



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

43rd PARLIAMENT, 2nd SESSION

Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 023

Wednesday, March 31, 2021

Chair: Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia



Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

Wednesday, March 31, 2021

• (1530)

[Translation]

The Chair (Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.)): It is 3:30 p.m., so we will get started. I now call the meeting to order.

At the end of our last meeting, we were discussing Mr. Albas' subamendment to Ms. Saks's amendment.

Mr. Bittle had the floor, and I'm not sure whether he had finished speaking. The next speakers on my list were Mr. Baker, Ms. Saks and Mr. Saini, in that order. Do I have that right?

Ms. Monique Pauzé (Repentigny, BQ): Mr. Chair, I'd like to move a friendly amendment. May I do it now or do I wait until everyone has had their turn?

The Chair: You'll have to wait until we get to you. I see you've clicked on the "raise hand" feature, so I will add you to the list.

Ms. Monique Pauzé: All right.

The Chair: We now go to Mr. Bittle.

[English]

Mr. Chris Bittle (St. Catharines, Lib.): Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

If Mr. Baker is on the list, I'll let him take over from here.

The Chair: Okay.

Go ahead, Mr. Baker.

Mr. Yvan Baker (Etobicoke Centre, Lib.): Thanks very much, Chair.

I want to reiterate my support for the amendment proposed by Ms. Saks.

[Translation]

At our last meeting, we heard from the Environment and Climate Change Canada officials. We also heard from members of the waste management and recycling industry all over the country. The public servants are the experts; they are the ones working every day to keep the system robust. I trust them and I trust what they told us when they appeared before the committee.

[English]

Mr. Albas has proposed in his amendment a timeline that is not achievable for a number of reasons. There is a range of deficiencies in the bill.

[Translation]

Namely, I'm referring to the lack of clear definitions, the inaccuracies in certain definitions, the fact that it's impossible to [*Technical difficulty—Editor*].

For example, if Bill C-204 were implemented, plastic waste that would normally be sent to another country would remain in Canada. However, according to what witnesses told us, we don't even have the capacity to dispose of the plastic here, in Canada.

If it were even possible to fix that, the government would need time to remedy all the deficiencies—

[English]

Mr. Dan Albas (Central Okanagan—Similkameen—Nicola, CPC): I have a point of order on relevance.

Mr. Chair, he's speaking to other elements of the bill. We should only be speaking to my subamendment, for proper debate. Otherwise, like in the last meeting, we will be talking endlessly about the same tired points that the Liberals are trying to hide behind.

The Chair: Mr. Baker, are you essentially trying to address the change that Mr. Albas is proposing to Ms. Saks's amendment? In other words, Mr. Albas is saying that the coming into force should be six months after adoption. Is that what you're speaking to, Mr. Baker?

Mr. Yvan Baker: Yes. I think what I was saying is perfectly relevant, Chair.

To respond to the point of order, the time and all of the things I'm raising are relevant in determining what an appropriate time for implementation would be. If you need to correct deficiencies in a bill, you need time to do that. I'm explaining what some of those deficiencies are for the purpose of explaining why we need more time than what Mr. Albas has proposed.

The Chair: Okay, I understand. Yes, that's relevant.

Are you finished your intervention?

Mr. Yvan Baker: Not yet, no.

The Chair: Go ahead.

Mr. Yvan Baker: I promise you it's relevant, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: I believe you.

Mr. Yvan Baker: Okay.

Just to recap, there's a series of deficiencies in the bill. I just finished listing them, which is I think what Mr. Albas was objecting to. However, even if it's possible to correct all this, the government would need time to correct the deficiencies.

• (1535)

[*Translation*]

At the last committee meeting, Mr. Albas, himself, acknowledged the work that needed to be done to correct the bill's deficiencies and the fact that it was the government's responsibility to make those corrections. The government needs time to do that, however.

