



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

---

# Standing Committee on Natural Resources

EVIDENCE

**NUMBER 001**

Wednesday, December 15, 2021

---

Chair: Mr. John Aldag





## Standing Committee on Natural Resources

Wednesday, December 15, 2021

• (1630)

[English]

**The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Hilary Jane Powell):** Hello, everyone.

Honourable members of the committee, I see we now have quorum. My name is Hilary Powell. I'm the clerk of the committee.

I must inform members that the clerk of the committee can only receive motions for the election of the chair. The clerk cannot receive other types of motions, entertain points of order or participate in debate.

We can now proceed to the election of the chair.

Pursuant to Standing Order 106(2), the chair must be a member of the government party.

I am now ready to receive motions for the chair.

Mr. Maloney, I see you have your hand up.

I apologize for the technical delay. I see Ms. Rempel Garner has her hand up.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC):** I would like to nominate MP Aldag, please, Clerk.

**The Clerk:** It has been moved by Ms. Rempel Garner that Mr. Aldag be elected as chair of the committee.

Are there any further motions?

**Mr. James Maloney (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.):** Madam Clerk, did you not hear me earlier?

**The Clerk:** I could not hear you.

**Mr. James Maloney:** Can you hear me now?

**The Clerk:** Yes, I can. Do you have a—

**Mr. James Maloney:** My apologies, I had nominated Mr. Aldag as well.

**The Clerk:** Okay. Thank you for confirming that.

**Mr. James Maloney:** I just thought everybody was thinking hard about it.

**The Clerk:** It has been moved by Ms. Rempel Garner that Mr. Aldag be elected as chair of the committee.

Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

(Motion agreed to)

**The Clerk:** I declare the motion carried and Mr. Aldag duly elected as chair of the committee.

Mr. Aldag, you're welcome to come and take a seat at the chair's table. Thank you.

**Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP):** I have a point of order.

**The Clerk:** I'm afraid that, as clerk, I'm unable to take points of order right now.

I will pass it over to the chair.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I was just asking for the chair's recognition.

**The Chair (Mr. John Aldag (Cloverdale—Langley City, Lib.)):** I recognize Mr. Angus on a point of order.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Thank you.

I know we have a lot of business to do. I just wanted to congratulate you on behalf of the New Democratic Party and say we will certainly be working, looking forward. I'm hoping we'll be able to get to business this afternoon, as we have much to do. I will be bringing forward a motion to look into at that time.

Thank you so much for being our chair.

**The Chair:** Excellent. Thanks, everybody, for your support.

We're going to go back to the clerk for the nomination of vice-chairs, and then we'll go into some regular business.

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

Pursuant to Standing Order to 106(2), the first vice-chair must be a member of the official opposition.

I'm now prepared to receive motions for the first vice-chair.

Mr. Angus.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I nominate Ms. Rempel Garner.

**The Clerk:** Are there any further motions?

It has been moved by Mr. Angus that Ms. Rempel Garner be elected as first vice-chair of the committee.

Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

(Motion agreed to)

**The Clerk:** I declare the motion carried and Ms. Rempel Garner duly elected as first vice-chair of the committee.

Pursuant to Standing Order 106(2), the second vice-chair must be a member of an opposition party other than the official opposition.

I am now prepared to receive motions for the second vice-chair.

**Mr. Eric Melillo (Kenora, CPC):** I nominate Mr. Simard.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Melillo, thank you.

Are there any further motions?

Mr. Melillo moved that Mr. Simard be elected as second vice-chair of the committee.

Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

(Motion agreed to)

**The Clerk:** I declare the motion carried, and Mr. Simard duly elected second vice-chair of the committee.

Thank you very much.

**The Chair:** Congratulations to our vice-chairs. I look forward to working with all of the members on this committee in the time we will have ahead.

If you can indulge me for a few minutes, there are some points we need to get through as we go through the routine business of the committee this afternoon.

First of all, welcome to meeting number one of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Natural Resources. Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format pursuant to the House order of November 25, 2021. Members are attending in person in the room and remotely using the Zoom application.

Regarding the speaking list, the committee clerk and I will do the best we can to maintain a consolidated order of speaking for all members, whether participating virtually or in person.

I'd like to take this opportunity to remind all participants in this meeting that screenshots, or taking photos of your screen, is not permitted. Proceedings will be made available via the House of Commons website.

Given the ongoing pandemic situation, and in light of the recommendations from public health authorities, as well as the directive of the Board of Internal Economy on October 19, 2021, to remain healthy and safe, the following is recommended for all those attending the meeting in person. Anyone with symptoms should participate by Zoom and not attend the meeting in person. Everyone must maintain a two-metre physical distance whether seated or standing. Everyone must wear a non-medical mask when circulating in the room. It is recommended in the strongest possible terms that members wear their masks at all times, including when seated. Non-medical masks, which provide better clarity over cloth masks, are available in the room. Everyone present must maintain proper hand hygiene by using the hand sanitizer at the room entrance.

Committee rooms are cleaned before and after each meeting. To maintain this, everyone is encouraged to clean surfaces, such as the desk, chair and microphone, with the provided disinfectant wipes when vacating or taking a seat. As the chair, I will be enforcing these measures for the duration of the meeting. I thank members in advance for their co-operation.

As the next order of business, I suggest the committee proceed to the consideration of routine motions. In preparation for this, the

committee clerk has circulated a list of routine motions that the committee adopted in the last parliamentary session. The committee clerk can also answer any questions you may have about the routine motions.

I recognize Mr. Maloney.

● (1635)

**Mr. James Maloney:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Let me add my congratulations to you for taking on this position. It's one I've held in the past, so I'm very much looking forward to working with you and continuing the good work of this committee.

As you pointed out, we have a number of routine motions. I'm going to propose that rather than reading them all out individually, we move to adopt them collectively. If that's not acceptable, then I will proceed to do it one by one.

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

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** If possible, because we do have many new members on the committee, can we have them read out?

**The Chair:** Mr. Maloney, the request is that we read them all out, because of the number of new members that we have on the committee.

If you'd like to start with the first motion, I'll get you to read it out.

**Mr. James Maloney:** I'm happy to do that.

The first motion deals with analyst services. I move:

That the committee retain, as needed and at the discretion of the Chair, the services of one or more analysts from the Library of Parliament to assist it in its work.

**The Chair:** Is there any discussion on this first motion?

Okay, we'll go to the second motion, Mr. Maloney.

**Mr. James Maloney:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Regarding the subcommittee on agenda and procedure, I move:

That the Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure be established and be composed of five members; the Chair, one member from recognized party; and that the subcommittee work in a spirit of collaboration.

**The Chair:** We'll go to the next.

**Mr. James Maloney:** On meeting without a quorum, I move:

That the Chair be authorized to hold meetings to receive evidence and to have that evidence published when a quorum is not present, provided that at least four members are present, including two members of the opposition parties and two members of the government party, but when travelling outside the Parliamentary Precinct, that the meeting begin after 15 minutes, regardless of members present.

**The Chair:** The next, please....

**Mr. James Maloney:** Regarding time for opening remarks and questioning of witnesses, I move:

That witnesses be given five minutes for their opening statement; that whenever possible, witnesses provide the committee with their opening statement 72 hours in advance; that at the discretion of the Chair, during the questioning of witnesses, there be allocated six minutes for the first questioner of each party as follows for the first round: Conservative Party, Liberal Party, Bloc Québécois, New Democratic Party.

For the second and subsequent rounds, the order and time for questioning be as follows: Conservative Party, five minutes; Liberal Party, five minutes; Bloc Québécois, two and a half minutes; New Democratic Party, two and a half minutes; Conservative Party, five minutes; Liberal Party, five minutes.

**The Chair:** Go to the next one.

**Mr. James Maloney:** Okay.

On document distribution, I move:

That only the clerk of the committee be authorized to distribute documents to members of the committee provided the documents are in both official languages, and that the witnesses be advised accordingly.

● (1640)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Next.

**Mr. James Maloney:** Regarding working meals, I move:

That the clerk of the committee, at the discretion of the Chair, be authorized to make the necessary arrangements to provide working meals for the committee and its subcommittees.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Next.

**Mr. James Maloney:** On travel, accommodation and living expenses of witnesses, I move:

That, if requested, reasonable travel, accommodation and living expenses be reimbursed to witnesses not exceeding two representatives per organization; and that in exceptional circumstances, payment for more representative be made at the discretion of the Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Next.

