



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities

TRAN • NUMBER 015 • 2nd SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Tuesday, March 4, 2014

—
Chair

Mr. Larry Miller

Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities

Tuesday, March 4, 2014

•(0845)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Larry Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC)): We'll call our meeting to order.

As everyone knows, we're going through clause-by-clause study on Bill C-3.

First of all, I want to thank our witnesses who are here from the department. There may be some interchanging at some point, depending on the topic. We have some people here from the aeronautics industry as well.

Accordingly, if anybody has questions and we need to bring somebody to the table, feel free to do that at any time.

Mr. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.): Could they introduce themselves?

The Chair: Yes, we can certainly do that.

Mr. McGuinty has asked that you introduce yourselves.

Mr. John Thachet (Legal Counsel, Legal Services, Department of Transport): I'm John Thachet, from the Department of Justice, with the Transport Canada legal services.

Mr. David Reble (Manager, National Airports and Air Navigation Services Policy, Department of Transport): I'm David Reble, from Transport Canada, airports and air navigation services policy.

Mr. Dave Dawson (Director, Airports and Air Navigation Services Policy, Department of Transport): I'm Dave Dawson, also from Transport Canada, airport policy group.

The Chair: Thank you, gentlemen.

First I'm going to propose that we group clauses 2 to 18 together just to make the best use of our time. If any of the committee members have an issue with any clause in that group, make me aware of it and we'll stop at that point, have the debate on it, and go forward from there.

Is everyone good with that?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Mr. Mai.

Mr. Hoang Mai (Brossard—La Prairie, NDP): Could I speak to clause 15?

The Chair: Clause 15, that's noted.

Clause 1 is postponed until the end.

(Clauses 2 to 14 inclusive agreed to)

(On clause 15)

The Chair: Mr. Mai, I understand you want to speak to clause 15.

Mr. Hoang Mai: I want to speak to clauses 15 and 16.

We made an amendment that was refused because it went against what the bill was. Maybe I could get some clarification from the officials.

[Translation]

By the way, thank you very much for joining us again today to explain things to us and, above all, answer our questions.

What I gather from clauses 15 and 16 is that they are removing the minister's discretion to request a board of inquiry when a problem occurs in the system.

Can you tell us why those sections of the act were repealed and why that power was taken away from the minister?

[English]

Mr. Jeff Watson (Essex, CPC): If I might, wouldn't the removal of clauses be an issue for the clerk, not witnesses, if you will?

Mr. Hoang Mai: Yes, but the reason I'm asking is just to have more information.

Mr. Jeff Watson: You're asking them why the clauses were removed. It's a question for the clerk.

Mr. Hoang Mai: No, no. The effect of Bill C-3, clauses 15 and 16, is they're deleting some sections of the previous bill. I'm just asking about that amendment, about why are we repealing. It's on the amendment, but it's more on the bill.

Mr. Jeff Watson: Fair enough. I appreciate that.

The Chair: Who wants to respond to that?

Mr. Alex Weatherston (Counsel, Legal Advisory Services, Department of Justice): We'll respond to that.

I'm Alex Weatherston, from the Department of Justice, and I've been supporting the air force with the legal side of this bill.

That's a good question.

Currently, there is the power to convene a board of inquiry under this act. It goes into the Inquiries Act. As Mr. Armour mentioned last time we were here, there have been incidents where we have been close to doing that, to obtain that legal authority.

With the powers in part II of the Aeronautics Act, we no longer need that power in part I. That's why it's being deleted.

The other section that's being repealed deals with privileges, and likewise, all those privileges, which are being incorporated right now under the CTAISB Act into the air force activities, are also now found in part II of the Aeronautics Act amendments.

• (0850)

[Translation]

Mr. Hoang Mai: So that authority still exists, but in another part of the legislation. Is that correct?

[English]

Mr. Alex Weatherston: Exactly. That power currently exists and is no longer required once we have our amendments in the Aeronautics Act.

[Translation]

Mr. Hoang Mai: Thank you kindly.

[English]

The Chair: Is there any further discussion on clauses 15 or 16? (Clauses 15 to 18 inclusive agreed to)

The Chair: We'll now move to clause 19.

Mr. Hoang Mai: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair. There was a mistake in our amendments. Amendment NDP-1 was with respect to clause 18. I would—

[Translation]

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Philippe Grenier-Michaud): No, that's right.

