



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

---

# Standing Committee on Industry and Technology

EVIDENCE

**NUMBER 146**

Thursday, November 21, 2024

---

Chair: Mr. Joël Lightbound





## Standing Committee on Industry and Technology

Thursday, November 21, 2024

• (0820)

[*Translation*]

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

Welcome to meeting number 146 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Industry and Technology.

Before we begin, I would like to remind all members to read the instruction card in front of them regarding the use of earpieces and microphones. This is a health and safety concern for everyone, especially the interpreters, whom we thank very much for their services.

There are no witnesses before the committee today. The meeting will be on committee business.

[*English*]

Colleagues, just before we start, you've seen the calendar that's in front you. With the clerk, we've been trying hard, with respect to the motion that was sent to us by the House, to have the witnesses who were named be invited and confirmed. They've all been invited. Some are confirmed. For some, we still have some work to do, but I think we have a pretty good schedule going forward.

Just as a note of information, next Monday, we're going to have a double meeting, so four hours, and the Monday after that, too, so both Mondays coming forward, just so that we can get through this motion before the deadline, which is on December 17.

Take a look at the calendar. This is going to help us.

I see you, Mr. Turnbull, and Mr. Perkins next.

Before we start the discussion, I'll just get this out of the way. We have a request for a supplementary project budget that you've seen. I think the clerk has distributed it. Is it the will of the committee to approve this request for extra budget?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

Given that we have a lot of motions outstanding... I've seen Mr. Turnbull, then Mr. Perkins, then Mr. Patzer and then Mr. Masse.

Mr. Turnbull, the floor is yours.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ):** Could you add me to the speakers list, Mr. Chair?

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Yes, Mr. Savard-Tremblay.

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC):** I have a point of order, Chair.

Even before I was already waving for your attention there, I believe the clerk had seen me waving earlier in the meeting already, to have the floor.

**The Chair:** Mr. Patzer, I saw Mr. Turnbull raise his hand first, and then Mr. Perkins. I believe you were third. My apologies for that.

Mr. Turnbull, the floor is yours.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull (Whitby, Lib.):** Thank you, Chair.

Colleagues, I know today we're considering committee business, so I want to put something else on the floor here for our consideration as a committee.

I'm going to move the following motion. I'll read it into the record, and we will provide it in both official languages by email in just a moment. It reads:

Given that governments have an economic and social incentive to act on climate change;

Given that climate change could lead to devastating impacts on Canadian businesses and industry, with climate damages and economic losses of up to 35 billion dollars per year by 2030, and \$865 billion by 2100 or six times the revenues of Canada's most populous provinces, in the absence of climate action;

Given that the energy, forestry, mining, agricultural and fisheries sectors will be particularly affected, putting many local economies at risk, given these sectors contribute to the economies of hundreds of municipalities and communities across the country;

Given that climate change, in turn, may impact labour markets, employment and wage growth, particularly in the absence of climate action, and;

That industry supports industrial carbon pricing as the backbone of decarbonization across the country, spurring growth, especially in lower intensive sectors of the economy, job growth and greener projects, and; that industry has called on governments to work together to strengthen Canada's industrial pricing system;

That the committee allocate no less than two meetings to study the topic of industrial carbon pricing, as well as the broader industrial and labour market impacts of climate change.

That's the motion. I'm just going to speak to it briefly.

This letter, I believe, was tabled with the committee on October 23, 2024. It's from some of our very large industrial producers. The Canadian Manufacturers & Exporters was a signatory to the letter, as were the Canadian Steel Producers Association; Alberta's Industrial Heartland, the capital investment destination; Carbon Removal Canada; the Canadian Renewable Energy Association; the Cement Association of Canada; the Chemistry Industry Association of Canada; Lafarge; Clean Prosperity, and the list goes on.

It's important for us to consider this as a topic of study. It's clear to me that the coalition of industry players here is calling on us, as well as provincial governments, to work together to strengthen our industrial carbon pricing system in Canada, which has its challenges.

If you read the letter that they've put forward, you see there are quite a number of barriers that are created by the patchwork of systems that we have across each province and territory. Perhaps I won't go into more depth on that, because there's more information, but I'm sure that if the committee decides to study this, we'll get a chance to look at what specifically those trade barriers and misalignments are, and what impacts they have on a strong industrial carbon pricing system in Canada.

I think this is an area where the federal government can help to eliminate barriers and red tape by working closely with provinces and territories. I think that's an exciting prospect for us here at this committee. We can undertake some work to look at that and say, "Okay, what could we recommend that would be helpful?" This group has called upon governments at all levels to look at this and to work together, so I think it's incumbent upon us to respond to their request. It's an important call from industry.

We also know from the Canadian Climate Institute's work that two-thirds of emissions reductions will be led by industry in this country—that's 66% of all the emissions reductions in this country. It's found that industrial carbon pricing will be the top driver of emissions reductions between now and 2030. Industrial carbon pricing will do more than any other policy to cut Canada's emissions. The large emitter trading system that is in place already is the single biggest driver of emissions reductions.

● (0825)

I will note that, recently, the journal *Science* published an article that was a very in-depth study. It's probably the most comprehensive study that has been done on climate policies and the intersection of those policies or the mixture of those policies. They looked at 1,500 different policies across 43 jurisdictions around the world and looked at 20 years' worth of data, and they were able to isolate and show that the most successful policy mixtures for emissions reductions included carbon pricing or pricing instruments and mechanisms, as well as incentives and regulation.

I would say Canada has all three, which is a good thing. We have the right policy mixture in Canada, but we have this misalignment across provinces and territories in terms of the system that we have. We need to work together to figure out a path for addressing the concerns that our industry associations and representatives are asking us to look at.

What hangs in the balance here is really how fast we can decarbonize and how much we can mitigate the risks of climate change as we move forward, which are very costly, as we know. Just this year, it's estimated that there will be \$25 billion in damages and losses due to climate change, which is half of projected GDP growth. That's not insignificant. Imagine half of our projected GDP growth going to just cover the costs of the damages of climate change and the productivity losses.

There is significant impact here that I think we need to be aware of. We can't put our hands over our eyes and pretend this is going to go away. It's not. I really think this committee can do some deeper work on a study. We're seeing no fewer than two meetings. I honestly think this will require more than two meetings, of course, and I would be happy to study it for longer.

Maybe I'll speak more to this if we have more time for debate on this, which I imagine we might, but we'll see what the other committee members have to say about this.

Thanks.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mr. Turnbull.

Just so we're clear, members, in the excitement, I think I had the wrong motion circulated—the one that Mr. Turnbull had given notice for—but this one is from the floor and it's been circulated via email by the clerk, so now we're talking about the motion that Mr. Turnbull has just moved.

Before we enter this discussion, I want to reiterate the list that I have after we've dealt with this motion. I have Mr. Perkins, and then I have Mr. Savard-Tremblay, Mr. Masse and Mr. Patzer. I saw all the hands go up more or less at the same time, so I'm going by party. I think that's going to make it easier.

Now we're on the motion by Mr. Turnbull.

Mr. Masse, go ahead.

**Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I appreciate the motion coming forward. I'm trying to figure out, as we go through several of these motions here, what it means for our current schedule with regard to the credit card study and then getting it, hopefully.... I was hopeful—and maybe this is a little bit too optimistic—that we might have a chance to either have a report before we break or table something if there's actually time, if we give direct discussion points to our analysts.

What I'm trying to figure out is how we go through this trifecta of suggestions on work we do without knowing our calendar. I don't want to end up in a situation where we do not end up finishing the work we wanted to get done. That's what I'm trying to figure out right now as we go through this. I'm not opposed to the motion, and I'm open to doing other things, but I'm just trying to figure this out.

Lastly, and I think this is a really important part of it, where the hell are the amendments from the government on Bill C-27? All I get is commentary from the minister in the public domain or in having to answer interviews. I think at some point I might have a motion to pull the minister here specifically for that issue, because it was promised that we were going to get these amendments. They weren't even amendments, if we go back in time. We still don't know where that is. I don't know how we can actually deal with all of these things, because we don't even know what the intent of the government is on him publicly saying here that he had amendments and publicly saying to us and in talking to us privately that we're getting something, but we still don't have it here.

If the government's real intention is that they've run up the white flag on Bill C-27, in terms of all the work.... I still thought there was some commitment to get the privacy stuff done. I have legislation ready that would split it in the House of Commons, as all parties know, and we've even discussed that before, so that we could actually get a piece of work to the Senate if there was compromise. However, we don't even know what that is. The government has another motion right now on committee business, and they still have not brought these other amendments on legislation.

I'm just trying to figure out how we prioritize all these things. If we knew exactly what the plan was from the government, then maybe that would help.

• (0830)

**The Chair:** Mr. Masse, I'll just share my two cents on this. Reading the motion, it has no hard timeline. Our schedule is pretty packed until the end of the session, until the holiday break. I agree with you on the credit card study. Once we're done, I'd like to finish our report and submit it. I don't want it to linger in a no man's land for too long.