**Mr. James Maloney:** On access to in camera meetings, I move:

That, unless otherwise ordered, each committee member be allowed to be accompanied by one staff member at in camera meetings and that one additional person from each House officer's office be allowed to be present.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Next.

**Mr. James Maloney:** Regarding transcripts of in camera meetings, I move:

That one copy of the transcript of each in camera meeting be kept in the committee clerk's office for consultation by members of the committee or by their staff; and that the analysts assigned to the committee also have access to the in camera transcripts.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Next.

**Mr. James Maloney:** On notice of motion, I move:

That a 48-hour notice, interpreted as two nights, be required for any substantive motion to be moved in committee, unless the substantive motion relates directly to business then under consideration, provided that: (a) the notice be filed with the clerk of the committee no later than 4:00 p.m. from Monday to Friday; (b) the motion be distributed to Members and the offices of the whips of each recognized party, in both official languages, by the clerk on the same day the said notice was transmitted if it was received no later than the deadline hour; (c) notices received after the deadline hour or on non-business days be deemed to have been

received during the next business day; and that when the committee is holding meetings outside the Parliamentary Precinct, no substantive motion may be moved.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Next.

**Mr. James Maloney:** On orders of reference from the House respecting bills, I move:

That in relation to orders of reference from the House respecting Bills,

(a) The clerk of the committee shall, upon the committee receiving such an order of reference, write to each member who is not a member of a caucus represented on the committee to invite those members to file with the clerk of the committee, in both official languages, any amendments to the bill, which is the subject of the said Order, which they would suggest that the committee consider;

(b) Suggested amendments filed, pursuant to paragraph (a), at least 48 hours prior to the start of clause-by-clause consideration of the bill to which the amendments relate shall be deemed to be proposed during the said consideration, provided that the committee may, by motion, vary this deadline in respect of a given bill; and

(c) During the clause-by-clause consideration of a bill, the Chair shall allow a member who filed suggested amendments, pursuant to paragraph (a), an opportunity to make brief representations in support of them.

**The Chair:** Next.

**Mr. James Maloney:** On technical tests for witnesses, I move:

That the clerk inform each witness who is to appear before the committee that the House administration support team must conduct technical tests to check the connectivity and the equipment used to ensure the best possible sound quality; and that the Chair advise the committee, at the start of each meeting, of any witness who did not perform the required technical tests.

**The Chair:** Now we have the next one.

**Mr. James Maloney:** Last but not least, regarding linguistic review, I move:

That all documents submitted for committee business that do not come from a federal department, members' offices, or that have not been translated by the Translation Bureau be sent for prior linguistic review by the Translation Bureau before being distributed to members.

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

Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt these motions?

Ms. Rempel Garner.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** Chair, I'm not sure if now is the appropriate time, or after we move the main body, which Conservatives are in favour of, but I'd like to add one to this. I think that our whips' offices have been in communication. It's another routine motion that has been adopted in other committees before.

I'm not sure if Mr. Maloney can hear me better now. I'm trying to speak right into the microphone as best I can.

**Mr. James Maloney:** I can hear you clearly. Thank you.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** Okay, good. I move:

That whenever a minister appears before committee, every effort be made to ensure that the meeting is televised.

**The Chair:** Is everybody in favour of that additional motion?

From the Liberals on screen there are thumbs up.

We will go to Ms. Lapointe—you have your hand up—and then Mr. Maloney.

Ms. Lapointe, did you have a question?

• (1645)

**Ms. Viviane Lapointe (Sudbury, Lib.):** I do not have a question on the motion, no.

**The Chair:** Okay, thank you.

Mr. Maloney.

**Mr. James Maloney:** All I was going to say is I don't disagree with this. My only concern is that sometimes, because of technical support, you can't always have a room available that can provide those services. I'd hate to see us lose meetings because of that.

Subject to that caveat, I don't oppose this.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Ms. Dabrusin.

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin (Toronto—Danforth, Lib.):** It was a ditto to what Mr. Maloney just said. I apologize. I wasn't sure that you had registered that I was good with it when you looked at the people online.

**The Chair:** Ms. Rempel Garner, can you give us the wording on your motion once more, and we'll put all of them to the committee.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** Yes. It is:

That whenever a minister appears before committee, every effort be made to ensure that the meeting is televised.

**The Chair:** With that, I'll put it to the committee members.

Are we in agreement to adopt all motions, including the additional one that has been put forward?

(Motions agreed to)

**The Chair:** It looks like we have full agreement. Thank you, everybody. We now have our routine motions in place for our committee.

I did want to make a couple of comments before we get started.

First of all, Mr. Maloney, thank you for the work that you've done chairing this committee, I believe, in the last two Parliaments. By way of introduction, I had been on the environment and sustainable development committee in the 42nd Parliament when I was here and chaired it for the final year. I have had two years away from the House, so I beg the indulgence of the committee as I get back up to speed.

What I'd like to suggest is that we'll go through a speaking order.

Did you have your hand up as well, Mr. Angus?

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Yes, I did.

**The Chair:** Okay. I have Mr. Chahal, Ms. Lapointe, Mr. Maloney, Ms. Dabrusin, Mr. Angus, and I don't know if anybody else has their name there, so we'll simply go into—

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I'm sorry. I don't want to challenge the chair, but I've had my hand up from the get-go and the clerk wasn't watching. We are being disadvantaged here because people can put

their hand up on the screen. I had my hand up and kept it up, but nobody even looked in the room. I want to challenge that.

**The Chair:** Okay, I'm happy to start with Mr. Angus, and then we'll go to the—

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** Mr. Chair, I had my hand up as well. I can't tell from where I'm sitting, but my hand was up, and if you look in the order online, I would have been first up.

**The Chair:** I had given the list. I heard a challenge to the chair. In the case of a challenge to the chair, is it a vote?

I had just gone with the list I had. It was Mr. Chahal, Ms. Lapointe, Mr. Maloney, Ms. Dabrusin and Mr. Angus. Ms. Rempel Garner, I wasn't sure if you had—

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** As a point of order, who are you ruling was first in the speaking order?

**The Chair:** Mr. Chahal.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** All right.

I guess you're in order, then.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I don't want to do this on the very first meeting, but since every single Liberal is on the list ahead, it seems to me that this is really not fair. I had my hand up from the get-go. I'm not trying to queue-jump here. We could talk till February before I actually get a chance to speak, given the experience at other committees, so I'm going to have to challenge this.

• (1650)

**The Chair:** We'll go directly to a vote. The vote is on the speaking order.

**The Clerk:** The vote is a challenge to the chair on the speaking order. The question is this: Shall the decision of the chair stand?

If you are in agreement with that, you say yea. If you disagree, you say nay.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Could you repeat that, just so we're very clear how we're voting?

**The Clerk:** We are voting on a challenge to the chair. The challenge to the chair is with respect to the speaking order. The chair has determined that Mr. Chahal is to go first. There is a challenge to the chair on that.

Shall the decision of the chair be sustained? If you agree with that, you're to vote yea. If you disagree, you vote nay.

I can do a recorded vote, if you like.

(Ruling of the chair overturned: nays 6; yeas 5)

**The Chair:** The ruling of the chair has been overturned. That then puts Mr. Angus first, Mr. Chahal second, Ms. Lapointe third, Mr. Maloney fourth and Ms. Dabrusin fifth.

Does anybody else want to get on the speaking list at this point?

Okay, that's the list we'll go with at this point, then.

Mr. Angus.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Thank you so much, Mr. Chair and Madam Clerk. I'm certainly very sorry I had to do this, because I have enormous respect for the work of the clerk. As the only member for the New Democratic Party, I sometimes feel that I need to assert my place because I'm with two bigger parties. There's no personal intent here.

I want to thank Mr. Maloney. I understand that he was an excellent chair, and I believe that we are going to get along very well.

I have the floor because I had stated my intention to bring forward a motion. I brought forward a motion because we have a lot of work ahead of us right now, and we have to hit the ground running for February. We cannot dilly-dally given the crisis we're facing on the planet and given the promises that the Prime Minister has made regarding our international obligations. It's incumbent upon this committee to do the hard work in order to make sure Canada lives up to its obligations.

It started off when I brought forward my motion. I had outreach from some of the other parties about how to improve the motion so that we could actually be more efficient at this meeting and not at cross-purposes.

