



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on Industry and Technology

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 044

Thursday, November 17, 2022

Chair: Mr. Joël Lightbound



Standing Committee on Industry and Technology

Thursday, November 17, 2022

• (1535)

[*English*]

The Chair (Mr. Joël Lightbound (Louis-Hébert, Lib.)): I call this meeting to order.

Welcome to meeting number 44 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Industry and Technology.

Pursuant to the order of reference of Wednesday, June 1, 2022, the committee is meeting to study Bill C-235, an act respecting the building of a green economy in the Prairies.

Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format, pursuant to the House order of Thursday, June 23, 2022.

[*Translation*]

Good afternoon. It's a pleasure to see everyone again.

[*English*]

First, there are a few items of business in terms of how we are going to proceed on the clause-by-clause consideration today that I'd like to share with you.

[*Translation*]

As the name suggests, this is an examination of all the clauses in the order in which they appear in the bill. I will call each clause successively, and each clause is subject to debate and a vote.

If there are amendments to the clause in question, I will recognize the member proposing the amendment, who may explain it should they wish. The amendment will then be open for debate. When no further members wish to comment, the amendment will be voted on.

The amendments will be considered in the order in which they appear in the package the committee members received from the clerk.

Members should note that amendments must be submitted in writing to the clerk.

Since this is the first time this committee is examining a bill clause by clause, I will proceed slowly so that everyone can follow the discussion.

[*English*]

Amendments have been given an alphanumeric number in the top right corner to indicate which party submitted them. There is no need for a seconder to move an amendment.

Once an amendment has been moved, the member will need unanimous consent to withdraw it.

[*Translation*]

When an amendment is being debated, members may propose subamendments, which must be submitted in writing. The permission of the mover of the amendment is not required. The committee can have only one subamendment before it at a time, and that subamendment cannot be amended. When a subamendment is moved to an amendment, it is voted on first. Then, another subamendment may be moved, or the committee may consider the main amendment and vote to adopt or defeat it.

Once the committee has voted on the various clauses, the committee will vote on the title and the bill itself.

If any amendments have been adopted, it may be necessary to order a reprint of the bill as a working copy for House use at report stage.

Lastly, the committee shall instruct the chair to report the bill to the House. The report shall indicate only the text of amendments that have been adopted and any clauses that have been removed.

Everyone seems to be clear on the procedure, so I think we are ready to start the clause-by-clause study.

Pursuant to Standing Order 75(1), consideration of clause 1, the short title, is postponed.

I therefore call clause 2.

(On clause 2)

The Chair: Does anyone wish to propose amendments to clause 2?

Go ahead, Mr. Fillmore.

[*English*]

Mr. Andy Fillmore (Halifax, Lib.): Thank you very much, Chair.

I'll draw committee members' attention to the package of amendments that is before them, specifically amendment G-1.

This is a very simple amendment. It is simply stating that the minister responsible would be "the minister responsible for economic development in the Prairie provinces" rather than the Minister of Industry.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Perkins.

[English]

Mr. Rick Perkins (South Shore—St. Margarets, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you for going slowly.

Mr. Fillmore, I don't have a problem with the change, but could you provide an explanation as to why there has been the change in the minister responsible?

Mr. Andy Fillmore: Certainly.

The bill itself refers to the Prairies and economic development in the Prairies. By good fortune, we have a minister whose portfolio is exactly that. It just makes good sense that we would have a minister who would have more of his or her attention to devote to this bill and its outcomes than the Minister of Industry.

[Translation]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Fillmore.

Go ahead, Mr. Vis.

[English]

Mr. Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon, CPC): In good faith, I have another question to Mr. Fillmore.

My experience with Pacific Economic Development and previous to that with Western Economic Diversification is that those ministers don't generally have much say over economic development or policy. They generally hand out grants to various businesses and organizations in their respective provinces. Including this clause in this piece of legislation would effectively enlarge the responsibility of the minister of economic development.

I'm not necessarily opposed to it. I just want to know whether the government side thought that implication through.

• (1540)

Mr. Andy Fillmore: Thank you.

I think that the drafter had included the Minister of Industry at the beginning as a statute minister. The drafter was under the impression that it must be a statute minister who is responsible in a case like this. Later it was determined that a non-statute minister could in fact be the minister responsible.

We think it's a great idea—the drafter thinks it's a great idea—for the reason that this will be a minister whose entire focus is the Prairies and their well-being. As we know, the Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry is drawn in many directions at once. A lot of his time is spent overseas developing trade opportunities for Canada, and we believe that the good outcomes intended by the bill would be better served by someone with better focus on the Prairies.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Williams.

Mr. Ryan Williams (Bay of Quinte, CPC): Thank you.

Through you, Mr. Chair, my question will go back to Mr. Fillmore.

There's a lot of language in here that does talk about.... For instance, in the summary, we still have “collaboration with the Minister of Environment, the Minister of Transport, the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Natural Resources and any minister responsi-

ble for economic development in the Prairie provinces”, so I think we already had that minister there.

Are we then eliminating the Minister of Industry? The Minister of Industry is being eliminated, but still we have collaboration with the ministers of environment, transport, finance.... I'm just wondering if the Minister of Industry should still be included in some part of this summary. How would we do that?

Thank you.

Mr. Andy Fillmore: Yes, you're quite right. The Minister of Industry is still implicated. In a later amendment, you'll see where that comes up. In fact, I believe it's G-2 and G-3.

