



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on Natural Resources

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 032

Thursday, September 22, 2022

Chair: Mr. John Aldag



Standing Committee on Natural Resources

Thursday, September 22, 2022

• (1105)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. John Aldag (Cloverdale—Langley City, Lib.)): I call the meeting to order. Good morning, everyone.

Welcome to meeting number 32 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Natural Resources.

This morning, I'd like to welcome guests Mr. Barlow and Mr. Lemire. I think that's all of our guests for the committee today.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the committee is continuing the study of creating a fair and equitable Canadian energy transformation. Today is the ninth meeting with witnesses on this study. Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format, pursuant to the House order of June 23, 2022.

I would like to remind all participants that taking screenshots or photos of your screen is not permitted. Today's proceedings will be televised and made available via the House of Commons website.

For the benefit of some of our witnesses—I think all of the MPs know the rules here, but for those who are joining us for the first time—please wait until I recognize you by name before speaking. For those participating by video conference, please click on the microphone icon to activate your mike, and please mute it when you're not speaking.

There is interpretation available for those online. You have the choice at the bottom of your screen of “floor” for the language that's being used at the time, or “English” or “French”. Those in the room can use the earpiece that is provided and select the desired channel.

All comments should be addressed through the chair.

For members in the room, if you wish to speak, please raise your hand. For members on Zoom, please use the “raise hand” function. The clerk and I will do our best to manage the speaking order between those in the room and those participating virtually. Bear with us as we try to find our way through the two formats here.

On the study of creating a fair and equitable Canadian energy transformation, we're going to go right to the witnesses today, so—

Mr. Richard Bragdon (Tobique—Mactaquac, CPC): Mr. Chair—

The Chair: —I would like to welcome....

If I can, Mr. Bragdon, I'll move through the welcoming. I'm hoping that if we have items of business—I know we have a number of

motions that have been made—maybe we can push that a bit to the end of the meeting.

Mr. Richard Bragdon: This is a point of privilege, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Okay, let me do the welcome and then we'll do your point of privilege. Then we'll get into opening statements.

Attending virtually from the International Trade Union Confederation, we have Samantha Smith, director of the Just Transition Centre. Welcome.

From the Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs, we have Judy Wilson. Welcome.

I missed Ms. Saks, who is joining us virtually as a guest today.

In person, from the Carpenters' District Council of Ontario, we have Mike Yorke, director of public affairs and innovation. He is joined by Finn Johnson, director of communications. Welcome to you.

Now we'll go to Mr. Bragdon's point of privilege before going to our five-minute opening statements by witnesses and then into our rounds of questions.

Go ahead, Mr. Bragdon.

Mr. Richard Bragdon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate it.

I wanted to bring this to the committee today. It's a point of privilege with regard to the order of witnesses.

I give all due respect to the witnesses who are lined up today. Thank you for taking the time. We look forward to hearing your testimony at some point.

The concern and point of privilege I raise, Mr. Chair, is with regard to.... It's been a long-standing tradition and long-practised tradition of committees within the House of Commons and Parliament to ensure that there's proportionality of witnesses and that the witnesses from each of the parties are definitely considered, approached and added so that the witnesses who are heard in any committee, any hearing or any study properly represent the representation within the House and the structure of the committee.

When we look at the makeup of this particular study we've done and the witnesses we've heard from—

Ms. Julie Dabrusin (Toronto—Danforth, Lib.): I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Go ahead, Ms. Dabrusin.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: I don't believe that is a point of privilege. This was decided by a motion among committee members. I don't believe this is a point of privilege, and we have witnesses here whom we would really like to hear.

Mr. Richard Bragdon: It is a point of privilege.

The Chair: I'll give you 30 seconds to continue.

I agree that it's not a point of privilege, but I'll let you finish your thought, and then we're going to move to our witnesses.

Mr. Richard Bragdon: I believe it is a point of privilege, because we're dealing with a very important matter and a very important study, Mr. Chair, and there are very important witnesses who have yet to be heard by this committee. They have not had the opportunity yet and have not, to my knowledge, been approached, or they haven't had the opportunity to speak. I know for a fact that they want to speak before the committee. Some of them are pretty significant.

We're dealing with first ministers. We're dealing with premiers of provinces who are willing and want to appear before this committee, and they have not yet been approached, to my knowledge. This is supposedly our last day of hearing testimony. We've had some key witnesses.

I have an email here, sir, from Premier Blaine Higgs of New Brunswick, and I think this is relevant to the committee. He wrote this—

• (1110)

Mr. Francesco Sorbara (Vaughan—Woodbridge, Lib.): Chair, I have a point of order—

Mr. Richard Bragdon: I've—

The Chair: You do have a motion that you submitted and we will entertain it.

As I said, I would like to try to get to our witnesses. I can allow time at the end of the meeting. We can set aside the last 30 minutes, if we'd like, to look at....

We do have a motion right now that was made in June and that was carried forward to have today's hearing with witnesses—

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

The Chair: It was decided by the committee that these would be today's witnesses, and the motion we had was that this would be the final hearing. You've been able to bring forward and table a motion, and I'm willing to entertain that, but I would like to hear from the witnesses today.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I have a point of order.

The Chair: I have a point of order from Francesco and then from Mr. Angus.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Good morning, everyone. It's great to be here today.

First off, thank you, Mr. Bragdon, for your intervention. I understand that every member wishes to raise concerns and issues they may have as we continue our work here at this committee. Unfortunately, on your behalf, it's not a point of privilege.

A motion was adopted by the committee for said witnesses, so I defer to you, Chair, to continue to move on with the study at hand. We have witnesses here who have flown in and witnesses here virtually whom we would like to hear from, and I wish to continue on that point. This is not a point of privilege.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: What I'm very concerned about is that the Conservatives, who've done everything to deny indigenous voices who might oppose the oil and gas agenda, are now trying to filibuster this committee with a false point of privilege. This was debated—our witness list—and they had an opportunity to bring forward witnesses. We were at a meeting where they decided they wanted to move on from this study, so to pull names out of a hat at this point—

Mr. Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC): I have a point of order, Mr. Chair—

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm not finished speaking—

Mr. Greg McLean: Yeah, you are—

Mr. Charlie Angus: This is an attempt to shut down witnesses—

Mr. Greg McLean: Point of order—

The Chair: I need order here.

Mr. McLean, please mute yourself. We'll get to you, but we're working now through a speakers list—

Mr. Charlie Angus: I just want to finish, Mr. Chair.

I'm deeply opposed to the idea of taking half an hour out of meeting with these witnesses that we agreed to in order to let the Conservatives do more obstruction. We've seen a relentless pattern of obstruction of our studies. I am very opposed if you would give half an hour from our witnesses, on whom we agreed—for this bogus claim of proportionality. We had decided on our witnesses and we voted on it and now we need to hear from them.

If they want to obstruct, they can do that someplace else.

The Chair: Do you have a point of order?

Mr. Eric Melillo (Kenora, CPC): Yes.

The Chair: Okay. I have Mr. Melillo, Mr. McLean and Mr. Bragdon on points of order.

Go ahead, Mr. Melillo.

Mr. Eric Melillo: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I in no way mean to challenge your decision. I know that we've worked together quite well so far throughout this committee, but I would like to read a quick quote from page 1060 of Bosc and Gagnon, which reads as follows:

If a member wishes to raise a question of privilege during a committee meeting, or an incident arises in connection with the committee proceedings that may constitute a breach of privilege, the committee Chair allows the member to explain the situation. The Chair then determines whether the question in fact relates to parliamentary privilege.

Mr. Chair, I would respectfully contend that you have not given enough time to hear Mr. Bragdon's point to be able to make that determination of whether or not it is indeed—

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: I have a point of order.

Mr. Eric Melillo: —a question of privilege. Again, I say that as respectfully as possible and in no way mean to challenge you, but given that this precedent has been established, I don't believe that there has been adequate time given at this point—

The Chair: I have three points of order that are—

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: I believe they are just debating the original point of order. Mine goes directly to what Mr. Melillo just stated, which is that you've made a decision. If they wish to challenge the chair—

The Chair: They can do so.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: —that is their prerogative, but there is nothing else to debate. You've made a decision. Are they challenging the chair? If not, let's move on.

The Chair: Yes, and that's where I was going to go.

Mr. McLean, if there's something new here....

Otherwise, I have made a decision. We're going to move to the witnesses. The chair can be challenged. We'll see where that goes. I will hear if there are points of order that are new or that add new information.

Go ahead, Mr. McLean.

• (1115)

Mr. Greg McLean: I do appreciate the input from my colleague Mr. Melillo on where a standing order on making a point of privilege ranks here, but I'll also put on the record here that Mr. Angus tried to put on the record that we're the party that didn't want to hear indigenous voices, because I remember his quote when he didn't want to hear from Mr. Swampy. Mr. Swampy is a very respected indigenous consultant here in Alberta—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Is that a point of order?

The Chair: Mr. McLean, we're getting into debate here, and I don't think that we're hearing anything new.

Mr. Charlie Angus: It's debate. It's shutting down our witnesses.