That said, it has no timeline, so at this point we're just putting potential studies on the docket.

**Mr. Brian Masse:** All right.

**The Chair:** Mr. Perkins.

**Mr. Rick Perkins (South Shore—St. Margarets, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I echo the comments of MP Masse. We all know, and I'll say it here, that the minister had conversations with everybody when the House came back, asking what he had to do to get Bill C-27 through. We—at least the three opposition parties, I think—all made it very clear what it would take, and the minister did pledge to go back and do that.

Then he's been yammering in the media about how the committee is blocking everything. The committee isn't blocking anything. The minister, once again, hasn't lived up to his commitment. He hasn't come back with the changes to the tribunal and the AI portion of the bill that we all required in order to proceed. It would be good if he would come here. I would support a motion by MP Masse to recall the minister and to ask him what the heck he's doing.

With regard to this motion, of course, I agree, Mr. Chair, that a lot of the things we're doing.... The House has ordered us to do a

study on the potential anti-competitive nature of the e-transfer and the broader economic payment system and banking system that causes Canadians to pay what appears to be way too much money for their financial services.

On this particular motion, however, I do agree that there should be a study on the Liberal government's carbon tax—a carbon tax on everything, a carbon tax that has put up the price of everything, a carbon tax that the government claims reduces carbon emissions, yet their own environment department doesn't even monitor its impact, so it has no impact. It's so important to the government that the radical Liberal environment minister doesn't even bother trying to monitor its impact. I think it would be great to have a study on this.

My problem with the motion that MP Turnbull put forward is that he actually wrote the report in the preamble before setting up the study and made a bunch of conclusions, so I would propose the following amendment to Mr. Turnbull's committee study: to delete everything from the first word, “Given”, until the last sentence. That last sentence, of course, begins, “That the committee allocate no less than two meetings to study the topic of industrial carbon pricing”, but what I would do is amend that line to say, “That the committee allocate no less than two meetings to this matter on the industrial and consumer carbon pricing, and that these meetings begin once the committee has set its schedule and figures out appropriate timing.”

• (0835)

**The Chair:** Okay. We have an amendment on the floor by Mr. Perkins. Essentially, it would be removing everything before “That the committee allocate” and include industrial and consumer carbon pricing.

On the amendment, we have Mr. Turnbull.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** Just a moment, Mr. Chair. I have to listen to the interpretation to make sure I understand correctly.

**The Chair:** I can repeat it in French, Mr. Savard-Tremblay.

Basically, what Mr. Perkins is proposing is to remove all the statements and just keep the following:

That the committee allocate no less than two meetings to study the topic of industrial carbon pricing...

The idea is to discuss the impact on consumers, too. He is also proposing that this study begin once we have finished what is currently on the agenda.

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** If I understand correctly, we would also remove “Given the recent evidence”.

**The Chair:** Everything before “That the committee allocate” would be deleted.

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** Okay, that's perfect.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Savard-Tremblay.

Mr. Turnbull, you have the floor.

[English]

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** It seems like the Conservatives are all talk, then, because they sound like they want to study carbon pricing and are against it—as usual, which is fine—but want to delay it as long as possible. They're actually scared to study it.

● (0840)

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Well, you can put a time frame on it.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Mr. Perkins has suggested that I presupposed where the study was going to land. I didn't do that. I actually referenced the most, I would say, significant piece of scientific research that has ever been done on climate policies. It showed that carbon pricing and pricing instruments in general work in combination with other policies as a mixture to bring down carbon emissions quickly.

I can quote directly from the article, if Mr. Perkins would like, but maybe he's suggesting that I don't have the right to take the floor and motivate a motion that I'm moving in committee. I don't see how that is relevant here, given the fact that the Conservatives do that every time they move a motion. Why would I not be afforded the same right and privilege to speak to a motion that I put on the floor?

I find it strange that they want to gut this motion and don't actually want to study carbon pricing. I find it strange, given how much time they spend talking about it in the House of Commons. It's a little bit strange.

The other thing is that our industry is asking us to do this. Isn't this committee supposed to study things that are relevant to industry? If industry associations, even in the prairie provinces, where I know some of the members across the way come from, want us to study and look at this as a major issue that they have.... They're aligned in asking us to look at the challenges and, essentially, how we can fix the interjurisdictional challenges that they experience—those misalignments that create problems for them within their operations. We want a more competitive industry. They're saying that carbon pricing is what helps them be competitive.

I don't know why the Conservatives would be against this. It seems to me to be a study that we should all be aligned on.

I know the NDP has backed down quite a bit from carbon pricing in general, and its members have said that they're against the carbon tax, but they certainly are not against.... I haven't heard them say they're against the industrial carbon pricing system that we have. In fact, I think Mr. Masse and his party, the NDP, are for carbon pricing. I think they always have been, even though they've backed down from the consumer-facing portion of it. We know they've been supportive. I know that within the circles of very progressive-minded people in this country, the NDP has often cited its leadership on climate change and wanting to raise ambition. It would strike me as very strange that its members would vote against or oppose a motion that would support us looking at how our industry could be more competitive and decarbonize faster.

I don't understand how it could be a major contentious issue here to study this in detail.

The preamble that's in here is really referencing most of what I think is significant about what the rationale is for bringing up this particular study at this moment. I think those elements of the motion should stay in.

I would, respectfully, say that I will be voting against Mr. Perkins' attempt to gut this motion because he's scared to study carbon pricing.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I have Mr. Patzer, and then Mr. Perkins.

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Mr. Turnbull, for admitting that you didn't pay any attention to what Mr. Perkins said when he put his amendment forward, because he did say that he wanted to include the consumer carbon tax in this motion. In fact, he was expanding the scope to include it, so your assertion that we don't want to talk about it is actually wrong. Thank you for putting on the record that you weren't paying any attention. I appreciate that.

I also appreciate how, previously, you put on the record publicly that consumers are going to face some significant pain because of your carbon tax. You admitted in public that people are going to have to pay up, and it is going to hurt. Those were your own words, so you were very clear about that, and that is exactly what we are seeing all across the country. People are in a lot of pain because of the economic ruin that you imposed upon this country—I think that's abundantly clear. That's why we would like to include the consumer carbon tax into this motion as well. Those were your own words, that people are going to experience a lot of pain. Let's see here. What were the words that you used? Was it “economic certainty”? Is that what it is? The economic certainty is that people are going to feel pain. I wonder, is that what you meant?

Then there's the element of dealing with the preamble as well. You've thrown in all these hand-picked statistics and different things like that. You're trying to set the tone for what you want the study to look like, and it's all speculative because the key word in there is “could”—“given that climate change could lead”. What you're insinuating is that it could lead to this.

Now, there are other factors at play here, of course. You look at the dollar values that you've assigned to it. Well, your government has failed on getting a softwood lumber agreement for nine years. That's had a substantive impact on the cost of building materials in this country. There are many other factors that have impacted the cost of building in this country, including your consumer carbon tax, which is a huge factor in that. There are many factors that are at play here, so if you want to have a real conversation about it, let's look at all of it. There's so much more to it than just simply saying, “Oh, climate change could cost \$35 billion per year by 2030.” Well, if your government had actually done its job over the last nine years, I'll bet you that number would be nowhere near as high. That includes everything from trade policy to economic development, respecting provincial jurisdiction and allowing the provinces and industry to do what they do best, but you stepped in, every single time, to get in the way.

I'm on the natural resources committee. We're doing a study on the Trans Mountain pipeline. We had the PBO and other witnesses come, and they said that government policy is going to have a direct impact on what someone's going to be willing to pay to buy the pipeline, because of the lack of certainty that has been put in place. When you look at the conditions that are in place, why would anybody want to buy that pipeline when it's going to be almost impossible to have any new development in this country and get anything done? That's the record that your government has, Mr. Turnbull, when it comes to handling the economy and the "economic and social incentive", as you put here.

When we talk to people, whether it's in meetings or when we go out on the road in our ridings and we tour around businesses, they talk a lot about the number one threat to them. In my riding, which is an agricultural and energy-producing region of the country, it's not climate change that they bring up; it's government policy that they say is the biggest threat to them. I would love to talk about the threat that government policy has been to these businesses, because they tell me on a regular basis how devastating it is and how hard it is to deal with trying to grow and expand their business, let alone just keep the doors open because of bad government policy that's been put forward by you and your government.

If that's what you want to brag about, I would love to hear it, and I would be more than happy to put those people's voices on the record during this study about the economic ruin that you have provided for businesses in Cypress Hills—Grasslands and all across this country.

● (0845)

[Translation]

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

Again, we're talking about the amendment.

Mr. Turnbull, you have the floor.

[English]

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** I'd like to make a couple more points.