Given what the department officials told us when they were here on Monday, it would be extremely difficult to implement the bill immediately. They told us that it usually took two years to make regulatory changes. The process can be shorter, but it can also require up to two years. With all due respect to my fellow member Mr. Albas, I think his subamendment fails to take into account the reality.

It's easy to picture where this subamendment could lead if we tried to shorten the coming into force time frame. It's almost certain the government would not be able to correct the deficiencies I mentioned in six months. On top of that, Canadians might not have an opportunity to fully participate in the consultation process, and companies might not have a chance to explain their circumstances. Frankly, I think it would be a disaster.

[*English*]

What Ms. Saks is proposing, I think, is to take into account this reality. Ms. Saks's amendment is about ensuring that the government has time to correct mistakes in the bill and to pursue the regulatory process correctly, which, as the officials highlighted for us, needs to be undertaken to implement the bill properly. By doing this, we can ensure that we make the most of this bill and protect our environment, or at least not cause further damage.

[*Translation*]

On Monday, I said that this was not a good bill. I think the Conservatives missed an opportunity to produce a good piece of legislation that addressed the problems around the recycling of plastics. If the bill were to pass, I think Ms. Saks's amendment would be reasonable, because it gives the government a chance to remedy the flaws that have been identified. I think Mr. Albas' subamendment fails to take into account the reality.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Baker.

We now go to Ms. Saks.

[*English*]

Ms. Ya'ara Saks (York Centre, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to thank my colleague Mr. Baker. I also want to thank Mr. Albas for being open to discussing my amendment. As he's put forward his subamendment, I'd like to speak to the reason that I put my amendment forward.

I'm a fan of getting work done that is done well, with due diligence and with the proper process that we need to go through, so that we come out at the other end with a bill that really does what

it's meant to do. It should serve the community and the various industries and municipalities that will be impacted by the piece of legislation we are debating, discussing and breaking down.

Officials have said to us that the process to get Bill C-204 to the point where it would be implemented well will take somewhere around two years. I hesitated to put a timeline on this, but I did so to give the Governor in Council the flexibility they need to do the work they need to do to get the bill in order. Without this, we aren't doing a process of due diligence.

My concern is that we get it right. That's why I put this amendment forward for colleagues of the committee to consider. At the end of the day, we all want a good piece of legislation to go forward. That's really why we're here. That's certainly why I'm here. As a rookie MP, I can feign ignorance, perhaps, on some things, but I know that I came here to get good work done, and I'm committed to that.

Good work takes time. It's not a process of hurry up and wait. It's not a process of hurry up and hurry up. It's a step-by-step process of taking the time to discuss things, to see where the deficiencies are in what's being proposed and to make sure that we get this right. Ultimately, it's not for us. It's for Canadians. It's for the industries that will be served by the bill and what they're able to achieve to move an environmental plan forward that works well for Canadians and communities. It's so that we don't have backups in landfills and don't have plastic being shipped off to other places that will cause harm in other parts of the world.

We want this to be a win-win. Wins don't happen by trying to ram something through the system. Wins happen when they're done step by step, with the intention and mindfulness that needs to come with moving through a process and really unpacking it properly.

That was my intention by putting the amendment forward. I certainly hope that colleagues will get behind it so that we can get good work done.

• (1540)

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Saks.

Mr. Saini.

Mr. Raj Saini (Kitchener Centre, Lib.): Thank you, Chair.

I believe that, with the testimony we've heard and the comments from the officials, this could take up to two years. My worry is twofold. One worry is the domestic situation that would occur. We've received correspondence from multiple stakeholders expressing their concern. I also think this is not only a domestic issue. It would affect us internationally with our trade agreements.

We need to make sure that it not only aligns domestically but also aligns internationally. That's important to look at because this bill will not only affect our domestic industry or domestic recyclers, but also impact any trade agreements we have internationally.

[Translation]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Saini.

Ms. Pauzé, you may go ahead.

