



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 036

Monday, November 14, 2022

Chair: Mr. Ali Ehsassi



Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development

Monday, November 14, 2022

• (1535)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Ali Ehsassi (Willowdale, Lib.)): I call the meeting to order.

Welcome to meeting number 36 of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development.

Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format, pursuant to the House order of June 23, 2022. Members are attending in person in the room and also, as you will note, remotely by using the Zoom application.

I would like to make a few comments for the benefit of the witness and members as well.

Please wait until I recognize you by name before speaking. For those participating by video conference, click on the microphone icon to activate your mike and please mute yourself when you are not speaking.

Interpretation for those on Zoom is at the bottom of your screen, and you have a choice of either floor, English or French. Those in the room can use the earpiece and select the desired channel. I'll remind you that all comments should be addressed through the chair.

In accordance with our routine motion, I am informing the committee that all witnesses have completed the required connection tests in advance of the meeting today.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2) and the motions adopted by the committee on Friday, July 15, 2022, and on Wednesday, September 21, 2022, the committee is resuming its study of the export of Russian Gazprom turbines.

It is now my pleasure to welcome, from the Canadian Gas Association, Timothy M. Egan, president and chief executive officer.

Mr. Egan, you will be provided five minutes for your remarks, after which we will invite the members to ask you questions. When you're 30 seconds away from your five minutes, I will raise this as a heads-up so that you're fully aware of that.

The same applies when members are asking you questions. There's a certain allotted time. When you're getting very close to it, I will raise this and then kindly try your best to wind things down with your response.

Mr. Egan, the floor is yours for five minutes.

[Translation]

Mr. Timothy Egan (President and Chief Executive Officer, Canadian Gas Association): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Good afternoon, everyone.

My name is Timothy Egan and I'm president and CEO of the Canadian Gas Association. I'm going to speak quickly today for five minutes.

[English]

CGA is the voice of Canada's natural gas delivery industry, and our members are responsible for nearly 40% of our country's energy needs, which is almost twice that of the electricity industry. We serve eight provinces and one territory. Since before Confederation, Canadians have been using gas energy; over 20 million benefit from it today, and still more want it.

Canada is home to world-class companies in natural gas production, transmission and distribution, and ours is some of the lowest emission gas energy in the world. Gas is the largest single contributor to our residential, commercial and industrial energy needs in the country.

Ask users, and they will tell you a key reason. It's because they feel secure with our service. The affordability of our offering, the reliability of our delivery and the environmental performance of our sector all contribute to this sense of security.

What's more, we're working constantly to serve changing energy needs. Many are calling for energy with lower GHG emissions, and our member companies have been meeting the demand with new, innovative end-use technologies, new emission management systems or new fuels like hydrogen and renewable natural gas. The scale of these efforts is worth noting, Mr. Chair. In British Columbia alone, the RNG, or renewable natural gas, currently being produced is equal to the energy potential of the Site C dam, which is a 1,000-megawatt hydroelectric project, but all that RNG in British Columbia is being delivered over existing utility infrastructure without the need for new infrastructure.

Now, your hearings are on the international situation, and our focus at CGA is domestic, but the two are related. The well-being of our country turns on the security of gas energy delivery, so we understand the energy security threat that Europe is currently facing. We've been very active in the discussion on it and on Canada's potential role in supporting our allies.

Russia's invasion of Ukraine has fundamentally changed natural gas energy geopolitics. Russia was meeting roughly 40% of Europe's gas needs, and that supply is of a scale comparable to what Canada produces annually. In other words, a doubling of Canadian production would be required if Canada were to replace Europe's Russian supply. This would be an extraordinary feat, but it is technically possible. We have hundreds of years of supply, some of the best infrastructure in the world and the expertise to expand that infrastructure.

Europeans know this, and their diplomatic missions have been meeting with Canadian industry on it. CGA has met with a majority of EU members' missions here in Ottawa and with the EU's diplomatic office itself.

Canadian producers have been flowing more natural gas to U.S. markets, which is then liquefied and sent to Europe. This amount could increase in the near term, but system capacity constraints pose barriers to it rising significantly without major infrastructure expansions.

However, it is in the medium and the long term that Canada could help much more, and Europe wants that help. While we're modest LNG exporters now, we are set to change that with the LNG Canada project, which will produce 13 million tonnes per annum in its first two trains, and the site is designed to allow the addition of two more.

What more should we do?

First, Canadian industry should work with government to map out a strategy to move more energy offshore. Canadian companies are standing by prepared to discuss the opportunity, and we know that government has been in touch with various players to date.

Second, we need clear signals that government is prepared to support more gas energy exports. We note that Minister Freeland has been forthright on the topic, and we draw members' attention to her remarks at the Brookings Institution in October in Washington, where she said, and I quote:

The EU set a powerful example during the COVID pandemic when European vaccine makers honored their contracts with non-European allies. Canada members. Canada must and will show similar generosity in fast-tracking, for example, the energy and mining projects our allies need to heat their homes and manufacture electric vehicles.

She also said:

And crucially, we must then be prepared to spend some domestic political capital in the name of economic security for our democratic partners.

We need specific action, and this is my third request. Minister Freeland, in her call for fast-tracking, is absolutely correct. We need to streamline our regulatory framework to enable rapid project development and to foster investment confidence that we're serious about delivering.

With a low-emission product, unrivalled expertise in moving it to customers and some of the highest standards of corporate and environmental performance, Canada should be working to ensure that the companies in our industry from wellhead to burner tip are helping the world. If we do this, we'll have the credibility to lead the global conversation on opportunities like RNG, hydrogen and other fuels and technologies as they emerge.

As a final note, Canada will be hosting two important international conferences over the next two years: the international LNG conference in Vancouver next July and the international gas research conference in May 2024 in Banff. These events present platforms for Canada to showcase our leadership. The fact that we are hosting them points to the reality that Canada has a significant role to play in a dramatically shifting and unstable global energy marketplace.

Canada's gas industry has brought and continues to bring energy security to our country, and we can and should help bring it to our allies and the world at large. The German Chancellor said it best when I spoke to him when he was here in August. He told me, "Mr. Egan, we need your gas."

Let's work to find ways to address that need.

• (1540)

Thank you kindly for allowing me to appear before you today.

• (1545)

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Egan.

We will open it up to questions from the members.

Our first member is MP Chong.

Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Mr. Egan, for coming to our committee.

Can you elaborate on what Chancellor Scholz said to you when you met with him last August when he came to Canada?

Mr. Timothy Egan: Yes. This was during the Chancellor's visit in August, and this was at a meeting he had with industry and public sector representatives in Toronto. He and the Prime Minister were both in attendance. They both made some remarks, and then there was a break afterwards, and I had a chance in the break to talk to the Chancellor.

It's not very often you get a chance to buttonhole a G7 leader, so I took advantage of the opportunity to do so. I thanked him for his remarks and I noted that his remarks were particularly friendly towards Canadian gas, and he said these are sensitive subjects. Then straight up he said, "Mr. Egan, we need your gas", and I said, "Chancellor Scholz, I encourage you to say that as much as you can publicly." I wasn't even going to repeat that he had said it, except he then said it on CBC news, so I felt it was fair for me to make reference to the remarks.

I think the Chancellor and his representatives here in Germany have been forthright, as have many of their European colleagues, and again, we've met with a majority of them. We've met with.... I can provide the committee with a list if you're interested. The Europeans have been amazed to learn the gas story in Canada, because frankly, even though we know it well, it's not advertised that well, and they've been quite overwhelmed by it. Their response is, "All right; what do we do to build a relationship?"

Hon. Michael Chong: Thank you for that information. I think it's clear that Chancellor Scholz came away empty-handed. He didn't get the gas he was looking for. Subsequent to his visit to Canada, Germany signed contracts to get gas from Qatar, which is unfortunate for Canada.

During the visit, Mr. Trudeau said that there has never been a strong business case for natural gas projects in eastern Canada. You said, however, that there is an incredible business case if the regulatory framework is clear. Who's right about the business case?

Mr. Timothy Egan: I don't remember the precise words the Prime Minister used, but insofar as we need a good business case, he's correct: We do need a good business case for any gas project in the country.

My point is that the business case is determined by a variety of factors, one of which is the regulatory framework, so I pick up on the Deputy Prime Minister's remarks about fast-tracking it, because if you can create a tighter regulatory framework, investors are going to be much more interested in the opportunity to invest in projects here in Canada and develop projects in Canada.

Hon. Michael Chong: In the Deputy Prime Minister's speech at the Brookings Institution on October 11, I believe it was, she indicated that Canada wanted to fast-track energy projects to heat people's homes, which I interpreted that to mean natural gas projects. Have you seen any changes from the government in terms of expediting projects for the export of LNG? Have there been any discussions with the government about this, or was this simply stopped at that speech she gave in Washington on October 11?

Mr. Timothy Egan: There have certainly been discussions. I know that many of my member companies and others in the industry have been in conversation with various government representatives, and I think it's fair to say that the government has moved significantly from its positioning early in the calendar year to how it talks about LNG projects now.