I think what's interesting is that we had the food professor here, Sylvain Charlebois. I remember very specifically what he said when he was here, that for those who have agricultural-producing regions.... My region is Durham region. We actually produce lots of agricultural goods and products, and I know that farmers are definitely concerned about climate change. I know that Sylvain Charlebois came here and said that climate change is actually the biggest challenge that our agri-food industry faces, and that we need to address it. That's a direct quote. If the guy whom the Conservatives like to quote all the time is saying that climate change is actually the biggest challenge that our agri-food industry has, then why wouldn't they want to study the impacts of climate change and understand how we can help ensure that our agricultural industry and our producers, whom we all value, can continue to feed Canada and the world, and prosper in the future? It seems a little strange to me that the Conservatives would want to take out the specific reference to the industries that were in the motion.

Anyway, I could say more about that, but I'll just say that it seems a little strange, when farmers are at the front lines of the im-

pacts of climate change, as we know, and we've heard this. I was on the agri-food standing committee for quite a while, and we heard about this as being a major concern for our food producers across Canada. I know that Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada projected net revenue losses of 49.2% in 2023 for Quebec farmers, and 86.5% in 2024. I referenced that when Mr. Charlebois was here, and he agreed that the costs of climate change were real, that they were very concerning, and that we needed to address it. He certainly disagreed with some portions of how to address it—I will say that—but he definitely agreed that this was a major threat to the agri-food industry.

Mr. Patzer said something about trade policy, and I think that's another major consideration here. The EU is Canada's second-largest trading partner, after the U.S., accounting for more than \$180 billion in bilateral trade in 2023. They have carbon border adjustments that will come into effect in 2026, which means that all of our exports will be subjected to tariffs if we don't abide by the same standard and bring ourselves up to the standard they've set. More than 70% of Canada's exports are either a variety of fossil fuels or goods resulting from emissions-intensive trade-exposed sectors. We're talking about energy, transportation, manufacturing and agriculture. Canada's most trade-exposed sectors are iron and steel. That's pretty significant when you think about the kinds of things that I think should appeal to all of us in our respective jurisdictions, in the ridings we represent. Those industries are part of the backbone of our economy, and we should all be concerned with the fact that they are trade-exposed in the European market as those carbon border adjustment mechanisms come into force in 2026.

I'll also just mention quickly that there are labour market impacts. I noticed that Mr. Perkins, when he proposed to gut this motion and take everything out of it, is taking out the specific references to labour markets. Those are real jobs, employment and wages for our workers, and in particular the most vulnerable workers in Canada, who I think would be most exposed to the risks of climate change, the natural disasters that affect their ability to go to work every day.

● (0850)

We've had conversations about climate justice. I know the Conservatives don't even believe in climate change, so they don't really participate in these conversations very often. We know that the most vulnerable people in Canada who would be most exposed to the risks or impacts of climate change are often the people who are already the most vulnerable and live in the areas that, through no fault of their own, would be impacted by the damages done by climate change.

For example, the Canadian Climate Institute finds that, due to climate change, "All households will lose income, and low-income households will suffer the most." Low-income households could see income losses of 19% in high-emissions scenarios by the end of this century.

Climate change is a job killer. It leads to job losses that could double by mid-century, and increase to 2.9 million by the end of the century. That's a really significant number of job losses in this country. For those of us who care about Canadians' jobs or pretend to care.... I hope most of us actually do care. It seems strange to me that the Conservatives would rip out that portion of the motion because they're not interested in understanding the impacts on labour markets and real people's jobs.

Perhaps I'll leave it there for the moment, Chair. I just wanted to add those points to my arguments.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mr. Turnbull.

As a reminder, colleagues, we're on the amendment of Mr. Perkins.

I have on my list Brian Masse and Ms. Rempel Garner.

Mr. Masse.

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

In the past, I've tried to see if we could amend things to get them passed here and get them done. I'm going to look at this. In the same line, and with a couple of words to that.... Perhaps if we concluded the first line, "Given that governments have an economic and social incentive to act on climate change", and then moved to the final line, "That the committee allocate no less than two meetings to study the topic of industrial carbon pricing" and so forth, we would get rid of some of the things in there that are causing some of the debate.

Even one of those lines in there right now, with the Liberal Party saying that "climate change could lead to devastating impacts".... I would argue that it has led to that. I could get into that. I could add a line like, "Given that the Liberal Party of Canada, as government, made the single largest economic investment in carbon pollution in buying a leaky pipeline that continues to expand emissions and increase debt and free market manipulation." I mean, I could do that kind of stuff, too.

I'm trying to figure out whether there's actually a sincere interest to try to see if we're even doing it.

I would suggest that if we could keep the first line and get the specifics of the other stuff out, which they could raise during testimony with the witnesses who are here, I don't know whether that would get us off to the point where we could actually get this done.

**The Chair:** I'm afraid, Mr. Masse, that we probably have to deal with the amendment first. I'm not sure that this is—

**Mr. Brian Masse:** Okay. I'm trying.

**The Chair:** Putting stuff back that's been removed in an amendment is not the most elegant way of doing things. I would suggest maybe, Mr. Masse, that we deal with the amendment, and you can bring it back if it's not adopted.

**Mr. Brian Masse:** Okay.

I apologize to the interpreters if I'm speaking too fast.

**The Chair:** I have Ms. Rempel Garner.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** I have a point of order.

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

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** The chair could seek UC, could he not, to do what Mr. Masse suggested?

**The Chair:** Everything is possible with unanimous consent, if there is unanimous consent.

Thank you, Mr. Perkins. You're a useful vice-chair.

Mr. Masse, maybe propose it again.

**Mr. Brian Masse:** Yes, thank you.

It would just be that we'd have Mr. Turnbull's motion as it stands here, "Given that governments have an economic and social incentive to act on climate change", and then move down to the final paragraph: "That the committee allocate no less than two meetings to study the topic of industrial carbon pricing, as well as the broader industrial and labour market impacts of climate change."

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Do you mean that includes the paragraph I had?

**Mr. Brian Masse:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Mr. Perkins had modified the concluding paragraph to include "consumer" and had given some sort of timeline that we would start the study after we are done with what's currently scheduled.

We would keep the last paragraph as Mr. Perkins had suggested, but basically we just keep the first sentence.

Do we have unanimous consent for that proposition by Mr. Masse?

I don't see unanimous consent, unfortunately, Mr. Masse.

That takes us back to the amendment as it stands.

I have Ms. Rempel Garner.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC):** Chair, my understanding is that my Conservative colleague, Mr. Perkins, has moved the following: "That the committee allocate no less than two meetings to this matter on the industrial and consumer carbon pricing". I mean, this sounds like a very reasonable motion. I think that lots of Canadians care about ensuring that the government addresses climate change in a meaningful way, but also in a way that doesn't make life unaffordable for them.

It shocks me today that my Liberal colleagues would vote against this motion. I don't know why they would vote against that, unless they don't care about climate change or making life more affordable for people. I think lots of Canadians would be shocked to see how the Liberal Party, when they think nobody is looking, would vote against a motion to study industrial and consumer carbon pricing. We'll make sure that people see how they vote on this motion.



Thank you.

• (0855)

**The Chair:** Just to make a correction, we're debating the amendment by Mr. Perkins, not the motion. I would like that to be clear for everyone.

Go ahead, Mr. Turnbull.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** I appreciate the attempt that Ms. Rempel Garner has made to contort this into something that we're voting against. This is clearly an amendment designed to gut and take out the industrial and labour market portion with specific references to the rationale and motivation for bringing this motion forward. I don't support that, and I don't think that it adds any value to take out all of the substantive stuff, to be honest with you.

The Conservative members seem to want to take out energy, forestry, mining, agriculture and fisheries, all of which I think are industries that they should care about. That's why we specifically made reference to those. We figured that you would want to understand the impacts of both climate change and industrial carbon pricing, in particular, on the competitiveness of those industries. Purposely designing it that way was to bring you into the conversation and have you, hopefully, support what I think is a strong rationale for a good motion.

Thank you.

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

Do I have any other speakers on my list?

[*Translation*]

It doesn't look like it.

We can therefore proceed to vote on Mr. Perkins' amendment.

Madam Clerk, you may proceed with the vote.

(Amendment negated [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** Since the amendment was defeated, we will now go back to the original motion moved by Mr. Turnbull.

Mr. Masse, you have the floor.

[*English*]

**Mr. Brian Masse:** Thank you.

I have an amendment for the main motion.

After "pricing system" in the main motion, we add the following: "Given the Liberal Party of Canada, as government, made the single largest economic investment in carbon pollution buying a leaky pipeline that continues to expand emissions, increase debt for the public, and free market manipulation".

**The Chair:** Would it be possible, Mr. Masse, to have someone in your staff send it to the clerk to be circulated?

**Mr. Brian Masse:** I'll work on that right away.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

There's an amendment on the floor. You've all heard it. Do we have any comments on this amendment, or should I put it straight to a vote?

I will put it straight to a vote, seeing that no one wants to comment on that.

(Amendment negated [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

• (0900)

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** The amendment was defeated, so we're back to Mr. Turnbull's motion again.

