



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

---

# Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

EVIDENCE

**NUMBER 047**

Monday, February 6, 2023

---

Chair: Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia





# Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

Monday, February 6, 2023

• (1105)

[*Translation*]

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

I hope that you had a good weekend somewhere warm because in most parts of the country, it was terribly cold.

Friday, we stopped at NDP-25, so that's where we will pick up now.

Please refresh my memory: had NDP-25 been presented? Yes? Okay.

We are now at the discussion or debate stage. Is that correct?

Do any members of the committee wish to speak?

Yes, Mr. Duguid.

[*English*]

**Mr. Terry Duguid (Winnipeg South, Lib.):** Mr. Chair, the government side will be opposing this motion, but we will be presenting a counter-motion. It is an alternative that I think expresses the spirit our NDP member was expressing in her motion.

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Great.

Would other members like to speak?

Ms. Collins, you have the floor.

[*English*]

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

To remind committee members, since it's been a bit since we were talking about this amendment, it's really about establishing clearer timelines for finalizing substance assessments. We know that there have been multi-year delays. This would prevent these kinds of multi-year delays between proposed and final risk assessments.

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Anyone else? No?

I will therefore ask the clerk if we can put NDP-25 to the vote.

(Amendment negatived: nays 8; yeas, 2 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** The amendment is negatived, which brings us to BQ-7.

Ms. Pauzé, you have the floor.

[*English*]

**Mr. Terry Duguid:** Mr. Chair, I believe I mentioned I would have a counter-amendment to NDP-25.

**The Chair:** I was told it might come after NDP-26.

**Mr. Terry Duguid:** Is that right? Okay. Very good.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Madame Pauzé.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ):** BQ-7 proposes to add a one-year deadline after publication. Personally, when I make plans, I always have a deadline or a date in mind to put my plans into action. This is essentially what we are proposing.

I always come back to the fact that everyone told us that the law hadn't been reviewed for 20 years. We therefore have an opportunity to set some deadlines so that evaluations are not pushed back indefinitely. That is what the amendment is about.

At subsection 21(8), we are adding that “the Ministers [...] may extend” the period. This means that if the evaluation or the review is not done after one year and if the ministers believe there is still data to be collected, it is always possible to extend the deadline for another year. That remains a possibility.

Then, at subsection 21(8.1), we are proposing the following: “If the Ministers extend the period [...] they shall provide notice of the extension [...].” This means that after one year, if certain things have not been done, the ministers may provide for a one-year extension and explain why they are doing so. We believe this is a logical measure.

**The Chair:** Ms. Collins, you have the floor.

[*English*]

**Ms. Laurel Collins:** I'm sorry, Mr. Chair. My hand was up from the previous vote.

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Okay.

Would someone else like to speak to the amendment?

Since there is no one else, we will vote.

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

• (1110)

**The Chair:** The amendment is negatived.

We now go to NDP-26.

Mr. Duguid, you have the floor.

[*English*]

**Mr. Terry Duguid:** Is now the appropriate time for the counter-amendment? It's after. Okay.

I'm sorry that I'm so anxious. You know I'm a keener.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Ms. Collins.

**Ms. Laurel Collins:** Mr. Chair, NDP-26 is about establishing timelines around substance assessments. The Bloc amendment in the middle has elements of both of these, but you can go to the vote.

**The Chair:** Okay. We'll vote.

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

**The Chair:** I believe, Mr. Duguid, that you have an amendment.

**Mr. Terry Duguid:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Excuse my enthusiasm this morning. It must be the great lunch.

**The Chair:** There's no need to apologize for enthusiasm.

**Mr. Terry Duguid:** Mr. Chair, I believe the amendment has been circulated. I want to check with the clerk.

It has been circulated and I believe everyone has it, so there will be no need for me to read it. I'll just say that it does reflect the spirit of some of the previous amendments in providing some definition around timelines.