I think early in the year the government itself was not convinced of the opportunity, and I think they're much more convinced now. I think in addition to Minister Freeland, Minister Wilkinson has been making positive statements, as has Minister Champagne.

Hon. Michael Chong: I agree with you. I think there's been a 180-degree turn by the government on LNG projects. I think they've realized their mistake and at least they're talking the talk about exporting LNG for our allies in Europe.

Just after the war began on February 24, with Russia invading Ukraine for a second time, Germany announced about a week or so later the construction of two new LNG terminals on the Baltic Sea, and they have since expanded that to five new projects on the Baltic Sea. Some of those projects are expected to be fully operational this

winter; in other words, they were able to go from zero to 100—to completion—in less than 12 months. Why can't we do that?

Mr. Timothy Egan: I think Germany has, like Canada, an exceptional environmental regulatory framework. I think in the face of what is really an incredible crisis in Germany, they've looked at that framework and they've said we have to speed it up dramatically. Canada needs to do the same thing.

• (1550)

Hon. Michael Chong: I know we are the fifth-largest natural gas producers in the world. We sit on some of the largest reserves of natural gas in the world. We have the engineering expertise. We have the private sector capital. We have the private sector companies like Enbridge and TransCanada PipeLines and other major energy companies based in Canada. It's just astounding to me that in an emergency context, when the very security and defence of the NATO alliance is at risk because of Russia's brutal attack on Ukraine, we as a country aren't able to do what other allies, such as Germany, have done and expedite the construction of these plants that are so necessary to displace Russian gas in Europe and cut off the funding for Putin's war machine.

Maybe you could comment on why there doesn't seem to be a sense of urgency here on the part of the government to get these projects done.

Mr. Timothy Egan: I think it's incumbent upon us in the industry to make clear just how significant the opportunity is for Canada. I think we have all been somewhat complacent, because—let's face it—energy is abundant and very affordable in this country, and we are suddenly seeing the shock involved for societies when prices rise dramatically and supplies are constrained. I think it's changing the conversation in Canada, and I just hope it changes it more quickly.

Hon. Michael Chong: I have no further questions, Mr. Chair.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Chong.

We now go to Ms. Bendayan. You have six minutes, Ms. Bendayan.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Rachel Bendayan (Outremont, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Egan, thank you for being here.

I understand your point of view and I appreciate it. It's your job to advocate for fossil fuel extraction. I want to make it clear that the Standing Committee on Natural Resources has already conducted a comprehensive study on this issue.

I'd like to ask you a few questions about the importance of our climate change and environmental commitments.

It will come as no surprise to you that, since I'm a Quebec MP, our commitments to reach net-zero emissions by 2050 are very important to me, as well as the Quebecers I represent. In fact, Canada now has legislation on the matter, the Canadian Net-Zero Emissions Accountability Act.

As you said in your opening remarks, our European allies are in a critical situation right now when it comes to energy in general, and natural gas in particular.

I'd like to know if Canada's commitments and the Canadian Net-Zero Emissions Accountability Act are compatible with what you're proposing, which is to increase Canadian natural gas and liquefied natural gas production.

Mr. Timothy Egan: I believe they're compatible.

[English]

First off, I should clarify that actually our association is not focused on the extraction of fuels but on the delivery of fuels, so our member companies are delivering gas energy right across the country. Overwhelmingly right now it's natural gas, but increasingly it's RNG, as it is increasingly in Quebec. Hydrogen, of course, is also an emerging opportunity.

The fundamental point here about what we do is that delivering gas energy has an enormous economic benefit and an enormous security benefit, and it's a benefit that the Europeans recognize.

To your specific point about how you reconcile a country like Canada, which is a natural resource-producing and resource-exporting country, increasing its exports in the face of targets we've set, I think the government has created an enormous challenge for itself with its emissions cap. I would say, however, that when you look at the performance record of Canadian companies across the value chain and you compare them to those of our global allies, we perform extraordinarily well. Our standards are as good as or better than virtually everyone else's in the world. If you think of Europe receiving resources from a place like Russia, where the standards are much lower and emissions are much higher, and you reflect on it in a global context, then you see that Canada could be contributing to lowering global emissions in a profound way. Are we making the perfect the enemy of the good by setting standards internally that prevent us from delivering much better benefits to the globe at large?

• (1555)

[Translation]

Ms. Rachel Bendayan: Thank you for the response.

You've brought up the possibility of exporting gas several times. Do you think it's realistic to export gas from the east coast of Canada?

[English]

Mr. Timothy Egan: That comes back to the Prime Minister's question about a business case.

I think every project deserves to be evaluated on its merits. The biggest advantage of east coast gas exports is that the transport distance is dramatically less. The biggest disadvantage is that you don't have the same supplies readily available and you don't have

the same infrastructure in place. You have to create a combination of factors for the business case in each application.

My view is to create a rules framework that indicates that we're supportive of exports and then let business projects come forward and evaluate them on their merits.

[Translation]

Ms. Rachel Bendayan: Because you're in the industry, you come to us fully aware of the business case for doing what you're here to propose.

Is the infrastructure ready or almost ready? How much are we talking about in terms of investment, public or private?

[English]

Mr. Timothy Egan: I don't know the business cases on a case-by-case basis.

What's fascinating about this—and you can see this in the U.S. in particular—is that new project proposals are coming forward all of the time. Why are they coming forward? They're coming forward because entrepreneurs see a new technology that they combine with this piece of infrastructure over here and this over here and they can create a new project opportunity.

[Translation]

Ms. Rachel Bendayan: How long would it take to carry out those projects?

[English]

Mr. Timothy Egan: That would depend on the regulatory framework. If you expedite that regulatory framework, to the point made earlier by another member, it's significantly less time.

I can't give you months or years, but I will say that right now it's taking years and years. The world needs it in a shorter period of time.

[Translation]

Ms. Rachel Bendayan: Besides the regulatory framework that we require, how long will it take for the industry to be able to export, for us to have the infrastructure to move the material, as you say?

[English]

Mr. Timothy Egan: You would have to talk to a project proponent. If you want to give me a specific project, I'm happy to go away, talk to the proponents and try to give you a sense of timing, but I haven't the means to tell you that there are a dozen projects and this one will take 12 months and this one will take 24.

I can tell you that with certain conditions in place, you will have much more interest in project development.

[Translation]

Ms. Rachel Bendayan: Is it possible to do this immediately, to answer the call from our European allies?

[English]

Mr. Timothy Egan: Immediately?

[Translation]

Ms. Rachel Bendayan: I mean in the near term.

[English]

Mr. Timothy Egan: As I said in my remarks, I think that in the near term there's very little we can do. From speaking with our European allies, I know there's an immediate need for the 2023 winter. Then there's the 2024 winter. Then there are the several winters after that. They're very concerned about that. In conversations I've had with the Europeans, they've said they'd love it if we could do a lot for next winter, but they're thinking about fundamentally changing a long-term relationship and they want Canada to be part of the future.

[Translation]

Ms. Rachel Bendayan: I believe my time is up.

Thank you very much, Mr. Egan.

Mr. Timothy Egan: Thank you.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Bendayan.

We now go to Mr. Bergeron. You have six minutes, sir.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Montarville, BQ): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Egan, thank you for being with us this afternoon.

As I listen to you speak, I can't help but bring up UN secretary-general Antonio Guterres, who in August called the record profits by the oil and gas industry immoral in the middle of a global energy crisis. Earlier this year, in April, he had already said that investing in new fossil fuel infrastructure was moral and economic folly.

We learned recently that among the G20 countries, Canada is the second highest public funder of fossil fuel projects. Each year from 2019 to 2021, Canada invested up to US\$8.5 billion in fossil fuel projects.

Given the current situation and considering the comments by the secretary-general of the United Nations, who describes the race to develop fossil fuels as madness and immoral, how do we reconcile what you're saying here this afternoon with these warnings from the UN secretary-general?

• (1600)

[English]

Mr. Timothy Egan: I've just come back from International Gas Union meetings in Peru. I represent Canada in the global association for the industry. At those meetings, there were representatives from several South American countries, including Colombia, Chile, Peru and others. Overwhelmingly, the comment they made about

natural gas development was that the single most effective way to reduce poverty in the developing world is to develop fossil fuel resources, like natural gas, to make affordable energy available to those who don't have it. That dramatically improves the lives of millions around the world, and it has dramatically improved the lives of millions in places like our country and Europe.

At that meeting, there was a representative from the Canadian first nations community who spoke about the opportunity that natural gas development represents to addressing economic reconciliation in Canada.

To your specific point about the profits of companies, companies are making profits as commodities rise in price. That's always the case. That's what happens in markets. I would also note that every government in this country benefits from those hard commodity prices in the generation of extraordinary tax revenues that underwrite a host of public services.

On balance, I think the economic opportunity offered by the existence of those companies and their success is great for all involved.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: I believe that we should understand the UN secretary-general's comments to mean: Profits are great, work is great; but in practice, if that eventually leads to the end of life itself, is it really worth it? I feel that's why he was talking about madness and immorality.