I would like to bring forward this motion:

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), before February 15th, 2022, the committee undertake a two-meeting study concerning the development and implementation of the Emissions Reduction Fund—Onshore Program, with particular focus on the method of accounting for greenhouse gases; that the committee invite the Minister of Natural Resources, the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development, experts and stakeholders; that the committee make recommendations on the future of the program; and that the committee report its findings to the House;

That the Minister of Natural Resources be invited to appear before the committee prior to February 28th, 2022, for no fewer than two hours on the subject matter of the Supplementary Estimates (B) 2021-2022;

That, pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), during the next eight meetings—

That's after this.

—the committee undertake a study of the government's proposal for a greenhouse gas emissions cap on the oil and gas sector, including, but not limited to, the ability of Canada to meet its climate commitments articulated at the UN Climate Change Conference of the Parties (COP26) in Glasgow; the government's plans and targets for funding renewable energy; the role of carbon capture, utilisation, and sequestration (CCUS); that experts and stakeholders be invited to appear; that the Minister of Natural Resources and the Minister of the Environment be invited to appear; and that the committee report its findings to the House prior to April 29, 2022.

I won't take a lot of time. I'm just going to explain to my colleagues around the table why I think it's very important that we pass this motion as the beginning of our work as a committee.

Certainly, the issue of reduction of methane is one of the most primary tasks that we have to be able to deal with as a country, and the fund that was in place—the emissions reduction fund, the onshore program—received over half a million dollars. It was money that was supposed to be used to ensure we reached methane targets.

My colleague Mr. Simard is very clear on the importance of getting answers on this, because we find that Canada missed its methane targets, and the money that should have been spent in

helping us decrease greenhouse gas emissions wasn't spent on that. We have an obligation to find out what went wrong in order to make sure this doesn't happen again, because when I speak with people in industry, they say we can easily hit the methane targets and we can exceed them.

If the Prime Minister is making promises of further reductions in methane when we haven't met the ones we already have, we need as a committee to provide recommendations to the government on what went wrong with this program, what needs to be fixed and how we meet methane targets.

The second part of this motion, regarding inviting the Minister of Natural Resources to talk to us on supplementary estimates, is very much I think an order of housekeeping, because this will come up. If we agree to a study in that time, we would have to be jostling around committee times. I got advice from members of other parties to put it in so that it's part of the work program. Of course, we're going to have the minister come forward on that, because it's self-evident.

• (1655)

The third issue, of course, is the need to have a plan on the emissions cap.

We know that on November 1, in Glasgow, the Prime Minister made a very important announcement to the world that, “We'll cap oil and gas sector emissions today and ensure they decrease tomorrow at a pace and scale needed to reach net-zero by 2050.” He went further: “That's no small task for a major oil and gas producing country. It's a big step that's absolutely necessary.”

I think my colleagues from all parties would agree on the importance of our examining how we are going to make this emissions cap. Does it begin now? We know that there is somewhat of a cap in Alberta, but that would allow for a large increase in production. Is the government going to support increasing production or decreasing production? How are we going to do that?

It comes to our committee to deal with this, my colleagues, because on the same day that he made the announcement at Glasgow, the environment minister wrote to that committee, the net-zero advisory body—which I'd never actually heard of—to ask for advice. I'm thinking that if the environment minister was looking for advice on how to set an emissions cap while the Prime Minister was making announcements on the international stage, our committee could do a lot of that work for the Prime Minister and we could come back with a credible plan.

Each of us will bring our own focus to it. For me, we have to have a plan that makes sure that our children have a world that's livable. We have to meet an emissions cap target that is credible, that is doable and that will be reached, because emissions continue to rise.

We need to do it within a frame, also, of the economic impacts. If sectors are going to be impacted, is there a plan for transition? We hear the words “just transition” thrown out and about, and I'm sure we'll end up looking at these issues later, but it all comes down to whether we can deliver on an emissions cap. If we can't deliver on an emissions cap, there's no talk about going further on issues such as the just transition.

I'm bringing this forward for a vote. I don't see that it is controversial. I think, across party lines, we all agree on these issues, so I'd like to put it forward to be voted on.

• (1700)

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

Could I just pause for a second? As I said, please bear with me as I get my legs back under me as far as chairing is concerned. I haven't operated in this virtual environment before. Again, my apologies with trying to sort out the hands up in different orders. I'll try to be much more aware of that.

I see that on the screen I have four hands up. I don't know if they are still waiting to speak. The clerk advises me that, as we have a motion in front of us, we need to deal with this before we go to other motions.

Perhaps if anybody on screen has their hand up for the next round of speaking, I'll get you to take your hand down. If it's to speak to this motion, then we'll go with the order.

Ms. Rempel Garner, you'd had your hand up. Was that to go on the speaking list or to speak to this motion?

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** That's correct. It's to this motion.

**The Chair:** Okay.

For all the hands that have been up on screen prior to Ms. Rempel Garner, does everyone want to speak to this one? I'm seeing nods, yes.

Mr. Chahal, you're taking your hand down.

Ms. Lapointe, did you want to speak to this one? You did.

We'll go with Ms. Lapointe first.

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** I'm sorry. I keep jumping in on this, but I think the way it works on Zoom is that the person in the left-hand corner is usually first in order. I could be wrong in how it appears.

**The Chair:** Yes, I think they do change, depending on screens. I'm looking at mine. It was actually Mr. Chahal, Ms. Lapointe, Mr. Maloney and then Ms. Dabrusin.

I'll go with Ms. Lapointe next.

**Ms. Viviane Lapointe:** I apologize. I'm having difficulty reviewing the motion. I'll put my hand down, if you want, and put it back up to be in a different order. I'm just not seeing the motion in front of me right now to be able to debate it.

**The Chair:** Okay. The motion has been emailed to everybody, to their P9s, by the clerk just now. Perhaps each of you would like to check to make sure you have it.

Ms. Lapointe, I'll put you after Ms. Dabrusin and go to Mr. Maloney.

Mr. Maloney.

**Mr. James Maloney:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

To be clear, I want to speak to this. I have something else I want to speak to as well. I'm not sure how the hands going up and down is going to play out on that one, but that remains to be seen.

The first of my comments—

**The Chair:** I'm sorry. I meant to say that I'll keep you on for this one, and then we also have another list for other things after we're through this motion. You're on that one as well.

**Mr. James Maloney:** Great. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. First of all, thank you for your kind remarks earlier.

Mr. Angus, thank you for your generous comments about my being chair of this committee before. One thing about this committee that always stood out to me and other members was that we were always able to get along incredibly well. There was virtually no conflict, and when there was disagreement, it was easily resolved through discussion and not confrontation. I know Mr. Melillo is in the room. I can't see him, but I'm hoping his head is nodding up and down and not left to right. I'm sure it is.

I don't see any reason we can't continue that. I almost voted with you, Mr. Angus, on your challenge to the chair, but I didn't think that would go over well. I didn't want us to get off on that sort of foot, either.

One way we managed to accomplish these goals was to compromise. I know you've introduced this motion. I haven't seen it in writing, although I gather it's being emailed around. I would like to do so based on what I heard you say. There's a lot in there that I agree we should be talking about. Probably everybody does.

It does need to be translated, in fairness to Mr. Simard and others who may want that option to read it in French.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** On a point of order, Chair, the motion has been translated.

**The Chair:** The motion that has been circulated and has been translated.

**Mr. James Maloney:** Okay. That just furthers my point. I have not seen it. I apologize for that.

There are going to be a number of other motions that I suspect people want to put forward. Some of them, I'm confident, will overlap in part, if not in large part, with this motion. What I would suggest is maybe that we take advantage of the subcommittee that was just formed pursuant to the routine motions, that we table all of the proposed motions today and that the subcommittee then review them.

I agree with Mr. Angus's sentiment that we don't want to lose any time and we want to hit the ground running, but I would hate to be in a situation where we adopt a motion and then other members see later that there were other motions they might have thought were things they should have put ahead of, or that they could merge with or do in conjunction with...whatever the case may be.

Anyway, all I'm saying is that there's a solution to this. Rather than going with the first one and not hearing about the other ones, I would propose that we hear all of the motions and then we put those over to the subcommittee. The subcommittee could even... There's a way to deal with this the first week we come back in the end of January. We could have witnesses ready to go quite soon. I suspect that whatever study we're going to do is going to involve departmental officials. We can have those people queued up to go on whatever route we take.