Mr. Greg McLean: We have a motion on the table here. It's a point of privilege. This committee did pass a motion that is clearly controversial, and against the conventions of Parliament, about how we actually hear it. To make a motion in a committee that we're not going to hear any more witnesses who come from one political party is absurd and a gross contravention of everything parliamentary democracy stands for as far as hearing witnesses is concerned, so

we have to hear this out at this committee. We have to hear it out further—

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm sorry, Chair. That is an opinion.

Challenge the chair, or.... We need to move on—

Mr. Greg McLean: —after this committee.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Challenge the chair or move on, because this is turning into a circus.

Mr. Greg McLean: That's the order in the rules. I don't need to challenge the chair. We've actually got—

Mr. Charlie Angus: This is a circus.

Mr. Greg McLean: Who makes things a circus here? I'll actually suggest that maybe the inmates are running the asylum in the back row there, but that's not for me to make comment on here, so I won't make that comment, obviously. We need to move forward here with actually hearing what the actual point of privilege is.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Can we see if there will be a challenge to the chair?

Mr. Greg McLean: Mr. Chair, are you going to actually rule that your running mate here in the NDP is actually going to ruled out of order when he speaks over me, or am I the only person you're going to rule out of order when I speak over Mr. Angus? You have to apply the same rules equally.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm sorry, I have a point of order.

Mr. Chair, your credibility is being attacked here, and I think that's not acceptable. We need to move on.

Mr. Greg McLean: I think I still have the floor here.

Mr. Charlie Angus: They're turning this into a circus.

The Chair: [I'm just going to ask everybody to mute their mikes for a second. I'm just consulting with the clerk—

Mr. Greg McLean: I can hear the talk—]

The Chair: —on a point here.

Mr. McLean, we'll just ask everybody for silence for a moment. I'm just confirming a procedural piece with the clerk and we'll be right back.

Thank you.

I appreciate, Mr. Bragdon, your bringing your point forward. I've heard from enough people to determine that I'm not accepting this as a point of privilege. We've had points of order and I've heard from all sides, and what I'm going to do now is say that you have a motion that's been made that can be brought forward. It can be voted on at such time as it's deemed appropriate, but at this point I'm not accepting the point of privilege, and if anybody wants, they can challenge the chair on that—

Mr. Greg McLean: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: —and then we will move into our witnesses.

Mr. Greg McLean: I have a point of order.

The Chair: Mr. McLean, you have a point of order.

Mr. Greg McLean: How on earth can the chair rule that it's not a point of privilege when he hasn't even heard the member speak about what the privilege is that's been contravened here in this committee? Now that's something—

The Chair: I've heard enough of his case. It goes back to the discussion—

Mr. Richard Bragdon: No.

Mr. Greg McLean: We haven't heard enough, Mr. Chair. He hasn't made the case, and every time someone raises a point of privilege, you have to hear the case.

The Chair: It goes back to a discussion we had previously.

Mr. Richard Bragdon: I have a point of order.

The Chair: I have the floor right now, Mr. McLean. I'm speaking and I'm going to ask you to stop speaking when I'm talking, or I'm going to have to.... Anyway, we'll just ask you to cease and desist when I'm speaking.

We've had this discussion before; it's the issue of proportionality of witnesses according to seats in the House of Commons. That is the point that's being raised. In this particular study, we had decided that the parties had put forward their witnesses and they were accepted. We had a motion brought forward by the NDP, which we accepted, to have one more panel of witnesses today, and that's what we're doing.

To go back to another point of proportionality, we can have that discussion at another point in subcommittee if we want. There's a subcommittee meeting on Tuesday. We have the opportunity for other parties to bring forward a motion that can be voted on to add additional witnesses to the study, but at this point I'm ruling that there is no point of privilege here. I'm not going to take any more. We are going to move forward with hearing from our witnesses.

If somebody wants to challenge me, I will take a challenge to the chair. We'll go to a vote and then we'll go into hearing witnesses. That's how we're going to proceed through this morning.

• (1120)

Mr. Greg McLean: I have a point of order.

The Chair: Are you challenging the chair?

Mr. Greg McLean: I'm raising a point of order, in case you can't hear me.

The Chair: What's your point of order?

Mr. Greg McLean: My point of order is that there is a process here as far as how we raise points of privilege in the House of Commons. If we have a point of privilege—

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: On a point of order—

The Chair: Are you challenging the chair, Mr. McLean? I'm asking right now: Is there a challenge to the chair?

Mr. Greg McLean: I'm actually talking about—

Mr. Charlie Angus: This is obstruction. Challenge the chair or stop interfering with the witnesses.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Challenge the chair.

The Chair: We can vote on it, or we're moving forward. That's where we're at.

Mr. Greg McLean: Point of order. Point of order—

The Chair: No more points of order; I'm not accepting your point of order. You're going around in circles.

Mr. Greg McLean: Mr. Chair, that's because you're not hearing what the procedure is. I respectfully ask you, after I say what I have to say here—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Respectfully, can you mute this so we can hear our witnesses? That's who we came here to hear, not Mr. McLean. Please mute him.

Mr. Greg McLean: Look, again we have talking over going on here, but I do have a point of order on the table that I would like to address, Mr. Chair. If you can hear the point of order, then perhaps we can progress in this matter.

If I can say this without being interrupted this time, I would really appreciate it. The procedure we have to go through here, of course, is to put on notice the work order here. We've done that.

The next procedure we have to go through in raising a point of privilege in the House of Commons is to raise that here and discuss it here with this chair. This is the procedure that we have to go through because, in our opinion, you have breached a point of privilege in this committee. We were going through that step here, and the first step of that, of course, Mr. Chair, is for you to hear what the point of privilege is. That's what Mr. Bragdon has put on the table here: a point of privilege that I think is, according to parliamentary procedure in Bosc and Gagnon, incumbent upon you to entertain at this time.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Chair, you have ruled. You have ruled.

Mr. Greg McLean: Mr. Chair, when are you going to—

The Chair: Mr. McLean, I have ruled, and I have said this is not a point of privilege.

Mr. Charlie Angus: You have ruled. This is disrespect of the chair and disrespect of our witnesses.

The Chair: I'm going to put it now. I'm being challenged. I'm obviously being challenged. I'm going to put it to a vote now.

Does the decision of the chair stand? That is that this is not a point of privilege and that we're moving on to hearing the witnesses.

Mr. Greg McLean: You haven't heard the point of privilege, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Yes I have. I have heard enough to make a decision, and I've made the decision that this is not a point of privilege.

Mr. Greg McLean: What is the point of privilege?

The Chair: I'm calling the question now. Does the decision of the chair stand? All in favour?

Mr. Greg McLean: Let's ask: Have you heard the point of privilege that's been raised?

The Chair: Yes, I have heard the point of privilege.

Mr. Greg McLean: What is the point of privilege? Could you clarify, because we have to take—

The Chair: The Conservatives feel that they have been disproportionately treated in the number of witnesses heard.

The vote has been called. Shall the ruling of the chair be sustained?

(Ruling of the chair sustained)

The Chair: We are now moving forward to our witnesses. I will move to Ms. Smith.

I'm going to turn to you for your five-minute opening statement. Thank you.

Ms. Samantha Smith (Director, Just Transition Centre, International Trade Union Confederation): Thank you very much, Chair, and thank you very much for the invitation to appear before the standing committee.

My name is Sam Smith. I work for the International Trade Union Confederation. We represent more than 200,000,000 organized workers in 162 countries. In Canada, our affiliate is the Canadian Labour Congress. I'm the director of the Just Transition Centre at the ITUC, which was set up in 2016 in the aftermath of the Paris Agreement and the negotiation of just transition guidelines in the United Nations to help unions and their members as well as governments and sometimes even employers to get good plans for a just transition so it does what it says on the tin.

I want to address two points in the opening statement. The first is on the international structures and rules for just transition and a bit of what's happening in countries other than Canada. Second, I have some practical observations after six years of working on just transition, mostly in the energy sector, with unions in countries around the world.

The first thing is that we have international rules for just transition that have been negotiated in the United Nations in the International Labour Organization, of which, of course, Canada is a prominent member state. Those rules are pretty clear about the processes for just transition, and there are two.

One is that you have to have social dialogue, which is negotiations between workers and our representatives and employers. Collective bargaining would be a part of social dialogue. Sometimes governments are a party to social dialogue.

Then the other is this broad multistakeholder process. I know you have heard testimony about the Scottish government's process, for example, on just transition. That is a broad multistakeholder process designed to bring people together and to get a consensus from which governments can build policy.

There are, then, two different processes with some different participants. They are both equally important, but there is one that is specifically related to unions, to employers and to governments, and that is social dialogue.

The other thing about just transition is that there are some outcomes we're trying to achieve. Those are also in international rules. One is to have decent work, meaning good jobs and making sure that the people who have good jobs today, for example, in the energy sector, also have good jobs in the future, and that where new jobs are being created in new sectors—let's say hydrogen, or carbon

capture and storage, or electrification of transport—those new jobs are good ones.

The other part is social protection. That would be things like expanding EI. It would be things like making sure that people have education, that they have health care and that they have secure pensions, because in times of uncertainty, when jobs and sectors are changing, that part of just transition becomes even more important.