You're talking about people who have jobs because of the fossil fuel industry. I'll give you that. However, these days, when it seems like fossil fuels are on the way out, you have to recognize that the companies in this industry are making huge profits. At Imperial Oil Limited, we're talking about a net profit of about \$1 billion in the first quarter of the year, almost triple the profits reported in the same period last year and one of its highest quarterly profits figure in 30 years.

Again, how can we reconcile this race to rake in profits by the fossil fuel companies with what the UN secretary-general said in August, that this race to make record profits in the middle of an energy crisis is just plain immoral?

[English]

Mr. Timothy Egan: Again, the profit of any company and any sector delivers benefits across society. If you take issue with the idea of profitable economic sectors, I think there may be more fundamental issues with the functioning of an open market system, because that's what a market system does. It delivers and distributes enormous benefits across the board. You can find exceptions where those profits are particularly high at a particular time. Again, invariably, the return in the tax-based revenue—the royalties and so on—is extraordinary.

On the point about the morality of the question, I would point to the fact that over the course of the 20th century, the human condition has improved dramatically, and the numbers of deaths and tragic incidents as a consequence of natural disasters and other disasters have dropped dramatically. The quality of human life has increased dramatically. I think that's a direct consequence of our ability to deliver affordable energy to people around the world.

In doing so, I would say to the Secretary General—as I know his staff do—that there are enormous benefits that come from this sector. They are benefits that have enabled us to do many of the things that the United Nations is doing around the world.

[Translation]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Egan, a few days ago this committee looked into the record flooding in Pakistan these past few months, which is a direct result of climate change.

You know that these changes are being caused by rising greenhouse gas emissions. In Canada, we know that many of those emissions are a direct result of developing and burning fossil fuels.

We're in the midst of an unprecedented energy crisis and inflation is running rampant around the world. Does it seem right to you that companies in the fossil fuel sector are making record profits? I find it somewhat improper in the current context.

• (1605)

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Egan, could you reply in less than 15 seconds, please?

Mr. Timothy Egan: Well, sure. What I would say is that we can point to any global crisis and we can identify the horrors that it represents for the human condition. We can say, “What do we do to address those horrors?” Those societies that are best able to address those horrors are those societies that have the infrastructure and the means to reduce the kind of human suffering you're referencing. The societies that can do that are the societies that have built that robust infrastructure. When we do that, we can make a dramatic improvement in the human condition.

The Chair: Thank you.

We now go to Ms. McPherson. You have six minutes.

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you very much for your testimony and for answering our questions and providing your perceptions on these things.

There's just one thing I want to clarify. When we talk about benefiting people in the global south, I think we all have to acknowledge that historically speaking, resource extraction has not benefited people in the global south. It has, in fact, been the opposite case.

That's not really what I want to ask a question on. I want to ask you a bit of a question on some of your experiences with the Chancellor and with our supplying of energy to Germany, because of course, on February 24, the world changed. None of us were ready for what ensued. Certainly the weaponization of energy by Vladimir Putin and his illegal war on Ukraine have had deep impacts around the world.

You said that Chancellor Scholz had said, “We need your gas.” I was in Germany last week. I actually met with the Chancellor. I met with Wolfgang Schmidt, who is, of course, the head of the Chancellery. They made it very clear that they do want access to natural gas right now to help them, but not in 2023, because they were quite clear that in 2023 they will be fine. They do want to have access to natural gas going forward, but they want it for the short term, because they have a very strong vision for dealing with the climate crisis.

As they are building their transition hubs, as they are building things within Hamburg to deal with natural gas, they are ensuring that all of those pieces are equipped, or will be able to be equipped, for hydrogen, because they are not prepared to go into 10-, 12-, 15- or 20-year contracts on natural gas. They are interested in short-term natural gas and then will do a very quick pivot and move as soon as possible to renewables.

That was made very clear to us, so when we talk about the idea that right now we don't have the capacity to give natural gas to Germany.... We don't have that infrastructure. I may agree with you 100% that the infrastructure could have been useful, that it would have been nice to have, but we don't have it.

Realistically, are you describing a “we want your natural gas for the long term” strategy when the long term doesn't appear to be what the world is looking for in terms of natural gas?

Mr. Timothy Egan: The comment about the German targets is a very good one.

If I recall correctly—correct me if I'm wrong—I think the Germans said they would like to be no longer using gas by 2040. I think that's their target year.

Ms. Heather McPherson: And they will be reducing it more and more every year.

Mr. Timothy Egan: Right. The year 2040 is 18 years away. When we talk about long-term contracts in natural gas, we are usually talking about 25 years in longer-term contracts, but, to your point, the Germans are saying, “We don't want a 25-year contract.”

As some German colleagues have said to me, there's also a concept of the—I apologize for my German pronunciation—*Ringstrasse*, the idea of a ring road. The point is to move gas into the market, and maybe for the next 18 years the Germans will use that gas, and maybe to your point, the Germans will use a declining amount of that gas over the next 18 years.

If you look at any forecasts—including UN forecasts, including IEA forecasts—you see that the world is going to be using gas well into this century, well beyond that target that the Germans have set for themselves. Many other countries will still be using gas, and Canada should be, as many have said, the last molecule. Our gas could be meeting that global need. Moreover, our gas is already performing better than much of the supply that's out there, so it could make a significant environmental contribution now.

The other point I'd make about hydrogen is that you can make hydrogen from a variety of sources, and, as this government has noted, the colour shouldn't matter at this point. What we should be about is making hydrogen. If we're making hydrogen in probably the most likely way around much of the world, it will be made from natural gas, so why wouldn't Canadian natural gas be the source for the German hydrogen? Why wouldn't Canadian natural gas be the source for hydrogen in many other markets of the world?

My point is, again, why wouldn't we, as we have done with a host of our resources over the course of our history, see that we produce those resources in an extraordinarily efficient way, in an environmentally preferable way, in an affordable way? Why wouldn't we try to get those to the global market to help the world?

• (1610)

Ms. Heather McPherson: One would also be able to argue it this way: Why wouldn't we want to be pushing for advancement in technologies that take more and more liquid natural gas off the market as we develop a greener way of providing energy to people around the world? There's also that, of course.

While I will say that I think we need to be open to all colours—the turquoise, the grey, the blue, the green, whatever colour that is—we can very clearly say that green hydrogen is the preferred hydrogen for Germany, and for all of us, because it is better for our climate change targets and our goals.

There is another thing I wanted to ask you about. I'm not an energy expert. I'm from Alberta, so maybe I should be, but I'm not an energy expert.

When we talk about infrastructure and regulatory frameworks, we are talking about building a pipeline to go across the country. That's what that means. When you say that we are going to expedite that, or it should be expedited, is what you're saying that we should not listen to provinces and indigenous groups in the development of that pipeline?

What expedites the regulatory framework? What's stopping the regulatory framework?

Mr. Timothy Egan: Of course, I wouldn't say we shouldn't listen to provinces and first nations. In my experience of late, certainly with respect to first nations, they've been some of the biggest advocates of resource development—

Ms. Heather McPherson: We always have to be very clear to note that there is not one opinion within any group.

Mr. Timothy Egan: That is correct. There are hundreds of first nations across this country. Each has a unique view on these issues.

In my experience over the last year, I've been struck by how many first nations are stepping forward and saying that they want these projects to go forward, in large part because they're now equity holders in these projects. There's a significant economic opportunity for them to improve the well-being of those in their communities, and that's an enormous benefit to them. They want that benefit, so they should be given that benefit.

In terms of provinces, I think it's province-by-province, but there are many provinces that are fully prepared to work with the federal government on expediting regulatory frameworks in order to build more infrastructure and so that we can move product to market.

Ms. Heather McPherson: Not all of them are.

Mr. Timothy Egan: Not all of them are, but yours is.

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mine is.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. McPherson.

We'll now go into the second round of questioning, and we will commence with Mr. Hoback.

You have three minutes.

Mr. Randy Hoback (Prince Albert, CPC): I have three minutes? How come?

The Chair: It's because we've gone over. All the members went over in the first round—

Mr. Randy Hoback: I'm getting penalized because the Liberals went over their time.

The Chair: —so I'm afraid the time will be reduced for everyone. Yes.

Mr. Randy Hoback: That's not right.

I'll have to be very quick, Mr. Egan. I had lots of questions for you.

Let's compare the gas going to the Gazprom pipeline to the gas that's produced in Canada. What's the ESG, for example, of the companies involved in Gazprom's supplies versus here in Canada?

Mr. Timothy Egan: I have no study to make reference on that. Obviously, you can access satellite maps of the world from the IEA and other sources that show methane emissions around the world. What's really striking is how low the emissions are in Canada compared to how they are in other parts of the world, like Russia. There is one comment on the “E”.

To comment on the “S” and the “G”, I don't see a mass movement from countries like North America to Russia of young engineers wanting to work in the oil and gas industry. Perhaps that's some indication on the “S” and the “G”.

• (1615)

Mr. Randy Hoback: As far as the governance is concerned, that's self-proclaimed on its own.