My last point is that there is some unfinished work from this committee in the last session. When I say "unfinished", I mean we were within sight of the finish line. There was one report. We had heard all the witnesses. We had started to discuss drafting instructions, but we hadn't finished it. It's a topic that I'm pretty confident Mr. Angus would be interested in. I'm also confident that my Conservative colleagues would be interested in it, because it was actually a study that resulted from a motion from one of their colleagues. That's something else we need to consider. That could be done in pretty short order if we were to adopt that, but that's just one of many.

My suggestion is, perhaps, with the room's consent, that we hear about other motions and then decide how to move forward procedurally thereafter.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (1705)

**The Chair:** Thank you for those comments.

We'll go through and hear everybody's comments, and then we'll work through how we want to deal with this motion and the others that come forward.

Ms. Dabrusin, you're up next.

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** Thank you.

Congratulations, Mr. Aldag, on being chair. I'm really looking forward to working with you. I'm sorry I'm not in a room with everyone else, but I look forward to working with all of you, too, over the coming months in the next session.

I have a couple of questions that came to mind when I was looking at this. The first point, just because Mr. Angus raised the net-zero advisory body, is that it was a body that has been established. It was part of Bill C-12, which was passed in the last Parliament, that there would be a net-zero advisory body. It will have an ongoing function of advising on how we achieve net zero by 2050. That's just as a point on that.

It's a long motion, and I'm just trying to get through it right now because it was just sent to me. As I was looking through it, one question I had was about the last part, which includes having the Minister of Environment come as well. It raises a point that it might

be something that the environment committee would ultimately be studying too.

Maybe the clerk can help me. I seem to remember that there's a possibility for joint sittings between committees. I was just wondering. What's the process for that, if that was something we would be interested in?

**The Chair:** Just give us one second. The clerk is consulting.

Apparently the process would be that the two chairs would meet to determine if there was interest in doing a joint meeting. If there was, then all members of both committees would come together for a joint hearing. That would be the process, and....

Go ahead.

• (1710)

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** I'm sorry. No, go ahead. I've never seen this done.

**The Chair:** I was going to say that it could be something that could be directed, perhaps through the subcommittee, if it would be the desire to go with that kind of approach.

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** Okay. I only flag it because my understanding is that at least that third bullet point might be largely something that's been also proposed for environment to look at. I just want to make sure that we have that conversation.

The only other piece I would say—again, this is all stuff that can be dealt with at the subcommittee—is that, if it's a bullet point to a larger motion, because this motion has three parts to it, is there a way to break out one part of the motion that would go for a joint sitting, or does it have to be the whole study? Again, it's just because I've never done that process before.

**The Chair:** We're looking into that, so let's hold that.

As I prepare to move to Ms. Lapointe—and Ms. Dabrusin, we'll come back to you as we sort this out—I want to find out if the members feel they need a minute or two to read the motion that has been circulated or if we're good doing it on the fly.

I was corrected. We have Ms. Rempel Garner next. Then we have Ms. Lapointe, then Mr. Angus, and then Mr. Melillo on the clerk's speaking order.

Go ahead, Ms. Rempel Garner.

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

I want to thank my colleague Mr. Angus for moving this motion. I support it. I want to make a few points on issues that have been raised, but first I want to speak to the substance of the motion.

The first part of the motion is with regard to the emissions reduction fund—onshore program. Mr. Angus has raised concerns that I also shared upon reading the report from the commissioner of the environment and sustainable development. I understand, from Mr. Angus's remarks, that Mr. Simard also shares those. There seems to be agreement among parties of all political stripes that this is an important issue for us to look at, particularly with regard to the impact this has on climate change and the urgency of that issue. I do believe that the first bullet point would be material and important for this committee to study.

The second part of the motion to me makes a lot of sense. It also gives the minister over two months to find a date, with the chair, to appear on supplementary estimates. That is a very long period of time. I would not like to come back to Parliament and have to waste a meeting slot on a subcommittee to have the minister come for supplementary estimates. I think that's something we should dispose of today. It also allows the minister to find time in his calendar over the break.

There's a similar argument for the way in which the last part of the motion is worded. This also gives the chair ample opportunity to work with the ministers' offices to come up with times to appear before committee on the last matter.

I'd also like to speak in favour, strongly, of the last part of the motion. We do need climate action. We also need clarity and stability for the natural resources sector, particularly the oil and gas sector, and in understanding the details with regard to the Prime Minister's announcement that he made at COP26. The lack of details that were put forward in that announcement—I have heard from civil society, the environmental activist community, industry groups and provincial stakeholders about the lack of stability that has occurred, because there is no plan on that—is troubling in terms of our ability to both protect the jobs and workers who are in affected industries and meet our climate objectives.

I think this is probably one of the most important and pressing things this committee could be doing right now. It falls squarely within the scope of this committee, given the impact it has on the oil and gas sector. I do not want this punted to subcommittee. This is an excellent motion. It programs the committee out, and it gives the chair the ability to begin putting witnesses together so that we can hit the ground running upon the commencement of the session in February.

We have not met in this committee, I don't believe, in over six months now. Given the impact of all these issues on the sector, we have to get to work. I would like to think that a rare moment of consensus could break out over this motion. This motion is neutrally worded. It doesn't come to any sort of conclusion. It doesn't take any sort of political position. It is a well-worded committee motion. It seeks to inquire on the government's plans. It doesn't take a position on the government's plans, but it seeks to do some work that is very material to many groups in the country.

I would not be in favour, particularly given that we are in a hybrid situation where resources are limited, of wasting more meetings on scheduling when we have a good motion like this ahead of time. I would remind colleagues that a committee's founding meeting is usually when we address business. If colleagues have other

ideas, I am open to calls from anybody, including the Liberal Party, on how we can move forward. We should come prepared here with how we should....

If colleagues have any other suggestions on the motion, they're welcome to do that here, but I certainly strongly support this. I want to thank Mr. Angus for putting it forward today. I'm very much looking forward to, hopefully, it passing. I hope other colleagues are as well. I'm looking forward to spending some time over the next several weeks getting our witness lists ready and, hopefully, collaborating behind the scenes so that we can get started with this study.

● (1715)

Those are my two cents.

Good work, Charlie.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Rempel Garner.

Just to clarify the process, we're going to go through and hear comments from everybody who has asked to weigh in on this motion. Then we'll be asking if there are any amendments to the motion that members would like to put forward. Then we'll be making a decision on the amendments and the motion. That's just to make sure we're all on the same page there.

The next speaker we have is Ms. Lapointe.

**Ms. Viviane Lapointe:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

My comments and concerns are very similar to those that have been expressed by my colleague, MP Maloney.

This is a very important issue. I absolutely agree with that. That is why I think it's very important that we are allotted the time to review this motion and look at it in full detail. We just received the motion this evening. I don't feel that I am prepared to weigh in on this motion. I would appreciate an opportunity to do my full, proper research and make sure I understand it fully.

**The Chair:** Mr. Angus, you're up next.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Thank you.

I welcome Ms. Lapointe to our committee. We will have three members from northern Ontario, so I'm sure we're going to work well.

I say this with the greatest respect, but people who show up at our committee have to come prepared. It is simply too much of a luxury to say that we'll put this off until February so people can read a motion. That's not on. We are dealing with a planetary crisis. We are dealing with the biggest crisis that has faced our country in terms of climate and economy. Hundreds of thousands of jobs are dependent on the energy sector, from Newfoundland out to B.C. We have to be ready to give the Prime Minister and the government recommendations in good faith.

Mr. Maloney, I have great respect for your work, as I've already said, but as you know, a motion is on the floor to be debated and voted on. You could vote it down and bring forward another motion. We could vote on this, get it and then deal with the other motions. I certainly think this is something we should all agree on. I'm ready to vote on it.

In terms of bringing the environment minister to our committee, I don't think we need to complicate it by saying that we need to reach out to the environment committee to have some kind of large group meeting, as much as we all love each other. The fact is that the Prime Minister set up two cabinet committees on the climate crisis. One has the natural resources minister and one has the environment minister. I want to know that they both have a plan. Who's making the decisions? We're not sure.

On inviting the environment minister on the emissions cap, it was the environment minister who wrote to the advisory body about the emissions cap, so he needs to come to our committee. The natural resources minister obviously needs to come to our committee because he is dealing with the sector. Those two ministers have to be here.