The amendments together eliminate the Minister of Industry as the implicated responsible minister, but add the Minister of Transport back in as one to be consulted with and to be part of consultations and collective work going forward, along with the Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Finance, Minister of Natural Resources and Minister of Transport.

The Minister of Industry gets put in that group of ministers, but we need somebody who's front and centre. The drafter and our team feel that it's best if it's the person who's devoted solely in their portfolio to the well-being of the Prairies. The Minister of Industry doesn't go away. That minister becomes one of the consulted ministers, along with those others that I've mentioned.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Fillmore.

Go ahead, Mr. Williams.

Mr. Ryan Williams: Thank you. I have a follow-up question.

Some of us are just coming into the INDU committee, so for clarification, is this the only bill relating to one part of Canada for a green economy? Do we have an act respecting the green economy of Atlantic Canada, for instance? Is there any other, or is this the only one in front of Parliament so far?

Thank you.

Mr. Andy Fillmore: I'm not sure, Chair, who the question was directed to, but I could offer one observation.

Regional bills like this—regional efforts—have passed in the past. For example, in the east coast, we had something called the Atlantic growth strategy, which was specifically geared towards some of the deeply ingrained economic hardships that we face in the Atlantic provinces. A special program was developed around that.

I liken this bill to that program. There is some fairly close precedent, I would say.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Williams.

Mr. Ryan Williams: Thank you very much.

Mr. Chair, to Mr. Fillmore again, where I'm getting to is this: Did we give that responsibility to another minister or did the Minister of Industry have that responsibility?

Mr. Andy Fillmore: It was the minister responsible for ACOA, which is the equivalent of the Minister for Prairies Economic Development Canada.

Mr. Ryan Williams: Okay. I have just one last question for Mr. Fillmore.

Just to get the wording right, through you, Mr. Chair, to Mr. Fillmore or whoever wants to answer, is this similar language? Do we have still that the minister would be collaborating with the Minister of Finance, the Minister of Environment, etc.?

Mr. Andy Fillmore: That's exactly right.

If you were just to flip to amendments G-2 and G-3, you'll see that all of those ministers are together in a very happy and collaborative space within the confines of this bill.

The Chair: Okay. I see no more interventions.

• (1545)

[Translation]

Shall G-1 carry?

(Amendment agreed to)

The Chair: Shall clause 2 as amended carry?

(Clause 2 as amended agreed to)

(On clause 3)

The Chair: We are now on clause 3.

I think Mr. Fillmore wants to move G-2.

[English]

Mr. Andy Fillmore: Thanks, Chair. This will pick up where we left off.

These two amendments are trying to create a complete list of ministers who will be consulted and have input and responsibility with regard to the bill. I would therefore propose that the line 14 on page 1 be replaced with the following. It's odd, because it starts in the middle of a word, so it sounds like this:

ister of the Environment, the Minister of Transport, the Minister of Industry, the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, the

That ends the replacement of line 14.

[Translation]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Fillmore.

[English]

Are there comments?

Go ahead, Mr. Perkins.

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

Mr. Fillmore, as I mentioned to you earlier in our conversation, I want to make sure I'm reading this correctly. The current version of this subclause 3(1) has the Minister of Finance on the list, and if I'm interpreting your amendment G-2 correctly, the Minister of Finance is no longer part of the list.

Mr. Andy Fillmore: We add the Minister of Finance in on G-3.

I can provide a little detail. I beg the members' patience on this. It is a bit confusing.

As written, the unamended bill mentions in this clause the ministers of environment, transport, finance, natural resources and the Prairies. Missing from this list are industry and agriculture. That is what these amendments are trying to put together in a way that works well for the legislative clerk within the construct of these lines and these clauses.

The net result of G-2 and G-3 is to add the two missing ministers to the existing list of ministers. That's what we'd like to get to.

The Chair: I have Mr. Kram and Mr. Perkins.

Mr. Michael Kram (Regina—Wascana, CPC): Mr. Perkins asked the question I was going to ask. I'm happy with Mr. Fillmore's answer, so we'll move on.

[Translation]

The Chair: Great.

It doesn't look like anyone else wishes to comment.

Shall G-2 carry?

(Amendment agreed to)

The Chair: Since G-2 was adopted, CPC-1 cannot be moved because the previous line was amended, so there is a conflict. Everyone seems to be clear on that.

Are there any other amendments to clause 3?

I think you wanted to move G-3, Mr. Fillmore.

[English]

Mr. Andy Fillmore: Thank you.

Here's the other half of the amendment to make sure that the list of ministers is complete.

Now we will replace lines 15 to 17 in clause 3 on page 1 with the following:

Minister of Finance and the Minister of Natural Resources, develop a framework to coordi-

Again, it ends in the middle of a word.

Taken all together, that gives us our complete list of ministers.

• (1550)

[Translation]

The Chair: Shall G-3 carry?

(Amendment agreed to)

The Chair: We also have G-3.1.

The floor is yours, Mr. Fillmore.

[English]

Mr. Andy Fillmore: Thank you.

This is strictly to correct the omission of municipalities as one of the consultees in the process of working on this bill.

It proposes then to replace line 4 on page 2 with the following:
and with municipalities, Indigenous governing bodies, the private sector

It's exactly the same phrase that's there. We're just adding "municipalities" into the mix.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Fillmore.

Go ahead, Mr. Lemire.

Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): I simply have a comment.

Obviously, the bill does not apply to Quebec, but if it did, we would oppose this amendment because it is not the federal government's job to consult with municipalities. That is a provincial responsibility.

The Chair: Just a moment, Mr. Lemire. I think we have a problem with the interpretation.