Mr. Hoang Mai: It's right?

[English]

I'm sorry. My apologies. Let's go to clause 19.

(On clause 19)

The Chair: We're on amendment NDP-1. Mr. Mai.

[Translation]

Mr. Hoang Mai: The idea behind the amendment is to ensure that the reports are made public.

Don't forget that one of the witnesses who appeared before the committee was Colonel Steve Charpentier, from the Department of National Defence. He told us how important it was for the department to ensure that the reports were made public.

The whole point was to ensure that information was shared and that certain agencies could see the reports. It used to be the Transportation Safety Board of Canada that did the reporting when a civilian-related accident occurred, and those reports were made public, as everyone knows.

Under clause 19 of the bill, the reports would be confidential and therefore would not be released to the public. The purpose of amendment NDP-1 is to ensure that the reports are made public. That follows through on what Colonel Charpentier told the committee about the Department of National Defence itself making the reports public. We wanted to make sure that was clearly stated in the bill.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Mai.

Is there any further discussion on amendment NDP-1?

Mr. Hoang Mai: Maybe I could add—

Mr. Alex Weatherston: Mr. Chair, my apologies, but we don't have a copy of the amendment before us. Is there a chance that we could see it?

The Chair: While this is being done, in the future, Mr. Mai, or anybody else on the committee, if there's an amendment and you expect an answer to it, maybe you could get the information to the witnesses. We would make better use of our time. That's all.

Mr. Hoang Mai: Sure. Well, we did send it to the clerk, so we were wondering if those amendments would be.... They were sent before today.

The Chair: Okay.

The Clerk: The amendments were provided to the members of the committee only.

The Chair: Yes, but it wouldn't go to anybody who might appear here.

Mr. Hoang Mai: We'll know next time. My apologies.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Mai.

Mr. Hoang Mai: Maybe I could read it just to make sure that it's what was sent.

[Translation]

The amendment reads as follows:

That Bill C-3, in Clause 19, be amended by adding after line 19 on page 19 the following:

“(1.1) The Minister shall, immediately after receiving the report referred to in subsection (1), publish the report.”

The point is really to have the report made public once the minister has received it.

[English]

The Chair: Is there any further discussion on the amendment?

Mr. McGuinty.

Mr. David McGuinty: Mr. Chair, are the witnesses going to give us some insight on this?

The Chair: Well, it hasn't been indicated to me.

Mr. David McGuinty: I'd like to add my voice to hear how they respond to this notion of making public the report.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Jim Armour (Senior Investigator, Department of National Defence): Just in our brief discussion in the chance that we've had to take a look at this.... This obviously is a statutory requirement, which the minister is presently doing on an administrative basis. That's our only observation. It just statutorily makes the administrative process that we now have in place statutory. It becomes statutory. That's our only observation on it.

• (0855)

Mr. Alex Weatherston: There's the added dimension, Jim, that in the context of the military, there are flight investigation reports that have confidential and classified material in them that the minister and Jim's staff here have to analyze and review before the process occurs and the report is put up on the public websites.

Mr. Jim Armour: A report that would go to the minister might have to be amended, if you understand what we're saying, for security or operational reasons, and that's just information that might be used contrary to the best interests of the Canadian Forces in their operations.

This would have to certainly reflect that that would be a possibility opposed to an unamended report. A report may be amended for security purposes, but the minister would still, if this was going to happen, have to publish a report that would be amended for operation or security purposes.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Watson.

Mr. Jeff Watson: Chair, to clarify, the amendment as it's written would compel a report with all information to be immediately published. Is that correct?

Mr. Jim Armour: That's what we would read that as.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Hoang Mai: I just want to make sure I understand correctly. We already know that, practically speaking, many reports are censored; portions are removed for security reasons. Wouldn't that happen in this case as well? If a report being made public contained information about national defence or security that should be kept confidential, wouldn't that information be removed or blacked out automatically?

In fact, the new section 19 reads as follows: "The Authority shall, on a confidential basis, provide an interim report...." So the element of confidentiality is already built in. We asked the Department of National Defence about the issue of information deemed to be confidential or to involve public safety. The government already has the power to keep some of the information confidential.

In this case, wouldn't it simply be a matter of saying where the preliminary investigation stands? I would remind the committee that when Colonel—

[*English*]

The Chair: Is there a response or comment?