Mr. Chair, I would like to present this motion to create a new requirement to publish a statement indicating the reasons for the delay to publish a statement under proposed paragraph 77(6)(b) and an estimated time frame within which the statement under that paragraph is to be published.

Proposed paragraph 77(6)(b) refers to statements indicating the final decision on measures related to an assessment. This motion, if adopted and enacted, will improve transparency and ensure that government remains accountable.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Duguid.

Are there any questions, comments or discussion on this?

Ms. Collins, is your hand up?

**Ms. Laurel Collins:** Yes.

I want to thank Mr. Duguid for putting this forward. I think the previous three amendments, two by the NDP and one by the Bloc, are stronger in terms of ensuring that we'll have clear timelines and prevent those multi-year delays. I do think that this is a step forward. I'll be supporting it.

**The Chair:** Thank you. We'll go to a vote.

Can we pause for a moment?

Which one is it that we're dealing with here, Mr. Duguid? The email I have has three different motions. Which one is it?

Let's pause, please.

• (1110)

(Pause)

• (1115)

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Let's get back to it.

We were going to hold a vote.

I will now advise the clerk that we are ready to vote.

[*English*]

**Mr. Terry Duguid:** Mr. Chair, I would like to provide some clarification to the committee. We're talking about an amendment, and the clerks have asked me to do this, so that we don't become confused. It's E021-020-34a. I just want to put that in the record.

**Mr. Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC):** What does that mean?

**The Chair:** It's a reference number. That's how it's named in your email if you got the attachment.

We'll go to a vote.

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

**The Chair:** It's pretty clear that's adopted, which brings us to PV-17.

Ms. May, please go ahead.

• (1120)

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This amendment will not surprise anyone here. It's part of a series of amendments. All of my amendments so far, if anyone is keeping score, it's everybody else whatever, Greens zero. You can be quite certain that none of my amendments have carried, and this is consistent with those in order to ensure we do not split the list of toxic substances, thus imperilling the whole scheme of the act.

I give it to you and urge you to surprise me.

**The Chair:** Are there any comments or questions?

Go ahead, Ms. Collins.

**Ms. Laurel Collins:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to thank Ms. May for putting this forward. I do think, given that the other ones haven't passed, this doesn't totally make sense without the previous ones, but I will be supporting it because I support the spirit of this amendment. I supported the amendments before. I want to thank her for putting it forward.

**The Chair:** Thank you. We'll go to the vote.

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

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** The amendment is negatived.

We now have CPC-5.

Mr. Kurek, you have the floor.

[*English*]

**Mr. Damien Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC):** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

It's a pleasure to move CPC-5. This amendment is meant to drive as much precision as possible into the route of exposure, the form, the use or any specific marker related to the list of toxic substances. This would ensure that the substance that is risk managed under the act is limited to that which has an unacceptable risk of exposure. This precision is all the more important for schedule 1, part 1, substances, where the proposed risk management outcome is the prohibition of that substance.

The intent behind this committee is to drive as much precision and to have as much clarity as possible in the regulations to ensure that, especially when something is being banned or prohibited, both industry and Canadians know exactly what that means and that there's as much detail as possible surrounding that.

**The Chair:** Are there any other comments?

We'll go to a vote.

(Amendment negatived: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

• (1125)

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** The amendment is negatived.

I will now call the question:

Shall Clause 21 as amended carry?

**Voices:** On division.

(Clause 21 as amended agreed to on division)

**The Chair:** We now go to NDP-27, which concerns clause 22 of Bill S-5.

Before Ms. Collins presents her amendment, I would like to tell you that if the amendment is carried, it will not be possible to present BQ-8, because both amendments pertain to the same lines in the bill.

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** Mr. Chair, you are right to say that BQ-8 does seek to bring an amendment by replacing part of paragraph (a). However, we are proposing to amend paragraph (b) with an addition after line 27.

The two paragraphs do not pertain to the same lines of the bill. In that case, how should we proceed?

**The Chair:** In that case, you will only be able to present the part of the amendment that concerns paragraph (b).

[*English*]

Ms. Collins.