Is the issue fixed now?

[*English*]

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): It is now, Mr. Chair.

Can we please have Mr. Lemire start over?

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire: All right, Mr. Masse.

As I was saying, the bill does not apply to Quebec. It applies to the Prairies. If it did apply to Quebec, however, we would not support this amendment because dealing with municipal governments is the responsibility of the provinces, not the federal government.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Lemire.

Over to you, Mr. Perkins.

[*English*]

Mr. Rick Perkins: I would agree with my colleague. The municipalities are the creation of a provincial act and derive their powers from that. They're not a constitutional entity. As such, I think we would oppose this in general form for that reason.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Perkins.

Go ahead, Mr. Fillmore.

[*English*]

Mr. Andy Fillmore: Thank you.

I won't chase this one too far. I will just point out that in the investing in Canada infrastructure plan, for example, we got a really good national infrastructure plan in part by consulting with the municipalities. Even though it is the job of the provinces to have that formal relationship, it's important, and I think incumbent on all of us when we set policies that impact all orders of government, that we consult with them, even though there may not be a formal constitutional relationship there.

I'll leave it there.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Fillmore.

Shall G-3.1 carry?

(Amendment agreed to on division)

The Chair: CPC-2 is no longer on the list, so that brings us to CPC-3, which also pertains to clause 3.

Does someone wish to move the amendment?

[*English*]

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

I wasn't in the committee for all the hearings on this bill. I was just in on the last one. In some of my questioning of one of the witnesses in that last meeting, I was trying to ascertain that as a company that was in the mining business, they were already highly regulated and their regulator already requires a certain amount of extensive consultation when they do their work. In addition, as a mining company, they were expanding that beyond just what was required by law.

I think from a philosophical basis on our side, the idea that we would impose a duplicate consultation process on a company or an entity when other laws and other requirements, whether they're provincial regulations or national regulators, are already covering it and require them to make those.

In some instances, companies aren't regulated, so the intent of this amendment is to say that this process is okay if they aren't already covered by some other regulatory process that requires them to do this consultation anyway. It's trying to avoid the duplication of two efforts and the prolonging of costs and time to get projects passed when really it's not needed in certain circumstances.

• (1555)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Perkins.

I have Mr. Erskine-Smith next.

Mr. Nathaniel Erskine-Smith (Beaches—East York, Lib.): My instinct was to say the same as Mr. Perkins, that we don't want duplication. I think we're sensitive to that. We don't want duplicative processes here. However, for clarity, with the language of subclause 3(2) the obligation to consult is not on the private sector. The obligation to consult is not on other orders of government. The obligation is on the minister. That obligation rests specifically in relation to the development of a framework pursuant to this specific legislation.

In my reading of proposed new subclause 3(2.1), effectively what we're saying, if we adopt this amendment, is this:

The consultation process provided for under subsection (2)

—i.e., that obligation of the minister pursuant to the development of this green framework for the Prairies—

is only required if such a consultation process is not already provided for under any other Act of Parliament or any Act of a province or by-law of a municipality.

It's not required. There's no obligation on a minister under any other act to do this development work.

To the extent that we want to avoid duplication in the work of a minister doing this kind of work, I would say that if there's a subsequent act of Parliament before us that would impose such an obligation, then we could deal with it at that time. We could maybe say, "Let's not do it, because we already have this green Prairies framework."

As it stands, it doesn't make a ton of sense to me.

[Translation]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Erskine-Smith.

Go ahead, Mr. Perkins.

[English]

Mr. Rick Perkins: I certainly see the viewpoint that you're expressing. However, I do believe this bill would require the minister to conduct a consultation process for companies, projects or initiatives that are already covered by other laws at other levels, thus ensuring that there is a duplication of effort. The intent of this amendment is to avoid that.

[Translation]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Perkins.

Does anyone else wish to comment on CPC-3?

[English]

I gather that there is no... There doesn't seem to be agreement among the parties on this amendment, so I will probably have this amendment go to a vote. However, if you just bear with me for one minute, we'll just wait.

Mr. Kram has something to add while we're waiting. Go ahead, Mr. Kram.

Mr. Michael Kram: While we're waiting. I think one of the challenges that the sponsor of this bill has encountered from the beginning is to strike the right balance between being inclusive and not being redundant. I think that this amendment helps to strike that balance.

The Chair: I appreciate your timely intervention, Mr. Kram.

[Translation]

I want to make sure everyone is on the same page. Since there doesn't seem to be consensus on CPC-3 given Mr. Erskine-Smith's comment, I think we should proceed with a recorded division.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

The Chair: That brings us to CPC-4.

• (1600)

[English]

I'm looking for a mover.

Go ahead, Mr. Williams.

Mr. Ryan Williams: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I will move the motion. Would you like some explanation of it?

The Chair: It's entirely up to you.

Mr. Ryan Williams: I don't mind doing that.

I think there is a big need to include what's happening right now in the Prairies in terms of what we feel is significant for economic development and jobs at the moment. Obviously, when we talk about "green", we're not talking about eliminating these jobs and these industries; we're talking about greening these jobs and these industries. When we talk about "traditional energy" in the Prairies, we are talking about Canadian oil. We're talking about natural gas. One of the big parts of this was also adding in the line "to prevent carbon leakage".

When we talk about certain technologies—obviously, we've heard from other witnesses, and we want to continue to speak about it—that's carbon capture. That's including making sure that we're retrofitting and fitting our piping so that it's, obviously, greener. We're talking about the industries that are employing roughly over 585,000 workers in Canada. In the Prairies, that is significantly where 80% or more of those industries are.