I'm watching the time. I don't know how long people want to stay tonight. I'm not going anywhere in the snow, so I'm ready to stay all night. I would think we could get this out of the way. Mr. Maloney says we have some other motions. I am more than willing to hear them. I'm more than willing to vote for them, but I am not willing to say that we'll put this off to a subcommittee, because the subcommittee means that we would not be able to come back until February. If we don't come back until February it robs me, as the only member of the New Democratic Party, the opportunity to do the research necessary to bring forward the witnesses we need so that we can do the work, and so that we have a month to prepare for what I think will be some of the defining studies that are going to happen in this Parliament.

I'm ready to vote.

● (1720)

**The Chair:** Mr. Maloney, you're next.

Then we have Monsieur Simard and Ms. Dabrusin.

**Mr. James Maloney:** Thanks, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Angus and Ms. Rempel Garner, I don't disagree with very much of what you said, although in Ms. Rempel Garner's case I hope that moments of consensus are not rare. I hope they're common in this committee. I agree with both of you that we need to come prepared to this meeting. We are, but if coming prepared means getting your hand up first, I'm not sure that's really what we're talking about.

The reality is that everybody around this table has some ideas that they would like to share with the table on how we move forward, but if the reason we don't do that is that Mr. Angus got his hand up first, I don't think it's fair to characterize anybody or any group of people as not being properly prepared.

What we're trying to do here is get a consensus—

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I'm sorry. On a point of order, I certainly didn't suggest that because my hand was up first people weren't pre-

pared. I was responding to Ms. Lapointe, who said she wanted to spend the month reading the motion.

**Mr. James Maloney:** That's fair. I don't think she said she'd spend a month reading the motion. Look, I just got the motion five minutes ago, and I'm trying to read it while I'm listening to you, Mr. Angus. I think that was her point. As I said earlier, there's a lot in there. There's some good stuff in there, and I'd like to give it some consideration.

Just to be clear, I don't want to wait until the end of January, the beginning of February, to come back here and have this discussion again either, but there is a compromise. It is that the subcommittee—and Mr. Angus, you're going to be on it, as will Mr. Simard, and I'm not sure who the Conservative members are—could meet sometime in January before the House starts sitting.

I would suggest that, at that subcommittee meeting, a number of motions be considered. We'd come out of there with recommendations, on the assumption that subcommittee members from the Liberals and the Conservatives go in there fully authorized to decide what goes first, so that, between the time of that meeting and the time Parliament resumes, we can actually then agree on witnesses and start the meetings right away, rather than losing more time.

The other problem is that, if we agree on this motion or any other motion today and then we go, we still have to figure out who the witnesses are going to be. This group, collectively, has to be involved in that discussion, in my view. We're all going to submit lists of witnesses. We have to agree on it, and perhaps vote on it. There's going to be overlap. I'm not trying to slow down the process. Quite the contrary, I'm trying to accelerate the process. I want to come back at the end of the month and get going right away too. I think the easiest way to do that, to accomplish everybody's goal, is to do as I suggest and have a subcommittee meeting then.

Mr. Angus, you face the possibility that—and you don't want to see this and I don't want to see this—if we're forced to vote on this now, some people might vote no just so they can move on to discuss the next motion, even though there are some parts of this motion of yours that they would like to support. I don't want to see it dismissed or voted on for reasons that aren't totally based on merit.

That's where I'm coming from. I'm not trying to slow things down. I'm not trying to put somebody else's motions ahead of yours or anything else like that. I just want to make sure that we're all able to take in all of the information that we have available to us—and we haven't heard it all yet—so that when we do come back, we can start off on that very first day.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (1725)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

We're going to move to Monsieur Simard.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Maloney knows that, in the last Parliament, we worked together a lot and it went very well. We have to figure out how to balance effectiveness and collaboration.

I don't think it would be appropriate to refer the motion to the subcommittee. It is not restrictive, but fairly broad. There is a strong consensus on the motion, especially among Mr. Angus, Ms. Rempel Garner and myself. Some people have said that what the motion contains was worthwhile. Nothing is stopping us from adopting it today and then figuring out in subcommittee how we could proceed. We could adopt it today so that we could be set and already know how to proceed at future meetings. It is just for the sake of logic and efficiency that I think we should vote on it right away, to then focus on shaping it for the subcommittee. However, we should not refer the motion to the subcommittee, as that would make us lose a huge amount of time. There is consensus for everyone.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Ms. Dabrusin.

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** Thank you.

I just got this. As far as preparation goes, I didn't have a chance to review this motion until it just arrived. I'm happy to be reading it now and discussing it, but I'm looking at how it breaks apart. It's like three studies in one, which is part of the challenge that, I believe, Mr. Maloney raised about when everyone gets their hands up and which motions gets considered.

I'm also going to point out that supplementary estimates (B) have already already been adopted, so I'm not sure how that works as part of this motion.

Is there a way to break this into three separate studies, again recognizing that supplementary estimates (B) have already gone? Maybe we can talk about when supplementary estimates (C) will happen. We can then have them go to the subcommittee to consider each as a separate study for analysis. That way, we can look at it as a way of going through all of them and then considering the other motions that will tabled as well. That way, they're all coming up.

That's one thought of how to deal with it, along with the other motions that have been proposed. Maybe as a friendly amendment to the second bullet, what we could do is just amend it to be on sup-

plementary estimates (C), instead, if any, and the main estimates. We could take away the reference to supplementary estimates (B), given that they've already passed as far as timing, anyway.

Those are my two suggestions. One is that we break it into three separate motions, because they are three separate studies in any event. The second is that the second bullet be about supplementary estimates (C), if any, and the main estimates. That way, we can deal with it all.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Dabrusin.

Mr. Angus, you had your hand up for this part of the discussion.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Supplementary estimates (B) matter because we haven't had a chance to review them, and we have to be able to put all of this in context for our work. If the government wants to bring forward supplementary estimates (C), I'd be more than willing to take that as well.

However, at this point, and given that the time is carrying on and it's snowing out there, I'm not willing to break this motion apart and send it to be studied by analysts or anybody else. It's at committee. It has followed the appropriate form. We're all ready for the work that lies ahead, and we all agree that this is important work. I say, let's get down and vote.

**The Chair:** Have we heard from everybody who wants to weigh in on this?

Go ahead, Mr. Maloney.

**Mr. James Maloney:** I have a question for Mr. Angus. I'm not going to repeat anything I've said already, but if we vote on this motion and it's successful, we're then going to hear other motions. Are you prepared to have the subcommittee consider sequence and timing and whatnot? If this goes ahead as it is, it is going to take the committee right through, probably, until April.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Mama Angus never raised her boy to answer hypotheticals in a political world, but I'm feeling like I'm being very.... I'm sorry. She's an old miner's daughter. She taught her son well.

I am in good faith here. I don't know what motions you're bringing in, but if we move on motions and there's outstanding business from the previous Parliament.... We can all agree that if there's outstanding business that we've agreed on, we're going to make sure that it gets done. It's about making sure that we didn't waste the resources of Parliament by having a study that's sitting there ready for an answer.

I would say, let's vote on this, and let's get the other motions. If there are conflicts, we can come back and figure a way to get a solution.

• (1730)

**The Chair:** Ms. Dabrusin, you have your hand up.

We're also approaching the end of the time we had allotted for this meeting, so we need to deal with that.

Go ahead, Ms. Dabrusin.

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** I've been trying to reach an agreement, but I actually agree in principle with a lot of what's being said about the importance of the issues to be studied. The question for me is how we do it, and what Mr. Maloney has raised.

What I would like to do is propose a friendly amendment to the second bullet, as I had mentioned before. I'm going to do this more formally, so that it can be voted upon.

The second bullet says:

That the Minister of Natural Resources be invited to appear before the committee prior to February 28th, 2022, for no fewer than two hours on the subject matter of the Supplementary Estimates (B) 2021-2022;

Given that those supplementary estimates have already been voted on and adopted by Parliament, I would suggest that the amendment be that it reads instead, "That the Minister of Natural Resources be invited to appear before the committee for no fewer than two hours on the subject matter of the Supplementary Estimates (C), if any, and the Main Estimates".

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I have friendly question. Would the members be agreeable to (B) and (C)?