Ms. Monique Pauzé: I have a friendly amendment to Mr. Albas's subamendment.

Just over a year ago, the Basel Convention was amended, and those amendments just came into force. That means the government had a year to take action and make sure companies knew what was coming. If companies are to change their behaviour, they need a predictable environment. The government could have started the work a year ago.

Be that as it may, I agree the deficiencies in the bill need to be corrected. I therefore propose a coming into force period of 12 months, instead of six.

The government has done nothing for a year, so it's time to speed up the process. The Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment didn't even discuss the issue when it met in July. We've already lost a year, so we have to move forward now. In the next year, we could help companies; we could build a plan and work on it with the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment since this is an area that falls under the jurisdiction of Quebec and the provinces.

I support helping companies. We've received letters from people sharing solutions that are in place in a number of provinces, solutions to turn plastic waste into a resource.

For that reason, I am in favour of Ms. Saks's amendment to include a coming into force date in the bill and allow for greater predictability. I move that the coming into force period be 12 months.

The Chair: I gather you are asking Mr. Albas whether he would accept a friendly amendment to his subamendment, to change the time frame to a year from six months.

Mr. Albas, do you accept the friendly amendment?

[English]

Mr. Dan Albas: Yes, Mr. Chair, and if there's an opportunity to speak to it, I will gladly take the floor when you specify.

The Chair: Okay. Actually—

Mr. Dan Albas: Would that be appropriate now?

The Chair: Yes. You're next, in fact, as I see it on my system.

Mr. Dan Albas: That's convenient. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would simply say to MP Pauzé that I appreciate the spirit of where she is going.

I want to make a few things very clear. We all know from debate that Liberals are opposed to our resolving our own plastic waste for final disposal—keeping that within Canada. Conservatives think we should be able to do it.

We've heard some members lament the low [Technical difficulty—Editor] this is the way to deal with it. We have heard that there are some deficiencies; that's what the Liberal members are calling this.

Let's be very clear, Mr. Chair. The way that MP Saks's amendment is structured is the final Hail Mary pass of this bill for the Liberals. In effect, if we were to pass her amendment without the changes proposed by Madam Pauzé and me, we would in fact be allowing the government to determine when and if this law would ever come into force. They are in a minority, so if this is given to the Governor in Council, they could postpone indefinitely or infinitely. It's all up to them.

This is about the will of Parliament expressing itself, saying that Canada needs to be a leader, much as Australia has done. Scot Davidson has created a bill, and while I still have the floor, Mr. Chair, [Technical difficulty—Editor] he said there was deficiency in enforcement. The officials actually said that there may be difficulties compelling inspection, which is systemic to the regime itself.

This bill only carves into CEPA this new provision, which is why I suggested that if the parliamentary secretary is concerned about enforcement, he should join with Conservatives and, at the upcoming review, try to strengthen the regime so that those who are tasked with enforcing CEPA have all the tools they need to comply, while bearing in mind that Canadian businesses are very honest. If the law is changed as Mr. Davidson suggested in this bill, that would go a long way towards seeing their compliance, albeit there may be an act or two that we need to work on. That's exactly what we're proposing here.

We've also heard the concerns of industry.

As a former parliamentary secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, I will say that the two-year timeline that officials gave is for a standard review of regulations. Again, this is a very small bill. For example, very simple changes to the schedule can be made by the minister directly. This is not the same as a wholesale revision of a set of regulations, which can take two years.

I want to thank Madam Pauzé for believing that we can express ourselves as a Parliament and, at the same time, recognize some concerns by government or industry about the implementation and, at the same time, give them a timeline that is clear and that allows them to be able to work within it. I certainly appreciate the friendly amendment and look forward to—hopefully—having convinced Mr. Bittle to vote for Madam Pauzé's and my amendment today.

Thank you.

● (1545)

The Chair: Thank you.

Ms. Saks.