Mr. Jim Armour: The only thing that I think there is some reticence about is if there's information in there that also might compromise an ally or something of that nature, or if there's information in it that would be proprietary in nature. In order to understand what had actually occurred, we may have to discuss proprietary information, and that also might require some editing, or not publishing those sections of the report.

We haven't really had to do this yet, but when we're looking forward at the possibility of that occurring, we have considered all of these things, so as we prepare a report and pass it to the minister, one of the things that we always bear in mind is those issues. At this point we haven't had to amend a report, as we publish them publicly

on the website through our administrative process, but we certainly wouldn't want to be statutorily obligated to make a report that we've made to the minister word for word available in a published format.

The Chair: Thank you very much. I think we're very clear on that.

I'm going to call the vote.

(Amendment negated)

The Chair: We now move on to amendment NDP-2.

Mr. Mai.

Mr. Hoang Mai: No, I won't be moving NDP-2. We'll be moving amendment NDP-3

• (0900)

The Chair: Then we'll move on to amendment NDP-3.

Mr. Mai.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Hoang Mai: This amendment is based on the same principle regarding public reporting. I'll read it quickly:

"19. The Authority shall publish an interim report on the progress and findings of an investigation."

Again, this speaks to how important the issue is right now. The Transportation Safety Board of Canada makes all reports public. It's a matter of Canadians' confidence in the processes and steps undertaken by the government. Similarly, that is why we want reports to be made public.

[*English*]

The Chair: Is there any further discussion on amendment NDP-3?

Mr. Alex Weatherston: Mr. Chair, we make the comment also here that this proposed amendment is not consistent with the CTAISB Act legislation. They're under no obligation to publish their interim reports like this.

The Chair: Thank you.

I'm going to call the vote.

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

The Chair: We're now going to vote on clause 19.

(Clause 19 agreed to)

(Clauses 20 to 22 inclusive agreed to)

(On clause 23)

The Chair: We have amendment NDP-4.

Mr. Mai.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Hoang Mai: I will read amendment NDP-4. I assume the officials have received the amendments.

[English]

The Chair: Just to clarify, amendments cannot be distributed to the public until they've been tabled here, and I should have known that.

Go ahead and read it. At least we'll be aware of it.

[Translation]

Mr. Hoang Mai: The amendment reads as follows:

That Bill C-3, in Clause 23, be amended by replacing line 2 on page 33 with the following:

“ensure that the”

Actually, we're removing

[English]

“take all reasonable measures”.

[Translation]

The purpose is to ensure that things actually move forward with the investigation, to make sure that the Department of National Defence and the Board of Transportation Safety do more than just take all reasonable measures to coordinate the investigation.

[English]

The Chair: Are there any comments?

Mr. Jim Armour: As worded in the proposed amendment—the existing proposed amendment, not the suggested change—those are exactly the words that are in CTAISB. That has been imported directly from CTAISB into what our amendment is. So this would also amend CTAISB.

A voice: That allows flexibility.

Mr. Jim Armour: It's being pointed out that the wording as it exists does allow flexibility. If it's hard this way, then we have no choice but to dedicate the resources to such investigations even if they don't want to participate or we don't want to participate, for whatever reason; whereas, the wording that exists does allow flexibility and give and take between the Transportation Safety Board and the AIA investigation.

The Chair: Thank you.

Is there any further discussion on amendment NDP-4?

[Translation]

Mr. Hoang Mai: I'd like a small clarification please.

Could you give us an example of a situation in which it would cause a problem? I am really trying to understand what you said about it giving you more flexibility. Could you please explain that?

[English]

Mr. Jim Armour: I can give you a practical example.

One of the things we do is investigate glider accidents. In Quebec, glider accidents are actually... They do what's called a power pilot scholarship. They make contracts with civilian power companies that teach the kids how to actually fly, so when an accident of that nature happens, we have a vested interest in finding out a lot about it, whereas for the Transportation Safety Board, it's not a very high-profile investigation for them to dedicate resources to.

Sometimes they have been contacted. We've told them that we're going to do an investigation, and they say they're not interested. This would sort of demand that they show up. It would really impose on them a need to investigate something that we were investigating. In reverse, it has never happened. We have never not gone to an investigation they've asked us to go to, but certainly, although they've always been notified when we're doing an investigation that would have a Transportation Safety Board connotation, occasionally the Transportation Safety Board says that it's beyond their mandate, or that they're not going to send any investigator for that.