Mr. Savard-Tremblay, you have the floor.

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** I just want to say that I think this is an extremely important study.

Having said that, I'm going to oppose the motion for a very simple reason. This is an extremely important topic, and we've heard what the European Union, in particular, intends to do. In my opinion, it's not enough to insert two meetings in the middle of the Bill C-27 study.

That would be extremely negligent, when this issue should be properly discussed, analyzed and studied. Therefore, I cannot support the proposal at this time.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mr. Savard-Tremblay.

Ms. Rempel Garner, go ahead on the motion.

[*English*]

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** I'll go back to what my colleague Mr. Masse had suggested, and I will formally move the amendment he suggested, which is to strike all of the words after the first paragraph, starting with the words "Given that climate change could". Then, we would keep the last paragraph, which starts with "That the committee allocate no less than two meetings to study the topic of industrial carbon pricing". We could keep that but add the words "and consumer carbon pricing" to that paragraph.

**The Chair:** We have an amendment on the floor, which is essentially what Mr. Masse had proposed and what he sought unanimous consent for. The motion is to keep the first sentence, which reads, "Given that governments have an economic and social incentive to act on climate change". Correct me if I'm wrong, MP Rempel Garner. Then, we would strike the rest and keep the last paragraph, adding "and consumer carbon pricing".

Are there any comments on the amendment proposed by MP Rempel Garner?

Mr. Turnbull, go ahead.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Maybe I misunderstood or I didn't follow, but I think this is exactly what Mr. Masse had suggested. I would like to see it in writing, if possible, just because I think it takes out everything so substantively.... I think it takes out almost everything.

Didn't we already vote on this? One of the rules I know in terms of the Standing Orders is that once a committee has substantively dealt with an issue, you can't reintroduce it and call a vote on it.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** I have a point of order, Chair.

**The Chair:** Just one second, MP Turnbull. There is a point of order. I'll yield the floor back to you once I have dealt with the point of order.

Ms. Rempel Garner, please go ahead.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** There was no motion moved. It was a request for unanimous consent, which was denied.

**The Chair:** Yes, thank you, MP Rempel Garner, but I'm addressing this with Mr. Turnbull right now.

Basically, it's a point of order you're raising, Mr. Turnbull, if I'm not mistaken. You're saying that we've already dealt with this issue. However, I debated it internally when I heard MP Rempel Garner present it, because it is very close to the amendment that Mr. Masse presented, on which we just voted and which was rejected, but it is not exactly the same.

I'm going to take one second with the clerk to see if she can enlighten me.

I sought and got validation from the clerk that basically there is a difference between this amendment and what Mr. Masse had suggested. He sought unanimous consent; he didn't move it as an amendment, so we're back to almost square one with the amendment by MP Rempel Garner.

Are there any speakers on that?

Mr. Turnbull, go ahead.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Could I ask for it in writing in both official languages, and then could we have a very brief suspension for just a couple of minutes to consider this, if you don't mind?

**The Chair:** We'll have a very brief suspension.

• (0900) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (0910)

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** I call the meeting back to order, colleagues.

Ms. Rempel Garner's amendment has been circulated in both official languages. We are now resuming debate on the amendment.

Is there any discussion on Ms. Rempel Garner's amendment?

Mr. Turnbull, you have the floor.

[*English*]

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** I'd like to propose a subamendment to Ms. Rempel Garner's amendment. I think it might get us to a place where we can all agree on this motion and get a vote done.

What I propose would be very similar to what Mr. Masse proposed, but I'm just adding back part of the language on labour markets, because I feel the impact on labour markets is particularly important: "Given that governments have an economic and social incentive to act on climate change, and given it leads to impacts on

labour markets, employment and wage growth, particularly in the absence of climate action, the committee allocate no less than two meetings to study the topic of industrial carbon pricing, as well as broader industrial and labour market impacts of climate change."

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** And consumer carbon pricing.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Yes, if you want to add that back in, that's fine. That's an oversight on my part. I don't have any problem with studying it.

**The Chair:** It's "that the committee allocate no less than two meetings to study the topic of industrial and consumer carbon pricing". That stays as is, as proposed by Ms. Rempel Garner. Basically, you're just adding "and given it leads to impacts on labour markets, employment and wage growth, particularly in the absence of climate action".

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Yes, exactly.

**The Chair:** Okay. That's the subamendment proposed by Mr. Turnbull to MP Rempel Garner's amendment.

We've heard the terms of the subamendment. Are there any comments on the subamendment proposed by Mr. Turnbull to MP Rempel Garner's amendment? Is it clear to everyone what has been proposed by Mr. Turnbull?

Okay. That's good. We'll put it to a vote.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Savard-Tremblay, did you hear that? I know that, with interpretation, sometimes a few words are lost.

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** Everything is going well with interpretation.

However, I think there's a translation error in the written version. The expression "*une tarification industrielle et consommateur du carbone*" is not French.

**The Chair:** We can work on that detail afterwards.

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** The rest is clear.

**The Chair:** We're still on Mr. Turnbull's subamendment.

Seeing no further debate, we will go to the vote.

The vote is on the subamendment.

(Subamendment agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0)

• (0915)

**The Chair:** I declare the subamendment carried.

[English]

Usually I can read the room, but I'm glad to see that we have unanimous consent on the subamendment proposed by Mr. Turnbull, which brings us back to the amendment.

At this point, colleagues, if we've agreed to this subamendment unanimously, I'm guessing that we're agreeing on the motion as amended. I think we can proceed that way. Do I have UC to say that it's adopted?

(Amendment as amended agreed to [See Minutes of Proceedings])

(Motion as amended agreed to)

**The Chair:** That's amazing. Thank you. We did that in an hour, which leaves us one more hour.

I have on my list Mr. Perkins.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Yes. I have had a motion on notice. I'm just trying to find it here in my package.

It's with regard to Telesat. We had some testimony on Telesat.

Can you hang on just a second?

**The Chair:** Mr. Perkins, do you want us to suspend briefly?

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** No. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The motion says:

That, in relation to the Government of Canada's recent \$2.1-billion loan to Telesat, the committee agree to hold two meetings examining the feasibility and business case justifying the deal—

The current motion says “within 14 days”. We'll have to amend that, but I'll read it in now because that's what's on motion:

—within 14 days of the adoption of this motion, and the committee agree to invite the following witnesses: Francis Bilodeau, acting deputy minister of ISED, and Daniel Goldberg, the CEO of Telesat.

**The Chair:** There's a Telesat motion. I think we have it printed here. It is somewhere. Notice was given.

Mr. Perkins, do you have anything to add on this, or do we start the debate right now?

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** I will just say that we had quite questionable testimony from the minister, who didn't seem to understand the deal and the terms of the deal on the \$2.1 billion that he had signed off on in a loan to Telesat, which is a company that's at least 63% owned by American hedge funds. The minister didn't seem to understand that fact, and neither did the department. I don't think they had done their homework.

It's to put up 198 satellites at a cost of somewhere between \$10 million and \$20 million a satellite. This is quite a huge commitment from the Government of Canada, to be subsidizing an American firm that has had failing revenue. The interest costs will now equate to about two-thirds of the revenue this company has, just on the debt, when you include this loan.

I believe it is our responsibility as members of the industry committee to look into bailouts of American companies, which is what the industry minister has tried to do.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I have Brian Masse on this, and then Mr. Turnbull.

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

I do support this motion. I just want to follow up in regard to my previous comments as we try to work our way through different evidence here.

We still have not heard from the parliamentary secretary or anybody about the intentions of the government on Bill C-27, so I would consider just drafting a motion for you, as chair, to ask the minister specifically. At the same time, I'm figuring that at this point I'll just assume that it's been abandoned. Why create more work for ourselves when we have other things like this that we can look at and that are important to Canadians? There have been significant issues in Telesat that have come up, as well as other things.

With that, I'm not going to propose that you write a letter to the minister to find out what he's doing, because I can only assume the behaviour that is conducted in public is really representative of what he sends his members here to do, and that's basically to abandon legislation. In committee in the past, we've abandoned our own studies and other things to focus on legislation. I want to remind everyone here that it was in the last two sessions that Liberal members were filibustering the committee by speaking through the time frames and timelines because they didn't know what to do about the tribunal.

We have a number of different organizations and companies that are asking us on a regular basis, on civil society to.... Even just yesterday I had another telecommunications lobby to me, asking what's going on with Bill C-27. I basically can only respond to what the minister is saying in public. I guess we move on at this point. If they're not going to come prepared to this meeting to tell us what their objectives are on this, we need to set our schedule and move ahead. It's entirely their fault on this, because we have set aside time and we have not heard anything back.

That's where I'm at. I'll support this because we will have some time when we get other things done. I'm hoping that we can clear the deck with the stuff we've already done. For those reasons, I'll support motions that will occupy our time, because, if not, we're just going to miss opportunities to look at very important matters. This is one that's been raised not only by the Conservative Party but by others with regard to Telesat. I'll support it based on that.