Ms. Ya'ara Saks: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to thank Madam Pauzé for proposing a way for us to work. I really appreciate having a committee that tries to work together, even at difficult moments. I think that's critically important in the work that we do here.

I'd like to ask the officials if they could weigh in on this. In light of the deficiencies and the matters we have discussed here, and in light of the concerns that many colleagues have expressed in the implementation process of this bill, could any of you weigh in with us on what are reasonable and realistic timelines in addressing a bill of this nature?

My colleague Mr. Albas seems to have an understanding that the timeline could be held tight.

Again, I will pull my rookie card here and say that I am less familiar with these processes. I would like to hear from officials, if I may, on what their thoughts are on getting this bill to a place that we're all comfortable with.

The Chair: Who among the officials would like to take this question?

Mr. Dany Drouin (Director General, Plastics and Waste Management Directorate, Department of the Environment): If it's okay, Mr. Chair, I will start, and I think you'll benefit from the expertise of both Nathalie Perron and Laura Farquharson.

I want to clarify that the plastic amendments of the Basel Convention were accepted by Canada in December, so they're now in effect.

On the question of the bill, Nathalie can present some implications on operations.

• (1550)

Ms. Nathalie Perron (Director, Waste Reduction and Management Division, Department of the Environment): Thank you.

With respect to implementing the bill, we'll definitely have to look at the need to develop regulations. The average timeline, which I would say is an optimistic timeline, is two years. That is because—if we take the definitions, for example—we will need to have an informal consultation before we even get into the formal consultation. We will have to talk to people and get information to allow us to do the requirements from Treasury Board and CEPA. They require us to conduct a socio-economic analysis and an environmental impact analysis. That of course takes quite a bit of effort and time.

As for amendments to a schedule of an act, the way we understand the bill as written is that it is the Governor in Council who would be able to make amendments to the schedule, on the recommendation of the minister. That process requires a mandatory publication and consultation period in the Canada Gazette of at least 60 days.

We must fulfill the mandatory requirements from the Treasury Board. That is why it would take an average of two years before we are able to publish the regulations in the Canada Gazette.

The Chair: Thank you.

Does that answer your question, Ms. Saks?

Ms. Ya'ara Saks: It does, Mr. Chair. Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. Bittle.

Mr. Chris Bittle: I guess I'd like to revisit Mr. Albas's revisionist history of the other day, especially in light of what we just heard from officials.

The Government of Canada has taken action on this file. I mentioned it on Monday. This is an issue that I think everyone here is interested in, that everyone here wants to see action on.

There are two different views. There's a view from Mr. Albas's party, which is “Oh dear goodness, let us pass some environmental piece of legislation as quickly as possible, regardless of what it is, so that we can get away from the bad couple of weeks we've been having and say that we're doing something,” even though there's a full acknowledgement by him that there are flaws, that it may or may not be enforceable and that investigation may or may not be possible with respect to this amendment. It's all coming back down to the length of time.

I appreciate the fact that Madam Pauzé is being far more reasonable on this subject with respect to an acknowledgement from the officials who have come to us and said that this is going to need some changes, that there are some issues and that it could take upwards of two years. If this legislation passes Parliament, don't we want to see it enacted properly? That should be a significant concern to everyone here, especially if Ms. Collins and Mr. Albas have fully acknowledged the flaws in this bill. I would think they would want as much time as possible.

I know that Ms. Collins said that any step forward is a good step forward, and this is a small step forward. However, do we even know if that's the case if industry is saying that jobs are going to be lost, if there's concern about landfills—and I'm just coming into this at the last minute—and if there are issues with respect to enforceability?

I agree with Mr. Albas that Canadian industry is well respected and is a solid player with respect to this—it plays by the rules—but he knows that there is a certain percentage that won't, which is why there needs to be an enforcement provision. [*Technical difficulty—Editor*] is to exist, it should be done in the appropriate way.