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** I would like the minister to not escape scrutiny for both the supplementary estimates (B) and (C). I don't want him at one meeting for both. I would like him at two meetings. I am very excited about him coming for the supplementary (B)s, and then if we need to move a motion later to have him for the (C)s, we can do it at that time. I am not in favour of a two for one for the minister.

**The Chair:** Have we heard from everybody? We're just beyond the scheduled time of 5:30. I understand we have this room until 6:30. We cannot go beyond 6:30 because of cleaning for COVID and all sorts of other things. Do the members of the committee desire to continue sorting through this motion and others, but until no later than 6:30?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

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

**Mr. James Maloney:** It just occurred to me that any reference to the minister appearing at committee, whether it's supplementary estimates (B) and (C), or (B) with (C), regardless of where we land, it should contain a provision that it's subject to the minister's availability because, again, Mario and Eric will remember that ministers have always been more than willing to come before this committee, but they're not always available at our beck and call. They will go out of their way to come, but I don't want to make it on a certain date or within a certain time frame if that's not something that's possible on the minister's end. Flexible language needs to be built into it.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** I have a point of order. That provision is assumed, Chair. The committee can't force the minister to appear. They can only invite them. It's more of a political problem if the committee invites them and they choose not to come.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Angus.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I didn't put in dates because it's practice for a minister to get back to us and say when they're available. We will adjust our schedule around that.

**Mr. James Maloney:** Are we debating the amendment now? If there is an amendment tabled we do have to vote on that first.

• (1735)

**The Chair:** My understanding is that this is the discussion part of it. Then we are going to look at specific amendments. We have an amendment from Ms. Dabrusin. I was going to come back to her. If there are any other amendments that want to be put forward we'll vote on those. Then we'll go to the amended motion and figure out whether we're carrying that or not.

Ms. Dabrusin, you had a couple of amendments that you put forward there, so I'll give you the floor.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** On a point of order, Chair, you have to dispose of the amendment that is on the floor first.

**The Chair:** Which one was that?

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** She put forward an amendment for the supplementary estimates (C). That is what we're debating, so we would vote on that. If she wants to change and do something else, she can have a second amendment, but the amendment is on the supplementary estimates (C).

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** I can speak to my amendment, just because I believe that there was a question from Mr. Angus, and it might help with how we resolve that one.

I was okay with its being supplementary estimates (B) and (C), which I believe is what he had proposed as a friendly subamendment to my amendment. I don't know if that was something that he was formally proposing, but if so, that's fine with me.

**The Chair:** We have the amendment that is on the second bullet. Is that where we are? I had marked down that we were going to remove "prior to February 28, 2022". Is that part of this amendment?

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** It was part of mine.

**The Chair:** Then it reads, "for no fewer than two hours on the subject matter of the supplementary estimates (B) and supplementary estimates (C)". Is that the wording of the amendment?

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** If I may, and I'm just looking for clarity about whether there was a motion for a subamendment. Mine had actually been for the supplementary (C)s, if any, and the mains, but I was willing to accept the suggestion by Mr. Angus for both supplementary (B)s and (C)s and the main estimates.

**The Chair:** Ms. Dabrusin, for the clerk's sake and, I think, that of everybody here, please read the amendment as you would like to put it forward on the second bullet. We'll let you take the pen and give it as you had proposed. Just read it so we have the exact wording you're putting forward.

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** Do you want what I suggested in the first instance or what I was willing to accept as the friendly subamendment to my amendment by Mr. Angus? I'm just trying to be sure I'm clear on where we're at now.

**The Chair:** I'm just looking to the clerk to see what we can accept.

Ms. Dabrusin, please read out what you're proposing with the friendly amendment.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** Just for clarity, Chair, there's no such thing as a friendly amendment. For clarity on committee purposes, it should be, "Is the parliamentary secretary amending the motion so that all committee members are clear on what they're voting on?"

**The Chair:** That's fair enough.

Please give us what the amendment is that you're putting forward. Read it to us, and we will take that as the amendment that's being put forward. That's what we will vote on.

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** I'm not trying to be difficult. I'm just checking to see if there was a proposed subamendment to my amendment, because it sounds like I was going to adopt that.

In the first instance, what I proposed as my amendment was that the Minister of Natural Resources be invited to appear before the committee for no fewer than two hours on the subject matter of supplementary estimates (C), if any, and the mains.

That's where it ended. That was my amendment, and then I understood Mr. Angus to suggest a subamendment to that to say both supplementary estimates (B) and (C).

• (1740)

**The Chair:** Is there a subamendment from Mr. Angus?

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I am more than willing to work with all of my beloved here, because it's the way my mama raised me. I would have no problem making a friendly amendment for supplementary estimates (B) and (C), as long as it is for the period of the two hours that we had stipulated in the first part of the motion. Is that correct?

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** The "two hours" part is correct.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** We have a subamendment that we will then vote on. Is everybody in favour of including supplementary estimates (B) to the amendment that's being put forward? It would also include the supplementary (C)s, if any, and the mains.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** Mr. Chair, my understanding is that Ms. Dabrusin's motion takes out the deadline of February 28.

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

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** It depends on the minister's schedule, so we can't order that anyway.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** You're never going to get him.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** We'll get him.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** I would put it in there so that we can shame them when he doesn't come.

**Mr. James Maloney:** He will come.

**The Chair:** The subamendment we have is for the tail end of this, which is on the subject matter of the supplementary estimates (B), (C), if any, and mains. That's the subamendment that we're discussing now. Are we able to call the question, and if we agree, then the amended one comes back that takes out "prior to February 28th", and we'll be debating or discussing that next.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** We'll vote on this, and if my colleague is concerned about losing the "February 28th"...but we'll vote on it. I'm ready to vote.

**The Chair:** We'll call the vote on the subamendment, which includes supplementary estimates (B), supplementary estimates (C), if any, and the main estimates.

(Subamendment agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

**The Chair:** Now we go to the motion as put forward with the amendment, removing "prior to February 28th, 2022" in the second bullet, but with the addition that was just carried.

Ms. Dabrusin

• (1745)

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** Can you please reread that to me?

**The Chair:** It's amending the second bullet which will then read: "That the Minister of Natural Resources be invited to appear before the committee for no fewer than two hours on the subject matter of supplementary estimates (B), supplementary estimates (C), if any, and the main estimates".

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** We'll proceed to the vote.

(Amendment as amended negatived: nays 6; yeas 5)

**The Chair:** We'll now vote on the motion which retains the "prior to February 28th, 2022", and also contains the supplementary estimates (B), supplementary (C)s, if any, and mains.

Ms. Jones.

**Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador, Lib.):** Is this the original motion without the amendment? I just need some clarification, please.

**The Clerk:** We are voting on the main motion as amended.

**Mr. Eric Melillo:** I'm sorry, Mr. Chair. Could you maybe read the section again? There's some confusion there. I don't believe the amendment passed. We are voting on the main motion.

**The Chair:** The subamendment passed and the amendment did not pass.

The motion that we have is as presented except the second bullet retains the "prior to February 28th, 2022" and then the subamendment that was carried includes supplementary estimates (B), supplementary estimates (C) if any, and mains. That's the new package. Otherwise, it's as presented.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I hope everybody knows that a camel was a racehorse that was designed by committee. We're just having to go through what we added to the camel's structure to make sure we're ready to vote.

**Mr. James Maloney:** Did your mother tell you that, too?

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** No. My sainted mother told me that if I was going to get a penalty, I might as well draw blood.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** Do we have the same mother? Honestly, that's sage advice.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** My mother goes to mass every day and takes no prisoners.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** That's amazing.

**Mr. James Maloney:** I'm from Thunder Bay, Charlie. I get it.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Look at your last name there, Mr. Maloney. You come from good stock.

**Mr. James Maloney:** Thank you.

• (1750)

**The Chair:** We have clarification and we'll restart the vote.

I'll give clarification and then I'll come to Mr. Chahal. Although the subamendment was carried, the amendment was defeated, so that kills both of them. We're now voting on the original motion as put forward by Mr. Angus, with no amendments.

Mr. Chahal, did you have a point before we start the vote?

We'll turn it over to the clerk for the recorded vote.

(Motion agreed to: yeas 10; nays 1)

**The Chair:** We have a list of others who want to speak. Now that this has been carried, we'll have Mr. Maloney first. If anybody else wants to speak now to any other motions or any other business of the committee, we'll take that.

Mr. Maloney.