The point I'm trying to make is there's a reason that Germany is looking at us in the long term and asking, as they look at our industries and their ESG requirements, where they want to see their supply chain get the supply of products they need for their facilities. There's also the fact that we have the war in Ukraine creating hardship at this point in time and forcing them to look at the future. Before, it was pretty easy; you just opened the valve and took the gas from Russia.

I'm curious. You talked about the 18 years left. In those 18 years, if we were to displace Russian gas, what would that mean for the global environment?

Mr. Timothy Egan: It would mean a dramatic decrease in emissions, straight up.

Again, Canadian gas is produced to the highest standards of environmental performance. The corporate governance we have in our country is exceptional. The transparency of the companies is extraordinary. All of that goes into creating what, I think, is a better quality product.

Moreover, and to come back to the question from your colleague about technology, I don't know of a sector in Canada that's investing more in technological improvements to further reduce our emissions and to further improve our performance. There's a reason why we have many across industry in this country talking about how a Canadian molecule is the cleanest molecule. It's because we work to such high standards, and I think we should be proud of those standards.

Mr. Randy Hoback: In that situation, then, if you're a Canadian company, if you're not allowed to get your product to market even though you've taken all of these steps, why would you continue to invest in doing this work in Canada when at least in the U.S., if you did the same work, you could get it to market?

Mr. Timothy Egan: That's a serious risk to future investment in the sector in Canada.

Mr. Randy Hoback: What does that mean for first nations and for investment in small communities all across Canada?

Mr. Timothy Egan: It means less economic opportunity for all of those communities.

Mr. Randy Hoback: Okay.

Mr. Epp, did you want to go?

The Chair: No, I'm afraid you're out of time. It's now over three minutes. I'm sorry.

Mr. Randy Hoback: I think you have to watch the clock a little closer. It's not fair.

The Chair: That's exactly what I'm doing now.

Mr. Randy Hoback: In the first round you weren't, obviously.

The Chair: Well, everyone took advantage of it. I do try to the best of my abilities, but when members do go over, this is what happens. My apologies for that.

Next we go to Dr. Fry. Dr. Fry, you have three minutes.

Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.): Thank you.

I just wanted to go back to what both my colleagues, Monsieur Bergeron and Heather McPherson have said.

I think we know that Europe is determined to have energy, obviously, for its heating and industrial purposes. That's its immediate need, but then it has a medium- and long-term strategy, which is what Canada is trying to focus on. That strategy is obviously to become carbon-neutral, to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to use hydrogen.

When he came here, Chancellor Scholz said that he's looking at Canadian hydrogen to produce hydrogen. Rare minerals that we have here can produce electric cars. We can look at doing both of those things immediately, right now. We obviously need the fossil fuel source of gas.

You said there was an enormous benefit for people in the world for affordable fossil fuels. It is that enormous use of fossil fuels around the world that is creating the climate change that we're having now.

I think I wanted you to answer a question. You said that you must build infrastructure, because obviously natural gas is the best way to create hydrogen. You know that solar energy focusing on water can split it into oxygen and hydrogen—H₂ is hydrogen, and oxygen is O₂. The result is steam. That is what you're doing here to remove greenhouse gas emissions. We know that micro-organisms can produce hydrogen as well.

Canada has an opportunity, because we have 20% of the world's water, to produce hydrogen. Your argument that we only need to go to fossil fuels and we need to build a huge infrastructure for fossil fuels is only dealing with an immediate need. It is not looking at where Canada and Europe want to go in the long term.

I wanted to know why you believe that we cannot produce hydrogen without fossil fuels.

The Chair: I'm going to ask Mr. Egan to reply in less than 40 seconds, please.

Mr. Timothy Egan: I don't think I said that it was the only way to produce hydrogen—it isn't.

To the member's point, hydrogen can be produced by electrolysis. Electrolysis technology is the technology that the member is referring to. Those are viable means to produce it. With any technology you use, you have to look at the cost. You have to look at the viability in light of the cost—

• (1620)

Hon. Hedy Fry: I'm sorry, but I don't have a lot of time.

I wanted to just focus on one quick thing that I really want you to answer.

The question, then, is why would we want to build a huge fossil fuel infrastructure when we should be looking at investing in ways to deal with electrolysis and the form of micro-organisms to create hydrogen?

Let hydrogen be the future—and of course, for electric cars, etc., Canada has rare minerals in large amounts. We have all the resources to do it—

The Chair: You are considerably over time. Perhaps I could ask that you get to your question.

Mr. Egan, could you provide a timely second response?

Hon. Hedy Fry: I did ask him to tell me why we would dismiss those other ways of producing hydrogen.

Mr. Timothy Egan: I didn't dismiss them. In fact, my industry is advocating them and is doing a lot of work on all of them.

I would point out that the development of rare earth minerals is a very costly experience and requires a great deal of energy input. If the energy input is too expensive, you won't develop those rare earth minerals, and that means you won't ever develop the kinds of electric technologies and other technologies that the member's referring to.

We all want to develop those things. Affordability is fundamental to all of this.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Egan.

We now go to Mr. Bergeron. You have a minute and a half, Mr. Bergeron.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Egan, this past August you gave an interview to The Hill Times in which you stated that the world will consume much more natural gas in the coming decades, regardless of emissions limits or targets.

Are you telling us that the targets set by Canada and others are just meaningless numbers?

[*English*]

Mr. Timothy Egan: What I'm saying is that countries around the world are starved for energy, and the energy they want is natural gas, and they're developing that resource or finding others who are developing that resource and buying it from them, so while Canada can indeed pursue the targets it has and pursue them in a host of ways—and again, my member companies are very active in pursuing those targets in co-operation with government—globally the reality is that the first priority for millions and millions is getting access to affordable energy, and more natural gas is going to need to be produced and used in the world in order to achieve that end.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: It's far from affordable energy these days.

Thank you, Mr. Egan.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Bergeron.

We now go to Ms. McPherson. You have a minute and a half.

Ms. Heather McPherson: A minute and a half....

Thank you again for your testimony.

When I last asked you some questions, you gave the impression that there are a lot of indigenous groups that are supportive of natural gas projects and that there are many provinces, including my own of Alberta, that are very supportive of a natural gas pipeline, so what's the problem?

Realistically, you're talking about the idea that we have. We are a massive country with many provinces, many indigenous peoples that have many opinions, so the reality is that we have to adhere to UNDRIP. We should want to. We have to adhere to provincial jurisdiction. We should want to. There is complexity in building massive infrastructure projects in this country; we can say that this shouldn't be the case, but it is the case. I know that quite well. I come from an oil family. I understand this.

However, realistically, the facts remain. This is the reality that we have. This is the reality of our situation at the moment: The potential for us to be able to get natural gas to Germany to help with Germany's immediate problems right now is quite limited. It's quite limited for us to help in 2023 and it's quite limited for us to help in 2024, 2025, 2026, and they're hopeful to not need it very much after that. Is that not accurate?

I know that you're talking about the global situation, but we're talking about Germany here. This study was about the impacts of the weaponization of energy.

That's my statement.

The Chair: Ms. McPherson, you're well over your time.

Thank you, Mr. Egan.

Now we go to Mr. Epp. You have three minutes, sir.

Mr. Dave Epp (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

My riding is the home of the second-largest cluster of greenhouses in the world after the Netherlands, and it consumes a lot of natural gas today. When gas prices spiked to \$14 a gigajoule over 15 years ago, we went back to bunker C, back to coal, etc. Fortunately, now it's come back to natural gas, the cleanest-burning alternative that's available to that sector.

Can you talk about natural gas's position structurally from a price perspective, looking at long-term investments in infrastructure relative to what could be coming down the road, such as hydrogen or things like that?

• (1625)

Mr. Timothy Egan: We don't forecast gas prices. It's a quick pathway to abject failure to try to forecast energy prices.

What I will say is that the supply picture is an extraordinary one in Canada and in North America. We often talk about Canada and the United States. We should also note that Mexico sits on enormous gas resources, and as Mexico begins to look at the development of its resources in a more robust way, that also offers enormous environmental and social benefits.

To the specifics of your question and what's going to affect the price going forward, obviously there are certain things over which we have no control that can have a dramatic impact on gas markets, such as Russia's invasion of Ukraine. Things that we can control include sending a signal to investors that it's worth investing more in supply in Canada.

Mr. Dave Epp: Thank you.

Mr. Chair, I'm going to cede the remainder of my time to Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Mr. Egan, for your excellent testimony today and for your work. I very much appreciate what you've had to share with us. It underlines the importance of the work we need to do on energy security.

We're now at the conclusion of our study on Gazprom turbines, and in that light, I would like to move a motion that Conservatives have put on notice. The motion is this:

That the committee report to the House that it calls on the Government of Canada to immediately revoke the waiver to Russian sanctions granted for the export of Gazprom turbines.

I'll make a few remarks on that motion and then I look forward to hearing the comments of other members. Again, I want to thank our witness today.

We began this study on the government's decision to grant a waiver to Gazprom in the summer. We did so under the rubric of an emergency meeting. There was strong support to proceed with that study. We heard very clearly strong arguments against the government's decision to waive sanctions on Russia in this particular case.