[Translation]

Mr. Hoang Mai: Very well.

● (0905)

[English]

The Chair: Okay. That's a good explanation of it.

(Amendment negated)

(Clause 23 agreed to)

(Clauses 24 to 41 inclusive agreed to)

(On clause 42)

The Chair: We have amendment NDP-5.

Mr. Mai.

[Translation]

Mr. Hoang Mai: The NDP submitted a series of requests after we heard from the Canadian Maritime Law Association.

One of the problems we want to fix has to do with the liability limit of ship owners. We think it's beneficial to pursue this to take advantage of what the international HNS convention says. It ensures that cleanup costs are not left solely to Canadian taxpayers.

If memory serves and if I understood what the Canadian Maritime Law Association told us, the liability of ship owners is limited to \$165 million. And in situations where the damage exceeds the ship owner's liability, additional compensation may be paid out under the convention up to a maximum of \$400 million. Because of the convention and its international fund, then, taxpayers do not have to assume all the cleanup costs.

But when the bill exceeds \$400 million, the party responsible for the cleanup, in other words, the government, has to assume the remainder of the bill, as was the case in Lac-Mégantic. And the problem is that when the government pays, it is really Canadian taxpayers footing the bill.

In the case of an oil spill, cleanup costs can be in the billions. And for chemical spills, as is the case here, the cleanup costs are not yet known, but they can rise quickly, as the experts have told us.

Given the dramatic increase in the transportation of hazardous materials, why limit the liability of private companies to \$400 million? If agreed to, our amendments would allow us to go after what already exists, in other words, we would have access to a fund that oil companies paid into until 1976—or rather 1973, as my colleague just pointed out to me. What we are asking for is access to that private fund, which was set aside and never used. One witness talked about some \$280 million.

In short, what we are trying to do through our amendments is ensure that Canadian taxpayers are not on the hook for all the cleanup costs following a disaster or accident involving hazardous materials, known as HNSs, hazardous and noxious substances.

That is the purpose of the changes we are proposing, changes that are based on what the Canadian Maritime Law Association told the committee.

[*English*]

The Chair: Is there any further discussion?

Mr. Watson.

Mr. Jeff Watson: I'll only point out for the record, Mr. Chair, that we're opposed to this.

I asked our officials to look into the most expensive cleanup done under an HNS protocol, and it's a \$60-million cleanup. We're talking about putting in place a regime that would offer—not paid by the taxpayers—up to \$400 million currently, so we think the regime is sufficient.

Also, there was the question of justice. I'm pretty sure I appreciate that the NDP would like the oil companies to pay for everything, including for chemical companies, but this would open up access to a fund paid for by the oil companies without changing the regime of who pays into the fund, and how much chemical companies would pay into the fund. Simply opening up the fund without changing the structure of who would pay into it is not sufficient either, so we're opposed to it.

●(0910)

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Sullivan.

Mr. Mike Sullivan (York South—Weston, NDP): I understand the government's position; however, given that the department has not yet conducted a risk assessment, it's difficult to say exactly what the risk might be. If the biggest cleanup required for HNS to date is \$60 million—there's no draw-down on the fund, because the fund hasn't yet been implemented anywhere—and the department has not conducted a risk assessment, nor has the panel turned its mind to HNS yet, it is difficult for us to state categorically that \$165 million is enough. The \$400 million comes into play only when it's an oil spill, which then comes back to the whole discussion of oil again.

I understand the government's reluctance to deal with this SOPF in any way other than as it applies to oil, but perhaps we can, after the fact... If there's money available that will save the Canadian taxpayers money in the long run, then maybe we should be looking at asking the other transporters of hazardous and noxious substances to contribute to a uniquely Canadian fund, the SOPF, in other words, to provide yet another backstop. It may never be needed, but in the

event that it is, I believe the taxpayers would rather we were being prudent than leaving the taxpayers open to a significant liability.

The Chair: Mr. Mai, you have the last comment.

Mr. Hoang Mai: Yes, I'll make it quickly.

The idea behind this is just to make sure the taxpayers don't have to pay. Right now what we're saying is that the taxpayers would pay for the cleanup, rather than the oil companies.