I'll just close by saying that, again, I was going to ask you to write it up. We've done this before, with unanimous consent, to have the chair look at it, but what's the point? They see all of this. They have their members in the room here. They have their people from their party lobby system, and they really don't give a damn, I guess, at the end of the day, so we'll just move ahead at this point in time.

• (0920)

[*Translation*]

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

Next, we have Mr. Turnbull.

[*English*]

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Thanks, Chair.

Thanks to all of the committee members for a good, productive meeting. I'm glad we got that last motion passed, with some consensus-building.

I propose to amend this and take out “within 14 days”. Basically, everything would stay the same, except that we'd be deleting “within 14 days of the adoption of this motion”. If you just take that out, then I think we'd be prepared to support it.

The background for this is that obviously it's a loan to Telesat. The loan is structured, and the nature of the industry—putting satellites up into space—is a complex one. You have to understand the business model, and the amount of time that that takes, to understand the structure of a loan that would support an industry like that. It's unique.

This would be a good opportunity for us to understand that a bit better and, hopefully, to educate the Conservatives, because they don't seem to get that.

[*Translation*]

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

Mr. Généreux, you have the floor.

**Mr. Bernard Généreux (Montmagny—L'Islet—Kamouraska—Rivière-du-Loup, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would propose a subamendment to Mr. Turnbull's amendment.

I agree with the 14-day deadline. However, we should make sure that the two meetings for this study are held after the study on potential anti-competitive behaviour in Canada's electronic transfer ecosystem.

We received the order from the House to study that question.

**The Chair:** It goes without saying that, regardless of the motions we adopt, they will not take precedence over the proposed December schedule.

Based on our current schedule, we will undoubtedly have to respond to the order of the House. We therefore cannot give precedence to this study.

I want to remind my colleagues that Mr. Turnbull's amendment proposes to remove the words “within 14 days following the adoption of this motion”.

Are there any comments on this amendment?

• (0925)

[*English*]

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** We proposed a subamendment.

**The Chair:** Yes, Mr. Généreux proposed a subamendment to the amendment.

I was just explaining to Mr. Généreux that we're not going to change the schedule for this motion. We have an order from the House to study anti-competitive behaviour, which is taking us until Christmas.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** Go head, Mr. Perkins.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Mr. Généreux's subamendment proposes a time, which is in order, and that time is after the study, as he said.

**The Chair:** I'm sorry, Mr. Généreux. The subamendment says that it's right after the anti-competitive ecosystem study that we have.

On the subamendment, do I have any speakers?

I have Mr. Masse.

**Mr. Brian Masse:** What does that do to all of our other business, though, including our current study? I'm not sure when we start the stuff from the House and when that finishes. If this goes right after that, it means we can't even have one meeting to finish anything else. I'm just wondering.

**The Chair:** Well, on the credit cards study, from my understanding, we've already had the meetings that we agreed to in the motion, and then some. We would need some time for the drafting instructions and the report, but I think that can be managed, if need be, through additional resources. Sometimes when we have scheduling issues, we can squeeze in a meeting to analyze the report, which has to be written by the analysts as well, so we have a bit of time on that, Mr. Masse.

**Mr. Brian Masse:** Okay. That's my only concern: locking us out of any flexibility.

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

**Mr. Brian Masse:** I don't think that's the intention of the mover on that, either. It's just that I didn't want us to get into that bind.

**The Chair:** Just to get back, in the interest of trying to speed things up, Mr. Turnbull has proposed to remove “within 14 days”, and Mr. Généreux is subamending that to just say that it would be right after the current study on credit cards and anti-competitive behaviour.

Do I have any comments on that specific subamendment?

On that subamendment, I have Mr. Turnbull.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** We had hoped, obviously, that we would be back on Bill C-27 after that particular study. I know that Mr. Masse is asking questions about that, and we've been working very diligently to come up with options to get back to Bill C-27.

I think that if that's a priority for a number of individuals, to me that would be the preference when we get back, after the study Mr. Généreux mentioned, which I think we've now clarified as the order from the House, that we need to study—

**The Chair:** It's right after the order from the House.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Yes. He's adding "right after", which would suggest the committee.... I would respectfully oppose that, because I would like to be back on Bill C-27 immediately following that.

**The Chair:** To be clear, this is all when we come back in January, because we're not getting there this session.

On the subamendment by Monsieur Généreux, I have Monsieur Généreux.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Bernard Généreux:** Basically, I don't share my colleague's opinion.

We're talking about holding two meetings for this study. As far as the study of Bill C-27 is concerned, I don't think that holding two meetings will change things considerably. I think it would be important for us to do this study as soon as we come back in January, or in February. In fact, in January, we'll have barely two days. Do we have a meeting scheduled for January? We'll probably have one or two at the beginning of the year.

I don't think it changes the agenda for Bill C-27. In any case, until the minister responds to our requests and says what he wants to do about the proposed amendments, we honestly can't work on or even plan to work on Bill C-27.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Do any members want to speak to Mr. Généreux's subamendment?

Mr. Arya, you have the floor.

[*English*]

**Mr. Chandra Arya (Nepean, Lib.):** On this subamendment, Mr. Chair, my preference would be to deal with Bill C-27 at the earliest. I'll speak to this motion later.

**The Chair:** Mr. Masse.

**Mr. Brian Masse:** Well, I started this meeting raising this exact point.

Maybe we could get, from the clerk, the exact timeline for when the Liberals broke off Bill C-27, so we can take a recess to find out whether or not.... We've been waiting for these amendments for four months, perhaps. I'd like to know specifically how many months it has been, because, magically, they seem to be suggesting to us that they're going to have amendments within a few weeks, even though I specifically asked for that over and over.

Now we're getting the Liberals opposing a specific thing we have to work on today in our calendar, because now they say amendments are going to come, after being quiet about it all meeting. We have to do our planning. Here we are back again. I think it has been four months. Off the top of my head, I'm just remembering when we broke off Bill C-27. We were promised all of these different things. I don't know how I'm supposed to even.... Mr. Généreux offered an amendment for us to do something. We're supposed to, I guess, have some faith that we're going to get some amendments and hold up from.... When the minister came here, he didn't even have amendments. He had ideas. Then, finally, we got into amendments, and that took about a year.

Now we're supposed to scuttle all of our planning for this meeting. Maybe we should recess the meeting. I should bring back a motion for you to find out from the minister, specifically. At this point, I, too, would like to know why it's taken so long. This is the challenge we have. I think the member is making a legitimate motion here that is important. Then we're supposed to disregard it. I don't understand the logic on the other side here. I really don't.

I guess I'm going to support the subamendment, based on all these things. I'm not going to wait for this unicorn to pop up with regard to having the amendments written for us while we're supposed to put all of our lives on hold again.

• (0930)

**The Chair:** I hope you don't put your life on hold for Bill C-27, Mr. Masse.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Brian Masse:** I'd rather just get on with stuff. Even with the last motion, I was glad Ms. Rempel Garner brought back the compromise we had so we can get stuff done and move along. However, we can't when we have this kind of stuff going on.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Masse. You've been heard.

On the subamendment still, I have MP Rempel Garner.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** Thank you.

I just want to echo Mr. Masse's comments. I mean, are there amendments coming? Come on. If there were going to be amendments, they would have tabled them by now. My sense is that the minister is very busy planning his leadership bid and announcing money we don't have for other initiatives that haven't even been approved in the estimates yet.

I think the safe bet is to assume there aren't amendments and agree with Mr. Masse that we need to get on with planning the business of this committee. Then, if the minister wants to surprise us and drop amendments today, wow. That would be something, wouldn't it?

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** We could change our schedule.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** We could. We could change our schedule if that were to happen.

However, I think the safe bet here is that he's out on a fundraising tour, trying to get ready for a leadership change. We should move forward.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Okay. If I don't have any more speakers, let's put the subamendment to a vote.

Mr. Turnbull, did you want to speak to the subamendment?

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** I just want to say that Francis Bilodeau is not the current acting deputy minister at ISED, so you might want to change that.

**The Chair:** We can get back to that after the subamendment has been dealt with. Let's deal with the subamendment first.

[*Translation*]

We will now vote on Mr. Généreux's subamendment.

Madam Clerk, you have the floor.

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

[*English*]

**The Chair:** It makes your amendment moot, Mr. Turnbull, because now we have a time frame that's outlined in the subamendment, which takes us back to the main motion, as amended.

Mr. Turnbull.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Just for accuracy, it would be good to include the deputy minister, Philip Jennings, who I believe would be the right person to actually have come as a witness.

**The Chair:** That's, I think, a fair change that doesn't need to be discussed.

On the main motion, do I have any more speakers?

Mr. Arya.

**Mr. Chandra Arya:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Whenever government provides loans, it has to be of very strategic value to Canada and Canadians. Our government has stepped in throughout the history of the Canadian government system. At least during the last 20-25 years, we have seen many times government step in and support private businesses through loans, grants and other means.