**Mr. James Maloney:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I have a motion here that's along the lines of what I said earlier about unfinished business from the last session. I'm hoping we can have two moments of consensus in one meeting.

I move:

That the committee take into consideration all evidence and documentation received as part of the study on the Low-Carbon and Renewable Fuels Industry in Canada during the second session of the 43rd Parliament; that, pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the committee undertake this study as its own and proceed to drafting instructions based on the evidence acquired in the previous session; and that the committee table its report in the House no later than February 28, 2022.

As I mentioned earlier, this is a study for which we completed hearing from all of the witnesses in June. I think we provided some preliminary drafting instructions, at least, if not formal drafting instructions. There may actually be a draft report kicking around somewhere. Regardless of whether that's the case or not, drafting instructions were ready to be provided by all parties. This is something that could be done very quickly, and it would be a shame, as Mr. Angus pointed out earlier, to not finish this after all of the work that went into it.

There were a lot of meetings. I think there might have been eight or nine meetings in total. We heard from a lot of witnesses, and I think it would be unfortunate and somewhat disrespectful to them if we were not to get this ball across the line.

I'm hoping that we will get consensus around the table to adopt this motion and then we can move on it forthwith.

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

Do you have that in writing? Could you forward to the clerk in both official languages, so that it could be distributed?

**Mr. James Maloney:** I will get that taken care of right now.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

To speak to this motion, I have Mr. Chahal, Ms. Rempel Garner, Mr. Angus and Ms. Jones.

Go ahead, Mr. Chahal.

• (1755)

**Mr. George Chahal (Calgary Skyview, Lib.):** Thank you, Chair.

I wasn't going to speak on this motion. I was going to speak on a separate one, but I do agree with my colleague Mr. Maloney that we should continue and support this important work that was done by the committee.

**The Chair:** I will keep you on my list for when we conclude this one.

Go ahead, Ms. Rempel Garner.

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

I'm new to this committee, Chair. It would be inappropriate for us to proceed with writing a report for members who didn't have any opportunity to have input into its substantive matter, including my colleague Mr. Chahal, who is newly elected.

I would also point out that, if this was so important to the Liberals, they shouldn't have called an election. Come on.

The last thing I would say is that this would interfere with the timeline that we just put forward to the committee. It would take at least two meetings to review, and I think we would have to invite witnesses again. I'm not inclined to support it for that reason, and I would remind colleagues from the Liberal Party that when the government calls an unnecessary election, things fall off the Order Paper. It's a problem.

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

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Thank you.

I am very uncomfortable. I thought we were going to be looking at a motion of a report that was finished and we were waiting for a response to. Then, it would be a straightforward thing to just bring forward the report and reintroduce it so that we could get a response. To take a study that wasn't completed and then do drafting instructions when I have had nothing to do with any of the witnesses and I don't know the direction, that, to me, would be a serious problem.

I'm sitting with the former chair of my last committee, Mr. Warkentin. We worked full out to get our final reports done and to Parliament, because you do not know—and this is political life 101—when a session ends if you're going to be taking that work up again. It's incumbent upon the committee to try to have the work completed, so I feel very uncomfortable.

If there's another motion that we are talking about, with work that has been finished, I would be interested in that one. However, I could not support giving drafting instructions to a report based on witness testimony on an issue that I have had nothing whatsoever to do with. I can't put my name to that.

**The Chair:** Ms. Jones.

**Ms. Yvonne Jones:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to support Mr. Maloney on this. I sat on the last committee and I was part of this study. We did this study based on recommendations by the Conservative Party. It was their motion. We certainly called many witnesses. We heard lots of evidence, and there was a lot of good work done in that process.

I think that when we come here as members, even though we represent ourselves, we also represent a broader perspective and the platforms of our parties and the policies of our parties, and the NDP was very engaged in this study, as well as the Conservatives and the Bloc. I really believe that the evidence and the testimony given to us and the work are advanced enough that we could very easily complete this report. It would be a shame to have this expert testimony and this study fall off the table at this point.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Jones.

I have Mr. Chahal, Mr. Simard and then Mr. Maloney.

Mr. Chahal.

**Mr. George Chahal:** Thank you, Chair.

I agree with my colleague and her statement. There's been a tremendous amount of work done on this. We've had experts come in. It seems like the previous committee was quite collaborative, with everybody working together. This was a motion from the opposition that was brought forward, and everybody has worked hard.

I think the expert testimony should be included and a report provided. I think that's the right thing to do to honour the work that's been done by everybody involved who put their time and energy forward. There are a lot of great ideas, I'm sure, that will come from this. This should be put together and brought forward for us for our consideration in the future and for the ideas that could help move our country forward. I'm happy to support this.

• (1800)

**The Chair:** Monsieur Simard.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Mario Simard:** I rather agree with Mr. Maloney. My only issue is with the time frame. Why not refer this motion to the subcommittee? That would give us a chance to discuss the time frame later. That said, I rather agree with what Mr. Maloney is proposing. To be a bit more efficient, we could refer it to the subcommittee and talk about it a bit later.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Maloney, you have the floor.

**Mr. James Maloney:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

First of all, in response to Mr. Simard, I'm prepared to remove the date. I'm not too fussed about it getting accomplished by February 28. My only concern is that it gets done at all.... I mean, if we're going to talk about consensus and whatnot, you can.... I lost track somewhere along there with the line about the opposition talking about this unnecessary election, but it was probably raised today in question period, and it will probably be raised tomorrow. You can say it over and over again.

If that's your view, which it is, you can say it to us over and over again. Don't take it out on the witnesses and all the people who worked so hard to contribute to this study. As has been said already, this was put forward by the Conservatives, with the support of Mr. Simard and Mr. Cannings.

Getting the drafting instructions is not a challenge in this situation. Mr. Simard was there. Mr. Angus and Mr. Cannings I'm sure would be more than happy to pinch-hit for you for one meeting to do that, as would others from the Conservative Party who were re-elected. I'm sure they would be happy to step in and do the same.

There's no obstacle to this happening other than politics. Let's not let politics get in the way of something that we had all agreed on previously, from all parties, getting done, because it is a sign of great respect to Parliament, but more importantly, to those witnesses and experts who took the time to put pen to paper and give their time to show up.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Ms. Dabrusin, you had your hand up.

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** I was just going to suggest this, because I don't believe that Mr. Maloney can amend his own motion. He was suggesting the removal of the date. If you need the amendment to remove the date reference, I'm happy to move that.

**The Chair:** I have two more people wanting to weigh in on this.

Actually, Mr. Warkentin, I think I might have missed you, and then I have Mr. Angus.

**Mr. Chris Warkentin (Grande Prairie—Mackenzie, CPC):** Thank you.

I agree with Mr. Angus. It would be difficult for members who weren't part of the study to be able to step in at the last minute as it's crossing the finish line. Of course, we worked diligently to get our reports done.

There was some information and some evidence that had been brought forward at the ethics committee with regard to the WE scandal. Mr. Maloney was at that committee because the Liberals said that they wouldn't allow that testimony to be brought forward in this Parliament, making the argument that it was outside the current work of the committee. I think it's important for us to be consistent. I think we have a good work plan. Mr. Angus's motion has now been passed, and I think we can all get behind that. I think that any other effort to try to delay or to stall would be difficult to now agree to, having just passed that motion.

I will be opposing Mr. Maloney's motion.

**The Chair:** Mr. Angus.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Okay, thank you.

In response to my colleague Mr. Simard, I am prepared to find a compromise. I think it is important for the subcommittee to consider this situation in order to develop a plan. Voting on the motion now worries me, but it is important to recognize this committee's good work and the witnesses' efforts. I am prepared to discuss this issue in subcommittee to prepare a work plan to help the committee find a solution.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Ms. Dabrusin.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** Thank you very much, Mr. Angus. I appreciate the fact that we could work with the subcommittee.

I just wanted to make sure that we can.

[*English*]

move the amendment that I proposed to remove the date. I say that just so that it's on the record.

• (1805)

[*Translation*]

This will make life easier for the subcommittee

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Okay.

Mr. Angus.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I'm not sure what the amendment would be if we simply remove the date. I think the amendment would be that we'd have to remove the date and send it to the subcommittee, and then return it to our committee with recommendations on how to deal with this unfinished business.