**Ms. Laurel Collins:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Yes, this is yet another time where two of my amendments are split into two different parts. You'll see that NDP-27 and NDP-28 are very similar to BQ-8. They have a similar spirit.

This first half is the one that is about requiring the minister to set out timelines for all measures identified in the risk management plan. I hope the committee will support it.

**The Chair:** I don't see any hands. Do we go to a vote?

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

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Ms. Pauzé, as NDP-27 was negatived, you may present your amendment in full.

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** I am sure it's going to be carried.

Instead of presenting the amendment, I'm going to ask my colleagues a question.

Why are they scared of setting deadlines? The deadlines that we are proposing aren't unreasonable.

Amendment BQ-8 proposes that clause 22 of Bill S-5 be amended by an addition after line 27. It states that the deadline "shall [...] not exceed two years". I repeat that the deadline can be extended. I don't understand why some of my colleagues seem so reticent.

I would like to know why my colleagues voted against any amendment that sought to tighten up deadlines.

**The Chair:** Have you presented your amendment for debate?

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** Yes, but I presented the amendment by asking a question.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Committee members may answer your question if they so wish, but they are not obliged to. This is not question period. Even during question period, we are not obliged to answer questions.

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** Indeed.

**The Chair:** Mr. Deltell, you have the floor.

**Mr. Gérard Deltell (Louis-Saint-Laurent, CPC):** I would just like to express my thoughts.

A bit earlier, the government presented an amendment seeking to put pressure on the authorities so that research and analyses would be carried out within a period of two years. We believe that this would allow us to reach the goal expressed by my colleague from the Bloc Québécois which, in passing, is completely spot-on, without making it mandatory. This will put pressure on the government and also give it some wiggle room, which is necessary. If the government has not reached the set target after two years without providing any information, it will have to explain itself. There will be pressure, but no mandatory deadline.

Points of view vary, of course, but in cases where a two-year period might be too short for certain stakeholders and too long for others, we would have that a target. However, there is a difference between a target and an obligation. I do understand my colleague's goal. Actually, I would say that I don't disagree in principle, but I would prefer that we put pressure on the authorities to arrive at a decision within two years and that afterwards, if the authorities believe that the timeline was insufficient, they will have to explain why.

We have exactly the same goal, even if our way of getting there is a bit different. I believe it would be just as efficient or even more so to exert pressure on the government so that the work gets done in less than two years and to demand an explanation if the goal is not met, rather than provide for an obligation to reach the goal in less than two years.

• (1130)

**The Chair:** Okay.

Mr. Longfield, you have the floor.

[*English*]

**Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.):** I agree with Mr. Deltell. A one-size-fits-all approach could be diverting resources at the wrong time and the wrong place. It could actually slow down the process.

I think that being able to put the pressure when and where it's needed to get the results that we need is really the spirit of what we're trying to do here.

**The Chair:** Ms. Collins, did you have your hand up?

**Ms. Laurel Collins:** I did, but we can go to the vote.

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

**The Chair:** That brings us to NDP-28.

Ms. Collins, you have the floor.

**Ms. Laurel Collins:** This has a similar spirit as the last two motions. Given the comments of my colleagues, especially Mr. Deltell and Mr. Longfield, I want to highlight one element of this motion.

It says:

The Ministers may establish a time frame of more than two years if they determine that a proposed regulation or instrument cannot be developed in that time, in which case they shall publish their reasons in the *Canada Gazette*.

It seems to me that this motion really speaks to exactly what the two members were in favour of. This gives flexibility to the minister. There is pressure to not exceed two years, but there is flexibility in the ability for the minister to establish a different time frame of more than two years, if needed. They just need to propose the rationale.

I hope the members will reconsider and support this motion.

**The Chair:** Mr. Kurek, you have the floor.

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Thanks, Ms. Collins, for that.

My question is especially in light of the amendment that the government brought forward, which talked about adding the two-year timeline and requiring a published statement and whatnot.

