



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 073

PUBLIC PART ONLY - PARTIE PUBLIQUE SEULEMENT

Tuesday, September 19, 2023



Chair: Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia

Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

Tuesday, September 19, 2023

• (1205)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.)): Okay, our meeting is now public. We're no longer in camera.

This reminds me that there was a time when the hockey game at the Montreal Forum would start at eight o'clock, but the CBC would only start broadcasting it at 8:30, joining the game in progress, so I'd like to welcome our viewers to our meeting, which is in progress.

Pardon me?

A voice: We'll be just as exciting.

The Chair: I don't know if I can guarantee that, but—

Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC): It was just the third period.

The Chair: Yes.

Mr. Kram, had you finished?

Mr. Michael Kram (Regina—Wascana, CPC): I don't think I even quite started.

The Chair: Okay, then please start.

Mr. Michael Kram: Maybe, Mr. Chair, I'll say that it's been an interesting first day on my new committee. I came here with the expectation that we would be working on the consideration of a draft report, and now it has come to my attention that we are entertaining a motion to basically do the exact same thing that the natural resources committee is doing. That strikes me as not a particularly good use of the committee's time.

If we have this draft report with amendments for consideration, it strikes me as eminently more reasonable to continue with our original order of business instead of doing something that is already being covered by another committee. It would make considerably more sense if we were to step back and let the natural resources committee do its job. I am not aware of any reason that we would not have confidence in the natural resources committee to answer the questions they want answered. Then we can see if it has answered all the questions to our satisfaction.

If that is not the case and if there are gaps in the work done by the natural resources committee.... I don't understand why we would entertain this motion and move forward before the natural resources committee has done its work.

I also would note that this motion is calling for the tabling of a comprehensive report. I wonder if we would have anything useful at the end of our meeting to table for the House, given that the vast majority of the content of said report would most likely already be covered by the natural resources committee.

I would like us to begin consideration of the draft report, but I realize that this is a committee and that this is a democracy, and we will see what other members of the committee have to say.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

I'd just remind everyone that we're debating the subamendment to invite the minister from Alberta.

Go ahead, Mr. van Koeverden.

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

On the topic of whose responsibility it might be to look at the most devastating wildfire on record in our country, I don't think it's practical, productive or constructive to be passing the buck. I'd just remind all members that yesterday the Conservatives on the natural resources committee did the exact same thing: They suggested that it was an INDU responsibility, that it was the Standing Committee on Industry and Technology that should look at this issue.

These committees are not designed to chase each other in circles; these committees are designed to take on the responsibility of inviting witnesses, getting expert testimony and putting together very representative recommendations to the government. I, for one, am in favour of that.

It's one meeting. It will be, clearly, a short report, and if we work with our colleagues at the natural resources committee, we can share some resources, ensure that people aren't flying back and forth across the country more than once, and ensure that we have a comprehensive recommendation from the committee on environment and climate change from the perspective of people who are looking at that issue, because their mandate is totally different from ours.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Mazier is next.

Mr. Dan Mazier (Dauphin—Swan River—Neepawa, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I guess I'm puzzled. I'm back on this environment committee and I was looking forward to working together as a committee, and as parliamentarians, more importantly. I was walking here today hopefully to talk about our draft response on the bill here, on a study that I know the committee had been working on for, if not weeks, probably months when I left the committee, so here we are.

I want some clarity here, Mr. Chair. What are we actually talking about? What is the motion we are debating today? Could you read that aloud, please? Could I get clarity on that—

The Chair: Can I just read the—

Mr. Dan Mazier: —and more importantly for our listening and viewing audience, because the show is in progress.

The Chair: Yes. Let me read the...

I won't read the "givens"; I'll just read what the motion is calling for.

Mr. Dan Mazier: I think that's the most important part. Read it right from what we're talking about, right from the "givens" through the whole motion.

The Chair: Do you want me to read the whole thing?

Mr. Dan Mazier: Yes, please.

Mr. Taylor Bachrach (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Mr. Chair, there was unanimous consent for the removal of a reference to Standing Order 106(4). Perhaps we can leave that out of the read version, just to avoid confusion.

The Chair: Yes. That's what I was planning on doing.