We think it's very important. Including this line in this bill is something we're very adamant about. It does talk about the significance of those industries, but also, of course, this is a green bill, and it talks about that. It has to include those industries and how we're also greening those industries there significantly, first because of the jobs that are there and their importance to the Prairies and to Canada, and second because of the need to work with those industries, have consultations and make sure that we're building that very important part of Canada.

That's why we included this, and we want to make sure it is a big part of this bill.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[Translation]

The Chair: Thank you for explaining your amendment, Mr. Williams, but I need to make you aware of a ruling by the chair.

Bill C-235 would enact the act respecting the building of a green economy in the Prairies. The purpose of the amendment is to foster "job creation in traditional energy industries in the Prairies", rather than fostering a zero-emissions economy through retraining.

According to page 770 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, "an amendment to a bill that was referred to a committee *after* second reading is out of order if it is beyond the scope and principle of the bill." The chair is of the opinion that job creation in traditional energy industries is contrary to the principle of the bill.

Accordingly, the amendment is out of order.

[English]

If there are no other comments, we will move to the next amendment we have, which is G-4.

I see Mr. Fillmore on G-4.

Mr. Andy Fillmore: Thanks, Chair.

Because the contents of G-4 are contained in the contents of G-5, we will not move G-4. We are happy to move on to G-5.

The Chair: Okay. G-4 hasn't been moved, from what I gather, so we're now on to G-5.

Mr. Andy Fillmore: I'll speak to that, if it suits the Chair.

This amendment is talking about the notion of economic growth, skills transfer and that kind of thing, so what we would like to do here is replace line 14 on page 2 with the following:

(b) fostering job creation and economic prosperity, as evidenced by supporting outcomes, in regions

We came to this because we heard in testimony some push-back on the notion of retraining, so we landed instead on economic prosperity. If members want, we could include the term “skills transfer”, because that phrase was discussed in testimony in a positive way, as opposed to “retraining”, but we'll start with the way it's written now. That is “fostering job creation and economic prosperity, as evidenced by supporting outcomes, in regions”.

• (1605)

[Translation]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Fillmore.

Go ahead, Mr. Lemire.

Mr. Sébastien Lemire: I just have a comment about the French version of G-5. Where it says “de manière à permettre aux ré-”, going by the English, I think it should say “régions”, instead of “ré-”. I think it's just a typo.

Ms. Marie-Hélène Sauvé (Committee Researcher): I'd like to clarify something, if I may. The amendment seeks to amend lines 14 and 15 on page 2 of the French version of the bill. Line 15 ends with “ré-”. The wording being proposed in the amendment simply reflects the end of the line as currently worded in the French version of the bill.

Mr. Sébastien Lemire: Thank you, Ms. Sauvé.

The Chair: Over to you, Mr. Kram.

[English]

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

To Mr. Fillmore, through the chair, I was a bit curious about the phrase “as evidenced by supporting outcomes”. Outcomes of what? Is it of job creation and fostering economic prosperity, or of greening the Prairie economy?

If you could clarify the intent of that clause, I would appreciate it.

Mr. Andy Fillmore: Thank you, Chair.

If I may, we heard testimony that said it would be great if there were some kind of nod in the act to metrics and the fact that we want to measure something and observe something that's changing with some positive outcomes.

This was the attempt in that phrasing. That's what's meant by “as evidenced by supporting outcomes, in regions”.

If we wanted to change some wording there to make it a little clearer, that would be great. I think if we were to change it to, for

example, “fostering job creation and skills transfer, as evidenced by supporting outcomes, in regions”, that would probably clarify what “supporting outcomes” are. “Job creation” and “skills transfer” are clearly talking about jobs.

If folks have suggestions, I think we're open to improving this language.

[Translation]

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Perkins.

[English]

Mr. Rick Perkins: Mr. Fillmore, I'm still a little confused, but not about what you thought might clarify it a little more. I don't know what you mean by “supporting outcomes”. Is that proof of success on some specific metric? I don't understand the phrase.

My second question is.... This about the Prairies, but we use the word “regions” in the amendment. Is this contemplating something broader than the Prairies?

Those are two questions I have. I still don't understand “supporting outcomes”. I get “fostering job creation” and the economic transfer of success of training or retraining, or whatever you're getting at. Are you trying to say that it has to be done in such a way that we can prove there are results? Is that what you're trying to get at—and what are “regions”?

Mr. Andy Fillmore: I'll take another crack at it.

Let's clear up the “regions” aspect first. I believe that the author of the bill recognizes that the Prairies are a vast place and there are multiple regions. I think we can clarify that by saying “Prairies regions” or “the Prairies”, even. “Prairie regions” might be the right term.

Coming back to the notion of metrics, I think it would clarify matters if we swapped the phrase “economic prosperity” for “skills transfer”. I think the intention of the drafter here was about jobs, so we could say “fostering job creation and skills transfer, as evidenced by increased employment”.

I think anything like that would work well.

The Chair: Monsieur Fillmore, what is the exact wording you're proposing?

Mr. Andy Fillmore: It's “fostering job creation and skills transfer, as evidenced by increased employment in Prairie regions.”

The Chair: I see some form of consensus with this subamendment.

Mr. Ryan Williams: Mr. Chair, I have one point of clarification on skills transfer.

Through you, Mr. Chair, to Mr. Fillmore, can you please clarify that a bit more? Is “skills transfer” upskilling, training? How would you define “skills transfer”?