I'm curious and I will ask officials this: With amendment NDP-28, is this something that would be concurrent with that? I'm hoping to get some guidance from the officials as to where they see this in terms of the impacts. We're talking about different clauses of the bill. Is there a similar impact? What is the possibility of this affecting different parts of CEPA?

I'd like to ask for some clarification from the officials, if I could.

**Mr. Greg McLean:** Chair, this is further to that same question for the officials. Ms. Collins was talking about publishing the reasons in the *Canada Gazette*. The amendment brought forward this morning, which we already approved, was that the minister shall publish in the environmental registry.

Perhaps we could have some clarification on just the difference between the two, and where people look for these reasons about what the delay is. It would be instructive.

**The Chair:** Is Ms. Farquharson going to take this?

Go ahead, please.

**Ms. Laura Farquharson (Director General, Legislative and Regulatory Affairs, Environmental Protection Branch, Department of the Environment):** I will start with the fact there are timelines on lots of the steps that are taken under the bill. Just to clarify, the amendment you discussed previously, and you adopted a government motion related to that, that was moving from a draft risk assessment to a final risk assessment. When the final risk assessment is published, a statement about proposed measures to be taken is also published.

The amendment you passed said that, if it takes you more than two years, then the minister must publish reasons. Now you're debating timelines on subsequent risk management instruments.

When the final risk assessment is published, there's a statement about the measures that are going to be taken. The first measure is under what we call the CEPA time clock, which is in CEPA and says you have to get the draft regulation done in 24 months and the final one done in 18 months.

The issue has always been about what happens to the other risk management instruments. What are their timelines? The bill proposed that when the first risk management instrument was published, the ministers would have to state what the estimated timelines were for the other risk management instruments. That is to allow for new information to come up and also flexibility among risk management instruments, because if you put a hard deadline on those subsequent risk management instruments, you may find, for instance, that the nature of the industry changes. The instrument you proposed may not be the one you need, not the most effective, or it could be that there are other risk management instruments related to other substances that should move faster.

That's why the flexibility is there. I hope that helps somewhat.

• (1135)

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. McLean.

**Mr. Greg McLean:** I didn't get the answer between the minister publishing in the environmental registry versus Ms. Collins talking about publishing the reasons in the Canada Gazette.

**Ms. Laura Farquharson:** I would say we use the Canada Gazette for official publications. I will have to look and see where these are. Let me check on that.

**The Chair:** Ms. Collins.

**Ms. Laurel Collins:** I wanted to remind the committee of that section. This isn't a hard deadline, but rather a specified deadline that has flexibility built in, because the minister may establish a time frame of more than two years if they determine that the proposed regulation or instrument cannot be developed in that time. Then they just need to give their rationale.

This is really about improving and helping prevent lengthy delays in implementing the full suite of risk management measurements.

I do hope my honourable colleagues will support it.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Is there anyone else before we go to a vote on NDP-28?

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** I'm sorry, Chair, but I was hoping to have a response from the official.

**The Chair:** That's fine.

Ms. Farquharson, were you able to pinpoint that answer in the very short time we have given you?

**Ms. Laura Farquharson:** NDP-28 says to publish in the Canada Gazette. NDP-29 says to publish in the registry, and there's more flexibility in that.

**Mr. Greg McLean:** I'm sorry. What does that mean, "more flexibility"?

**Ms. Laura Farquharson:** "More flexibility" just means that we operate it. I'm not sure there's more flexibility in it. We operate the registry and can put it on the registry ourselves. With the Canada Gazette, obviously, we're going through a different process.

I believe stakeholders consult both the registry and the Canada Gazette. I guess I'll stop there. It's the NDP motions that refer to different ones.

**Mr. Greg McLean:** If I may, Mr. Chair, if the two said the same thing, would the stakeholders be able to get the information from one source as opposed to drifting between two sources here? As a layperson, I would say that the Canada Gazette is more well understood than an environmental registry, but maybe people who work in this sector and who specifically look at CEPA on a regular basis are more familiar with the environmental registry. Perhaps we should have consistency between the two reporting channels.