Mr. Dan Mazier: What's more important is the actual motion that we're talking about.

The Chair: Yes. The motion reads as follows: "That, given that over 15 million hectares of forests have burnt this summer from forest fires, nearly 200,000 Canadians have been placed under an evacuation order this season and climate change continues to increase the likelihood of extreme fire conditions; given that recent comments made by Suncor CEO Rich Kruger indicate a clear move away from environmental sustainability in the oil and gas sector in the interest of maximizing profits; given that the oil and gas sector is responsible for 28% of GHG emissions in Canada; given that the oil and gas sector is poised to make record profits in 2023 following a year of record profits in 2022; given that the Alberta government announced this summer a moratorium on renewable energy projects in that province; given that Canadians are relying on provincial governments and leaders in the oil and gas sector to do their part to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and tackle climate change, pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development invite Suncor CEO Rich Kruger to explain why their companies are abandoning their climate targets that had been previously been laid out in the face of a climate emergency, as well as invite the Alberta Energy Regulator in a separate meeting to explain the decision to place a moratorium on renewable energy projects despite the booming industry in the province; that given the urgency of the climate crisis, Rich Kruger and the Alberta Energy Regulator be invited as soon as possible to appear; that a report of the meetings be prepared and reported to the House; and that pursuant to Standing Order 109, the government table a comprehensive response to the report."

Right now, we're debating an amendment to include an invitation to an Alberta minister. I forget which one it is.

• (1210)

Mr. Patrick Weiler (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, Lib.): It's Brian Jean, the Minister of Energy and Minerals.

The Chair: It's Minister of Energy and Minerals Brian Jean, a former parliamentarian. That's the amendment we're debating right now.

Mr. Mazier, do you have more to add?

Mr. Dan Mazier: Could we have the amendment read aloud and then circulated as well?

The Chair: Could you read the amendment?

It would have to be translated, no?

Mr. Patrick Weiler: Yes.

It would amend the motion from the point of "as well as invite the Alberta Energy Regulator" by adding "and the Alberta Minister of Energy and Minerals, the Honourable Brian Jean", and then it will continue with "in a separate meeting to explain the decision to place a moratorium on renewable energy projects despite the booming industry in the province".

The Chair: We're just adding "and the Alberta Minister of Energy and Minerals, the Honourable Brian Jean". That's the amendment. That's what we're debating right now.

We don't have it in French, right?

Mr. Dan Mazier: Can we suspend to get translation and then circulate it properly?

The Chair: Just a moment, please.

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Natalie Jeanneault): You can suspend if you want to.

[Translation]

The Chair: Ms. Pausé, we need to take a moment to translate the amendment. However, we do have another option. I read out the amendment in English and, obviously, the interpreters provided an interpretation. Would it be okay if I just read the amendment in English and the committee relied on the interpreters for the French version?

Ms. Monique Pausé (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Chair, if I understand correctly, the purpose of the amendment is to also call Minister of Energy and Minerals of Alberta.

The Chair: Yes, Brian Jean.

Ms. Monique Pausé: That's the amendment.

The Chair: Yes, that's it.

Ms. Monique Pausé: We don't need to have a whole discussion on that, since it's the same thing in French.

The Chair: That's correct.

Actually, everything is fine, because we now have the amendment on paper in both languages. I have just read the amendment in English, it has been translated by the interpreters and everyone understands what it means.

Mr. Gérard Deltell: Mr. Chair, if I may say so, instead of spending all this time on this, you could have suspended for a minute and the translation would have been done.

The Chair: Yes, and it could have been sent to everyone.

Mr. Gérard Deltell: Yes. We've been talking about this for several minutes. We're wasting time talking about this when we could be getting things done.

The Chair: I understand.

[English]

Mr. Dan Mazier: So where are we at?

The Chair: We're at—

Mr. Dan Mazier: Have these been circulated?

The Chair: No. We've read it and we've said it. We've read it in English. It's been interpreted by the interpreters. As well, Madame Pauzé has translated it verbally in front of the committee into French. I think we all...

It's been in French and English verbally. It's a very small amendment—

Mr. Dan Mazier: Okay—

The Chair: —so I think we're good to go.