It wouldn't be initiating a fund; it's a fund that already existed. It was stopped in 1973, in terms of how much money was put in. If we want to be fair, I think we should change the law, and it's Canadian law, to make sure that all HNS transporters contribute to that fund. Then we would have a fund that would make sure that Canadian taxpayers wouldn't have to pay.

It's really hard for me to understand why the government wants to protect the oil companies rather than the Canadian taxpayers. There's a fund that already existed. It was paid up until 1973. No additional money has been put in. Right now we're saying, "Well, no, let's not use that fund," instead of, if we want to be fair, asking the transporters to put more money into the fund. That would be better. But to say that because the maximum cleanup cost \$60 million it means that we won't have more, that's not prudent, in my mind.

The Chair: (Amendment negated [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clause 42 agreed to)

(On clause 43)

The Chair: We have amendment NDP-6.

Mr. Mai.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Hoang Mai: I don't want to waste any more of the committee's time. NDP amendments 6, 7 and 8 are all related to what we discussed. I won't repeat my explanation, but I will stress the importance of not making taxpayers pay these costs. Unfortunately, it seems that the government's preference is to make taxpayers pay instead of the companies.

●(0915)

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you.

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

(Clause 43 agreed to)

(Clauses 44 and 45 agreed to)

(On clause 46)

The Chair: We have amendment NDP-7.

Mr. Mai.

Mr. Hoang Mai: It's the same thing, Mr. Chair.

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

(Clause 46 agreed to)

(Clauses 47 to 49 inclusive agreed to)

(On clause 50)

The Chair: We have amendment NDP-8.

Mr. Mai.

Mr. Hoang Mai: It's the same thing, Mr. Chair, and I'll just ask for a recorded vote.

The Chair: Okay.

(Amendment negatived: nays 5; yeas 4 [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clause 50 agreed to)

(Clauses 51 to 59 inclusive agreed to)

(On clause 60)

The Chair: We have an amendment moved by Ms. May.

Ms. May, welcome to the committee. You have the floor.

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

As committee members will recall, I'm here based on instructions to show up at clause-by-clause study with amendments if we're concerned.

On this bill, Bill C-3, An Act to enact the Aviation Industry Indemnity Act, to amend the Aeronautics Act, the Canada Marine Act, the Marine Liability Act and the Canada Shipping Act, 2001 and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, not to be cheeky about it, but I think the short title, safeguarding Canada's seas and skies act, should get some sort of prize for overblown marketing in the public relations category in future Oscars.

It does a lot of business, like housekeeping, for which I have no concerns, relating to aviation accidents and war risks for the aeronautics industry.

I certainly think that implementing the international convention on liability and compensation for damage in connection with the carriage of hazardous and noxious substances by sea is a good idea, but I completely support the attempts which the NDP just made to get rid of the cap on marine accidents involving oil.

I've focused my amendments on part 5. There are three amendments, but I'll just speak briefly to—

The Chair: We're dealing with amendment PV-1 right now.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Okay, thank you, Mr. Chair.

What this amendment to clause 60 would do is create some public access to this information about the plans that the minister would be approving in relation to oil pollution prevention plans or oil pollution emergency plans. They are in the act now, that the minister will approve such plans, but as we understand it, none of these plans would be accessible by access to information legislation. We're suggesting in this very straightforward amendment that the minister would publish in the *Canada Gazette*, as well as on the Internet site of the Department of Transport, the plans that are received, and the minister would consult with the public about any of these concerns

that the public might express once they had an opportunity to review the plans.

It's merely a piece on public accessibility to information that's been prepared already. There's no additional preparation of information that's required by this section. The minister publishes the plans that have been accepted and then, if there are concerns, the minister shall consult. That's the extent of the amendment.

The Chair: Is there further discussion on the amendment?

All those in favour of the amendment?

Are you in favour of your amendment, Ms. May?

Ms. Elizabeth May: Am I allowed to vote, Mr. Chair?

The Chair: No, that's right.

Ms. Elizabeth May: I'd like to be in favour of my amendment and I appreciate your extending my rights and privileges. Larry Miller for—

The Chair: I have to withdraw that right.

Voices: Oh, oh!

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

The Chair: Next is amendment PV-2, proposed by Ms. May.