Just transition also has these other objectives, and these are seen through the lens of the world of work. Just transition is about poverty eradication and about bringing more people into the benefits of well-paid union jobs with rights.

Those are the international rules. That's also what we're seeing now in countries around the world, including now in the United States.

For the other part of my opening remarks, I thought it might be useful to share some of the experiences we have had. We work with unions around the world in some of the sectors that are experiencing the most change, such as the energy sector. We work with unions in oil and gas, in coal mining and in other forms of mining, and in the power sector. We work in everything from coal mining to nuclear to renewables; in auto, transport, construction and heavy industry, for example; and in steel and cement.

The first observation is that not one of us likes to be told we're going to lose our job, but the second is that when people see good jobs on the table, they see that path forward for themselves. They see a plan; they see investments; they see that they and their families are going to be okay, and their views about just transition and about the energy transition change.

This is a process that works. It works in different countries and in different sectors, and we would love to see federal legislation in Canada that also reflects these principles.

Thank you very much.

● (1125)

The Chair: Thanks so much. Your timing is perfect.

We will now go to Judy Wilson from the Union of B.C. Indian Chiefs.

If you're ready, Ms. Wilson, we will go to you for your five minutes.

Chief Judy Wilson (Kukpi7, Union of British Columbia Indian Chiefs): Good morning. I'm Chief Judy Wilson, secretary-treasurer for the Union of B.C. Indian Chiefs, which is more or less half of the first nations in British Columbia. I'm chief of the Neskonlith Indian Band.

Canada's current economy is unjust, and not only because the reliance on oil and gas is fuelling the climate crisis and leaving behind a less safe and less sustainable world. The status quo approach to energy and natural resources in this country has completely ignored our rights as indigenous peoples and the long-term viability of the oil and gas industry.

The economic prosperity promised by the industry is, in most cases, stolen from indigenous peoples' territories without their free, prior and informed consent. After over 150 years of colonization and being confined to tiny remnants of our traditional territories, in most cases we do not have the restitution that we have the right to for the lands, territories and resources that have been taken and damaged without our free, prior and informed consent.

The Government of Canada passed legislation to implement the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Any just transition of the Canadian economy must have the rights outlined in the declaration as a pillar and include the full participation of title and rights holders to avoid replicating the inequities that we currently live with.

In terms of indigenous rights, what is Canada transitioning to? Is it a similar extractive economy, in which indigenous peoples' rights are ignored and ecosystems are destroyed for clean energy rather than oil and gas? In a country whose wealth has been gathered from natural resources stolen from indigenous lands, transitioning to an equitable, safe and sustainable economy represents a deeper level of change than the need for new jobs that don't directly contribute to the climate crisis.

These are tensions that won't be resolved by limiting the just transition discussion to skills training for oil and gas workers. Our rights as indigenous peoples to control the resources and economic activities in our territories have been continually violated, and change at the scale that the committee is discussing needs to be made with the free, prior and informed consent of rights holders.

The implications for this energy transition are wide-reaching and absolutely require a holistic approach. This does not just affect workers in the energy sector; most communities in the country have been forced to be reliant on oil and gas in some way because that's really been the only option supported by generations of successive governments.

Canada has long been a friend to the owners of the oil and gas and continues to embed the wanton use of fossil fuels into public infrastructure and the economy, even in the decades since the UN convened the Framework Convention on Climate Change and clearly identified fossil fuels as the main driver of climate change.

The myth that fossil fuels are a cheap source of energy is coming undone. We are witnessing the costs in our communities and on our lands as climate-driven disasters escalate in their frequency and scale. We desperately need significant investments in radically different ways of living and structuring our society.

For Canada to make good on its climate change commitments and commitments to implement the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, our communities must be involved and adequately resourced to contribute to the transformational struggle.

Those are my remarks. Thank you for the opportunity to present.

• (1130)

The Chair: Great. Thank you so much for your opening comments.

We'll turn to the Carpenters' District Council of Ontario.

Mr. Yorke, I believe you're going to take the five-minute opening statement. The floor is yours.

Mr. Mike Yorke (Director, Public Affairs and Innovation, Carpenters' District Council of Ontario): Thank you very much, Chair.

As noted, my name is Mike Yorke, director of public affairs and innovation. With me is Finn Johnson, director of communications.

First of all, thank you very much to the chair and the committee for the opportunity to appear here. I wanted to say that we could have done it virtually as well, but it was obligated on two members of the carpenters' union to appear in this beautiful room in the magnificently restored and revitalized West Block. We're very proud to be here today, in fact, in the rooms that our members had worked on.

I'll give a quick introduction, and then we'll get into what we think is key to a sustainable workforce and green building.

We're a council of trade unions throughout the province of Ontario, and we represent over 30,000 working men and women in all sectors of the economy, in the construction industry and in manufacturing.

Admittedly, there are other provinces, such as Alberta, that are more involved in Canada's just transition and the extraction of the oil and gas, and other unions may have a more direct interest in our energy transformation. That being said, Ontario will still have a huge role in transforming Canadian energy policy, as we're one of the largest consumers of energy in Canada.

In order to achieve a fair and equitable Canadian energy transformation, we believe there is a two-pronged approach: first, rethinking how we produce our energy, and second, addressing the amount of energy we consume and the way in which we do so.

From there, we move on to our sustainable workforce and green building.

On the second point, net-zero targets have to involve Ontario and Canada changing how much energy we do consume. How are we going to make the changes in our construction industry to facilitate this? Individual construction projects involved will vary in scale and size from massive dams and other hydro projects to potentially small retrofitting in individual homes, so to speak.

Added together across the country, the total volume of work will be massive. Given the sheer volume of future work, it can't be assumed that we will have the skilled workforce necessary to do the work that needs to be done, and therefore we need a real plan, with government help and support, to make sure we have the workers we need. We need a well-trained, fairly paid cohort of young Canadians and new immigrants. It's no secret that we're facing a huge shortage in the skilled workforce. This is currently putting a strain on our industry, and it will only become more difficult over the next five years as we see, according to BuildForce Canada, up to 160,000 retirements across the country.

We also need a sustainable workforce. For example, in the city of Toronto where I live, there are many undocumented workers insulating homes for cash. We need to put an end to that underground economy, which impacts and hurts workers. The government's in a real position to make sure this will happen.

A sustainable workforce will have the technology and techniques to be able to build a more energy-efficient Ontario. Mass timber, for instance, involves using timber more prevalently in major construction projects, as opposed to other non-renewable building materials. Building with mass timber will not only support immediate areas where the infrastructure is being built, but also communities across Canada that harvest and manufacture timber products. With our abundance of resources and innovation, Canada has an opportunity to be a world leader in this technology, and we call that a symbiotic relationship between the urban centres and the resource-based communities and indigenous communities across our country. We can really be a leader in that, and that opportunity exists before us.

Federal funding needs to be targeted to achieve a fair and equitable Canadian energy transformation. We need requirements on sustainability and training for future infrastructure projects to ensure that we are supporting green building, in addition to the future generation of a Canadian skilled trades workforce.

I want the committee to be aware that we are an interested partner in that. I speak not just for carpenters. If I look at the industry, I see that the partnership and the potential collaboration is huge. Recently, one of our better-known architects in the country, Don Schmitt of Diamond Schmitt Architects, wrote an editorial pointing out that industry and architecture and construction cannot wait on regulators to make a green economy. Right there, that's a solid position from the industry recognizing that we can play a leadership role.

With the committee's work and the work of the government, we can be real collaborators in terms of the transformation to a green economy.

With that, thank you very much. We look forward to an opportunity for dialogue and questions.

• (1135)

The Chair: Thank you so much to each of our witnesses for their opening statements.

Now we're going to go into our first round of questions, and these are six minutes each. First up we have Mr. Bragdon.

Mr. Richard Bragdon: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

To the witnesses, thank you for your testimony today. We really appreciate your taking the time to share your valuable insights with us as a committee.

At this time, Mr. Chair, I would also like to move a motion. It does pertain to the nature of the business.

That motion is as follows:

That, before moving to finish the study "Creating a Fair and Equitable Canadian Energy Transformation" the committee invite as witnesses: the Government of Saskatchewan, the Government of Alberta, and the Government of New Brunswick.

I have also received, Mr. Chair, in relation to this, a letter from the Premier of New Brunswick—

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Mr. Chair, on a point of order, I have been flagging you to add me to the list. Can you confirm that I'm on the list after Mr. Bragdon has made his motion?

The Chair: Well, at this point we're into the rounds of questions.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No, we're not. He's moved a motion.

The Chair: I gave him the floor for his six minutes of questions and the clock is running. I've stopped the clock right now, and he has four minutes and 55 seconds left.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair. Maybe the clerk can advise you, but he's moved a motion, which means we're out of rounds of questions and into debate on the motion. That's why I'm seeking the speaking list.

A voice: Sorry, Chair—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Maybe the clerk can advise you on how the rules work.

The Chair: Okay. My apologies—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You've got me on the list to speak to the motion?