Again, it's really bizarre to see a committee so gung-ho about passing legislation where there's acknowledgement that it is flawed and there are significant problems. Perhaps there are broader problems with the act beyond this. It should warrant some discussion.

Again, I'm new. I'm getting briefed on various elements of Environment and Climate Change Canada, and I look forward to my briefings on the Canadian Environmental Protection Act and issues and possibilities forward.

Again, this is strange ground in my five and a half years in this place. I don't think I've ever seen a bill like this where all the parties have said, “There are problems and there are flaws. Let's try to limit the debate and get this through and done as quickly as we can.” This isn't a bill that is pure symbolism. This is going to have real-life impacts on people's lives.

I appreciate the significance of wanting that symbolic political win, and I think we would all like that win for the environment. Every person in this committee wants us to do better on plastic waste. That's something I want to see. However, if we're not going to do it in a realistic way, with a realistic timetable, with government officials, in their professional diplomatic way, waving the red flag at us....

• (1555)

I don't know. Is there an acknowledgement by the opposition? I believe the officials in what they're saying and that they're telling the truth. Is there not a belief by the opposition that there's exaggeration going on by the officials? That's what it seems like to me, with Mr. Albas saying, no, it won't take that long, six months is fine—now 12 months—and two years can't be right.

I take the officials at their word that this is the likely process, so if there's an acknowledgement that it needs to be fixed and that it's going to take that period of time, perhaps we should be engaged in a realistic discussion about the length of time and perhaps be more amenable to what the officials are telling us: that even though we might like it to happen tomorrow, there's a process in place and there are consultations in place.

Though we might like it to go faster, there's a process that needs to play out for it to be appropriate and for it to be done properly, and we're not giving that to them. If it does pass the House and it does pass the Senate, what are we left with if the will of Parliament can't be carried out in the way that the committee and Parliament want?

At the end of the day, passing this piece of legislation and expecting that it be carried out, that it be enforced.... If we're all here and we're all saying that's going to be a problem, let's at least give ourselves some time, the proper amount of time, to address these issues.

I appreciate that, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Baker.

Mr. Yvan Baker: Thank you, Chair.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Pauzé, I appreciate your efforts to find a reasonable solution.

The department officials just told us that two years would be an optimistic time frame for implementing the bill.

In the spirit of co-operation, I would like to propose a subamendment to Ms. Pauzé's amendment. I move that the time frame for the bill's coming into force be increased from one year to two years. That would provide the necessary flexibility to implement the bill properly.

• (1600)

The Chair: Mr. Clerk, can you tell me whether Ms. Pauzé and Mr. Albas both have to agree, or whether we just need consent from Ms. Pauzé?

Mr. Jacques Maziade (Legislative Clerk): Mr. Chair, procedurally speaking, there is technically no such thing as a friendly

amendment. I noticed earlier that everyone was in agreement to increase the time frame from six to 12 months. In this case, neither Ms. Pauzé nor Mr. Albas needs to consent. If everyone agrees on what is being proposed, then, it's fine. If they don't, however, the subamendment cannot be moved, since it's not possible to move a subamendment to a subamendment. The committee has to deal with the first subamendment, and then, a new subamendment can be put forward.

The Chair: Is everyone in agreement, then?

An hon. member: No.

The Chair: We don't have unanimous consent, so we have to vote.

Just before, Ms. Collins would like the floor. Then, if no one else wishes to speak, we will proceed with the vote.

[*English*]

Mr. Dan Albas: I'd like to speak to this subamendment as well.

The Chair: Are you talking about the 12 months? The six to 12...?

Mr. Dan Albas: Are we going to be voting on Mr. Baker's subamendment, or are we just simply going to—

The Chair: No, we're going to finish with this, as I understand it now.

Mr. Dan Albas: Okay.

The Chair: We're not going to change the 12 months to two years. There's no consensus. I can sense that.

We'll go to Ms. Collins. At some point, we'll have to vote on the 12 months.

Go ahead, Ms. Collins.