• (1610)

Mr. Andy Fillmore: It came up in testimony once or twice, but there was some backlash to the notion of retraining. The witness described to us that they felt it was demeaning in some way to workers who have valid skill sets and who don't want or need to be retrained but can repurpose those skills, so we should refer to that as "skills transfer".

That's all that is. We're softening the language of the original drafting, which was "retraining", to "skills transfer".

Does that help?

Mr. Ryan Williams: I'm sorry. I'm going to clarify this.

Through you, Mr. Chair, instead of "skills training", we're replacing "training" with "transfer". Would that be correct?

Mr. Andy Fillmore: That's right. It's the idea that a welder in the oil patch could be a great welder on a solar farm. They already know how to weld.

Mr. Ryan Williams: My last question would be about "by supporting outcomes". I agree with "increased employment".

Was there any talk about increased training? Is there something around the training programs and/or school? I'm trying to think of school programs. I don't think there's a specific word you can put in there, but I love that we're looking at outcomes, so it's great that we have specifics to put in place of "supporting outcomes".

I'm wondering if there's anything else with the skills transfer that we would put into wording that would essentially mean that we're seeing that outcome, besides just "increased employment".

Mr. Andy Fillmore: My sense, as someone who's been involved in writing public policy for a very long time, is that we don't want to get too prescriptive in the legislation. Maybe we can leave room in the work that follows among the consultations to determine what the positive outcomes are, but we can give it some general framing and direction here, perhaps in the language that I've provided.

The Chair: Mr. Fillmore, to be sure that everyone's on board, would you mind repeating one last time the change in language that you're proposing? By the same token, I would ask if you or someone on your team could send the subamendment by writing to the clerk.

Mr. Andy Fillmore: Sure.

On the language, we would replace line 14 on page 2 with the following: "fostering job creation and skills transfer, as evidenced by increased employment in Prairie regions."

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Fillmore. Is it the will of the committee to adopt this amendment to the amendment?

[Translation]

(Subamendment agreed to)

The Chair: Shall G-5 as amended carry?

(Amendment as amended agreed to)

The Chair: We are now on G-6.

The floor is yours, Mr. Fillmore.

[English]

Mr. Andy Fillmore: I beg the forgiveness of committee members who may be getting tired of hearing me speak. This is a quick one, though. This is simply making a change that would improve the drafting of the bill.

This clause refers to building a zero-emissions green economy. What we really want to be building is a net-zero green economy. This is simply adding the word "net" before the words "zero emissions".

To say it officially, in the English version, we would replace line 16 on page 2 with the following:

them to build a net-zero emissions green economy and

[Translation]

The Chair: Thank you.

Go ahead, Mr. Perkins.

[English]

Mr. Rick Perkins: Thank you, Mr. Fillmore. I have a quick question. I think I know the answer, but I want to make sure before I vote on it.

Could you explain what you see as the difference between "net-zero emissions" and "zero-emissions", which is the way it's written right now?

Mr. Andy Fillmore: Yes, sure. There are lots of ways to get to net zero. There is only one way to get to zero.

To get to zero, you have to stop putting carbon in the atmosphere and stop burning fossil fuels. To get to net zero, you can have transfers, swaps and all kinds of things that still get you, effectively, to net zero, but still allow the very necessary combustion of fossil fuels and other emissions still necessary in industry.

That's a high-level description of it.

• (1615)

The Chair: I think that's a worthwhile amendment.

Are there any other further comments?

[Translation]

Shall G-6 carry?

(Amendment agreed to)

The Chair: That brings us to CPC-5.

Over to you, Mr. Perkins.

[English]

Mr. Rick Perkins: Mr. Chair, I think it's probably pretty self-evident. This is adding additional important industries in western Canada to the framework. They may have been overlooked a bit.

This would include include "natural gas, liquefied natural gas, oil drilling and pipeline transportation to ensure that more of Canada's world-leading environmentally and socially responsible oil and gas reaches foreign markets", which we need to do to reduce carbon around the world.

That's the purpose of adding this to this consultation.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Thank you for explaining your amendment, Mr. Perkins, but I need to make you aware of a ruling by the chair.

Bill C-235 would enact the act respecting the building of a green economy in the Prairies. The purpose of the amendment is to prioritize projects in traditional energy industries “to replace higher-emission energy sources produced under lower human rights standards”.

As I mentioned earlier, *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, states on page 770 that “an amendment to a bill that was referred to a committee *after* second reading is out of order if it is beyond the scope and principle of the bill.” The chair is of the opinion that the amendment would add a requirement to adhere to human rights standards in developing a framework for a green prairie economy, which amounts to a new concept that is beyond the scope of the bill.

Accordingly, the amendment is out of order.

That brings us to PV-1.

Mr. Sébastien Lemire: I can move it, because I don't think we have anyone from—

The Chair: Just a moment, Mr. Lemire. I need to clarify something.

I know it doesn't seem like it, but I'm new to this as well. This is my first clause-by-clause study.

I've just been told that, when it's a Green Party amendment, it's deemed to have been moved, so we can proceed to the debate.

If you have something to say, the floor is now yours, Mr. Lemire.

Mr. Sébastien Lemire: I will simply say that I support this amendment, and I urge my fellow members to vote in favour of it.

The Chair: Thank you.

Does anyone else wish to comment on the first Green Party amendment, PV-1?

Go ahead, Mr. Williams.