Mr. Dan Mazier: I'm back on the floor, correct?

The Chair: Yes.

Mr. Dan Mazier: Could you now read to the committee the natural resources motion that was passed in public yesterday?

The Chair: Is this it here? Okay—

• (1215)

[Translation]

Ms. Monique Pauzé: Mr. Chair, the proposed amendment is quite simple: It would add a witness, the Minister of Energy and Minerals of Alberta.

The Chair: It is quite simple, yes.

Ms. Monique Pauzé: When can we vote on something as simple as this?

The Chair: We'll do it once no one else wants to speak.

With that, I will suspend for a moment.

[English]

Given that we're debating the amendment, and it's very specific about inviting Brian Jean, I think I will decide not to read the NR-Can motion at the moment. Let's just get—

Mr. Dan Mazier: Okay, so we're back on the—

The Chair: We're back on the amendment.

Mr. Dan Mazier: Well, we'll talk about the—

The Chair: We're back on inviting Brian Jean. I'd be happy to...

Has this been distributed?

The Clerk: Yes.

The Chair: Okay, it's been distributed, so I don't really know if I need to read it. Anyway, we'll get to that later.

Mr. Dan Mazier: That will be the debate later.

The Chair: Yes. Okay.

We're back on the amendment.

Are you...?

Mr. Dan Mazier: I'm not done yet.

The Chair: Okay. Go ahead, then.

Mr. Dan Mazier: Brian Jean is the minister of...?

The Chair: It's energy and mines, I believe.

Mr. Dan Mazier: Last time I checked, I believe that's a natural resources responsibility. I think this is the whole point of what my colleagues are trying to prove out here. The natural resources committee has passed it. They are going to be studying this. I think it would be even better if we could see what they came up with it from their angle. Then, after they did their study, we could complement theirs by doing another study at that time. That's what I would ask of this committee: that we park this motion just to see what they come up with in the natural resources committee. If it's that big a deal and there could be holes being driven right through it, we could actually then get on with some really good solutions from an environmental perspective.

Right now, for a federal committee to call out an energy minister of a province is pretty rare. To call out an industry rep to come out here and to impact a certain industry is doing nothing more than really isolating and making the environmental conversation more divisive than ever. I really don't think this is a good, positive conversation.

The Chair: That is noted.

Mr. Longfield, you're on the list.

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. van Koeverden covered my points very well.

The Chair: Okay.

Go ahead, Mr. Weiler.

Mr. Patrick Weiler: I would say that one of the reasons it's important that we have this in this committee is that one of the measures the government is actively developing right now is a regulation to cap emissions from the oil and gas sector. When very clear comments coming from one of the major oil-producing companies in Canada are making it very clear that they're deprioritizing action on climate, I think it's directly within the mandate of this committee that we be looking into that in further detail so that we can be better informed and better able to do our due diligence on this forthcoming regulation that we'll be expecting in the coming months.

The Chair: Go ahead, Ms. Thompson.

Ms. Joanne Thompson (St. John's East, Lib.): Thank you.

I don't know if it's the appropriate time, but I think we should vote on this. We've spent a considerable amount of time talking. I think it's quite ironic that it's the clean tech study we're pushing to the side again. We spent a considerable amount of time on it in the spring and we've still not completed it.

This is the work of the committee. It is around the environment, it's around emissions and it's around how we address the climate crisis in real time, so I would like to see this go to a vote.

The Chair: That is noted, but we have Ms. Taylor Roy and Mr. Leslie.

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy: I agree. I think we first need to vote on the amendment and then on the motion, but I think we should go to a vote as well.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Leslie.

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

This is my first opportunity, so I would say “hello” to all of my colleagues. I look forward to working with you.

This perhaps isn't the motion that I would have expected to start working on from a positive footing, but that said, we are where we are.

On the amendment specifically, I'm curious. Maybe I'll ask you, Mr. Chair, as a more experienced member of Parliament, since I'm the new guy: Is it normal to bring a provincial minister before the committee to harass them about a policy decision they've made within their jurisdiction?

The Chair: It's happened before, I believe.

Didn't the former minister of environment come at one point? She appeared on Zoom. It happens.

• (1220)

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: It's not to harass them.