• (1140)

**Ms. Laura Farquharson:** Everything that is in the Canada Gazette ends up in the registry, so the registry is probably more complete in that sense.

**Mr. Greg McLean:** The Canada Gazette goes to the registry, so getting it on the gazette would automatically put it in the registry. Is that what you just said?

**Ms. Laura Farquharson:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Ms. Collins.

**Ms. Laurel Collins:** I want to speak to Mr. McLean's comments. You'll notice that most of my amendments have the Canada Gazette in them, and that was really hearing from the environmental stakeholders who use this that it was their preference. NDP-29, which is coming up, does have the environmental registry, and that was done to attempt to get support from other parties.

If Mr. McLean supports this amendment but with it going into the environmental registry, I'm very open to amending it as such. I do think the Canada Gazette is a better option, but I think moving forward with this is the best option. I would be in favour of either one if there is support around the table.

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** I'm sorry, Chair.

To the officials, just so I'm perfectly clear about the environmental registry versus something being gazetted, everything that is gazetted ends up in the registry, but what I don't think your explanation included was that the reverse is not necessarily true or is true. Everything in the environmental registry is not necessarily gazetted; however, the other way around it is. Am I correct in that understanding?

**Ms. Laura Farquharson:** That is true. I'm trying to find out how much is in the registry that...

What you said is true.

**Mr. Greg McLean:** I'm sorry. Back to the analysts here, I'm really trying to understand the difference between Bills-5 and.... Outside of the wording on the registry versus the Canada Gazette, which doesn't seem to be that large a hurdle, what is the difference between the two? Both of them are saying two years, and if we exceed two years, the minister has to give reasons for the delay and the estimated time frame within which the statement under this paragraph is published. It really seems like it's saying the same thing here, just through a different mechanism.

Ms. Collins, if you can walk me through what the difference is between the Liberal amendment and your amendment outside of that point, I'd appreciate that.

**Ms. Laurel Collins:** Mr. McLean, I will be repeating a lot of what Ms. Farquharson said, but the Liberal amendment deals with the risk management plan and the proposed versus the finalized assessment—"proposed" is the wrong language, but I hope you understand what I mean—whereas this is a later step, and it's really about additional measures and instruments to make sure we have accountability and prevent lengthy delays in the full suite of risk management plans.

Ms. Farquharson, if you want to jump in to correct anything I've said, please feel free.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Duguid.

**Mr. Terry Duguid:** Mr. Chair, like others, I appreciate this very nuanced discussion, and it does seem that officials wanted a little bit more time to explore the subtleties. I know that our side would very much like to have a pause.

**The Chair:** Okay, we'll pause for a few minutes.

• (1140) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (1150)

**The Chair:** I call the meeting back to order. I think we're ready to resume.

Ms. Collins, you were next on the speakers list.

**Ms. Laurel Collins:** I was curious about procedure. With regard to the pauses, when a member asks for a pause, is it by consensus, debate or a vote?

**Mr. Terry Duguid:** Anyone can ask for a pause.

**The Chair:** That's a good question.

We've been acting informally, but I'll get you a formal response. It's at the discretion of the chair, but the chair can always be challenged. It's not unlimited power.

**Ms. Laurel Collins:** That's good to know.

I'll make a comment as someone who very much wants to be there in person, but is sick today and can't fly. It's difficult knowing that the other committee members are having discussions in those pauses, when I think we should probably have those conversations here, on the record.

**The Chair:** Sure. I think they were just trying to clarify some things.

We've opened up the debate now, so if there's anything else you want to say or if you want ask a question...

Go ahead, Mr. Lake.

**Hon. Mike Lake (Edmonton—Wetaskiwin, CPC):** This is an observation.

First of all, that's why it's so important that we're in person. I understand that the member can't be here right now, but even if we were in the same room all together and we had a pause for clarity, not everybody is in every conversation that we would have if that were the case.