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

I want to quickly correct the record. Mr. Bittle misrepresented my words. I clearly stated that I want this bill to be strengthened to include provisions for hazardous waste and waste for special consideration, since the Liberals have refused to ratify those Basel Convention amendments. I would like to strengthen the bill to make sure that Canada no longer uses loopholes to get around its international commitments when we're exporting to the U.S.

If the Liberals truly cared about addressing the issue of exporting our waste to poorer countries, they would have voted to bring this bill to committee and they would have voted in favour of my amendments to strengthen the bill. I am concerned, because of the tactics that were used in our last committee meetings and what I think I'm seeing here again, that the Liberals are just trying to delay this.

I think that Madam Pauzé's amendment is a reasonable one. I'll be voting in favour of it. I hope we can quickly move to that vote and move on, so that we can keep on with our committee business.

The Chair: We have to go to Mr. Bittle first.

Mr. Chris Bittle: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I guess I'm here to announce the death of irony, in the opposition accusing us of delaying things while the House of Commons is backlogged, while opposition parties put up dozens of speakers for amendments. I'm a little surprised at those allegations. All of my comments have been based on questions to officials.

Again, Ms. Collins has not addressed any of the concerns raised by officials, which is surprising. These are hard-working civil servants who have brought forward their concerns, and the lack of willingness to meet them is surprising.

All of my comments and all of my colleagues' comments have been based on these concerns. We want to see this strengthened. We want to see more action. We want to see better action on plastic waste. Just because this isn't the proper vehicle to do it....

We asked for a few more witnesses. We asked for a bit more time to have all the evidence in front of us. That was denied. We're not delaying this.

I think Mr. Albas accused me of being a professional filibusterer. That may have been suggested last time. Having sat through months on PROC, through amendments to the Elections Act from one particular opposition party—months and months of filibuster—I can appreciate it. However, none of that was substantive. None of that was based on any evidence from officials.

We're raising our points. We're raising concerns. We're raising concerns from industry. We're raising concerns about actually delivering on what Parliament is seeking to do. Again, though, we don't see the.... We've raised our concerns with respect to the bill. At the end of the day, the Government of Canada will be required to enact these provisions. If we're not doing so in a way that is meaningful and provides a clear path forward, where are we and what are we doing?

I've just been raising concerns. The members of the committee may see this as delay. We're getting near the end of the bill. It's not much of a delay if it's been a few hours that we've been debating it. I know when Mr. Albas's party puts up 80 speakers on a bill, they say they need more debate, but when the Liberals want to talk about it for an hour or two, based on evidence from government officials on the issues with the bill, we're engaged in a horrific filibuster against the environment.

Again, perhaps it's the death of irony in this meeting, Mr. Chair, but I appreciate the opportunity to raise those concerns.

I see that Mr. Albas would like to respond, so I will yield the floor.

• (1605)

The Chair: Mr. Albas.

Mr. Dan Albas: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I appreciate Mr. Bittle's yielding of the floor for a whole host of reasons I don't have time to get into.

I would just say this. On the subject of irony, this government, I believe, has had legislation fly through to which changes have been necessary, but I would also point out that this is a piece of private members' business. There was debate in the House of Commons. There was, and it's an accelerated process, so if he doesn't like it,

maybe he can speak to his House leader as to whether or not those changes in the standing order should happen.

Second, as a former parliamentary secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, I do recall, with respect to temporary foreign workers, that there were many concerns by many parliamentarians from all parties in 2012, and the government quickly moved through the gazette process, right to the Canada Gazette, part III, skipping the normal process, because government has to be able to act on certain things when it is required to.

I think what Madam Pausé has put here on a three-clause bill.... This is not like changes to an entire regime like the Safe Food for Canadians Act regime, which the Harper government put in place and which took many years because it materially changed the nature of how the regulator regulated. This is just a very minor change, adding to the CEPA regime.