[*English*]

Mr. Ryan Williams: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

We will be opposing this amendment. I do like that nuclear energy has been included in the content section, line (c). We certainly look at net-zero emissions or zero emissions when we look at nuclear energy, especially CANDU, Canadian nuclear energy. It is probably one of the top reasons we can find net-zero emissions, especially when that's combined with a need for energy and power as a whole. When we look across the world, we see that CANDU continues to be the pillar for nuclear energy, not only with the technology that we've had for many decades but also with the new modular nuclear reactor technology that's being developed in Saskatchewan and in the Prairies specifically. Some of that technology is being developed in Ontario—which is, of course, fantastic—and in the Prairies, more importantly, because of the work in Saskatchewan and Saskatoon.

When we've studied this in the science and research committee—and we've had quite a few studies on nuclear technology—every expert talks about two things. Number one is the need for three times as much energy in our grid by 2030, and number two is that nuclear power is the only way that we're going to be able to achieve that with a sort of net emissions base. If we remove nuclear energy from that, every expert has testified that there's no real clean way to add power that goes to people's homes to power them and allows people to heat their homes during the winter, when it can be quite cold, I hear, in the Prairies.

Canada is looking at lowering emissions and providing that technology across the world, and I think our nuclear energy and nuclear modular reactors and our CANDU energy are some things that the European Union is looking at right now. From an innovation and industry perspective, it's also something that we can export, meaning it does increase jobs and GDP and the supportive outcomes.

However, I think the premise of this is very much.... It can be debated. Nuclear is absolutely a green technology because it does remove emissions. When we look across the world at nations like China that are burning coal in their power plants, we see that nuclear technology is the only answer to respond to massive amounts of energy need and to reduce emissions.

On that note, we will be opposing this amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (1620)

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

I have Mr. Kram, Mr. Masse, and then Mr. Perkins.

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

Along those same lines, at the October 20 meeting we heard from Mr. Dale Austin from Cameco Corporation, the uranium mining company. He was, I would say, one of the more supportive witnesses of the bill, and he was very clear that there is no way to get to net zero without nuclear energy. Therefore, I don't know how this bill could possibly proceed if this amendment proceeds.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Kram.

Mr. Masse is next.

Mr. Brian Masse: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you for the interventions.

I want to be clear that I will be supporting this amendment. The reason is that I've been actively opposed to the storage proposal of a DGR, a deep geological repository, in the Bruce-Huron area.

For members who are not aware, this is to build a nuclear storage facility within a kilometre of the Great Lakes. It would actually be the height of the CN Tower. There was actually a turning down of that proposal by Saugeen First Nation, and then the subsequent proposal just went next door to the Saugeen First Nation and has actually created quite a conflict.

To conclude, this is a policy that Canada promised never to do under then foreign affairs minister Joe Clark in the Brian Mulroney government. Therefore, until there's resolution to this situation, I will not be supporting the expansion at this point in time.

Thank you, Mr. Chair and committee.

[Translation]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Masse.

Over to you, Mr. Perkins.

[English]

Mr. Rick Perkins: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate Mr. Masse's position, but there is no way that we can get to net zero if in places other than the Prairies, we were to eliminate our nuclear energy, whether it was Ontario or in my part of the world, New Brunswick. The New Brunswick government, as part of their strategy to get off the Saudi Arabian oil that we're required to burn in Atlantic Canada, is looking to expand the small modular nuclear program and make that an important part of the net-zero carbon economy for the Atlantic region.

To lose the opportunity for that initiative and to lose that tool available to us for the Prairies in this bill would be going against the goal of getting our country to net zero.

[Translation]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Perkins.

It doesn't look like anyone else in the room or online has any comments.

Seeing as we don't have consensus on PV-1, I will call for a recorded division.

(Amendment negatived: nays 9; yeas 2 [See Minutes of Proceedings])

• (1625)

The Chair: That brings us to G-7.

Do we have a mover?

Go ahead, Mr. Fillmore.

[English]

Mr. Andy Fillmore: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Members may recall that during the previous discussion at the committee when we were discussing nuclear energy, it had been framed in the original drafting, I think, as a new form of energy, but there was an intervention that reminded us all that in fact there is a long history in Canada of nuclear energy. It's not a new energy source. This amendment amends the bill to reflect the fact that it's not a new energy source and simply would replace line 22 on page

2 with the following: "make use of all sources of energy, including nuclear".

[Translation]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Fillmore.

Do we have any other comments on G-7? It doesn't look like it.

Shall G-7 carry?

(Amendment agreed to)

The Chair: Now we are on CPC- 6.

Do we have a mover?

[English]

Mr. Rick Perkins: Yes, Mr. Chair.

[Translation]

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Perkins.

[English]

Mr. Rick Perkins: The simplest way to support the purpose of this amendment, I'll say it's to try to moderate the top-down orders from Ottawa when there are already other vehicles available for this consultation. We would like to continue to push for this amendment and approach this part of the bill by modifying it by saying "supporting the continued development of", as opposed to "integrating", which was the original language.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Perkins. Are there any comments?

[Translation]

Go ahead, Mr. Lemire.

Mr. Sébastien Lemire: We oppose this amendment, so can it be adopted on division? Otherwise, I would like a recorded division, please.

The Chair: My understanding is that CPC-6 can be adopted on division, if that is the wish of the committee.

(Amendment agreed to on division)

The Chair: We are now G-8.

Do we have a mover?

The floor is yours, Mr. Fillmore.

[English]

Mr. Andy Fillmore: This amendment is based on the testimony of a number of witnesses—for example, the Alberta Irrigation Districts Association and the Canadian Cattle Association—that large water projects, irrigation projects, should be included in the scope of this study. We are simply adding a phrase "including large water projects".