Concerns were raised, of course, about how waiving sanctions provides an economic benefit to Russia—

Ms. Heather McPherson: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

Would it be possible for us to excuse Mr. Egan? I think our time with him is done, and we should probably allow him to leave if he would like.

The Chair: We did have another member who had a time slot, but regrettably, it does not seem like he will get the opportunity. You have our apologies, Mr. Sarai.

Mr. Egan, allow me to thank you on behalf of the entire committee. We're very grateful for your time. You can leave if you so wish.

Mr. Timothy Egan: I'm happy to talk to any of the members afterwards and take questions privately, should that be a request. Thank you for the opportunity to appear today.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Egan.

Go ahead, Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Of course, one reason to oppose the waiver was a concern about the economic benefit that comes to Russia any time you waive sanctions. We also heard clearly about the message it sends when countries talk a big game about sanctions, but then find exceptions here and exceptions there. The accumulation of exceptions leads to what one witness had described as kind of a sanctions Swiss cheese, where there are all sorts of holes and your sanctions regime is no longer effective.

These were some of the powerful arguments made. We had the opportunity, of course, to hear directly from the Ukrainian ambassador as part of that discussion.

We heard three distinct arguments from the government as to why they granted the sanctions waiver. First of all, they talked about how this was going to supposedly help get energy resources to Germany. That's obviously a moot point now in that the one turbine that was sent back to Europe was never used and now the pipeline has been out of commission. We're not seeing these turbines play any role in supplying energy to Germany.

The government then said that allowing the sanctions waiver, which was in effect giving Putin exactly what he wanted, was somehow a way of calling Putin's bluff. We didn't particularly buy that argument at the time, and at this point it's obviously past the moment of that argument because we've sent one turbine back and it hasn't been used. Any bluff that was or wasn't going to be called has been called and there's no reason to repair and send back five additional turbines.

Another argument that was used by the government was the alleged impact on jobs here in Canada, but we heard very clearly from Siemens representatives that no jobs in Canada would be negatively affected.

We've seen, either through witness testimony or through other global events, the dismantling of these arguments in favour of granting the sanctions waiver.

The point remains that if we're going to stand strong behind Ukraine, we should not be granting exemptions to our sanctions. We should not be repairing turbines for Gazprom. I think that's the clear conclusion for me from this study. Based on comments that have been made by others, I'm fairly confident this reflects the majority view on this committee.

I hope we'll be able, therefore, to send a strong message in support of our friends and allies in Ukraine by opposing the sanctions waiver and we call on the government to revoke it. Hopefully, we'll see the adoption of this motion, which indeed sends that message.

Thank you.

• (1630)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Genuis.

We now go to Mr. Oliphant.

Hon. Robert Oliphant (Don Valley West, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I've had a little bit of time to think about the motion—not a lot of time—and I'm opposed to it for two reasons.

The first is on principle, and the second is on the actual substance of the motion.

There may be a variety of disagreement with respect to the substance, but I want to talk about the principle first.

We are in the midst of a study on the war in Ukraine by Russia, including the aspect of the Gazprom turbines. We are in the midst of that study, and I do not think it is ever good for a committee to jump to conclusions before we finish the study. That is just good process. That is the way we work best as a parliamentary committee.

We have a study. We will have a report, and there can be recommendations in that report with respect to the waiver. I'm very willing to entertain it at that time, but I think that there's a certain amount of grandstanding that is going on with a motion like this that I don't think is necessarily helpful in a parliamentary system. Nor do I think it is wise for us to set that kind of a precedent for jumping to conclusions before we have finished our study.

In that regard, we have just spent an hour without any substance related to the topic at hand, which is the Gazprom turbines. We heard committee testimony that should have gone to our natural resources committee; that's where it belongs. It was an inappropriate waste of time of the foreign affairs and international development committee to spend time talking about a very important issue, but it's not our issue, sir. It is not our issue to deal with. It is the natural resources committee's responsibility as part of the energy infrastructure of this country to deal with it. It had nothing to do with a turbine, a pipeline or two pipelines in supplying Russia with energy. It was, again, a political manoeuvre by one of the opposition parties to attract attention to an issue that really deserves time, as I will admit, but not at this committee. This committee is meant to be dealing with our international relations and our international development portfolios that we are responsible for and charged with as part of the standing orders that we deal with.

We had an hour. I did not raise the question of relevance of the questioning because the witness was absolutely clear and absolutely forthright in his testimony. It had nothing to do with Russia and it had nothing to do with Germany and nothing to do with the Gazprom turbines particularly, but it had to do with a failure of one of the opposition parties to understand the nature of climate change, the nature of the change in the economy and the nature of energy.

No questions were raised about the fact that we have nuclear energy in this country, which far outweighs the importance. I would suggest to some European countries that they should deal with that. That's not, again, this committee's responsibility. Those are domestic issues in Germany, and their ability to have energy security is their absolute responsibility. They will seek other forms of energy. Particularly, we know that the Prime Minister and the Chancellor

had great discussions with respect to green hydrogen, and I think that is an important discussion.

On the process, I simply disagree. Let's wait until we get our report. Let's get an understanding of the whole complex nature of the situation. Let's get a whole understanding of what is going on, and then we can, indeed, look at whether or not we want a recommendation with respect to one particular waiver. It's also facile to attempt to say that somehow the Government of Canada is not supportive of Ukraine with this one waiver.

Canada is ranked in the top five countries. Some of us were able to meet with the Polish Speaker a few months ago, who looked at the five or six countries that are key to supporting Ukraine militarily, economically, with sanctions, with UN resolutions at the International Criminal Court and at the International Court of Justice. That is what Canada is doing. Canada is well known for doing it.

● (1635)

Canada is extremely honoured on our defence spending, on our economic measures, as well as on our sanctions, which we do in concert with other countries.

Let's get the whole report and see whether there is a place for a recommendation to the government with respect to the waiver. That's on the principle.

On the content, I would still say I'm getting rather circular reasoning from the Conservatives. I hear that the turbine is of no value, is not being used and is simply superfluous to the whole situation. I hear that somehow it is hindering Ukraine's ability to fight in a war. It can't be both.

The reality is that I am hearing these arguments that then take me simply into pure politics and an attempt to divide. I think if there's one thing we've learned from other experiences of war, Canada has been at its best when we actually unite and talk together about how we do things in the best interest of Canada first and in our support for Ukraine.

We are engaged in the illegal conflict of Russia and its invasion of Ukraine for several reasons. It offends our sense of international law, of territorial integrity and of our understanding, and the world's understanding, of the history of Ukraine and the Ukrainian people. We have stood united, I believe, against Russia's illegal invasion. We should continue to do that based on the fact that it is wrong.

We also stand united by this because Canada has a unique relationship with Ukraine. We are home to the largest diaspora of Ukrainian people outside of Russia, if that is to be considered, on absolute numbers and on percentage. We have an emotional connection. Nobody doesn't care about Ukrainian people or Ukraine as an emerging yet fragile democracy that we have been supporting since its independence.

The second reason we are doing that, which I hope will come out in this report that we are united about, is the deep and abiding people-to-people connection that we have had for well over a century.

The third reason—and I sometimes have to remind people of this when I've been travelling—is that if you look at the globe in one way, Russia seems very far away from Canada. If you look at the globe from the top, you recognize that we share a maritime border with Russia. It is a matter of Canadian security to be sure that we are able to watch, manage and push back on Russian aggression when it comes to anybody's territorial integrity because we have Canada's Arctic as well.

People live in the Arctic. Resources are in the Arctic. Climate change is affecting the Arctic. The ocean is opening. We are watching very closely what Russia is doing in Ukraine because we obviously have sovereignty concerns in our Arctic.

That tells me that we need to engage in a different way on this discussion. We need to find ways that don't play politics about it and don't try to divide and conquer. We have to find a way to be a unity government and we will take advice from the opposition regularly. The Minister of Foreign Affairs is regularly engaged with members of the opposition, who have had constructive, important and positive statements with respect to Ukraine and have been engaged all the way through.

It's absolutely appropriate for the opposition to push on military weapons that we should be sending to Ukraine. However, we've also seen that they are often out of date and may not actually be wanted in Ukraine.

We look at our allies. We look at NATO and at how we do what we can. Canada offers transport for weapons constantly. We are engaged in providing support and care. We are continuing with the training mission, which began after the invasion of Crimea. We are continuing to provide financial support, sovereign loans and other supports to ensure that the economy continues. That's what we should be talking about.

On the content of the motion, it's circular, it's specious and it is going back and forth to try to somehow prove some nefarious idea that the government is not helping Ukraine to every degree we can. We are, and we will continue to do that.

Also, on the concept of principle, I would be against it because we haven't done our report yet.

• (1640)

If we need more evidence, we'll get more evidence, but I think we have a good calendar to get us to a report, despite the fact that we just wasted an hour on a natural resources committee hearing when we should have been doing more important work with respect to this study.

I would be against this motion as I just....