The Chair: I've stopped the clock. I'll have to see the speaking order—

A voice: [Inaudible—Editor]

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No, you weren't up before me.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Yes, I was.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: That's a lie and you know it, and you're better than that, Francesco.

The Chair: He was trying to get my....

Continue with your motion. Then—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Sorry. I have a point of order—

The Chair: I am going to rule that this is in order, because it does relate to this existing study. We'll hear the motion and we'll have the debate on it, and then we'll dispense with it.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I just wanted to raise a point of order here—

• (1140)

The Chair: Charlie, it's—

Mr. Charlie Angus: I just wanted to raise a point of order here. We have worked hard to try to get this study finished when the Conservatives wanted it finished and didn't want it to continue—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: That's not a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: —but as soon as we have the B.C. chiefs talking about indigenous rights, we see these efforts to obstruct—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: That's not a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Charlie, I need to stop you. No, Charlie, you're out of order—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Put it on the record that this is why you're doing it.

The Chair: Charlie, you need to mute your mike.

I have a motion that's under way right now. We're going to hear the motion. It is within the scope of the study, so we'll hear the motion and then dispense with it.

Mr. Bragdon, the floor is yours.

Mr. Richard Bragdon: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

In reference to this motion, Premier Higgs, the Premier of New Brunswick, submitted a letter to me as of last night, saying:

Members of The Standing Committee on Natural Resources (RNNR),

I want to express my disappointment at not being called upon to participate as a witness in relation to your study on "Creating a Fair and Equitable Canadian Energy Transformation."

It is more evident than ever that the reality of energy security, both domestically and internationally, is in peril. We need national policies that allow for a transition to requirements that will reduce our emissions while ensuring reliable and affordable energy supplies.

This is of crucial importance to New Brunswick, the Atlantic Region, and Canada.

A variety of voices should be part of the conversation to ensure that all factors are considered as we move toward a net zero carbon energy source, while at the same time, identifying clearly the shortfall to meet current and forecast energy supply demands.

Sincerely,

Blaine Higgs

Premier of New Brunswick

We have first ministers, and we also have letters here from the Government of Saskatchewan and the Government of Alberta that I can read as well. I don't mind. I'll just continue to read what they're saying as to the importance of hearing their perspectives on this very important study. I find it somewhat shocking that those governments have not been invited to this committee to give testimony on such an important study for the future pathway of energy transformation in this country.

Then when you look at the proportionality of witnesses, we see that my honourable colleague from the NDP and others have had the same number of witnesses called before the committee as we have as His Majesty's official opposition. That breaks the convention of committees and of Parliament. I think that at the least, the committee could consider inviting these important witnesses.

The broad strokes of responsibility for implementing and carrying out this just transition and this transformation of our energy sector is going to be borne by our provinces; therefore, given the fact that first ministers who want to appear before this committee have not yet been invited and have not had the ability to get in front of this committee to share their perspectives, Mr. Chair, I think it behooves us as a committee to act upon this and take them up on their willingness to appear before the committee and be heard. It's going to be very important information for us to have in taking a holistic, balanced approach as it relates to the full study that's being composed.

I think we've received a lot of input. When we go back to Confederation and how we were founded, we see that we obviously recognized there was a role for the federal government, but there were also distinct roles for provincial governments. We have to respect those jurisdictions. A lot of the implications of this study and what we're researching fall upon, and become the burden of, our provincial governments.

They want to speak into this matter. They want to have their voices heard. I think we as a committee can at least do our best to make sure that this desire is facilitated and make sure that those voices are brought to the table.

I will read from the Government of Saskatchewan. It is addressed to the committee and the chair, and it says:

I am writing in response to the Government of Canada's study on the "Just Transition." As global events have notably caused energy crises in European countries, it is incumbent that all Canadian governments focus our efforts on advancing the conversation around energy security instead of an approach that seeks to phase-out our oil and gas industry and move to arbitrary electricity emissions targets that do not take into account the reality in individual jurisdictions. This misguided federal focus on prematurely shutting down critical industries in Canada — some of the most sustainable in the world — would have significant and severe consequences for Saskatchewan workers and families and miss a critical opportunity to support our international allies.

Our government remains deeply concerned by the Government of Canada's approach to a Just Transition for coal workers and communities. The unilateral approach to phase-out a sector of the economy without a plan to transition displaced workers to comparable jobs within their communities has left workers, many of whom are unionized employees in Estevan, Coronach and surrounding areas, understandably concerned about their futures and livelihoods.

It is our government's every intention to grow our economy, to provide a better quality of life for our residents. Saskatchewan has a unique opportunity to provide the world with sustainably and ethically produced critical minerals, food, fertilizers and fuel that the world needs for energy security, food security and climate security.

• (1145)

Mr. Charlie Angus: Chair, I have a point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Bragdon, if I could pause you just for one second, I have a point of order being called.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I don't mind. He can talk all night if he wants.

My question, out of respect for our witnesses and the intense disrespect they're being shown, is whether or not the Conservatives plan to talk all night and—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: That's not a point of order, Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus:—whether or not we can ask the witnesses to be excused so they don't have to listen to this farce.

Mr. Richard Bragdon: Mr. Chair, the fact that the honourable member would refer to the concerns of provinces and first ministers of this country as a farce is beyond—

The Chair: Mr. Bragdon—

Mr. Richard Bragdon: It's not appropriate. This committee—

The Chair: I'll ask you to continue with your statement.

For clarification to your point, I want to let you know that of the ministers, Minister Savage was actually invited when we made the original invitations and was unable to attend.

I'll let you finish with your—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Maybe he stole the invitation out of her box.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Seriously, that's not okay.

The Chair: We're degenerating to a point—

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: You're better than that.

The Chair:—that's not really healthy for the standards at which I expect the committee to operate.

Mr. Bragdon, I respectfully ask you to continue, but to conclude as quickly as you can, because we have witnesses. I'd like to hear their testimony.

Mr. Richard Bragdon: Climate security and energy security go hand in hand.

In a world where nations want products sourced from stable, democratic regions you will find no other jurisdiction better positioned to deliver results. Saskatchewan's oil and gas industry directly and indirectly employs over 30,000 people, and through our Growth Plan, we will continue to support these important segments of our economy.

It was unfortunate that, despite having vast supplies of energy and energy potential, we did not further assist our European allies, namely Germany, when Chancellor Olaf Scholz requested assistance with receiving natural gas in the face of Russian aggression and threats of limited energy supplies for this coming winter. Canada and Saskatchewan have the enormous potential to be part of the solution when it comes to supporting continental and global energy security for our partners with sustainably sourced resources.

Now more than ever, it is important for nations to consider where one gets their energy products. As the Saskatchewan Industrial and Mining Suppliers Association once asked, "you care about where your coffee is sourced from—why not your oil?" I would argue that the best place to buy one's energy from is Saskatchewan. If all oil-producing countries in the world adopted environmental regulations similar to Saskatchewan's, greenhouse gas emissions from oil production would be cut by 25%. Given factors like this it makes sense that the last barrel of oil ever used should come from Saskatchewan.

We recognize the need to reduce emissions and our province has undertaken many measures to further improve our emissions intensity. For instance, SaskPower has committed to achieving net-zero by 2050, is developing small modular nuclear reactor technology for clean energy generation and is reducing

emissions by 50 percent from 2005 levels by developing renewable power. Our province also continues to pioneer carbon capture utilization and storage technology, which in Saskatchewan, produces 82 percent fewer emissions compared to conventional oil production. However, the federal government, the NDP-Liberal Coalition government, and the committee need to recognize that phasing-out energy, mining and agriculture sectors will only shift activity to jurisdictions with lower environmental standards and lead to higher emissions globally.

Recently, I had the privilege of attending the Lloydminster Heavy Oil Show. At the trade show, many exhibits showcased the emerging technological and practical innovations the energy sector is using to curb hazards, spills and emissions. The show was a great example of how our western Canadian oil companies and service workers continuously strive to be the most sustainable energy producers in the world.

CAPP noted that many Canada's clean technology solutions will continue to come from the oil and gas sector, as they have heavily invested in research and development. It is vitally important therefore that the federal government recognize, acknowledge and support the oil and gas industry in these efforts.

Any form of "Just Transition" should be about ensuring energy security and supporting our existing wealth generating growth sectors. As industry adopts new technologies, it is unrealistic to believe that all displaced workers can be retrained to work in green jobs. It is important that the federal government offer adequate supports for any displaced workers and to hear their perspectives.

I would invite the House of Commons Natural Resources Committee to travel to and visit Saskatchewan and hear from our community members in Lloydminster and other oil producing regions about their thoughts on the federal government's push for a "Just Transition." I would also urge the committee to invite the Government and Province of Saskatchewan to present as a witness and testify before the committee.

As the policy of a just transition would have disproportionate impact on our province, it is critically important that Saskatchewan's unique perspective be heard and receive due consideration.

Sincerely,

Jim Reiter

Minister of Energy and Resources

I also have here, Mr. Chair, a letter from the Government of Alberta.

• (1150)

The Chair: Mr. Bragdon, I'm happy to have it shared. I'm sure that they have many great things to say as well, and perhaps instead of reading it into the record, we could offer it as a very similar appeal to appear before the committee. That could be part of the motion that's before the committee.