Telesat is a private sector company funded by venture capitalists. Typically, if they have a business case, commercial banks should be able to step in and fund the business. If the government is coming in and providing this huge loan of \$2.1 billion, obviously I'm interested to know the reason behind it. I do support this motion, so that we can look into it. There's nothing to indicate that there's anything wrong in the government decision. My only thought is that we need to know more about the reasons why the government stepped in to support a private sector company. Although a point has been made that the majority ownership lies with U.S. entities, that in itself should not be an issue if there are benefits to Canada and Canadian technologies. If the implementation of whatever project Telesat is undertaking is going to be in Canada, that will stimulate technological development and add to the technological capabilities of Canada.

I don't see any problem there. However, for me to understand in more detail the reasoning behind why this loan has been given to Telesat, I would support this motion.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (0935)

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Arya.

Do I have any more speakers?

I gather from the room that there is unanimous support for the motion as amended. If no one objects, then I understand that the motion is adopted, as amended by Mr. Généreux.

(Motion as amended agreed to [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, colleagues.

Now on my list, I have MP Savard-Tremblay.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I also have a study motion for a short study. It will be emailed to you right now. You'll receive it in both languages.

Would you prefer to wait until you receive it?

• (0940)

**The Chair:** No, go ahead, Mr. Savard-Tremblay.

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** I'll read it to you, but first I'll explain it briefly.

In January 2024, 911 emergency calls were made using IP telephony, that is, over the Internet. In some cases, these calls were transferred to unilingual English call centres in Ontario.

If emergency services are not accessible at all times in both official languages, it can lead to complications and even death.

At the time, the industry minister and the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission, or CRTC, said that measures would be taken. We can't wait for deaths, injuries or fires to decide to act.

However, we have not seen any directives or announcements of potential changes. During the summer, though, new cases involving citizens came up in our ridings, which means it's likely nothing was done.

Mr. Chair, would you like me to read the motion or let everyone read it on their own?

**The Chair:** Please read it, Mr. Savard-Tremblay.

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** Here is what the motion says:

Whereas francophone users of 911 emergency services must have access to a fast, efficient and clear service, regardless of the official language in which they express themselves, for their safety to be fully ensured;

Whereas under the Official Languages Act, citizens enjoy the same rights and services regardless of the official language in which they express themselves, and federal institutions are required to provide services equitably to all citizens;

Whereas the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) is the government organization responsible for regulating IP telephony, and that, consequently, the CRTC must resolve problems arising from call localization;

that, pursuant to section 108(2) of the Regulations, the committee undertake a study of the difficulties that persist for francophones in Quebec or in francophone minority communities in Canada in receiving service in French when they call 911 emergency services, because of their locality at the time of the call;

that the committee hold two meetings to hear witnesses, and that it invite to testify, for one hour per witness, the Official Languages Commissioner, the Department of Public Safety, the CRTC and the Department of Innovation, Science and Industry;

that the committee report back to the House.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mr. Savard-Tremblay.

The clerk is distributing your motion in both official languages, and it will be received shortly. Are there any immediate comments?

Mr. Généreux, you have the floor.

**Mr. Bernard Généreux:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'd like to tell my colleague that I sit on the Standing Committee on Official Languages, and I think it would be more appropriate for his motion to be tabled at that committee.

I understand that there's a connection with the CRTC, but the premise of his motion, which I've not yet read, is essentially that francophones were allegedly failed. So I think this is an issue that concerns the francophonie and official languages.

Many times in the past, CRTC officials have appeared before the Standing Committee on Official Languages, as have Statistics Canada officials. I think it would be more appropriate to table the motion at that committee than to table it here, especially if we consider our work schedule over the coming months. This would allow mishaps to be prevented. In my opinion, the Standing Committee on Official Languages has more time to study this issue, which seems to be a very relevant one.

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

I'll turn it over to Mr. Savard-Tremblay.

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** I'd just like to say that, on paper, this may seem more like a matter for the Standing Committee on Official Languages. However, that committee mainly monitors official, institutionalized bilingualism, as it were, whereas, in this case, the CRTC is the regulatory authority.

In addition, we're not talking about an institutional language issue, but about private companies. This falls within the purview of the Minister of Industry. So I think he should be the one to answer.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Savard-Tremblay.

Mr. Masse, you have the floor.

[*English*]

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

This might help newer members of the committee. This committee, in the past—and this is why I will support this motion—actually looked at the failing of the telcos on the 911 problem we had about seven years ago. If my memory serves me correctly, I think we even had a couple of special meetings for it, when we reconvened during the summer, related to the 911 call failure.

There were two of them, actually. There was one, most recently, when the minister had to call from Japan to get in touch with somebody from Rogers and others because they were fighting over their jurisdictions. There was that. Prior to that—and I'm going from memory right now—I believe it was in the Ottawa area, and it was related to tornadoes and other inclement weather. There were 911 failures at that time as well.

Given that we've looked at this with the CRTC before, related to 911, I'll support my colleague on this motion.

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Next on my list is Mr. Patzer.

[*English*]

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:** Thank you very much.

I guess it's just a technicality, of sorts. In the paragraph where it says, “considering that the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission is the government body responsible for regulating IP telephony”, on that wording right there, “IP telephony” actually refers to a very specific type of phone that people use, generally speaking. I know it wouldn't necessarily preclude the study from including other types of telecommunication services that are provided, but that is actually a very specific type of service that people get, using a phone over IP, rather than an analog line or even a digital line.

I don't know if there's a way to clarify that it would be all telephone systems, not just one specific type, to make sure it fully captures the breadth of the phone systems that people use.

For example, when I worked in the industry, I would install an IP set only in a business location and only in some locations. It wasn't widespread usage just yet, but I certainly don't recall.... The only instance where I ever installed it in a residential area was for a lady who worked from home. She had her own business that she ran out of her house, as a call centre type of business.

It would be a very small sample of the public that would use an IP phone. Just to make sure that we have an accurate summation, for people who are calling 911, probably fewer than 1% would be doing it over an IP phone.

● (0945)

**The Chair:** Mr. Patzer, are you suggesting an amendment? What I would advise is maybe.... From what I'm guessing—and I haven't heard from the Liberals—the Conservatives seem to be opposed to the motion.

[Translation]

Mr. G n reux, I thought you said you would prefer to have Mr. Savard-Tremblay's motion referred to the Standing Committee on Official Languages.

**Mr. Bernard G n reux:** Actually, I was just saying that it would be more appropriate. As our colleague explained, this motion does indeed fall within the purview of the Standing Committee on Industry and Technology.

Now, I'd add, as was the case with the previous motion we just passed, I think it's important to set a timeline, to set some time aside for that. That's my suggestion.

**The Chair:** Please wait one second, Mr. G n reux. We'll get back to you.

Basically, Mr. Patzer, I was wondering if you were moving an amendment. If so, do you have wording for the amendment?

[English]

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:** [Inaudible—Editor]

[Translation]

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** Before Mr. Patzer moves his amendment, I just want to see if it's actually necessary to move it.

First of all, I would point out that this is not a marginal issue. There have been articles on actual cases of calls from IP phones. There have been cases in our ridings. We've received reports to this effect.

That said, as far as we know, the 911 emergency call centre issue is only related to IP phones.

That said, if there are other cases that we are not aware of, we are open to considering them. I don't know if you want us to go further down that path.

I'm not aware of any cases unrelated to IP phones. If there are, obviously, we're not foolish, we wouldn't be opposed to looking at them.

**The Chair:** In the context of the study, the motion may be broad enough for us to also look at other cases, if there are any.

[English]

Mr. Patzer, you still have the floor, if you have an amendment to make, in light of what Mr. Savard-Tremblay has just mentioned.

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:** Can I ask him a question? Is that okay?

**The Chair:** I will allow it.

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:** Is this, then, in regard to the phone systems they are using in the 911 call centres, specifically? Is that what you are specifically requesting in the study?

[Translation]

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** I want to make sure I understand the question.

The way it's worded, we're trying to find out whether the measures promised in January are being delivered or will be soon, and to get a status report. There was a promise to act. As for the techni-

cal details, it won't be up to us to specify them; it will be up to the relevant authorities. We will find out where things stand. Promises were made in January, but, as we know, the matter remained unresolved last summer. Now, we have to see where things stand.

I don't know if that answers my colleague's question. I'm not sure I fully understood the specifics of his question.

[English]

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:** My concern is this. If it's simply because the 911 call centres use an IP phone, then, sure, let's study the impacts of IP telephony. However, there is a very specific.... This is a cellphone. It's not an IP phone. You know, it utilizes multiple technologies, but this is not an IP phone. The Cisco phones we all have in our offices are IP phones. The landline you have at your house is not an IP phone. It's a very technical thing. I'm kind of geeking out here, because I worked in the industry.