In closing, I'll repeat that on the principle, we have not finished our report yet. On the substance of the motion, I think it is wrong and not in the best interest of Canada's international position or Canada's domestic position, as well as our alliance with countries like Germany—but not exclusively Germany—and with respect to Ukraine. It has still not been proven to me that this has affected Ukraine in any negative way whatsoever. Perhaps, while being able to at least open the door to helping allies, we want to continue to work with and be with all of them every step of the way.

The very last point would be that every country needs a social licence from its voters, from its electorate, from its citizenry and from its residents to engage in these wars. That's what we need. Our European allies constantly need that. If they have an energy security threat, just as our southern neighbours may have a food security threat, we need to stand with them. We need to work on energy security, absolutely, and we need to work on food security, absolutely, while we push back against Putin's regime to say “enough is enough”.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Oliphant.

We'll go to Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm sorry. I'll strike for now.

The Chair: We'll then go to Ms. Bendayan.

Ms. Rachel Bendayan: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I wanted to speak to the motion brought forward by my colleague. I am very interested in the discussion that we're having. As I'm sure he is well aware, the situation in Ukraine is something that I care about very deeply.

However, we heard testimony on various occasions that was very specific to the turbine issue, including with respect to where this turbine currently is and what it is being used for. I was unable to pull up the exact transcript, but I am sure that the clerk and analysts can help us with the testimony that we heard from witnesses, who told us that the turbine is essentially sitting in a room, serving no purpose to anyone, including Russia.

What I know is that we need to continue to move forward to support the Ukrainians in ending this war. Huge advances have been made as recently as a few hours ago. Again, today we announced an additional \$500 million in support of the Ukrainian war effort and the fight for democracy and freedom.

What I find a bit troubling.... Of course, I understand the position of my colleagues, but I would like to put on the record that the only time members of Parliament have ever voted to weaken the sanctions regime imposed on Russia by our country was when Conservative members put forward a motion on the opposition day of June 7, at the very height of the war. They requested that our government eliminate tariffs on fertilizer. At that point, all four members of the Conservative Party who sit on this committee voted in favour of that motion. It is a motion I found then and still find today extremely problematic.

That would be an important waiver of our sanctions regime. It would effectively mean that the Conservative position on sanctions against Russia is that we should weaken them, not strengthen them. I find it important to mention that today as my colleagues attempt to take the high road on sanctions following their vote on June 7 which, again, was at the height of the war.

Mr. Chair, I understand that my colleague will speak again, so perhaps I can respond to what he says at a later time during this discussion. That's all I wanted to say for the moment.

• (1645)

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Bendayan.

We'll go to Mr. Chong.

Hon. Michael Chong: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

First off, on the timing of this motion, it's entirely appropriate, Mr. Chair, to debate this motion at this point. This is our last scheduled meeting on this study concerning the Gazprom turbines. I think it's entirely appropriate for us to conclude these hearings with debate and either adoption or rejection of the motion. The Ukraine study is separate from this particular study that brings us here today, and so I think it's entirely appropriate for us to debate this motion and to conclude this particular study on the Gazprom turbines with this motion.

In regard to eliminating the tariffs on fertilizer, the member opposite is wrong in her argument. The government applied the tariffs on fertilizer for Canadian farmers retroactively, Mr. Chair. Farmers who had contracted nitrogen last fall, before the war had begun in Ukraine on February 24, were suddenly dinged with a massive tariff that directly affected their ability to fertilize their crops this past spring. It has led to effects on yields for corn, wheat, soybeans and a range of other crops. To suggest that it was inappropriate for us to ask the government to not retroactively apply the tariff on nitrogen fertilizer is wrong. We simply asked that the government not apply the tariff to fertilizer that had been contracted for before the war began on February 24, an entirely reasonable position. Farmers shouldn't be penalized for making decisions last fall, a year ago, before the war began in Ukraine.

I heard from dozens and dozens of farmers in my riding of Wellington County in Halton Region who were quite upset about this tariff because they had made decisions on crops and on fertilizer use, whether they were going to use nitrogen or other types of fertilizers, based on the fact that there was no tariff on it at that time.

We support the tariff on fertilizer that was contracted after the war began on February 24. I think that's an entirely cogent and consistent position. In fact, I think it's the right position for the government to have taken, but it didn't take our advice, clearly, which is why farmers were negatively impacted, as they often are with this government, for decisions they made well before the war began in Ukraine.

By the way, Mr. Chair, we cannot neglect the fact that these farmers are often operating on razor-thin margins. It was an unfair retroactive application of a sanction that should never have been retroactively applied prior to the war beginning on February 24.

Regarding the meeting we just had with Mr. Egan from the Canadian Gas Association, it's entirely appropriate for this committee to talk about exporting LNG in the context of the Gazprom decision by the government. At the end of the day, what we are talking about is whether or not we should have any role as a country in replacing 40% of Russian gas in western Europe.

We clearly believe that Canada does have a role to play. In fact, Mr. Chair, I'll put to you that Canada, being a middle-sized power, can't impact many of the aspects of this security situation in Europe in a way that a larger superpower, such as the United States, or larger powers such as the United Kingdom, France or Germany, can by virtue of their size, but the one area in which we could have an outsized impact on countering Putin's aggressive war in Ukraine is in cutting off the source of some \$100 billion that has flowed since February 24 into Russia from the sale and export of oil and gas. That is one area where Canada could cut the Putin regime off at the knees by replacing Russian gas in western Europe with Canadian natural gas. By doing that, we will cut off the 30% of the Russian economy that is based on oil and gas, large parts of which are exported.

• (1650)

If we do that, we can make an outsized contribution to the NATO alliance, and an outsized contribution to the defence of democracies both here and across the Atlantic, which is why this is not simply a natural resources issue for the natural resources committee. This is not simply an economic issue for the finance committee; this is a geopolitical issue, a foreign affairs issue for this committee.

In fact, we had a visit from a head of government of a G7 ally to this country in August. His number one request was for more Canadian gas, for any Canadian gas. He went away empty-handed. To suggest that this is just a narrow issue that should be restricted to some economic committee is simply false.

In fact, Mr. Chair, if it was simply an economic issue, then why did the Deputy Prime Minister go to Washington on October 11 to give a keynote foreign policy speech, a large part of which centred on expediting Canadian energy for our allies? In fact, many have dubbed it the "Freeland Doctrine" on foreign policy. She also indicated in that speech that this was a new policy of "friend-shoring".

I quote a sentence from her speech. She said, "And crucially, we must then be prepared to spend some domestic political capital in the name of economic security for our democratic partners." That is a foreign policy doctrine of the Deputy Prime Minister of this government that makes it clear that the government sees the export and expediting of natural gas not just as a narrow economic issue but as an essential geopolitical issue in support of our allies across the Atlantic.

Mr. Chair, I hope that members of this committee support the motion. It's done in good faith.

I'll finish by saying this: The government should immediately revoke the waiver. Nord Stream I has been blown up. There's a 50-metre hole in the pipeline. These turbines aren't going to be of any use to anyone. That pipeline is not coming back. It is broken and dead. As a point of principle, the government should acknowledge the mistake it made in granting the waiver in the first place and simply cancel the waiver so that we can get our foreign policy back on track, which is to say that we don't support Russian exports of natural gas to western Europe. We support the exports of Canadian liquefied natural gas to Europe. Adopting this motion will send a clear statement from this committee about its opinion on the matter, and hopefully sway the government to do the same.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Chong.

We have five more people on the list currently; however, I did want to inform everyone that we do have a hard stop at 5:30 p.m., because we don't have resources past that.

We next go to Mr. Hoback.

• (1655)

Mr. Randy Hoback: Thank you, Chair.

A lot of questions have been asked about why. If they're going to use it, why should we use it? There's a simple answer to that: It sends a signal. It sends a hard signal back to Russia that it doesn't matter what you do; we're not going to supply things to you.

It's symbolism going to Europe to say that we're supporting you guys, and we're supporting Ukraine by making sure that the waiver was revoked, so there's no chance you're ever going to get that turbine. It sends a signal to the company doing the refurbishing that the turbine has no value, so they can take it apart and throw it away or do whatever they want with it. Just do something with it, because we're not going to ship it. That's the symbolism it's going to send.

When you looked at the motion, why now? It's been waiting long enough. This motion has been on notice for quite a while; it's nothing new. This notice of motion has been in the committee probably for two or three weeks, so there's no surprise here that this was going to come up. In fact, it was talked about before, but then we said, "No, let's wait until we have Mr. Egan testify and then do it", which is what has happened here today, so there's no surprise to the Liberal party or any of the other parties that this was going to come up today. It was clearly laid out in front of people that this would be coming forward.

This is something that I think really needs to be done. It's just another example of where we need to step up and do what we say we're going to do and show that we're going to back our words with action. In the midst of the study, the parliamentary secretary said that we had a study going on. There are things that are changing, but one thing we know is the right thing to do. You don't need to wait to finish a study to know when you're doing the right thing, and the right thing is revoking this waiver.