The Chair: No.

It's not totally unusual. It's not something that's done as a matter of course, but it's not totally unusual.

Is there anyone else?

Go ahead, Mr. Kram.

Mr. Michael Kram: I was just wondering if the mover of this amendment could explain why we are singling out only one province. There are nine other natural resources ministers across the country who all adjust their policies on emissions from time to time.

I know that in my province of Saskatchewan, we have had changes to the solar panel programs for houses and different rebate programs for the like. I really think it is pretty obvious politics when we single out one province instead of making a more comprehensive study and including all provinces that are interested in participating and that can offer different perspectives.

If there is legislation that's going to be moving forward on this matter, I hope that the government is not considering legislation to apply to one province only. There are other provinces with consid-

erable oil and gas sectors. Saskatchewan has a large oil and gas sector, as does Newfoundland and Labrador.

I think it would be useful to see what goes on at the natural resources committee before we single out one particular province.

The Chair: Thank you.

Your question to Mr. Bachrach, I think, is rhetorical, because he's not obliged to answer the question, but if he wants to get on the list, of course, I'll put him on the list for a bit later—or you can pass.

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: Sure. I'm happy to be on the list if you like, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: It's up to you. I'm not inviting you to be on the list. I'm just saying you can't directly answer this question now. If you want to answer it—

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: I have to get on the list.

The Chair: Yes. Do you want to be on the list?

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: Why don't you add me to the list, just in case?

The Chair: Okay.

Go ahead, Mr. van Koeverden.

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

With respect to the comments about singling out a province, I believe—to the best of my knowledge, at least—that there's only one province or territory in Canada that put a moratorium on new renewable energy projects this past summer, at least, since we went on break, but if the member from Regina is interested in having the Minister of Energy from Saskatchewan, I certainly don't think that's outside the scope of this study.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Mazier.

Mr. Dan Mazier: Can you update who's on the speaking list?

The Chair: Yes.

After Mr. van Koeverden, I have Mr. Weiler, Ms. Taylor Roy and Mr. Bachrach.

Mr. Dan Mazier: Thank you.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. van Koeverden.

Mr. Adam van Koeverden: I'm done. Thanks.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Weiler.

Mr. Patrick Weiler: I was going to say much the same as Mr. van Koeverden. This isn't about singling out a province. It's about getting information on the decision that was made to put a very surprising moratorium on renewable energy development in the province of Alberta. It's important to have the decision-makers who made the decision to do so answer to that.

If we have just the Alberta Energy Regulator, as was proposed in the original motion, they won't be able to speak to the rationale behind it. It's important that we have that information at the disposal of this committee.

The Chair: Go ahead, Ms. Taylor Roy.

Ms. Leah Taylor Roy: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to address that too.

First, welcome, Michael and Branden, to the committee—Mr. Kram and Mr. Leslie. You've been here before. I was here with you, but welcome back. It's nice to have you all here.

I want to address that, because I think the moratorium on renewables is having a major impact on what we are trying to accomplish as a government in this committee. We have targets, and I know that you and the opposition often bring up the fact that we're not meeting our targets rapidly enough.

You also mentioned the price on pollution and how that is hurting Canadians because it is costing them more. Often, there's a number quoted for how much it will cost a farmer in 2030, but that doesn't take into account any possible accommodations that any individual might make in their operations. When I see a province blocking the potential for energy sources that could save farmers and individuals in that province a lot of money because they will reduce their greenhouse gas emissions and thereby not pay as much in the price on pollution, which is the entire objective of the price on pollution....

We can't just look at the way things are now and what people are using in terms of energy and say, "Oh, they're going to keep using that until 2030, and therefore it's going to cost them \$150,000." The whole intention—and what economists and experts around the world have said—is that this price signal for the price on pollution will help incentivize companies to offer alternatives. That is what the renewable energy sector in Alberta is doing.

To see a province then block that possibility and that option for people to have a lower-emission source of energy and force them to pay a price on pollution is, in my mind, of grave concern to our committee. We want to help Canadians. We want to help Canadians and our economy, and we want to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. That cannot be done if provinces work in complete opposition to what we're trying to do and actually stop any alternatives from being developed.