I'd invite you to perhaps conclude your comments so we can get back to the discussion of this motion by others on my speaking list—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Chair—

The Chair:—and then we could get back to our witnesses.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Chair—

Mr. Richard Bragdon: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Is this a point of order, Charlie?

Mr. Charlie Angus: Yes. Can we vote to adjourn debate on this motion?

A voice: You can't move a motion unless you have the floor. Is he permitted?

The Chair: He has the floor right now.

I have a speakers list. If you want to get on the—

Mr. Charlie Angus: As I said, I'm just concerned that we are showing such incredible disrespect to witnesses, taking their time—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You're showing a bit of respect by ignoring the rules and just talking any time you think you can.

Mr. Charlie Angus: —to come here to watch this circus.

The Chair: I'm back to Mr. Bragdon to conclude his—

Mr. Charlie Angus: I have to do the Michelle Rempel look.

Mr. Richard Bragdon: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I will continue.

I believe this is so important that we need to hear it. I think this further substantiates the point we've been making in this motion, which is that the first ministers and the provinces want to have input into this vital and important study that the government has undertaken, that this Parliament has undertaken, and right now, obviously, they feel their voices have not been heard yet and have not been brought to the table.

When provinces within our Confederation are not being welcomed to this committee or are not able to present their viewpoints, their concerns, their thoughts, their suggestions on a subject of such absolute importance as we move towards the future, I think it really is troubling for us as members. We have a responsibility to make sure the voices from our region and around the country are heard, including the provinces. When first ministers are reaching out to us and ministers responsible for various areas want to make sure their voices are heard before this committee, we have a responsibility as committee members, I would think, to want to hear their voices, as we have from other great witnesses all throughout this time. I think we want to make sure that these voices are included.

The minister goes on in his address to the ministers responsible, as well as to the committee:

Dear Ministers:

Below is the Government of Alberta's response to the Federal People-Centred Just Transition Initiative.

Alberta's energy sector is a key source of revenue and employment for Canadians, underpinning the quality of life enjoyed by citizens across the country. As skyrocketing energy costs and other recent global energy challenges have shown, there is a growing demand for energy that is developed responsibly and that is affordable. It should come from us. Alberta and Canada are among the most responsible energy producers in the world. However, federal overreach into Alberta's jurisdiction over its energy and natural resources jeopardizes the province's ability to drive prosperity through a robust oil and gas sector while balancing the need to reduce emissions.

In the name of centralized planning, the federal Just Transition initiative for oil and gas workers threatens to undermine the economic future and livelihoods of Albertans and Canadians by prematurely signalling the end of Alberta's oil and gas sector. It implies that Canada is moving away from oil and gas, and essentially Canadian workers. However, all credible forecasts show oil and gas will continue to be integral to the global energy mix.

The Just Transition initiative erodes investor confidence in the sector, discouraging the investments needed to provide the energy the world needs at a time when energy affordability can no longer be taken for granted. The result is counterproductive to Canada's climate and social goals. If energy production does not come from Alberta, it will come from jurisdictions with much lower environmental human rights standards, at no net-zero emission benefit to the world and at no

benefit to Canada's jobs and economy. To be clear, no change in our supply of oil and gas will affect the world's demand for energy.

The federal government's poor track record on its previous transition initiatives for coal workers and fishery workers is cause for serious concern given that many federal promises were made with no coherent follow through or fundamental understanding of the economics, with those workers left unemployed and their communities left behind.

Alberta urges the federal government to listen to the concerns raised by industry and provinces and end the Just Transition initiative. Federal efforts would be better spent continuing to work with Alberta to develop and deploy clean technology, such as Carbon Capture, Utilization, and Storage (CCUS), and enhance provinces' capacity to target emissions directly. Creating an attractive and stable investment environment that encourages industry—

• (1155)

Mr. Charlie Angus: Sorry, I'm not opposing this. I didn't hear that correctly. On a point of order—

The Chair: I have a point of order. I'm just going to pause you briefly.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Did he say that the Government of Alberta says they want us to end the just transition? If you could just put that on the record, it would be very helpful. Thank you.

The Chair: I'm sorry. This is getting into debate, so we'll move on.

We'll move on with Mr. Bragdon's intervention.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's just a prediction, Charlie, that turned out to be right.

Mr. Richard Bragdon: The letter continues:

The oil and gas industry recognizes the need to reduce emissions and several companies have already adopted net-zero commitments — with the right federal supports, they will drive the creation of future positions in clean tech and ensure workers have the skills they need.

We have outlined our key concerns with the Just Transition initiative below. We have also proposed a partnership that underscores our shared commitment to addressing climate change while providing affordable and reliable energy to Canada and the world.

Here are Alberta's concerns.

1. The Just Transition initiative is out of touch from economic realities, as Canada's oil and gas sector is seeing and responding to real, robust demand for its energy. It is basic supply and demand.

2. Skyrocketing energy prices are a serious challenge for Canadians and people around the world. Limiting Canadian oil and gas at this crucial time will make essential fuel and utilities even more unaffordable.

3. The federal government is prematurely signalling the end of a vibrant oil and gas industry that is a key source of revenue, employment, and prosperity for Canada at a time when the world clearly needs more democratic and reliable Canadian energy, not less.

4. The Just Transition initiative undermines investor confidence in the sector, undercutting our industry's ability to meet increasing demand to the benefit of energy producers with much lower environmental, labour, and human rights standards.

5. Undermining the oil and gas industry will actually harm Canada's ability to meet ambitious climate change targets, given the industry is the key funder and developer of the technologies that will be required to transition to a low-carbon economy. Without the oil and gas sector, Canada will not be able to deliver this transition.

6. Oil and gas companies representing the majority of production in Canada have already adopted net-zero commitments and the jobs of tomorrow will be created as companies adapt to new technology and fuel sources like hydrogen. It is impossible for the federal government to transition workers to jobs that do not exist or that the private sector will not support.

7. The Just Transition initiative discourages Canadians away from high paying jobs in the oil and gas sector, where companies are experiencing labour shortages and hiring demand continues to grow. Alberta has already heard from industry that the announcement is harming their ability to attract, hire, and retain workers.

• (1200)

The Chair: I'm sorry, Mr. Bragdon. Can I interrupt you? I just noticed Mr. McLean has had his hand up, and I don't know if he has a point of order or if that's a residual hand.

Mr. Greg McLean: Mr. Chair, I'm waiting to be on the speakers list when my colleague has completed his intervention.

The Chair: Okay, I'll add you. I have the list, and you're included on it now.

Mr. Richard Bragdon: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Next is "Implications for the Economy and Energy Security"—

Mr. Greg McLean: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair, but I've had my hand up for a considerable amount of time. Am I just getting added to the list now?

The Chair: Yes, you're on the list, and....

Mr. Greg McLean: Am I just being added to the list now? I had my hand up for at least 15 minutes.

The Chair: At the same time, Mr. Genuis and Mr. Sorbara had their hands up in the room. Yours went up, I noticed, after that, so you're after Mr. Sorbara.

Mr. Greg McLean: Can you check the timing of when my hand went up on the screen? I'm sure you can do it electronically. Can you just take a quick look?

The Chair: We'll look.

I'm going to give the floor back to Mr. Bragdon. I'll work with the clerk, but I will be making a ruling on the speaking order, and that's what we'll be going with. That can be challenged, but you are on the list, and we will confirm the order to the best of our ability. I will be announcing the order when Mr. Bragdon is done, and then we'll move forward from there.

Mr. Bragdon, can you please continue?

Mr. Richard Bragdon: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We were at "Implications for the Economy and Energy Security":

Signalling a transition away from oil and gas without any affordable and reliable alternatives for transportation or heating homes is impractical, with significant economic ramifications for the entire country. The federal Just Transition initiative is taking place as oil, gas and electricity prices have jumped to record highs not seen in years, while Canadians are struggling with spiking inflation. This en-

ergy crunch is squeezing households and companies alike, posing risks to livelihoods. The increase in natural gas prices has also prompted jurisdictions in the United States, Europe and Asia to switch from natural gas electricity generation to coal, driving up global emissions, particularly as European countries reduce their reliance on Russian energy.

Recent geopolitical events have highlighted long-term global and North American energy security issues, as well as Canada's unique position as a democratic and reliable global energy player with high environmental standards. Alberta oil and gas can reduce Canadian, American and European dependence on imported crude oil and natural gas from countries with low environmental standards or dictatorial regimes committing human rights abuses. However, unless the federal government addresses the constraints and hurdles that impede market access, Alberta will be unable to fulfill its potential to contribute to global energy security. The federal government can play a strong role in supporting energy infrastructure within Canada and advocate for Alberta energy as the responsible solution to energy needs worldwide.

The current energy crunch may be the first of many on the way to a lower-carbon economy. Recent price increases have played out against the backdrop of a multi-year global decline in investments in hydrocarbon production. Declining investment has made global supply more vulnerable to the kinds of exceptional circumstances we are seeing today. As the world moves to lower carbon economies, prematurely choking off investment in hydrocarbons could pave the way for future price shocks.