He says that we're grandstanding; I addressed that. We're not grandstanding. I asked about Gazprom, and when I asked about Gazprom and the type of gas going in there, what did he say? He said environmentally, Canadian gas would displace a much less en-

vironmentally friendly gas. He talked about methane being released in the fields in Russia and the impact that has for the global environment.

I asked about ESG, environmental social governance. You can look at the Canadian companies and see what they've done in ESG compared to a Russian company. I don't think there is any comparison. When you look at their allies in Europe, when their companies are looking at our gas and saying that they have to meet what their bankers, insurance companies and shareholders want in regard to ESG requirements, we can help meet those requirements and fulfill that need, not just in the short term but in the long term, because we've gone through that process. We've put in the regulatory process to do that.

What's really frustrating is when they've done all this work to meet these requirements and are told they can't take advantage of them here in Canada. What do they have to do? They have to go to Mexico or the U.S. to take advantage of all technologies they've developed here in Canada, because this government won't let them fulfill the ability to take this technology into the world marketplace.

You've heard that 18 years of gas are still going to be used in Germany, and that's just Germany. We're not talking about third world countries that are going to be using gas for maybe another 40 or 50 years. Where would you want to see this gas come from? Where do you want to see the wealth created? Do you want to see the wealth created in Russia, where it funds the military machine for further aggression within Europe and in Ukraine, or do you want this to come back into Canada and go to our health care system or schools or a variety of social services that we have here in Canada that we want and dearly feel we require?

You know those are things paid for by long projects such as natural gas, and energy security around the globe is one of the bargaining chips that Canada has on the international stage. We have gas, we have uranium and we have critical elements. We have things that the world wants. It's a strong bargaining chip and it allows us to influence Canada's agenda on the global stage, but when you tie the hands behind the backs of the people who are doing this, you're taking away those bargaining tools, those chips. You're not allowing Canada to fulfill its destiny or requirements within the world.

It sounds kind of silly that a simple motion like this would not go through relatively quickly. I think it should have just been bang, yes, let's get her done and move on. I don't even understand why we're debating it for another five minutes. It's just a no-brainer; it should happen.

If you tell me you're going to ship a turbine to Russia next week to a pipeline that's blown up, really, what do you care? You're not doing that, and you know that, so what do you care about the waiver? Just get rid of it, and let's move on to doing something else in this committee. We've eaten up committee time debating something that doesn't need to be debated.

I'll leave it there, Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Hoback.

We now go to Mr. Bergeron.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Stéphane Bergeron: Mr. Chair, first, I must say that I'm a bit uncomfortable. We were supposed to hear from other witnesses on Bill S-223. If we are planning to do that, I wonder if we wouldn't be better off thanking these witnesses and letting them go because the discussion on our colleague Mr. Genuis's motion seems to be dragging on.

With respect to the motion, and in response to Mr. Oliphant's remarks, with which I largely agree, I would say that it was appropriate for this committee to address the decision made by the Government of Canada. The decision did put us at odds with the Ukrainians, as well as the Germans and many other Europeans.

From the outset, I thought that it must not have been an easy decision for the government to allow this turbine to be returned to Europe. We wanted an opportunity to let the government explain its decision, which it did. For quite some time now, we've felt we should end this turbine study because there's no need to debate the issue any longer, for a number of reasons.

First, we've called Mr. Putin's bluff. Whether or not we return the turbine, we realized that the Kremlin had no intention of continuing to supply Germany or any other European nation via the Nord Stream 1 pipeline, which the Russians likely bombed themselves.

When she appeared before this committee, the German ambassador herself alluded to Canada suspending the permit given that the bluff had been called. The turbine was no longer relevant, and leaving the permit open when the government had planned to be able to revoke it is not only inappropriate, it's bordering on laughable, absurd, ridiculous.

For the sake of credibility, the committee must end its work on the turbine issue. If it were up to us, we would have stopped working on this a long time ago. It was our Conservative friends who insisted that we add witnesses. However, as Mr. Oliphant pointed out, the additional hearings did nothing to further fuel the debate.

It's very clear from our perspective. While controversial, the government's reasons for allowing the turbine to go back to Europe seemed to us to be justified in the circumstances. They are no longer justified, they haven't been for some time, and we should have come to an agreement on that long ago.

That's why, despite Mr. Oliphant's reservations, which I mostly agree with, we have to conclude that the government needs to suspend and revoke the permit, and we need to move on.

• (1700)

Again, I regret that this debate has somewhat dragged on and kept our witnesses waiting.

Because you momentarily refrained from speaking when I was talking about this, Mr. Chair, I would again suggest that we thank the witnesses, let them go and call them to appear at a later date.

Thank you.

• (1705)

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Bergeron.

Allow me, just before ceding the floor to Mr. Genuis, to apologize to the two witnesses who made themselves available. When a motion is tabled, the rules and procedures here are that it has to be debated. We're terribly sorry that this has happened.

That said, I now go to—

Ms. Rachel Bendayan: Are they excused?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'll strike.

The Chair: Okay.

Perhaps I should also tell the two witnesses—I understand there's one witness online and another in the room here today—that they are dismissed. It does not appear, given the number of people who have asked to speak to this motion, that we will have any time left. We only have until 5:30, and there are currently three other members on the list.

Thank you very much for having made yourselves available. Again, our apologies for this development. We're very grateful for your kind appearance here today.

We now go to—

Go ahead, Dr. Fry.

Hon. Hedy Fry: My hand has been up for quite awhile. I don't know if you've seen it.

The Chair: Yes, there's one person ahead of you, Dr. Fry.

Hon. Hedy Fry: Thank you.

The Chair: As the list currently stands, it is Mr. Zuberi, Dr. Fry and then Ms. Bendayan.

Mr. Zuberi, the floor is yours.

Mr. Sameer Zuberi (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This is an important debate and conversation we're having right now.

I want to thank the witnesses for taking the time to be here and I hope that we will have them in our next meeting, where we can ask some questions and get into their testimony. I was very much looking forward to that and I'm sorry that we'll have to postpone it to next time. I do hope that they come again in person, if possible. I know one's online and another is in person, but I'm hoping to see them again here in person if possible. I'm very grateful to them for taking the time to be here.

So much attention has been given to Ukraine. So much of our country's attention has been focused on it, in our hearts and minds and discussions as parliamentarians, and so much ink has been spilled in the papers about Ukraine. We, all of us as a country, clearly support the territorial integrity and political integrity of Ukraine. Obviously, we take extreme offence with the fact that Russia has betrayed article 2(4) of the UN charter, which speaks directly to the territorial integrity and political integrity of nation states. What is happening is a great affront, which is exactly the reason that we as a country have been fully in solidarity with Ukrainians, why we with our allies—including the United Kingdom, the U.S., EU, Australia and many others—have been checking President Putin and have been ensuring that this aggression comes to a halt.

We have done so much already as a country to shore up and restore Ukraine, Ukrainians and the independence of the country. We know, just to remind us here around the table, that as of February 22, we have imposed sanctions on the Russian Duma, the State Duma, which was an important act. That was followed up with other acts, including on February 24, when we sanctioned President Putin's inner circle and close contacts. Then on February 25, we moved against President Putin himself as an individual and sanctioned not only him but also his chief of staff, and we continued on to his foreign minister, Sergei Lavrov, and the ministers of justice, finance and defence. We have acted clearly and swiftly.

Speaking of swift, we've also seen that Russia was removed from the whole SWIFT system, which sent a signal that we are not just sanctioning individuals—those who are leading this war machine—but also making it hurt so that they cannot profit from this, the country cannot profit from this, and people respond to this. Thankfully, we know there have been many brave individuals within Russia itself, including key journalists, including civil society actors and protesters, who have come forth and spoken against their own government. This is extremely brave. We know this. It's easy for us in Canada to do this and it's easy for those in Australia or the EU to do this, but it's extremely difficult for those in Russia to stand up and speak to their own government in speaking truth to power. This is something we have to remind ourselves of and support those sorts of actions.

On March 1, we said that we intend to ban Russian-registered ships from entering our waters, our ports and our internal waters, which is an important move. On March 2, we additionally announced that we would impose restrictions on an additional 10 key individuals from two important companies in Russia's energy sector, including Gazprom.

Today, at a G20 summit in Bali, Indonesia, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau announced that \$500 million in additional military assistance would be given to Ukraine.

- (1710)

This is on top of the \$500 million already allocated in budget 2022 towards military surveillance and communications equipment. We have thus far sanctioned 1,400 individuals and entities. This is all in an effort to halt what's happening. All of this that I just mentioned is on top of the \$3.4 billion in assistance that we have given to Ukraine.

We are steadfast in our support of Ukraine, and we have done so much already, but I think the key issue here is the motion. I'll read it again. It says:

That the committee report to the House that it calls on the Government of Canada to immediately revoke the waiver to Russian sanctions granted for the export of Gazprom turbines.

As my colleague Mr. Oliphant said, the challenge around this particular motion is that it is putting forth what should be a potential recommendation and putting it forth in terms of a motion from this committee that we vote upon.