The floor is yours, Ms. May.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Chair, again, this amendment is affecting the same line of reasoning on page 56, also in clause 60, looking at ensuring that the oil pollution prevention plans and emergency plans that are submitted pursuant to section 167.4 would also be made public by the minister in the fashion of a publication in the *Canada Gazette* and on the Internet site of the Department of Transport, and that, again, this would facilitate public access to this information.

As you will know, Mr. Chair, this is an area of extreme interest to communities that live near facilities that handle the transport of oil. The pollution prevention plans and emergency plans being made public would be in the public interest. I hope that committee members will approve this amendment.

● (0920)

The Chair: Is there any further discussion?

Mr. Mai.

Mr. Hoang Mai: Could I hear from the officials what they think about the amendment?

The Chair: If anyone cares to....

Mr. Hoang Mai: It's in terms of making things public and publishing in the *Canada Gazette*.

Mr. Sylvain Lachance (Executive Director, Regulatory and Quality Assurance, Marine Safety and Security, Department of Transport): There's a lot of consultation that would already take place within the public with our RAC system that's in place, and we were looking at possibly enhancing those bodies.

The Chair: Mr. McGuinty.

Mr. David McGuinty: Is there a lot of discussion with the public in advance of the preparation of the submission of these plans? Is that what you're suggesting?

Mr. Sylvain Lachance: A lot of consultation with the public will be entailed previous to putting in place, not the plans themselves, but the regime for oil spill cleanup, and so on.

Mr. David McGuinty: The consultation would be conducted by whom?

Mr. Sylvain Lachance: The consultation will take place mainly with our CMAC system that we have in place, and that's open to the public, plus our regional advisory council that is in place.

Mr. David McGuinty: Could I ask another question, Mr. Chair?

The Chair: Certainly.

Mr. David McGuinty: Are there any national security concerns that would arise if these plans were made public?

Mr. Sylvain Lachance: No.

Mr. David McGuinty: Acts of terrorism, targets, nothing?

Mr. Sylvain Lachance: Not that I know of, but it's a possibility.

Mr. David McGuinty: Thank you.

(Amendment negated)

(Clause 60 agreed to)

(Clauses 61 and 62 agreed to)

(On clause 63)

The Chair: We have amendment PV-3, moved by Ms. May.

The floor is yours, Ms. May.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Mr. Chair, this amendment is similar, but deals with a different type of information that is collected under this act. This relates to clause 63 of the bill that deals with what in the old act was section 168. I would create a section 168.4 as an addition to what's found on page 58. You will find these terms under proposed section 168.3:

If the Minister believes on reasonable grounds that an oil handling facility has discharged, is discharging or is likely to discharge oil, that the oil pollution prevention plan or the oil pollution emergency plan for an oil handling facility does not meet the requirements set out in the regulations or that the operator of an oil handling facility does not have the procedures, equipment and resources required—

—the minister may then take steps.

What my amendment adds in is that when the minister becomes aware of this situation, that an oil handling facility has discharged, is discharging or is likely to discharge oil, and isn't prepared to deal with the emergency, the Minister shall prepare and make public a report in respect of those circumstances so that the community becomes aware of any incident either past or prospective or a lack of preparedness.

It's once the minister is aware of those things. Again, this isn't an additional step. The minister is already aware of these things. It's just a question of opening it up so the public is aware of it as well.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Mai.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Hoang Mai: I'm a bit surprised to see that the government members are voting against making the reports public. Officials from various departments have told us that it wasn't really a matter of national security.

If we draw a parallel and look at what's happening with railway safety, we see that people are worried, that they are asking questions and that they want all the information made public. Even municipal officials don't have the information. It is clear that concern is growing.

I have trouble wrapping my head around the fact that government members are voting against publishing the reports without even explaining why. So my question is more for the members of the government. I hope to get an answer.

● (0925)

[*English*]

The Chair: is there any further discussion on the amendment?

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

(Clause 63 agreed to)

(Clauses 64 to 79 inclusive agreed to)

The Chair: Now we move on to the short title.

Shall clause 1 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Shall the schedule carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Shall the title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Shall the bill carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Shall I report the bill to the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: That's it. Thank you ladies and gentlemen.

To all of the departmental staff that were here, thank you very much.

With that, the meeting is adjourned.

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

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

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 Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

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

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

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.

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 du Parlement du Canada à l'adresse suivante : <http://www.parl.gc.ca>