I think that is one of the reasons that Mr. Bachrach's motion is very relevant. It's not singling out a province; I think Alberta singled itself out when it introduced that prohibition on renewables, quite frankly, and we are simply responding to their action.

● (1225)

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Bachrach.

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

I am keen to get to a vote on this matter at this meeting.

There have been a number of questions asked around the utility of this motion. I want to assure my Conservative friends that the intention is not to harass anyone. I take some umbrage at the use of that word. The intention is to hold people accountable and to get answers for Canadians. That's very much the role of this committee.

There are two separate matters that are covered by the motion I've put forward. The first has to do with recent statements from

leaders in the oil and gas industry, particularly Mr. Kruger. Everyone at this table, and I think across the country, knows that the oil and gas sector is absolutely vital to meeting Canada's stated greenhouse gas emissions reduction targets and our international commitments as well.

To date, what we've heard from Canada's major oil and gas companies has been an acknowledgement of that role and indeed a commitment to work toward meeting those ambitions, notwithstanding the fact that emissions from the sector continue to rise and the progress has been far too slow. Now what we see in Mr. Kruger's comments is essentially a throwing in of the towel and a signal to future generations of Canadians that the oil and gas sector isn't serious about meeting the imperative of the global climate crisis and that it's more interested in making short-term profits.

Young Canadians especially deserve to hear directly from Mr. Kruger exactly what he means by that and what his understanding is of the predicament that we find ourselves in as a country and as a planet.

With regard to the Alberta government, I think very similarly. There's the recognition that provinces are vital if we are to meet our national objectives when it comes to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. Here's a province that has the best opportunities in Canada for the generation of renewable power. The progress that we've seen in Alberta is absolutely spectacular when it comes to renewable energy. A real boom has taken place there, yet right when things are heading in the direction we need to see them go and when the province of Alberta is on the brink of making a major contribution to the fight against climate change, we see a provincial government slamming on the brakes. I think that's something that is alarming for many Canadians.

I think the provincial government should be here at this committee to answer some basic questions around its justification for the moratorium on renewable energy development in that province and what it means for the larger national context.

Certainly my intention in bringing forward this motion is a productive one. I think it is complementary to, but different from, the motion that was brought before the natural resources committee. The two committees have different mandates. I can read out the mandates if you like, but I know we're short on time. That committee very much focuses on the natural resources industry sectors, while this committee focuses on issues of environmental sustainability and sustainable development.

I hope and trust that the members of this committee will keep their questioning and their comments to the scope of our mandate. Between the two committees, we can provide a comprehensive picture for Canadians of how these recent developments impact our ability as a country to tackle what I think—and, I believe, what others around this table believe very strongly—is the most serious issue facing Canadians and people around the world.

I'll leave my comments at that.

Mr. Chair, I hope we can get to a vote on this motion before our time runs out here.

I thank you for allowing me the time to speak.

• (1230)

The Chair: Thank you.

Go ahead, Mr. Mazier.

Mr. Dan Mazier: Thank you.

That brings me back to the motion from the natural resources committee.

Can you please read what the motion was? We don't even know what we're referring to, because we say, "Well, we just—"

The Chair: I will do that later if you wish. I don't feel obliged—

Mr. Dan Mazier: I think we should do it now—

The Chair: No.

Mr. Dan Mazier: —because it's on the amendment. We don't even know if it's in the original.... Maybe we're amending something that is—

The Chair: No. You have this. This was distributed in both languages. If I read it, it's really for the benefit of the people at home.

Mr. Dan Mazier: But no one on this committee knew about this natural resources motion until we entered here—

The Chair: I understand, but right now—

Mr. Dan Mazier: No one knows, and no one in the public knows about it either—

The Chair: I understand—

Mr. Dan Mazier: —so we need to know what we're comparing it to and why we're voting on this amendment.

The Chair: In my view, it's not to decide whether we invite the Minister of Energy and Minerals. That's a very small amendment.

I will read it later if you wish, but right now I think many people on the committee want to get to a vote on whether we invite Brian Jean to our committee.

We'll go to Madame Pauzé.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Pauzé: Mr. Chair, I'd like us to vote on this amendment, which, as you just said, is very short.