I'm just making sure there won't be any issues coming up in the study because we only narrowly prescribed it to IP telephony when, at the end of the day, most people don't use IP telephones. The call centres might, but the person phoning the call centre looking for help is most likely not using an IP phone.

[Translation]

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** It's not—

**The Chair:** Mr. Savard-Tremblay, I'd ask you to be brief, because I don't want us to continue like this much longer.

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** I just wanted to clarify that that's not the issue. We're not talking about call centres but about individuals. In Quebec, because of Videotron's market penetration, many people in the regions have IP phones.

The problem is that individuals making calls from their IP phones were transferred to call centres in Ontario, where they could not be served in French. The current problem has to do with the people using these types of phones, not with the 911 service.

● (0950)

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

Mr. Savard-Tremblay, thank you for clarifying that.

Mr. Patzer, just let me know if you want to table an amendment later, unless you want to do it right now, but I think Mr. Savard-Tremblay has clarified his motion.

[English]

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:** Yes, that clarified it for me. I was missing the transfer link into Ontario and back.

I'm good.

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.



I now give the floor to Mr. Généreux, who will be followed by Mr. Turnbull.

**Mr. Bernard Généreux:** I'd like to get back to what I was saying. We are considering the motion passed earlier, but with a timetable. I think it would be worthwhile to add one here, considering that we don't know when we're going to have the government amendments on Bill C-27.

Perhaps we should plan for when we come back after the holidays. I don't see how we could fit this in. I'd suggest to my colleague that we include a time frame, so we can be sure we will ultimately conduct the study. If this really is an urgent issue that needs to be addressed, I think it's important that it be included in the motion.

**The Chair:** In that case, Mr. Généreux, an amendment would have to be moved. What you just suggested is a little too vague.

**Mr. Bernard Généreux:** I move that the study be carried out before the end of February 2025.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** The amendment proposed by Mr. Généreux is that this study be conducted before the end of February 2025.

Are there any comments on the amendment?

Do I have unanimous consent for the amendment proposed? I see a thumbs-up from Mr. Masse, and I don't see any objections to the amendment saying the study must take place before the end of February 2025.

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

**The Chair:** Thank you. It's agreed and so ordered.

We are back to the motion as amended.

I have Mr. Turnbull.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Thanks, Chair.

It's a good discussion here. Thanks to Mr. Savard-Tremblay for bringing this forward.

My understanding is that the CRTC is bound by the Official Languages Act. As far as I know, they jumped on the issue fairly quickly. Maybe I'll provide a bit of detail on that.

The CRTC, in January, distributed several letters to telecom industry players requesting information on recent incidents in which 911 callers were unable to access service in French. There were some issues. The letters were sent to mobile service providers such as Rogers, the VoIP service provider Transat Telecom and the third party call centre Northern911. They had until February 2 to provide information. The three parties were also required to provide details on any existing provisions in their respective service agreements regarding the provision of French-language or bilingual services. That's also important to note. We also have documentation that there have been.... I think some of the issues were resolved. There were a couple of cases in Gatineau where lines were relayed to Ottawa centres, and those would have been unilingual speakers.

I want to ask Mr. Savard-Tremblay whether he's referring to specific instances in specific places or locales. I'm inclined to say—

similar to what Mr. Généreux said initially—that this seems to be more of an official languages study. I really want to understand what locale and specific incidents he might be referring to in the motion.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** I can give you a specific example that happened last summer in the riding of Berthier—Maskinongé. I don't have the exact name of the community, but my colleague mentioned it to me. When it was mentioned in meetings with other colleagues, several said that they'd had similar cases in their ridings.

So we'll have to look into it. The problem has not likely been resolved because these types of cases are still happening. I'd add that it will certainly give our colleagues an opportunity to check whether there were any such cases in their ridings, to gather information and to resolve the problem as soon as possible.

That said, with regard to the relevance of tabling my motion at this committee rather than at the Standing Committee on Official Languages, I think I answered that earlier.

● (0955)

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mr. Savard-Tremblay.

I, for one, wondered if it should....

You could make a case for the motion being better suited to either the Standing Committee on Official Languages or to our committee. In my mind, there is enough of a link with businesses and telecommunications for it to be in order here.

Is that desirable? I'm in the hands of the committee.

Would anyone else on the list like to speak to the motion as amended?

Mr. Turnbull, the floor is yours.

[*English*]

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** It feels to me as if this would be better suited for the official languages committee. Because the CRTC is subject to the Official Languages Act and must abide by it, it seems to me that this might be better placed there. This is an issue with service being provided in English when it should be provided in French. That, to me, is an important issue. I don't mean to sound as if I'm saying it's not an issue. It is an issue, and it's important. I agree. I just think it would be better placed in that committee.

That's where I stand on it. Thanks.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** I support MP Turnbull. I know—

**The Chair:** Mr. Perkins, you don't have the floor, but that's nice to hear.

I have Mr. Masse. Did you want the floor, Mr. Perkins?

Okay. It's Mr. Masse.

**Mr. Brian Masse:** I'll try again on this. First of all, we are jettisoning something here to another committee and expecting that other committee to abandon their schedule for something we're doing here, which really is going to be the death knell, most likely, for it, not knowing what that committee is doing. On top of that, anything they recommend will have to go back to the CRTC anyway, which will then be out of their jurisdiction and the minister they deal with for the issue.

Lastly, we have dealt with 911 in the industry, specifically on this, on two separate file cases that were very specific to 911. As well, it's been raised in testimony numerous times for the telcos, and also for the CRTC several times during other testimony when we've studied the issues related to coverage in rural and remote communities, on which this committee does actually have a study. I believe there are some recommendations in those studies related to that.

For those reasons, I still think it's appropriate that we deal with this. We all have our different issues that we've been raising here. To be fair, I don't believe there's been a Bloc issue that's been studied recently on this committee. It's not that there is a history of them not bringing numerous studies to the committee. I think the member has done the due diligence necessary, and I support dealing with this, especially in the constrained way that we have. If we do this, I would ask that the previous reports on 911 from this committee be brought back, so that all members would have these in front of them before then, so that we have the opportunity to be well prepped.

For those reasons, I still support this motion, because it would be continuing a practice of the work we've done on 911.

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

We'll cross the bridge when we get to the river, but it's a fair point that we look at what the committee has done in the past on this so that we don't replicate it.

Are there any other speakers on the motion as amended?

(Motion as amended negatived: nays 9; yeas 2)

● (1000)

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** The motion is defeated.

Mr. Savard-Tremblay, it's unfortunate the motion was defeated, given that it was your first motion before the committee. I understand—

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** I don't find you very welcoming.

**The Chair:** I understand.

I don't think we can necessarily send your motion as it stands to the Standing Committee on Official Languages. We could, but....

Mr. Généreux sits on the Standing Committee on Official Languages, as do I. I will gladly work with Mr. Mario Beaulieu, who also sits on it, to get your motion passed.

Indeed, as Mr. Généreux mentioned, for the time being, the Standing Committee on Official Languages has a little less on its plate than our committee does.

I think there's a lot of sympathy around the table for the very important issue you're raising.

I'm counting on Mr. Généreux's co-operation. I will be watching him at the Standing Committee on Official Languages to make sure things run smoothly.

**Mr. Bernard Généreux:** I do know that, in the Bloc Québécois, the—

**The Chair:** We'll have that debate later at the Standing Committee on Official Languages.

Thank you, Mr. Savard-Tremblay, for raising this issue. I really appreciate it.

Next on my list I have Mr. Masse.

[*English*]

On committee business, Mr. Masse, are you good?

**Mr. Brian Masse:** I'm good. Thank you.

**The Chair:** I have Mr. Patzer, and then I think I have MP Badawey.

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:** Thank you very much, Chair.

I have a motion here that was talked about previously:

That, in relation to the committee ongoing study of credit card practices, and given various departments have refused to answer questions and produce documentation related to the committee's ongoing study, the committee therefore order the department to produce:

(a) Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner's request for any briefing notes and summary documents prepared by the department related to the Government of Canada's consultation process on reducing interchange fees, including any and all written submissions received by stakeholders;

(b) MP Jean-Denis Garon's request for all copies of Visa and Mastercard's initial offer to reduce interchange fees, including any and all counter offers by the department, as well as any and all email exchanges related to these negotiations between Visa, Mastercard, and American Express;

(c) MP Brian Masse's request for any advise letters or memorandums provided to the minister on the matter of reducing interchange fees or credit card reductions more broadly;

that these documents be produced to the committee within 14 days following the adoption of this motion, unredacted, and in both official languages.

I think it's important because, when we look at some of the committee testimony we've had here, and the lack of answers provided when we had government officials and these companies here.... The production of these documents would be extremely helpful for this committee in terms of getting answers and results for Canadians as to why things continue to be the way they are in that ecosystem.