The Just Transition initiative is counterproductive to Canada's domestic and international policy objectives. To investors and stakeholders, it signals a declining oil and gas industry and an uncertain investment environment. To allies, it indicates that Canada may no longer be the reliable supplier they know and trust. They may have to source oil and gas from sanctioned suppliers or state actors with lower environmental standards.

Furthermore, the initiative fuels speculation that the federal government is actively trying to phase out oil and gas in the same way as it announced a coal phase-out in electricity generation in 2018.

There are no current alternatives that can sufficiently bridge the gap. A reduced role for Canada in oil and gas development would result in a larger role for oil and gas producers in unstable regions or with despotic regimes. Not only does this further heighten the risk of future energy crises, but it also moves Canadian jobs and capital offshore.

To help achieve climate ambitions and emission reductions, the federal government needs to remove regulatory bottlenecks, approve new energy corridors, and support this critical industry while it simultaneously works to reduce emissions.

Next is "Canada's Prosperity is tied to the Vitality of Alberta's Oil and Gas Sector".

The oil and gas sector's significant economic contributions underpin the quality of life and services all Canadians have enjoyed for decades. Canada exported nearly \$126 billion worth of energy products to the rest of the world, representing more than 20 per cent of the value of all goods exported from Canada in 2019. In other years, such as 2008 and 2014, this reached over 27 per cent, indicative of the vital role that energy production and exports play in Canada's economy in this post-pandemic recovery.

Oil and gas sector salaries are higher than the Canadian average, which translates to strong business and community support across the country. In 2019, the sector directly employed more than 282,000 Canadians and indirectly supported over 550,500 jobs, with 138,372 of them located in Alberta. Signalling a move away from this type of employment, without equivalent replacement positions, threatens the national economy, and the livelihoods of hundreds of thousands of workers across the country at a time when good jobs are needed the most.

- (1205)

The energy sources and associated energy jobs of the future will be in new fuel opportunities such as hydrogen. Canada risks missing out on being a leader in these opportunities if the federal government prematurely shuts down the oil and gas sector. Opportunities in emerging sectors are not only dependent on our resources, expertise and technology, but also on the revenue from Alberta's oil and gas sector. Revenue generated by this sector has enabled economic diversification in Alberta, spurring technological innovation and investment attraction across many sectors. A strong oil and gas industry supports the development of technologies and human capital that leverages the growth and development of alternative energy and emerging non-energy sectors. Oil and gas development has been essential for driving activity in a number of other industries, including construction and manufacturing, which benefits communities across Alberta and Canada.

The energy sector is also a significant source of government revenues. Government revenues collected from the oil and gas industry averaged \$14 billion over the last five years, including \$11 billion from upstream oil and gas extraction and its supported activities. In 2018 government revenues from the energy sector reached \$17.9 billion. In addition, the energy sector's share of total taxes paid by all industries averaged 7.4 per cent between 2014 and 2018, and brought in over 10 per cent of all operating revenues earned by governments in Canada. These revenues fund important federal and provincial priorities, including the development of clean technologies, fuels, and projects that are critical to Canada's emissions reduction.

Finally, capital expenditures in Canada's energy sector stood at \$72 billion in 2019, accounting for more than a quarter of total business sector investment. Oil and gas extraction was the largest contributor at \$33.9 billion, followed by electric power generation and transmission at \$22.2 billion. The stock of foreign direct investment (FDI) in mining, oil and gas extraction sector stood at nearly \$198 billion in 2019, making up close to 20 per cent of Canada's total stock of FDI. Investment attraction in the oil and gas sector will continue to be crucial as Canada moves forward with economic recovery. Improving investor confidence in Canada as an attractive place to do business with a solid and predictable regulatory regime will be critical for the country's future prosperity.

Alberta is focused on continuing to build an attractive investment environment. On this front, the federal government should prioritize working with Alberta rather than launching initiatives that undermine investor confidence and drive investment from the country to our competitors.

Next is "Canada's oil and gas industry funds and supports clean tech: an essential in the fight against climate change".

In forecasts of future world energy consumption, oil and gas will continue to dominate the supply mix for decades, even in lower-carbon futures. According to the International Energy Agency's "2021 World Energy Outlook", oil and natural gas is projected to account for more than half of the world energy supply through 2050. The International Energy Agency's Sustainable Development Scenario — which aligns with the Paris Agreement — predicts global demand at 66 million barrels/day in 2040 (compared to 98 million barrels/day in 2019). In this scenario, approximately US\$6.9 trillion would be needed to offset declines from existing oil and gas fields worldwide to 2030, and an additional US\$4.6 trillion would be required to 2040.

Further, the current geo-political realities should highlight that the need for energy should be responded to by democratic energy suppliers who seek to achieve responsible climate action. The alternative is to seek to be beholden to autocrats and non-democratic providers of energy. Proceeding with the just transition would be tone deaf at best and underline Canada's fall from a responsible, reliable world participant at worst.

- (1210)

Against the backdrop of strong global demand for oil and gas, Canada is well-positioned to meet demand as one of the most credible and responsible global suppliers of energy products. Alberta continues to develop its resources under stringent environmental standards while continually reducing emissions per barrel. In fact, Alberta was the first jurisdiction in North America to place a price on carbon for all large emitters across all sectors, and the first regional government in North America to commit to a methane emissions reduction target for the oil and gas sector.

The province has also invested billions in technologies that reduce emissions, such as CCUS. In addition to carbon emissions, the province has made tremendous progress on other issues, from water reduction policies to Indigenous par-

ticipation in resource development. Alberta will continue to build on its progress by further expanding environmental, social and governance (ESG) policies, identifying areas of performance and potential investment.

Based on third-party assessments, Canada tops global ESG scores across the full spectrum of factors, from environmental policy to social progress/welfare, political stability, regulatory oversight, and corporate governance. In 2018, the oil and gas extraction industry in Canada spent \$3.6 billion on environmental protection. This exceeded all other industries by a significant margin and represented 37 per cent of total environmental protection spending by businesses in Canada. The largest portion of industry investment went toward wastewater management, followed by protection and remediation of soil and water, and air pollution management. Given that most oil and gas extraction businesses are in Alberta, the province contributed the largest share of national spending at 39 per cent.

Canada's oil and gas industry is committed to being part of the solution on emissions reductions. For example, the Oil Sands Pathways to Net-Zero Alliance — which accounts for 95 per cent of oil sands production in Canada — has committed to net-zero by 2050. Canada's oil and natural gas companies are also spending more on clean technology than all other industries in Canada combined, accounting for 75 per cent of clean tech spending in Canada. The industry is achieving real results: Alberta's oil sands producers have reduced emissions per barrel by 36 per cent since 2000 (22% over the past decade), and leading producers are on track for another 16-to-23 per cent reduction over the next 10 years.

Producers in the oil and gas sector are the key funders of the clean technology that will be essential for meeting emissions reductions goals in Canada. There will be no clean tech to enable the transition without investments from a healthy oil and gas industry, as governments simply cannot fund the transition alone. Resource-rich provinces are diversifying into new, low-carbon energy opportunities — such as hydrogen, geothermal and small modular reactors — thanks to the strength and innovation of Canada's oil and gas sector. The resources and skills of the industry play a vital role in helping to tackle emissions from some of the hardest-to-abate sectors, including the development of CCUS, low-carbon hydrogen, and biofuels. Scaling up these technologies and bringing down their cost will require large-scale engineering and project management capabilities — qualities that are a good match to those of large oil and gas companies.

Furthermore, Canadian resources can play a key role in helping to reduce global emissions while meeting rising demand for energy in places like China and India. Canadian liquefied natural gas (LNG) is well-positioned to displace coal in the growing Asian market, thanks to an abundant resource base in Western Canada and shorter shipping routes compared to the Gulf Coast. The LNG Canada project on Canada's west coast, for example, is expected to provide enough energy to displace between 20 and 40 coal-fired power plants in Asia, reducing global greenhouse gas emissions by 60 to 90 million tonnes of carbon dioxide each year. Given the emergent need in Europe, more work could also be done to explore moving LNG via the Port of Churchill.

Ultimately, governments and industry must agree that the shared goal is to reduce emissions, not pick winners and losers. Alberta and other provinces are working with their industries to improve Canada's environmental performance. Alberta needs the federal government to work with provinces, not against them. This means helping Canada's oil and gas sector thrive in a lower-carbon future via supports for emissions reductions that align with federal climate ambitions (like CCUS and low-carbon hydrogen) or for alternate hydrocarbon uses (such as plastics or carbon fibres), instead of planning for the sector's demise at immense cost to the country. It is essential that the federal government works with Alberta to develop a coordinated messaging that demonstrates our shared commitment to emissions reductions, cleaner energy, and responsible energy development, and positions Canada as the optimal solution to global energy needs.

● (1215)

Next is "Conclusion".

Alberta is in an excellent position to be a global leader in a lower-carbon energy future by meeting global security needs for sustainable and stable energy, while sharing our technological innovations that will make real reductions in global greenhouse gas emissions. Alberta urges the federal government to end the Just Transition initiative for oil and gas workers and acknowledge the role that the sector plays in supporting the Canadian economy — and can play in providing responsible energy the world desperately needs. Instead, the federal government should focus on collaborating and funding efforts to reduce emissions and diversify the energy mix.