If we want to get back into a discussion, I too will have an amendment to propose later. It has to do with the energy regulator to preserve what I might call the environmental sovereignty of the Province of Alberta.

For now, can we proceed? If not, it will be my turn to begin a major presentation of the motion and tell you why I need to delete the passage in question.

The Chair: Seeing no other speakers, I think we can vote on the amendment that we also call the Minister of Energy and Minerals of Alberta, Brian Jean.

[*English*]

Mr. Dan Mazier: Can we have a recorded vote?

The Chair: Yes. That's what we're doing.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Then we will be inviting Mr. Jean.

Now we'll go to the main motion.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Pauzé, you have the floor.

Ms. Monique Pauzé: I'd like to move an amendment, Mr. Chair.

My amendment is to delete from the motion the part that deals with the Alberta energy regulator.

I will go back to the French text: "*que le Comité de l'environnement et du développement durable invite Rich Kruger, PDG de Suncor, à expliquer pourquoi leurs entreprises abandonnent les objectifs climatiques qu'elles s'étaient fixés antérieurement face à l'urgence climatique*". After the comma that follows, I propose to delete "*ainsi qu'à inviter l'organisme de réglementation de l'énergie de l'Alberta, lors d'une réunion distincte, à expliquer sa décision d'imposer un moratoire sur les projets d'énergie renouvelable*". Consequently, in the previous comments, we should also delete the whereas statement that specifically talks about the Government of Alberta.

This motion contains—

The Chair: One moment, Ms. Pauzé. Do you want to delete the rest of that part, "*malgré l'essor de l'industrie dans la province*"?

Ms. Monique Pauzé: No, no.

The Chair: Okay.

Ms. Monique Pauzé: It ends with "*d'imposer un moratoire sur les projets d'énergie renouvelable*".

The Chair: I'll read the motion as it would be amended by the proposed amendment, just to make sure we're on the same page.

Ms. Monique Pauzé: Please do.

The Chair: La motion would read "*que, conformément à l'article 108(2), le Comité permanent de l'environnement et du développement durable invite Rich Kruger, PDG de Suncor, à expliquer pourquoi leurs entreprises abandonnent les objectifs climatiques qu'elles s'étaient fixés antérieurement face à l'urgence climatique malgré l'essor de l'industrie dans la province*".

Ms. Monique Pauzé: Now I see what you were saying, Mr. Chair. You're right: it could be deleted to the end, including "*malgré l'essor de l'industrie dans la province*".

The Chair: So we would delete everything right up to the word "*province*".

Ms. Monique Pauzé: That's correct.

The Chair: Okay.

It's not complicated. We want to delete the passage after "*l'urgence climatique*" up to the semicolon. So we would delete the passage from "*ainsi qu'à inviter*" to "*malgré l'essor de l'industrie dans la province*".

• (1235)

Ms. Monique Pauzé: That's correct.

May I now move my proposed amendment?

The Chair: Yes, you have the floor.

Ms. Monique Pauzé: Mr. Bachrach's motion deals with two things: the oil and gas companies, which are not taking climate targets into account at all, and what happened in Alberta.

The Chair: One moment, Ms. Pauzé. Mr. Mazier has a point of order.

[*English*]

Mr. Dan Mazier: Mr. Chair, on a point of order, can we have this in writing? Right now you're just jotting notes. Can we have this in writing so that we're all looking at the same thing and we all know what we're debating? Can we get this circulated, please?

The Chair: You know, it's....

Mr. Dan Mazier: I don't know; you had to do lots of doodling there. I think it's—

The Chair: No, no. I struck out a whole phrase, that's all.

Mr. Dan Mazier: Well, what was that phrase?

The Chair: I can read in English what we'd be striking out.

The motion is basically the same, except we've added the Alberta minister of energy and mines, the Honourable Brian Jean. We're all clear on that. There's no objection to that.

What Madame Pauzé is doing is that she wants to take out the reference to the Alberta Energy Regulator. Basically, in English it would end after “in the face of a climate emergency”, and then you'd have a semicolon. We'd be taking this out: “as well as invite the Alberta Energy Regulator in a separate meeting to explain the decision to place a moratorium on renewable energy projects despite the booming industry in the province”. All of that would be out.