Again, I would say that if members have problems with the way CEPA currently works, perhaps the government should get on with the 2017 review and the 80-plus recommendations that this committee made at that time, but which it has chosen not to bring before this Parliament.

Mr. Chair, I am simply going to say that we believe 12 months is enough time for a very minor change. [*Technical difficulty—Editor*] to do it, we'll be able to do it excellently. We know we have excellent public servants who want to see good things happen in the public interest.

Let's bring this to a vote so that we can move on and talk about committee business.

The Chair: Seeing as there are no other speakers, we'll have the vote on this amendment.

The amendment says that "12 months after the day on which this Act receives royal assent". It's an amendment to Ms. Saks's motion.

Mr. Jacques Maziaide: Mr. Chair, just to make sure that we are on the same page, the committee will vote on the subamendment, regarding the 12 months, and after that they will vote on the amendment as amended.

The Chair: That's right.

(Subamendment agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0)

The Chair: Wow, we have unanimity.

Now we vote on—

• (1610)

Mr. Yvan Baker: Mr. Chair, I'm sorry, but I had my hand up.

The Chair: Mr. Baker, I just saw that. Go ahead.

Mr. Yvan Baker: I know it's hard. You have a lot to keep track of there.

I wanted to propose an amendment. I don't know if I'd call this an amendment or a subamendment. I'm open to being told which is the correct terminology, but I'd like to propose an amendment to the amendment we just voted on, which would change 12 months to 24 months.

The Chair: Maybe the legislative clerk could provide some guidance here.

Can we amend the subamendment that was just adopted?

Mr. Jacques Maziade: Yes, Mr. Chair, it's an admissible amendment, a subamendment.

The Chair: Right, it's essentially a subamendment to—

Mr. Jacques Maziade: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair, I have to backpedal a little bit. The committee has made a decision on 12 months. There's no possibility to change this. I'm sorry about this.

The Chair: We're talking about months now. Once we've decided on 12 months, we can't keep going on about the number of months. Is that what you're saying?

Mr. Jacques Maziade: Exactly. The committee has made a decision. The committee has decided 12 months and that is it. We cannot change the decision.

The Chair: That's right.

Now we'll vote on Ms. Saks's amendment as amended. Is that correct?

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Isabelle Duford): Yes, that's correct.

Ms. Laurel Collins: Can we try unanimous consent, Mr. Chair?

The Chair: Yes.

Is there unanimous consent? Did somebody say no?

Mr. Yvan Baker: I said no.

The Chair: Okay, so we'll have a vote.

Madam Clerk, can you count the votes?

Mr. Yvan Baker: I'm sorry, Chair, but can you clarify again? Are we voting on Ms. Saks's original amendment?

The Chair: Yes, it's the amendment as amended, so it is 12 months.

(Amendment as amended agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0)

The Chair: Wow. It is another unanimous vote.

(On the schedule)

The Chair: We will now proceed to NDP-2, on the schedule.

Ms. Collins.

Ms. Laurel Collins: I would like to move the amendment. I'm flipping between screens. I don't have it in front of me, but maybe I can speak to the spirit of the amendment, which is to add PVC to

the schedule. It's one of the pieces in the Basel Convention list. It's missing. It's one of the most toxic plastics when it is in our environment, and I'm hoping that I'll have the support of the committee to add it.

The Chair: We'll see what Mr. Albas has to say about it.

Mr. Dan Albas: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'd like to thank MP Collins for this contribution. I know she spoke a lot about strengthening the bill. I believe this does that.

The Chair: I'm seeing no other speakers.

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

The Chair: That's great.

Are there any other amendments? I think Madam Pauzé has an amendment.

Is Madam Pauzé moving this amendment? We've already dealt with it, I guess.

• (1615)

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Pauzé: It's already done, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Yes, great. It had to do with the coming into force date.

We are now voting on the amended schedule.

(Schedule 1 as amended agreed to [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall the title of the bill carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Shall the bill carry?