It goes like this. We would replace line 32 on page 2 in clause 3 with the following:

(f) preparing infrastructure projects, including large water projects, that facilitate

The Chair: Thank you.

Are there any comments on amendment G-8?

Go ahead, Mr. Perkins.

Mr. Rick Perkins: Just to clarify the interpretation, would adding “large water projects” to this bill mean that if this bill passes and there was a large water project on the Prairies, it would not be required to go through this Ottawa-driven consultation process?

• (1630)

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Fillmore.

Mr. Andy Fillmore: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

If we look at the framing on page 2, we see that it starts as follows:

Content

(3) The framework must include measures that promote economic sustainability and growth and employment in the Prairie provinces by

Then we'll skip down to paragraph 3(3)(f), the subject of this amendment. If the proposed amendment is added to the paragraph, it would then say, “preparing infrastructure projects, including large water projects, that facilitate adaptation to climate change and mitigation of its adverse effects.”

This is really in direct response to, for example, the testimony from the Canadian Cattle Association:

I can say that the eastern part of the Prairies was impacted by pretty significant flooding this year as well. We're just seeing major shifts one way or the other. Critically, we need systems that make us all more resilient. To the degree that this bill would help with that, we're definitely supportive.

There's a similar quote from the Alberta Irrigation Districts Association that I could offer, if asked.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Fillmore.

Go ahead, Mr. Perkins.

Mr. Rick Perkins: I appreciate that, but I'm not sure why, in this paragraph of the bill, we'd be picking out just water projects. I believe they would already be covered. I know I asked the question in reverse the last time, so I'll ask it the opposite way this time.

Isn't it a sort of general clause now about preparing “infrastructure projects”? It doesn't eliminate any infrastructure project from being under this, so I'm not sure why we need to list just this one particular type.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Perkins, for your comment.

I don't know, Mr. Fillmore, if you want to volunteer a comment. Otherwise, I see there is probably disagreement on this amendment.

Hearing no comment, I will call the vote. I will ask the clerk to proceed.

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

The Chair: Amendment G-8 is defeated.

CPC-7 has been withdrawn.

[*Translation*]

Shall clause 3 as amended carry?

(Clause 3 as amended agreed to)

(On clause 4)

The Chair: That brings us to clause 4.

Does someone wish to move G-9?

[*English*]

Mr. Andy Fillmore: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This is just shortening the report deadline from 18 months to 12 months. It's giving the minister six fewer months to prepare the report to Parliament. It is replacing line 35 on page 2 with the following:

4(1) Within 12 months after the day on which this Act

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Fillmore.

Are there any comments on amendment G-9?

Go ahead, Mr. Kram.

Mr. Michael Kram: I remember that this one came up. I believe it was the sponsor of the bill who first floated that idea in the very first meeting.

Throughout the course of the study of this bill, I don't think we found any witness who had actually been consulted about the bill before coming to committee. Indeed, I found quite a few who had never even heard about it until I reached out to them.

I don't see what has changed since that first meeting to justify a compressed timeline. I'd be open to hearing other views on that subject.

The Chair: Are there other views on that subject?

If there are none, I can call this amendment to a vote.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

• (1635)

[*Translation*]

The Chair: That brings us to G-10.

Do we have a mover?

Go ahead, Mr. Fillmore.

[*English*]

Mr. Andy Fillmore: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This is regarding the publication of the report once it's completed.

The original drafting of the bill—now we're on page 3, lines 1 and 2—says “The Minister must publish the report on the website of the Department of Industry”. However, you will remember that some of our very early amendments today broadened the responsibility to a number of ministers, so this amendment acknowledges that and says that we would replace lines 1 and 2 on page 3 with the following:

(2) The Minister must publish the report on the departmental website within 10 days after the re-

It ends mid-word there.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Fillmore.

Are there any comments?

Go ahead, Mr. Williams.

Mr. Ryan Williams: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Through you to Mr. Fillmore, would it not be more relevant to post these on all the websites if we are seeing this through all the relevant ministers?

Mr. Andy Fillmore: The relevant ministers.... It's a fair question.

I could imagine that there would be natural resources information that might not be exactly relevant or important to post on the Minister of Finance's website. I think this was opening it up to sort of put the information on the website to which it most closely cleaves, whether that's natural resources, agriculture, industry or transport, rather than flooding them all with things that may not be relevant to the mandate of that particular minister.

The Chair: Mr. Perkins is next.

Mr. Rick Perkins: I think that's a great idea, Mr. Fillmore, but I don't think that's what this says. I think, because of the earlier amendments making the Prairies economic development minister the responsible minister, it means that this has to be published on that minister's website regardless of whatever other ministers are also driving the bus, if I'm reading this correctly.

The Chair: Do you have any comment, Mr. Fillmore?

Mr. Andy Fillmore: Yes. I'm thinking very carefully about Mr. Perkins' wise intervention there. I believe that he makes a good point. In fact, I'm going to have to reframe my framing and say that, yes, in fact, this amendment is intended to get the report onto the responsible minister's website. That's the minister we set up back in G-1, the Minister responsible for Prairies Economic Development.

The Chair: Just to understand, Mr. Fillmore, are you then proposing to just modify the language of G-10?

Mr. Andy Fillmore: No, what I was modifying was the language of my framing. I think the language of the amendment is fine, and Mr. Perkins interpreted it correctly in his first instance.