The logic is that Madame Pauzé does not think we should be getting involved in a provincial jurisdiction. It's all pretty simple. I mean, I think everyone understands.

[*Translation*]

Is that correct, Ms. Pauzé?

Ms. Monique Pauzé: Mr. Chair, you understood my thinking entirely.

The Chair: Perfect.

So you may continue to defend your proposed amendment.

Ms. Monique Pauzé: I will go back to my argument.

You can take a ruler and strike out what I said. It doesn't change any other wording; it just deletes the passage.

What I find especially interesting about Mr. Bachrach's motion is the first part, which refers to the fact that the oil and gas companies, particularly North American ones like BP and Shell, are backtracking on their commitments, somewhat behind the scenes. All of a sudden, they no longer have their targets and they definitely haven't put in the effort needed to limit warming according to the plan set out in the Paris Agreement.

However, the other part of the motion concerns the jurisdictions of Quebec and the provinces, as well as their environmental sovereignty. That's why I voted earlier against calling the minister from Alberta.

I'm therefore moving this amendment that respects the jurisdictions of Quebec and the provinces.

The Chair: Would anyone else like to speak?

Mr. Mazier, you have the floor.

[*English*]

Mr. Dan Mazier: I completely agree with Madame Pauzé on that one. I think that's been the problem I've had with this all the way along. We're isolating the minister. I guess I would ask that this be stricken.

Again, I would move that we remove bringing in the natural resource minister.

The Chair: We have to deal with Madame Pauzé's amendment. Then you can present an amendment.

Mr. Dan Mazier: Okay.

The Chair: Are we ready to vote on Madame Pauzé's amendment?

It looks like we are.

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

The Chair: Now the Alberta Energy Regulator has been spared a trip to Ottawa, as I understand it.

A voice: [*Inaudible—Editor*]

The Chair: Is he coming anyway, to the other committee? Pardon?

Mr. Patrick Weiler: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair. We do have another motion that was passed in this committee to reinstate Imperial Oil—

The Chair: Right—for the Kearn.

Mr. Patrick Weiler: —and the Alberta Energy Regulator to come and speak to Kearn.

The Chair: Yes. Okay.

Go ahead, Mr. Mazier.

Mr. Dan Mazier: May I call a short recess here?

The Chair: Yes.

Mr. Dan Mazier: Thanks.

• (1235)

(Pause)

• (1255)

The Chair: Order.

You should all have received the motion as amended—not the “whereases”, but just the core of the motion.

Mr. Dan Mazier: Thank you, Chair.

The Chair: No, no; I understand the utility of that.

It's basically one o'clock. I would ask for a motion to adjourn, and we can continue this at the next meeting.

Mr. Dan Mazier: I'll make a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: I'm sorry, Chair; are you recognizing me?

The Chair: Yes. Mr. Mazier has—

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: I move that we postpone this matter until September 21. That's our next meeting.

The Chair: Well, that's what I'm saying. Yes, you can, but apparently it's at the discretion of the chair. I agree with you that we should continue this at the next meeting. I don't know if you still want to propose your motion, but the plan is to continue this at the next meeting.

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: I think it will convey the will of the committee—

The Chair: Sure.

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: —and that will complement the discretion of the chair.

The Chair: Let's just hope you don't get beaten on this. Anyway, go ahead, if you wish, Mr. Bachrach.

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: Sure. It's non-debatable.

The Chair: It's non-debatable.

Mr. Taylor Bachrach: Let's just go to a vote and see where it goes.

The Chair: We'll continue next meeting where we left off, with the speakers list as it stands now, although I don't know if Mr. Falk will be—

Mr. Dan Mazier: Can I get a copy of where the speakers list is at?

The Chair: Yes.

Mr. Dan Mazier: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: Then let's vote.

Mr. Dan Mazier: To adjourn.

The Chair: No. It's to continue at the next meeting, to postpone this until the next meeting. Then we can vote to adjourn.

(Motion agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0)

The Chair: The motion passes.

Now do we have a motion to adjourn, Mr. Mazier?

Mr. Mazier: Yes.

The Chair: Does everyone agree?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: We'll see you on Thursday. We are 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>