Strong economic recovery and growth start with the recognition of the need to stand up for the oil and gas sector given its ability to create jobs, generate revenues, and grow the economy. Accordingly, the focus should be on helping the sector thrive in a lower-carbon economy and working with Alberta to meet growing demand for affordable and responsibly produced energy, instead of planning for the sector's demise.

Canada has the opportunity to play a real leadership role in the global challenge before us — to end the power and the threats that despotic regimes hold over the world because global need for their energy supply. Canada must not continue to sideline itself on the world economic and energy stage when we have the resources to play a determining role in a safer world where all can access the energy they need.

Working together with Alberta, we propose that Canada take up the challenge of providing the world with sustainable, affordable, and secure energy.

Sincerely,

Sonya Savage

Minister

That was copied to several of you.

The Chair: Thank you for sharing that. It is unfortunate that Minister Savage wasn't able to accept our invitation.

Mr. Richard Bragdon: With regard to this, Mr. Chair, it's so important that the provinces and first ministers who desire to be heard are heard in a study such as this, which has such ramifications and potential.

The strength of our Confederation is the effective work between the federal and provincial governments. A committee of this nature is going to have some major ramifications. The outcomes of this study could find their way into various sources of legislation.

It could have massive ramifications for provincial governments that are going to bear a disproportionate weight of the responsibility of implementation. They need to be heard from; they should be heard from; and they should be welcomed here at this committee, whether they're from Alberta, Saskatchewan, New Brunswick or Newfoundland. We want to make sure that whatever their province may be, they have a voice at this table and they know that when this committee is doing its work, it's valuing their perspectives.

Yes, we need to hear from all sectors, and we have been hearing from them, but I think our provinces and especially our first ministers and those responsible for carrying out a lot of the implementation of whatever recommendations find their way into legislation have their voices heard at this committee.

It's of paramount importance that we consider this. I ask that you support this motion and make every effort to ensure that we are able to hear from the governments of those provinces, whether it be the premiers or ministers of natural resources, so that they are able to have a voice at this committee and so that those voices are given consideration when it comes to the findings of this study. It's absolutely important.

If we go back to our founding.... I'll quote our first prime minister, John A. Macdonald, who said:

It is our desire to do so. I hope that we will be enabled to work out a constitution that will have a strong central Government, able to offer a powerful resistance to any foe whatever, and at the same time will preserve for each Province its own identity — and will protect every local ambition; and if we cannot do this we shall not be able to carry out the object we have now in view.

Our first prime minister understood the absolute importance of making sure that there's adequate consideration for our provinces and their perspectives and the burden they're going to have to bear. When we have representatives from those provincial governments reaching out to us as members of this committee, saying, "We want our voices heard", I feel it is part of our responsibility to make sure that their voices get heard and that we bring their concerns forward—

● (1220)

Mr. Charlie Angus: I have a point of order.

Mr. Richard Bragdon: —and that we have this come to this table here.

The Chair: I recognize the point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: On a point of order, now that we've diverted to talking about the history of John A. Macdonald rather than our study, it is worth pointing out that the Conservatives are deliberately obstructing the voice of indigenous leadership from being able to speak.

The Chair: That's not a point of order.

I will invite Mr. Bragdon to perhaps continue with or even conclude his comments on his motion.

Mr. Richard Bragdon: What we have here, Mr. Chair, is that we are moving to make sure that voices are being heard at this table. We absolutely value the voices of our indigenous communities and indigenous leaders who spoke, but I would like to also submit that we have seen first-hand in this committee that when indigenous representation was made at this committee, some of their voices were disrespected by other members of this committee. That was totally inappropriate.

When we talk about having indigenous voices heard, we want to make sure that all indigenous voices are heard and respected, not just those that align with one particular ideology or perspective. All voices and perspectives of indigenous peoples are welcome at this committee and need to be heard and respected, but the voices of our first ministers also need to be heard and respected. The voices of our provinces and provincial governments need to be heard and respected. The weight of the decisions or the recommendations that get put into legislation as a result of the work of this committee is going to fall on them disproportionately. They have concerns. They want those concerns to be expressed. They want to be able to have their voices heard. I believe we as a committee have a responsibility to ensure that those voices are heard at this table.

Mr. Chair, I really appreciate the ability and the opportunity to bring this motion forward. I thank you for that. I appreciate your effort. I get along with you very well. I respect you as an individual. I just really feel like we're missing a major opportunity by not hearing from our provinces on a study of such consequence. We need to make sure that their voices are here at this table. It is key to national unity.

We're hearing from our people—every one of us here at this table is hearing from our constituents from across the country—that their cost of living is going up. They're seeing energy prices soar. They want to make sure their representatives on these committees are bringing those concerns forward. Those who are hearing that every day are also our provincial governments. They have people who are worried about their livelihoods and their future employment, or whether they'll have to move or relocate as a result of any kind of transition that comes into place. If we don't take into adequate consideration those perspectives, those fears, those sincere concerns, then we have not done our full job as a committee.

That's why I moved this motion here today. I ask my fellow committee members to give this due consideration and make sure that we have adequate representation from the first ministers and provinces that want to speak before this committee. I think all of us would want to hear from the provinces that want to make sure their voices are heard here, so I trust that we'll have good support for this motion going through.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (1225)

The Chair: Thank you so much, Mr. Bragdon, for a very thorough motion and explanation in support of it.

I want to go to the question Mr. McLean had with regard to the speaking order. As I had noted when Mr. Bragdon made his motion, both Mr. Genuis and Mr. Sorbara had their hands up. I was working with the clerk to try to figure out who was who.

The speaking order we have put in place, as it was tight, was Mr. Genuis, Mr. Sorbara, Mr. McLean and Mr. Angus.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Chair, I would like to challenge the chair on the speaking order list, please.

The Chair: Okay.

This would be a challenge that....

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: The challenge is that I had put my hand up before Mr. Genuis.

The Chair: You're suggesting you're first.

I put Mr. McLean—

Mr. Greg McLean: Chair, I think he's saying that I should go first. Is Francesco saying that I should go first?

The Chair: No, that's not what I'm—

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: No, Greg, I'm not saying that—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On a point of order, Mr. Chair, I think the rules prescribe that it is who catches the eye of the chair. Mr. Sorbara is not trying to make a challenge on the basis of rules; he's trying to make a challenge to something that the rules prescribe as being a matter of the eye of the chair. I don't think you can challenge that, Mr. Chair. I think it's—

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'm going to actually have to correct you on that, based on the very first meeting. Within the first five minutes of my taking this chair, the Conservatives and the NDP challenged me on my speaking order, my very first speaking order, and so I'm going to—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I'm challenging your ruling on that.

Mr. Charlie Angus: It certainly was the Conservatives who did challenge you on the chair. I remember that it was the Conservatives, and then I felt that I had to be fair—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I'm challenging your ruling.

The Chair: Could I have order? I have the microphone, and so I want everybody else to mute their microphones. I've just made a ruling that the challenge to the chair has been accepted—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On a point of order, Chair, I'm challenging that ruling. If I can challenge any ruling, I can challenge—

The Chair: We'll vote on this first and then—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No, no, no. You made a ruling about the challenge, and I'm challenging that ruling. Are you saying I can't challenge your ruling, but he can?

The Chair: I'm saying that we have this challenge first—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No, no, no. You made a ruling about the challenge, and I challenge your ruling about the challenge. Mine has to proceed.

The Chair: —and we have to do that first.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, you can't accept this challenge.

Mr. Chair, you're being a hack here. You're being a total hack. You can't accept his challenge—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Whoa, whoa. I ask for that mike to be shut off, because he's attacking the chair personally.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: This is ridiculous. You can't accept his challenge and not my challenge.

Can we get the clerk to weigh in, Mr. Chair? Can we get some advice from the clerk on this? Would you like to get some advice from the non-partisan clerk on this, Mr. Chair?

The Chair: I'm calling the vote.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You're not welcoming the advice from the clerk? You're not even going to let the clerk weigh in, Mr. Chair? Come on.

Mr. Greg McLean: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair, but we don't even know what the vote is.

The Chair: If people would cut their mikes and listen to the chair, you would know what the vote was. The vote was that you asked the chair about the new speaking order, and the new speaking order is Mr. Sorbara, Mr. Genuis—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I would like a roll call vote on that, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: The was vote under way and we have seven in favour. All opposed?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I would like a roll call.

The Chair: Nobody is opposed?

Mr. Charlie Angus: The vote has passed, Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I request a roll call vote and I requested a challenge to the chair. This is a complete abuse of process.

The Chair: Mr. Sorbara, the floor is yours.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I do have the floor, Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I requested a roll call vote. The rules prescribe I have the right to request a roll call vote—

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: I move to adjourn debate—

The Chair: We have a dilatory motion—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I requested the right to a roll call vote. I was saying it while it was going on. I request a roll call vote. Mr. Chair, you're completely ignoring the rules.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: I move we adjourn debate on the motion, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, you're completely ignoring the rules. I want to hear from the clerk on this. You're completely ignoring the rules. You can't just pretend the rules don't honour it. The rules establish that you can request a roll call vote. The rules establish that you can challenge the chair—

The Chair: We're going to take a five-minute break. I'm suspending right now while I consult for a moment with the clerk. I'm setting the clock for five minutes and I would suggest to everybody to go stretch your legs and I'll reconvene in five minutes.