Ms. Émilie Thivierge (Legislative Clerk): Mr. Chair, it's the bill as amended.

The Chair: Yes, thank you.

Shall the bill as amended carry?

[*English*]

Mr. Dan Albas: I'd like a recorded vote, Mr. Chair.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: All right.

(Bill C-204 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall the chair report the bill as amended to the House?

Mr. Dan Albas: Yes.

The Chair: Is there unanimous consent?

Mr. Yvan Baker: I'd like a recorded vote, please, Chair.

The Chair: Okay.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Pauzé, your hand is up. Would you like the floor?

Ms. Monique Pauzé: Yes, Mr. Chair.

I think we can submit a supplementary report or letter in connection with a bill. Is there a deadline for doing so?

The Chair: I believe it can be done only for committee reports.

Ms. Monique Pauzé: I took a training session yesterday given by the law clerks, and they told us that, after [*Technical difficulty—Editor*], we could submit something.

Mr. Jacques Maziade: Mr. Chair, as a legislative clerk, may I clarify something?

A dissenting or supplementary report can be submitted only if it relates to a substantive report. Such a report cannot be submitted in connection with a bill, unless the committee conducts an independent study that does not pertain to the bill directly. For example, today, the committee is proceeding with clause-by-clause consideration, and a dissenting or supplementary opinion cannot be submitted in that context.

Ms. Monique Pauzé: I see.

Mr. Chair, I'd like to ask something else, if I may.

The Chair: Go ahead.

Ms. Monique Pauzé: At one point, I had asked that departments provide us with additional information on assistance and financial supports provided to the plastics industry. As far as I know, nothing has been received yet. Will we be getting that information?

The Chair: You should ask Ms. Ryan, because the request was made to department officials.

Ms. Monique Pauzé: Very well.

The Chair: Ms. Ryan, do you know about the request?

Ms. Helen Ryan (Associate Assistant Deputy Minister, Environmental Protection Branch, Department of the Environment): Yes, I do. I can tell you that the answer to the request [*Technical difficulty—Editor*] in the system.

The Chair: Very good. Thank you.

Let's get back to the bill.

Shall the committee order a reprint of the bill, as amended, for the use of the House?

[*English*]

Mr. Dan Albas: Yes.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Well, I think that wraps it up.

Congratulations to the committee members for passing, if I'm not mistaken, their first—

[*English*]

Mr. Lloyd Longfield (Guelph, Lib.): Mr. Chair, I'm sorry. I had my hand up for a bit.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: My apologies. Go ahead, Mr. Longfield.

[*English*]

Mr. Lloyd Longfield: I haven't been involved with a study where a bill like this has gone through without discussions on amendments. This has been a very unique situation for me.

I'm wondering about the testimonies we've received, the background information. What happens to that information? Does that go through with the bill? Does it just stay in the public domain? We've had a lot of discussion, including from some officials, about enforcement. What happens to all that information since there isn't a report being generated?

• (1620)

The Clerk: The information is made available in the minutes and in the transcripts, and that is publicly available on the committee's website.

The Chair: What about these letters? I think Mr. Longfield is asking about the letters we've requested or—

Mr. Lloyd Longfield: Yes, exactly.

The Chair: —the letters that have been sent in even unsolicited.

Mr. Lloyd Longfield: I think Madam Pauzé also made a comment about things coming back from officials. How do we include that? Does that get transmitted in any way?

The Clerk: It gets circulated to the members of the committee. It gets translated and circulated to the members of the committee.

The Chair: Okay, so they're not publicly available unless somebody approaches a member of the committee and says, "Can you share this?"

The Clerk: That's correct.

The Chair: Okay. Great.

I hope that answers your question, Mr. Longfield.

Congratulations to the committee. I think that's the first bill we've adopted at committee stage.

The plan was to end the meeting and for some of us to reconvene as part of the steering committee. I'm gavelling the meeting.

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>