**The Chair:** Are you making a subamendment, then?

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I wanted to know if she had an amendment that simply removed the date because that would not be sufficient. We would need to remove the date, and then we would actually

have to say that we will refer it to subcommittee to bring back a recommendation to the larger committee.

If necessary I'll make the subamendment to Madam Dabrusin's amendment. Does that make sense?

**The Chair:** Ms. Dabrusin, would you like to add that to your amendment, the sending to the subcommittee as well as removing the date? If not, then we'll treat it as a subamendment.

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** I guess it was an assumption that we'd send everything to the subcommittee, so I'm a bit confused as to the need to specifically state it. I don't have a problem with it going to subcommittee, but it seems like we're going to talk in circles forever if we do it.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Mario Simard:** Sorry, I have a point of order.

[*English*]

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

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Mario Simard:** We no longer have access to the interpretation.

It's okay, it has been resolved.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** We missed the translation.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** I assumed that everything went to the subcommittee, but if Mr. Angus wants that to be written into the motion, I agree with his proposal. We can say that we are removing the date and that this will be also sent to the subcommittee.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** We will then put the question on this one as amended, removing the date and sending it to subcommittee. Do you want a recorded division?

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0)

**The Chair:** Mr. Chahal has his hand up.

Mr. Chahal, you have the floor.

**Mr. George Chahal:** Thank you, Chair.

I also have a motion to request a response to the critical minerals study—

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** On a point of order, Chair, you can't move a new substantive motion when there is a motion on the floor.

**The Chair:** Didn't we just dispense with that motion?

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** No, we dispensed with the amendment.

**The Chair:** I apologize.

**Mr. George Chahal:** I apologize.

**The Chair:** I stand corrected. The amendment was carried.

Now we will go to the vote on the amended motion that Mr. Maloney brought forward.

(Motion agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

**The Chair:** Now Mr. Chahal, I recognize you.

• (1810)

**Mr. George Chahal:** Thank you, Chair.

I request a government response to a critical mineral study from 43-2. I move:

That, pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the committee undertake a study of Critical Minerals and Associated Value Chains in Canada; that the evidence and documentation received by the committee during the 2nd Session of the 43rd Parliament on the subject be taken into consideration by the committee in the current session; that the committee adopt the report entitled "From Mineral Exploration to Advanced Manufacturing: Developing Value Chains for Critical Minerals in Canada" adopted during the 2nd Session of the 43rd Parliament and tabled in the House of Commons on June 17, 2021; that, pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee request the government to table a comprehensive response to the report.

**The Chair:** Is there any discussion?

I didn't see who was first.

Monsieur Simard.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Mario Simard:** I am not sure I understand my colleague's motion. Does he want to return to the study we already did? Is that the idea behind his motion?

We have already conducted a study on critical minerals here, so I am not sure I completely understand his motion.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I'm sorry. The interpretation cut out after the first part of the question. I'm just wondering if the translation is coming through.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Mario Simard:** I want to know what he is proposing in his motion.

Does he want to redo the study we have already done on critical minerals?

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Mr. Chahal, I don't know if you want to speak to that, to explain the motion, or if everybody needs clarification.

**Mr. George Chahal:** =Would you like me to respond, Chair?

**The Chair:** I believe so, and then we'll go to Mr. Angus and then Mr. Maloney.

**Mr. George Chahal:** Sure. I'm just asking that essentially we readopt the report and get a government response to the work that's been done.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Angus.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** My understanding is that the report was done and we did not get a response, so we need to bring it back to committee and then ask for the government response.

Critical minerals are essential. There's a massive, worldwide geopolitical struggle going on, particularly with China. In the Democratic Republic of the Congo and all over the world we have horrific human rights abuses taking place in the search for critical minerals, yet, here in Canada we have the opportunity to mine those minerals in an environmentally safe manner with proper health and safety standards and with agreements with indigenous communities.

I certainly speak for my region. I live in a town called Cobalt, which is a critical mineral. Our industries are very much focused on this and on the potential of getting us to near zero through the use of battery technology. These important minerals would be much better mined in Canada than in some other jurisdictions where the rule of law is very suspect.

I applaud the committee for the excellent work they did under Mr. Maloney. I followed a lot of the committee's work, and I think it would be a complete waste if we did not get a response from the government. I'm more than willing to vote to have that study brought in. If we have to resurrect it, we can then ask for a response to it to be sent to our committee and then our committee can look at the government's recommendations. I'm ready to vote on that.

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

Mr. Maloney.

**Mr. James Maloney:** I'm not going to repeat it. I was going to respond to Mr. Simard.

Thank you, Mr. Angus, for your comments.

Mr. Simard, this is the report we did. You're quite right. We finished it. It was tabled in the House, and there wasn't time for the government to respond. All we have to do is readopt the report as a committee. We're not doing anything over again. That would give the government an opportunity to respond.

• (1815)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Are we ready to vote on this motion?

Do we want a recorded division?

**An hon. member:** Yes.

(Motion agreed to: yeas 7; nays 0)

**The Chair:** We're just coming up on 6:20. I appreciate everybody's work.

I'll just make a couple of comments, Mr. Angus.

I do have a question. One of the things from other committees I've been on is that when we started we invited departmental officials to do a briefing. Is this something that would be of interest to this committee as we get up and running?

I'm getting a couple of headshakes, no. We'll just get to work. Okay.

The other thing I was going to say is about the subcommittee. On other committees I was on, such as environment, we asked parties to send in other thoughts or suggestions that they had for motions that could be considered once we got the ones going that had been adopted. I don't know if you want to have anything else in the hopper, or if we just get going with what we have started with today.

I'll reach out to the subcommittee and see if we want to actually have a meeting prior to returning at the end of January, or early February, so that we can hit the ground running, as was stated, to have things lined up. I'm willing to do that work in January to make sure that we're ready to proceed. I will be working with the subcommittee to do that. That offer's there and I will be reaching out after we finish and when we're back in our homes to see what the interest of the subcommittee is to move things forward.

We have Ms. Lapointe. Ms. Rempel Garner is ready to also provide some comments, and then Mr. Angus.

**Ms. Viviane Lapointe:** I had a motion that I wanted to present to the committee this evening.

**The Chair:** You have the floor. Please proceed.

**Ms. Viviane Lapointe:** This motion is important for many reasons. Primarily, the work is vital to our forestry sector, and I believe it is incumbent upon us to continue the good work of the previous committee.

The motion reads, regarding a request for a government response to the forestry study from session 43-2:

That, pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the committee undertake a study of Economic Recovery in the Forestry Sector; that the evidence and documentation received by the committee during the 2nd Session of the 43rd Parliament on the subject be taken into consideration by the committee in the current session; that the committee adopt the report entitled "Economic Recovery in Canada's Forestry Sector: Green and Inclusive" adopted during the 2nd Session of the 43rd Parliament and tabled in the House of Commons on May 25, 2021; that, pursuant to Standing Order 109, the committee request the government to table a comprehensive response to the report.

**The Chair:** Is there any discussion?

Mr. Angus.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Is this like the last one where a study had been done, and we just need to get the response?

Okay.

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

We are ready to vote.

(Motion agreed to: yeas 7; nays 0)

**The Chair:** We have Ms. Rempel Garner and Mr. Angus.

• (1820)

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** I'm happy to cede the floor to Mr. Angus and speak after.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Yes, so that we can talk about hitting the ground running, I'm looking for direction on our spending time in January and using the Christmas break to get our witness list together. Can we get that to the subcommittee, so that we can come back with a plan and actually be ready to go, as opposed to letting things drag out?

I'm ready to meet whenever a subcommittee is called by the chair, but I think that we could start looking at witnesses, and then talking about how we see this going. This is something that would be better dealt with at subcommittee, because we may have many common witnesses or we may, by talking, find there are gaps in our common witnesses.

I'm ready to do that, but I'd like to know that we can get that work done in January so we can start this committee work in February, and we're set to go.

**The Chair:** I appreciate that offer of support, so thank you.

Ms. Rempel Garner.

**Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner:** Thank you, and I share my colleague's sentiment to get witness lists. We trust you to schedule the witnesses. We will certainly be sending witness lists. I don't believe we need a subcommittee to go through witness lists. We would just send those to you. The clerk would be coordinating that.

With that, I move to adjourn.

**The Chair:** This is a dilatory motion, so we need to vote on that.

We have a motion to adjourn.

(Motion agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0)

**The Chair:** We're 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>