The Chair: Okay, so—

Mr. Andy Fillmore: This is because we've established in G-1 that the minister in this bill is, in fact, the Minister responsible for Prairies Economic Development.

The Chair: Then it's that minister's website, if we read this correctly.

Is there agreement to adopt G-10?

(Amendment agreed to)

• (1640)

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Shall clause 4 as amended carry?

(Clause 4 as amended agreed to)

(On clause 5)

The Chair: We are now on clause 5.

I have G-11 on my list.

Would someone like to move the amendment?

The floor is yours, Mr. Fillmore.

[*English*]

Mr. Andy Fillmore: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Members will remember G-2 and G-3. These are the analogues of those, but later in the bill. This is simply clearing up the ministers who are implicated by this bill so that the list is complete.

The speedy way to do this.... Just like with G-2 and G-3, where we had the ministers spread over two amendments, likewise they are spread over two amendments here in G-11 and G-12.

What I'd like to propose is that we not table G-11 and instead table G-12 and have committee members move subamendments to include the missing ministers.

The Chair: Just so we proceed in the proper fashion, Mr. Fillmore, I understand you're not moving G-11.

Mr. Andy Fillmore: That's correct.

The Chair: Now that brings us to G-12.

Mr. Andy Fillmore: That's right.

Why don't we start with tabling the amendment? Then we can fill in its missing pieces by subamendment, if I could propose that.

I'll table the amendment. It's to replace lines 8 to 10 on page 3 with the following:

of Transport, the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Natural Resources, prepare a

The Chair: The amendment has been heard. You have some slight change that you want to propose to it by way of subamendment.

Mr. Andy Fillmore: Yes. I'm just making sure I have all the ministers here. Yes, we're just missing the Minister of Industry here. I would propose to insert the Minister of Industry anywhere in that list.

The Chair: I understand that the Minister of Industry is missing, so you're just proposing to add that minister to the list somewhere in G-12.

Mr. Andy Fillmore: I could reread it with that inclusion if that's helpful.

The Chair: I think we all get it.

I'll go to Mr. Perkins first.

Mr. Rick Perkins: I'm striking out what I think is being withdrawn with this rewriting of the clause, so I just want to check to make sure I understand it correctly.

If I'm reading G-12 correctly, what's being deleted after "Minister of Transport" is "the Minister of Finance" and the words "and any minister responsible for economic development in the Prairie provinces".

Is that correct?

The Chair: I don't know, Mr. Fillmore, if you can read through it. That's not my understanding. I have, instead of—

Mr. Andy Fillmore: Yes, it is to remove the Prairie provinces minister, because that is “the” minister in the bill, and these are the supporting ministers, the reason being that the minister can't consult with himself or herself. This clause is about the Minister responsible for Prairies Economic Development consulting with these other ministers, so that minister is eliminated from this list.

Mr. Rick Perkins: That part makes sense, but I think the Minister of Finance is dropped as well.

The Chair: No, that minister is still there in the amendment. I think Mr. Fillmore was also proposing to just add the Minister of Industry, who is missing in amendment G-12.

Mr. Andy Fillmore: That way it's the same list of ministers that we had in G-3 that's brought forward here.

The Chair: Is the subamendment to add the Minister of Industry?

I see no opposition to that. We'll just take our time.

• (1645)

[*Translation*]

Shall the subamendment carry?

(Subamendment agreed to [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: That brings us back to G-12 as amended.

Over to you, Mr. Kram.

[*English*]

Mr. Michael Kram: Mr. Chair, for clarity, could we get you to read the amended amendment?

The Chair: Yes, we'll do that before we go on.

Mr. Fillmore, would you like to read it one last time as amended?

Mr. Andy Fillmore: It is to replace lines 8 to 10 on page 3 with the following:

of Transport, the Minister of Industry, the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Natural Resources, prepare a

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Shall G-12 as amended carry?

(Amendment as amended agreed to)

The Chair: I want to let everyone know that CPC-8 cannot be moved because it is no longer applicable now that G-12 has been adopted.

Shall clause 5 as amended carry?

(Clause 5 as amended agreed to)

The Chair: That was the last clause, which brings us to the short title.

Shall the short title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Shall the title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Shall the bill as amended carry?

Some hon. members: On division.

The Chair: Do I have the committee's consent to report the bill as amended to the House?

Some hon. members: On division.

The Chair: Do I have the committee's consent to order that the bill as amended be reprinted for House use at report stage?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: That concludes clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-235.

[*English*]

I want to thank you all for your collaboration today. It is much appreciated. That was the only order of business. It was a first experience for me and for this committee in this legislature, so I appreciate your collaboration and your hard work.

Thanks also to the legislative clerks, the analysts, the translators and all the support staff.

That concludes the business we had on the agenda today.

I see Mr. Masse.

Mr. Masse, before I adjourn, the floor is yours.

Mr. Brian Masse: I want to say, Mr. Chair, to you and the supporting staff, how good a job it was. Thank you also for explaining your decisions about amendments not being in order. It was a really good process today. I want to assure you that it made things a lot easier and was well done.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Masse.

Voices: Hear, hear!

The Chair: The credit goes to our amazing staff here at the House of Commons.

Thanks to all who have helped with this.

With no further ado, this meeting is adjourned.

Published under the authority of the Speaker of
the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the Copyright Act. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the Copyright Act.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: <https://www.ourcommons.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité
du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la Loi sur le droit d'auteur. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre des communes.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la Loi sur le droit d'auteur.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante :
<https://www.noscommunes.ca>