I'm fairly new here—three years. Most of the others have been here many more years than I have. What I've learned in my three years here is that this type of statement might be very valid and it might be where we land as a committee; but the rightful place for it is within a recommendation. To fast-forward and fast-track that through a motion isn't ideal. It is far from appropriate, I would suggest, although it's within the rules. However, I would suggest that it be put forth as a recommendation, and that's where it belongs.

To make a long story short, we've done so much for Ukraine. We stand by Ukraine. We have stood by Ukraine not only in words but also in concrete actions since the beginning. We will continue to do so. With respect to this particular motion, it's best placed in a potential recommendation.

I'll share with you that I was in Europe just last week. I went to Belgium and saw so many Remembrance Day ceremonies over there, on the night of the 10th and on November 11. What I saw and appreciated was how much the society over there still remembers conflicts from the past 105 years up through World War II until today.

We have to be very grateful that we thankfully do not have these sorts of problems and challenges here in Canada and that we have a beautiful society where people come together from all backgrounds and have built a project. This is something we should cherish and guard and actually share with the rest of the world.

I was touched by how much people remember and also how they remember the presence of Canada and Canadians. I spent the eve of November 10 in Passchendaele, where approximately 450,000 soldiers, young souls, died during World War I, over 105 years ago. This city, a space of over a few kilometres, was liberated by Canada.

One thing I'd like to share with this committee is the affection that the city of Passchendaele has for us as Canadians. I encourage those who are here watching this and those who are in this committee room—staff and others—to just go to this city, if ever they're in that region on November 11, and see the celebrations.

On this motion, I've said what I need to say. Maybe I'll have more to say on it in a bit, but for the moment I'd like to see this in a recommendation to be debated and discussed, as opposed to here.

• (1715)

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Zuberi.

We now go to Dr. Fry.

Dr. Fry, the floor is yours.

Hon. Hedy Fry: Thank you very much, Chair.

I have some empathy with what Mr. Bergeron said, but I also want to agree with Rob Oliphant. We have spent some time doing this study and we have listened to witnesses. We need to put forward a report and recommendations.

To have a motion that actually presumes it is the major report in many ways and that kicks aside the report doesn't seem to me to be wise, nor is it in keeping with good committee procedure. I think it should not have happened.

At the same time, I know that Mr. Chong talked about the fact that the Ukraine study is separate. It's not. This is about Ukraine. This is about the very complex issue we're dealing with. This is about the fact that there is no right or wrong, black or white, in terms of how we deal with some of the complex problems of energy needs in Europe right now and how that butts up against sanctions that we are willing to make. Those are not easy answers. They are not black or white. They are not simple answers. We need to have listened to people, which we did, and we need to come up with a report that reflects what we heard. Then we can talk about recommendations.

I think I agree with Mr. Zuberi. This motion should not have been made, because it suddenly makes everything we have done and the time we have spent listening to witnesses into wasted time. It presumes that the rest of this committee does not have an opinion, that the rest of this committee did not hear witnesses and that the rest of this committee doesn't have anything to say in a report. For me, that is a little bit disrespectful of this committee and what we have been doing. It makes our time wasted, so to speak.

We have come to the end of the hearings on this. Let us do what committees always do. Let's have our analysts present us with their report. Let them go about listing what we heard from witnesses. Let them put some recommendations forward for us. Let us put some recommendations forward from us. Let us do it the way we always do, with a report.

For me, what is bothersome about this motion is it is back to everyone saying that we all agree that Ukraine is important, that Canada stands firmly, that all the political parties stand with it, and then we take these little cheap partisan political tricks and throw them on the table. Why, for once, can't we act with some kind of integrity about the way that these hearings, these discussions, of Gazprom went on? We heard a lot of things from witnesses.

I also agree with Rob Oliphant when he said the discussion about how Canada sends energy to Europe is not for this committee. It is for trade and it is for natural resources. It's both a domestic issue and an export issue. It's not our issue.

What we want to talk about is how we stop the money going to Russia that in fact feeds its war effort. How do we stop that? How

do we stand firm on the things we want to do? Canada has been one of the strongest supporters—we have heard everybody saying it—of Ukraine and we have moved forward. We, in fact, are even talking now of adding sanctions to those who are responsible for what is happening to Vladimir Kara-Murza. We're adding things all the time. We're still there and we should all be moving forward in that direction.

As for the issue about whether the turbine is now moot, the issue about whether the government should have done it when it did, we're second-guessing everything. When people make decisions at certain times—governments and people—they do it based on the environment in which they are sitting at the time, or what is there, what they see and the choices they have to make. This is exactly what the government did then.

Whether or not our report will tell us, as we heard, that it may be time to move forward, to move on, not to continue with going around with Gazprom, is another story, but that will have to wait for us to table a report and to table recommendations. Jumping the gun, second-guessing this committee, making this committee seem as if its work is not important after all the time we spent listening to witnesses would be exactly that: wasted time.

• (1720)

I know that Rob talked about disrespect. I think that's disrespectful of all of us in the room. We're all here on the committee. I think we all care about the issues. I understand the intent behind the motion, but I think that it's too soon for that kind of motion to come forward.

I think, as Mr. Zuberi said, this should actually be a recommendation. As we discuss it and we discuss a report, we can deal with it that way. If we continue to subvert the committee process for all parties, coming up with how the processes work, what we do, what a report is, how we have recommendations on a report, then why bother to have committees at all? Why bother to waste the time of witnesses and the time of this committee to actually listen to those witnesses?

We have moved forward since this committee began this study. Lots of things have happened. We've heard from a lot of people. I think we know very clearly that while Europe is in immediate need of energy right now, they have energy for the next year. The big question, then, is what do our Canadian natural resources and Canadian trade do about that?

We've heard about that. We heard about what our Deputy Prime Minister had to say. We have a report to table and we have recommendations on that report to move forward. To subvert this process by throwing in some motion at the end of the day—and, I might add, by taking away the ability to ask a question from the last questioner, who would have been a Liberal—is disrespectful.

It's clever. It's a clever ploy. We all know that we do that. Everybody says, "I know when I'm going to move my motion so I can stop anybody else from asking questions." Is that what we really are about as a committee, or are we really, as a committee, looking at finding good answers? In this instance, when we're talking about an illegal war waged by a man who is bent on being sociopathic, or whatever you want to say about him, that is what we should all be focusing on. What do we do? How do we do it? How do we cut the legs out from under Vladimir Putin and his war effort?

There are a lot of other countries that can supply immediate resources to Europe. There's Kazakhstan, which is not siding with Russia in this war. We have Norway. We have Scandinavian countries that have oil and gas. If what we're really thinking about is just an opportunity for Canada to make hay and for Canada to go out there and set up a new industry of fossil fuels and build infrastructure to do that, that's not what we're meant to be discussing. We're meant to be discussing whether Europe can have energy to heat itself and to run its factories over this period of time, and how we develop a long-term strategy through which Canada can take a part, but that's not for us to discuss. That's for trade and natural resources to discuss.

I think what we need to do is talk about whether we should continue with the turbine thing or, as many people have asked, is it moot? I don't know. Let's have that report tell us what we should be saying and what we should be doing.

We know that Germany is interested in Canadian energy. We heard that at this committee, but Germany came and met with our Minister of Natural Resources and talked about hydrogen. They talked about low-fossil fuels. They talked about bringing down greenhouse gas emissions.

• (1725)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

Hon. Hedy Fry: I'm sorry. I have the floor and I'm speaking. Unless your point of order is that I do not have the right to speak—

The Chair: Dr. Fry, sorry; there's a point of order.

Hon. Hedy Fry: Fine; go ahead, but I'm not ceding the floor.

The Chair: One second.

Go ahead, Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

It's clear we're into a Liberal filibuster, which is their right to do.

I wanted to get the advice of the chair with respect to the procedures around what happens at 5:30. I understand that we don't have resources available after 5:30.

The rules of committee are also that you need the consent of the committee to adjourn, so my understanding would be that if we can't adjourn but we can't continue, then the appropriate thing to do at 5:30 would be to suspend. That's been our practice in the past when we've run out of resources but there isn't a consensus to adjourn. We would suspend.

I wanted to clarify that your intention would be to suspend at 5:30, unless there's a motion to adjourn. If there's a majority that wishes to adjourn, so be it, but if not, I think we should suspend at 5:30, given the resource issue.

The Chair: As I understand it, we can adjourn, but allow me to check.

Hon. Hedy Fry: I move to adjourn, Mr. Chair. It being 17:28, I move to adjourn.

The Chair: Sorry, Dr. Fry.

Yes, as I indicated, there is nothing to stop us from adjourning at 5:30, so that is obviously something we could do. We could also suspend. Both those options are available, Mr. Genuis.

Hon. Hedy Fry: I moved a motion to adjourn, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Did you? Okay. I did not hear you. I'm sorry.

Hon. Hedy Fry: Yes. My voice is so calm and quiet that no one hears me.

The Chair: This meeting stands adjourned—

Some hon. members: No. We have to vote on her motion.

The Chair: Did she bring a motion? I'm sorry.

We'll have a recorded division by the clerk, please.

(Motion agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

The Chair: Thank you.

The meeting stands 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>