.

The Chair: It's for the main motion.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Pauzé, was your hand up?

Ms. Monique Pauzé: Yes, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Is it on the motion or the amendment?

Ms. Monique Pauzé: It's on the amendment.

The Chair: I see Mr. Leslie has his hand up as well. Is this on the amendment, Mr. Leslie?

[*English*]

Mr. Branden Leslie: It's for both. I'll talk whenever. Let's go.

The Chair: Basically, I'm trying to formulate Mr. Longfield's idea here.

My question is for you, Mr. Longfield.

After "May 24, 2024" do we put a semicolon and—

Mr. Lloyd Longfield: Before that, we said that we'd conduct a study for three meetings, including an invitation to the minister.

The Chair: We just need some language here. Do we need 108(1)?

It's "given that the committee conduct a three meeting study" of what?

• (1620)

Mr. Lloyd Longfield: Information we received....

The Chair: It's of information we've received.

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): With all due respect, is that your job to take what the—

The Chair: Okay. We're going to pause. Thank you. I'm just trying to expedite things.

Can you write it down, Mr. Longfield?

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: I think this is something worth considering. This is definitely—

The Chair: No, we're not debating that. I need the language.

Mr. Dan Mazier: Talk to Lloyd about it. Put it down on paper. Let's go.

The Chair: Colleagues, we're going to pause for a couple of minutes so that Mr. Longfield can put his amendment on paper. We can proceed from there.

We've sent it out, Mr. Longfield, but we'll make sure you get it.

• (1620) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1629)

[*Translation*]

The Chair: I call the meeting back to order.

Mr. Longfield, would you like to move an amendment to Ms. Collins' motion?

Mr. Lloyd Longfield: No.

The Chair: My apologies. Is this an amendment to Mr. Leslie's motion?

[*English*]

Mr. Lloyd Longfield: I want to get more information. We haven't seen it yet. I'd like to have witnesses come at some point to talk about the information.

I also know we have a study coming from Madam Pauzé in which some of that could be included.

I think if we start with having the minister come and talk about the information, we may want to have a further study, or we may want to include this in Madam Pauzé's study.

• (1630)

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Lloyd Longfield: Just go ahead with what we have.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Mr. Longfield is not proposing an amendment after all. I'll take him off the list for the amendment.

We're at Ms. Collins—

[*English*]

Mr. Lloyd Longfield: We have to make an invitation and find out when that date is.

The Chair: If I understand correctly, we're basically going back to the original motion by Mr. Leslie. There were no amendments to the motion. He withdrew his amendment.

Is there a need for debate?

I have Ms. Collins, Mr. Leslie and Mr. van Koeverden on the list.

Do you want to proceed to a vote? Do you want to withdraw your names from—

Ms. Laurel Collins: I'll withdraw my name.

The Chair: Mr. Leslie, go ahead.

Mr. Branden Leslie: Thank you, Chair.

I just have a quick comment. I appreciate my colleagues across the way recognizing that it will be difficult for any experts to come to committee without having that information. It's probably not an appropriate time to add to this motion.

I fully agree that we could have a study of 10 meetings with experts. We could bring in industry associations that have been impacted. We could bring in farmers and families who are being crippled by this. There are a lot of experts we could bring in to talk about this. I think that's a great idea.

However, my colleague Madam Pauzé's study is on the books, and I think it would be unfair to jump ahead of that by altering this motion. Hopefully we can get unanimous support and get the minister here in short order.

The Chair: I can take you off the list.

I have Mr. van Koeverden next and then Madam Pauzé.

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: My concern is that we're launching the meeting after more information on the modelling was requested. I think we ought to get the information on the modelling, and then take an opportunity to look at it. It was just delivered on Monday. They want further data and more comprehensive information. I think that's the next step. I don't think inviting the officials to committee prior to even seeing it is the next step. I think it's pre-emptive—

The Chair: Are you against the motion as it's written?

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: I'm not against the motion. I'm against doing it right now. I'm against the date.

The Chair: Okay.

Madam Pauzé, go ahead.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Pauzé: I think the date has been changed to May 24.

The Chair: May 24.

Ms. Monique Pauzé: That's why we talked about changing that date. That gives us a month and a half to get the information we need, and I think that's reasonable.

[*English*]

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Mazier, go ahead.

Mr. Dan Mazier: I just want to reiterate that we need the factual information about what the Liberals have been talking about and what the minister has been talking about for eight years now.

Is the truth, if it's to be known, measured, or is it not? Is there a wanted outcome, or are there just projections? This is really what we're getting at here.

If we could get on with this motion, we'll see, and hopefully we'll have some more information, but I encourage members to pass this motion.

The Chair: I have a sense there's unanimous consent to pass this motion as is.

Mr. Dan Mazier: We want a vote.

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

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Is there anything else? Can we adjourn the meeting?

Everyone agrees. We'll see you next Thursday, thank you.

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>