I think it's good to do this motion. It ties in with what the parties all heard and saw in committee. It respects the wishes of multiple parties here. I think this is a good one that the committee can get done quickly. It won't interfere with any of the meetings we are trying to schedule. It's simply asking for these documents and provides a very clear timeline for when they need to come—obviously, in both official languages and clearly unredacted. That way, we get the information this committee is requesting. It's entirely within the rights and ability of this committee to do so.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mr. Patzer.

I note that this is a motion that had already been moved, but on which no decision had been made.

[*English*]

It's fair game to bring this back, because we started to debate it but we had to adjourn.

I'll note one thing.

[*Translation*]

In the French version, it says “the honourable Michelle Garon”. I think it should read “the honourable Michelle Rempel Garner”. This change will have to be made.

Otherwise, on my list, I have...

Is this what you wanted to say, Mr. Savard-Tremblay?

**Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay:** I just wanted to point out that Ms. Rempel Garner was entitled to her own identity. That was my only comment, even in French.

As for the rest, we agree. We are in favour of the motion.

• (1005)

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mr. Savard-Tremblay.

I think Mr. Turnbull wanted to speak as well.

[*English*]

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** I know the meeting we had on this topic was a good one, where we all got into asking some pretty tough questions of the witnesses. We also clarified with the departmental folks that they are to provide the documentation referenced here. They agreed to do that in their testimony. They will provide that documentation to the committee. I feel as if this motion is moot, in the sense that they've already agreed to provide the very documentation being referred to here.

What I want to do is ask whether the clerk or the chair has received any of those documents yet. I believe they are forthcoming already, and the committee should probably take note of those and review them before we go requesting anything in addition to that. I don't think this is adding any value, to be honest, but if we think there's a need to ask for additional information, maybe we could craft a motion tailored to that specific need. That's if we feel the documentation is somehow insufficient, or whatever.

My understanding is that they were going to provide that documentation, and that it is forthcoming. Could we double-check whether we've received anything yet?

**The Chair:** As to your question, MP Turnbull, the clerk indeed received information last night from Finance. It was just sent to committee members at 10 a.m. this morning. It is also available in the digital binder.

Do you still have anything to add, Mr. Turnbull?

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Obviously, we haven't had a chance, because we've been in this meeting, to review that documentation. I would suggest that, if this is a real priority for us as a committee, we take the time to review that documentation before voting on a motion that is sort of redundant. Maybe there's something that's of substance still left in this motion, after that documentation has been provided.

We should take the time to review it, understand what is actually there and what has been provided, and see what it is that the committee desired but that may not have been met. If that is the case—I don't think it will be, as I think it will be fairly thorough—then we should give the benefit of the doubt to the officials who provided the very information that this committee was unanimous in requesting from them.

**The Chair:** MP Rempel Garner.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** Just for my colleagues, what has been, at the very last minute, provided from finance officials to this committee is not what this motion requested.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** You haven't read it yet.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** I actually can read very quickly, thank you. That's why I'm successful in my career and why I typically outflank the Liberals on most things. Thank you for trying to presuppose my reading abilities, Mr. Turnbull. I assure you that they are very adequate. Thank you.

What has been submitted by the government is talking points. It's not what was requested by any of the members who are mentioned in this motion, and I think we should proceed with the production order.

Thank you.

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

Mr. Masse, you have the floor.

[*English*]

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

First, I'm going to support this. If it is redundant, then that's fine. They can then weed out those parts that are redundant, and we can go forward with the information we get. You could actually apply the logic that's being used here to the benefit of what the committee could receive.

Second to that, on the timeline we have here, my only concern is that we should have some flexibility with regard to making sure that, at the end of the day, it doesn't hold up the report or anything else like that. It could be added value later, or whatever it might be, if we get into a document issue.

The meeting that a lot of this came out of was one of the most successful meetings, I think, and it highlighted a lot of the issues we're dealing with. Hopefully, this information will make our report even stronger.

[*Translation*]

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

Is there anyone else?

Mr. Turnbull, you have the floor.

[*English*]

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** I note that we received the email from the clerk at 10:04. Ms. Rempel Garner's intervention was at 10:08—

• (1010)

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** I have a point of order.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** —and there are over 40 pages of documents—

**The Chair:** One second, Mr. Turnbull.

There's a point of order by Ms. Rempel Garner.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** I can read. I would like to assure my colleagues that I can read. I can assure the colleagues that there are no briefing notes and summary documents in the package that was sent. That is related to me. Since—

**The Chair:** Thank you, MP Rempel Garner. That is not a point of order.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** On decorum, though, Chair, my colleague is impugning my ability to read. I assure you—A, B, C, D, E, F, G—this girl can read.

**The Chair:** MP Rempel Garner, this is not a point of order.

Mr. Turnbull, you have the floor.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** Thank you.

As I was saying, there were about four minutes since the time we received these documents. There are over 50 pages, as I count. I haven't had a chance to read them myself, but I would welcome debate on this motion after having read those documents. I would like to actually look at what's being proposed and ordered here in this motion, as a series of documentation, and I would like to compare what we've received specifically to what's being requested here.

I think it's more than fair that we don't waste the committee's time. I think this is a waste of the committee's time. If we've already received the documents, then let's have a look at what they contain and what information has been provided. There was a lot of work, obviously, that went into this, at our request, when witnesses were here. Respectfully, we should honour the fact that we made that request. I remember clarifying with the woman, whose name I'm forgetting right now, what we were specifically requesting. She

made a commitment, on the record, that she would provide that documentation.

It hasn't been that long, Chair. Maybe we could clarify when that meeting was and how long it has taken because, obviously, documentation takes some time to put together, at the committee's request. How long has it been?

**The Chair:** It was on November 7 that we had that meeting.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** It has taken 14 days to put together over 50 pages of documentation at the committee's request and then provide it to the committee. Come on, let's be clear here: That's a sufficient and realistic amount of time. I don't think anyone can say that the officials didn't do their job to provide the documentation we requested. We may have some differences of opinion about whether they have provided sufficiently detailed information in specific areas, but we have not had the chance to read over 40 pages of documents between the time that email was sent and four minutes later.

I don't know whether you're a speed reader. Maybe all of you are and you were reading as you were talking into the record here, but I think that's clearly nonsense. We need to focus on the fact that this committee—

**Mr. Brian Masse:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** There is a point of order.

Go ahead, Mr. Masse.

**Mr. Brian Masse:** Now he's making personal qualifications on another member here. Maybe we can take a step back on that. He's actually breaking the timeline down to four minutes. I mean, make the points, but—

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

I was listening very closely to Mr. Turnbull because I think he has to tread carefully. However, I noted that he was talking about the fact that, for most members around this table, four minutes is not enough time to read 50 pages. He's been talking about himself as a member. He has been asked to vote on a motion—as are other members—and he wasn't targeting anyone in the last couple of minutes when I was listening to his speech, so I'll leave him to pursue that.

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** I have Mr. Patzer.

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:** In the amount of time that Mr. Turnbull has been speaking, I was able to flip through all those documents, and I can tell you that there's nothing in there about reducing interchange fees or the counter-offers between the department and Visa and Mastercard. It was all copied and pasted, things such as a code of conduct, which wasn't even part of the request—

**The Chair:** Mr. Patzer, that's not a point of order. I'll add you to the list if you want.

I have Mr. Turnbull.

**Mr. Ryan Turnbull:** To my point, though, most of us have not had a chance. Mr. Patzer may have done a superficial flip through the documents, but personally, I would like the time to actually read through and see what was provided. I think that's pretty fair and realistic. There actually may be more than 50 pages of documents, and I think there are substantive pieces of information that this committee should take the time to review. I think that's more than fair.

If Canadians are watching this committee—I hope they are—the documents that have been provided were requested by this committee on a particularly important issue that we've chosen to study as a committee. I think all of us have specific concerns around interchange fees and making sure that we hold accountable both credit card companies and some of the other stakeholders involved in that complex system. We have very specific sets of information here that I really think it makes sense to review before we go requesting additional documentation.

That's my perspective on it. I think we should revisit this at a future meeting.

This is Mr. Patzer's motion, I believe, but maybe he could take the time to review it, and then we could discuss at a future meeting whether there's anything left that's desirable, so the committee can make its determinations around what's been provided.

Thank you, Chair.

• (1015)

**The Chair:** Mr. Turnbull, your timing is perfect, because we're at the end of this meeting. We'll have to bring this back at some later point.

I have Mr. Perkins.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** I'd like to seek unanimous consent, which I think there is in the committee, to move the following motion: “That the committee invite Minister François-Philippe Champagne to testify on supplementary estimates (B), 2024-25, for two hours by no later than the end of the current supply period.”

**The Chair:** I'm looking around. Yes, it's the usual practice that we invite the minister on supplementary estimates.

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** That is a fantastic note to end this meeting on. Thank you, Mr. Perkins, for bringing consensus right at the end.

[*Translation*]

Thank you all very much.

The meeting is adjourned.

---





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

---

### SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

---

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

---

### PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

---

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

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

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

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

---

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