**The Chair:** That's true. That's a good point.

I think we can proceed, but if you have any questions or comments, Ms. Collins, on the substance of your amendment...or do you want to allow others to intervene on the amendment?

**Ms. Laurel Collins:** I think I've spoken extensively on it so far. I'm open to members' questions or comments.

**The Chair:** Would anyone else like to comment?

Go ahead, Mr. Duguid.

**Mr. Terry Duguid:** Mr. Chair, I'll offer to Ms. Collins that the government side will be opposing NDP-28, NDP-29 and NDP-30, but we'll be supporting NDP-31.

**The Chair:** Should we go to a vote on NDP-28?

**Mr. Terry Duguid:** I'm sorry. We will be supporting NDP-29 as well.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Shall we go to a vote on NDP-28?

**Ms. Laurel Collins:** Mr. Chair, I have a quick question for my Conservative colleagues.

There seem to be some interest in this and statements in support of the spirit of this motion. I'm curious if we have their support around the table.

**The Chair:** Do you mean on NDP-28?

We're going to the vote now.

**Mr. Greg McLean:** Ms. Collins, you'll find us voting against this because of input we had while we were paused on what this implies.

Our concern was.... We wanted to make sure that there was consistency between your motion and the one that the Liberals passed earlier today. We discovered that there wasn't consistency, and there were some reasons to oppose it.

I apologize. I didn't want you to be surprised.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Ms. Collins.

**Ms. Laurel Collins:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to thank Mr. McLean for the explanation.

I think this speaks to the point, especially for people who are listening in right now and following our debates, of having the reasons why—

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** Mr. Chair, on a point of order.

I have been told that interpretation is not possible because of problems with the sound quality.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** That's strange. I believe Ms. Collins is wearing the right headset. There might be a transmission issue.

**Ms. Laurel Collins:** I'll talk for a moment and see if the translators.... I'm wondering if it's....

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** I have been told that the problem for the interpreters is not the headset, but rather the quality of the sound.

**The Chair:** I'm guessing that the distance is such that the sound quality is not good enough.



• (1155)

[*English*]

Can you speak again, Ms. Collins, and we'll test it?

**Ms. Laurel Collins:** Absolutely.

I'll speak to Mr. McLean's point about the pause and the fact that members were able to get information from the officials that could be valuable, both for other members of the committee and for the public who's listening in.

**The Chair:** I want to check in with the interpreters.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Monique Pauzé:** The interpreter has just told me that the sound quality is not good enough. She is therefore not able to fully interpret my colleague's comments.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Unfortunately, the quality of the sound is not sufficiently good at the moment for the interpreters to interpret.

Mr. Kurek.

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** Chair, I've faced similar challenges and frustrations, especially when it comes to the translation.

I would suggest a call with IT to make sure that everything is in order. Having the right headset doesn't necessarily mean that it's working.

**The Chair:** Do you mean a call with IT right now?

**Mr. Damien Kurek:** Maybe we could take a short break just to ensure that Ms. Collins can engage.

**The Chair:** We're going to take a short break and we'll see where we land on this.

• (1155)

(Pause)

• (1210)

**The Chair:** We're back in session.

There's not much time left. I'm going to suspend the meeting.

Before I do, I want to make sure that we all understand that, when someone is virtual, we have to plan for a potential malfunction, which means that we have to plan for a quick substitution, especially when we're proposing amendments.

For future reference for everyone here who might be on screen next time, if you're proposing amendments and we run into difficulty, then your side has to be able to scramble and find a substitute to present your amendments. There is some contingency planning involved. Obviously, if you're not presenting amendments, it's not as complicated. It's something to keep in mind.

We haven't encountered this before and I guess we're not prepared for it on any side.

With that, I'm going to adjourn the meeting.

**Mr. Terry Duguid:** I'll move that, Mr. Chair.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Thank you.





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>