Thank you very much.

• (1230)

(Pause)

• (1235)

The Chair: Our five-minute recess, or break, or whatever you want to call it, is up. I will ask everybody to take their seats.

When we left off, we had a challenge to the chair. A new speaking order was presented. It was voted on and it was passed, so that is concluded.

The floor has now gone to Mr. Sorbara, who made a motion, as things were deteriorating, to adjourn debate.

That's where we are in the order of business today. I'm going to—

Mr. Greg McLean: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: —call the question on adjourning debate.

Mr. McLean, I will hear your point of order.

Mr. Greg McLean: I'm participating virtually, which is part of this current Parliament, if you recall. The point of order is that I don't know what you were calling the vote on. As you can see, I didn't vote. It's sort of like, "What's the vote that's going on here right now? Is it the challenge to the challenge? Is it the challenge?"

We have no idea what you were voting on if we're participating on screen. It was complete mayhem. Mr. Chair, you've lost control of this meeting—

Mr. Charlie Angus: I have a point of order, Chair.

Mr. Greg McLean: That is part of what we need to get. Can we get back to the point where we're actually voting on something?

Mr. Charlie Angus: On a point of order—

Mr. Greg McLean: What we're voting on, I think—

Mr. Charlie Angus: The vote happened.

The Chair: The vote was taken. The fact that people were not muting their microphones and listening—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I would like to speak to the point of order as well.

Mr. Greg McLean: Mr. Chair, as I say, that was not a vote, because I was asking in the middle of the vote, "What's the vote on?" You were just rushing ahead as if nothing was going on in your head. You weren't paying attention to what was happening with the committee members. You have to respond to the room, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: I explained what the vote was. People were not listening.

Mr. Greg McLean: Oh, people were not listening.

The Chair: You need to take some responsibility for not listening when the chair is speaking. Everybody needs to take some responsibility. I explained multiple times what the vote was. It was the reordering of the speaking order.

We voted. It's done. Now we're into the next order of business, which is to adjourn debate.

Mr. Greg McLean: Well, I disagree. I'm participating online and—

The Chair: That's a dilatory motion, so I'm going to call the vote on it.

All in favour on adjourning debate?

Mr. Greg McLean: I ask for a—

The Chair: You're out of order, Mr. McLean.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I would like to speak to the same point of order, Mr. Chair—

Mr. Charlie Angus: He called the question to a vote. The chair just called to adjourn debate.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I would like to speak to the same point of order—

The Chair: The point right now—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order on the floor, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I beat you to it, Garnett.

The Chair: Please shut your microphones down, because I am calling the vote to adjourn debate.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You can't. I'm raising a point of order.

Mr. Greg McLean: What vote?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You can't just make things up, Mr. Chair. There are rules to committee, and I have a point of order raised.

The Chair: I will hear your point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Chair—

The Chair: What's your point of order, Mr. Genuis? Then we're going to have the vote.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you.

Mr. Chair, there is a process with respect to votes that has to be respected at every committee. That process is that when a vote is taken, the question is read by the chair, and the committee is asked to cast their votes. If a member requests a roll call vote, a roll call vote must be taken.

This is clearly established in the precedence of committees—

Mr. Charlie Angus: He asked for the roll call after the vote.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —and in the rules of this committee.

You did not read—

Mr. Charlie Angus: This is interference. Mr. Chair, you called the vote, the new vote—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, we can go sequentially on points of order or we can not go sequentially on points of order. I'm pretty comfortable with either—

Mr. Charlie Angus: You clearly don't want to do that because you keep interrupting.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis has the floor right now on his point of order.

The issue is that you called for the recorded vote after the vote was already under way. You can't do that. It needs to be done before the vote. The vote was already under way. The ruling is that we had a vote and it's been done. We now have a motion on the floor to adjourn debate. That's it.

Is there anything further on your point of order?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Yes, Mr. Chair.

There have been a number of violations of order by you, respectfully, in the last 10 minutes.

Number one, when it comes to a vote, you have to read the question in advance, which you did not do.

You have to then allow members the opportunity to request a roll call vote, which you did not do. I was trying to do that. As you'll note, I was talking continuously throughout that process.

Mr. Charlie Angus: So I noticed.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Mr. Angus. Mr. Angus noted it. I think other members did as well, because the rules were not being followed—

Mr. Charlie Angus: You are out of order. He called the question.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I welcome Mr. Angus' feedback after I am finished, or he can provide it concurrently, but it might be more useful for other members if he wasn't providing it concurrently.

● (1240)

Mr. Charlie Angus: This is filibustering.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Now, the other issue in terms of order, Mr. Chair, is that you ruled that a member can challenge the chair on anything. You subsequently ruled that I couldn't challenge the chair with respect to a ruling.

I don't understand why you think it's okay for a Liberal member to challenge the chair and then you rush through a vote without a roll call vote and without reading the question, and yet you think it is not okay for a Conservative member to challenge the chair. I know you were elected as a Liberal, but you come into the committee with an expectation of impartiality, an expectation that should be upheld.

Mr. Charlie Angus: On a point of order, Chair, these are personal attacks against the chair. He's called you a hack. He's saying that you're being partisan. This is ignorant behaviour.

You called the question. We should be moving on, and you need to shut him down.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, my encouragement to you would be to rule that a challenge to the chair is of equivalent value and impact whether that challenge to the chair comes from a member of the government or from a member of the opposition.

The Chair: To the question, Mr. Genuis, are you challenging the chair?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I wanted to initially, prior to the vote. I do again. I think—

The Chair: Okay, so if you're going to challenge the chair, please challenge the chair, and then we'll—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I will challenge both of your rulings separately.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I will challenge your ruling that the vote was taken, and I will challenge your ruling that a challenge can be taken on the speaking list.

I would request a roll call vote, to be very clear, on both of those challenges. I hope members will uphold the rules, but at least we'll have a chance to properly adjudicate this and find out on my first challenge and on my second challenge. Once we've at least adjudicated that, it will provide us with some basis for knowing what the next steps are.

The Chair: I will accept your two challenges.

We're going to go through the first one, which is, as I understand it, a challenge to the vote I had called on the new speaking order.

Is that what you're—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: The first challenge to the chair was about whether or not a member can challenge the speaking order. You ruled that they can. I don't think they can.

The Chair: We've already set that precedent in this committee. It's already—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: But I can still challenge the chair, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Chair, you ruled on this.

The Chair: You can challenge the chair. I ruled on it, but you can challenge. That's what we're voting on.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: That's the first challenge, yes.

The Chair: Okay.

Can you give us how you would like it worded?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You ruled that Mr. Sorbara can challenge the chair. You identified what the fair speaking order was. Mr. Sorbara challenged that. I do not believe he can challenge that, so I'm challenging your ruling that Mr. Sorbara can challenge the speaking order. That's the first challenge.

The Chair: Okay, what we're going to vote on is that the chair can rule on the speaking order. Is that correct?

Mr. Greg McLean: I thought it was that the chair can change the speaking order at the request of one of the Liberal members.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I guess another issue is that when—

The Chair: Let's get this one figured out first.

You're saying that the challenge is that the chair cannot rule on speaking order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Yes, Mr. Chair, formally, and this is another issue, because you didn't read the question properly previously. Formally, when there's a challenge to the chair, the question that has to be put to the committee is, "Shall the chair be sustained?" That was not the format in which you put the previous question. In the previous question, the answers were flipped around. Maybe the clerk can clarify that, but I think the question you should be putting to the committee is, "Shall the chair be sustained?" Then the committee will vote on whether the chair's ruling shall be sustained. That's the question.

The Chair: I'm just looking to the clerk if to see if the appropriate wording is that the chair shall be sustained.

We have to be clear on what we're talking about. The decision is on the updated speaking order. That's what we're—

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: No, Chair. The question is, "Shall the ruling of the chair be sustained?" That's the question we need to vote on.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Exactly. That's what I just said.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: It's not debatable. We just need to go to a vote.

The Chair: I'm just clarifying. If somebody asks what decision and what ruling, it's the ruling on the speaking order. That's what we're talking about.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Sorry; it's my challenge to your ruling that the speaking order can be challenged.

The Chair: Yes, okay.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You ruled that it can be challenged, and now we're voting on the question of whether your ruling in respect of allowing the challenge shall be sustained.

The Chair: Right.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: A vote "yea" means you agree with the chair; a vote "nay" means you agree with me, which is the opposite of the way you took the vote on the previous challenge, which is part of the problem, but we'll get to that.

The Chair: Okay. Shall the ruling of the chair be sustained? All in favour?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I asked for a roll call vote. Thank you.

The Chair: We'll have to turn to the clerk for the roll call vote.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: The decision of the chair on the speaking order is carried.

• (1245)

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: I do have the floor now, Chair—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

We've established as a result of that challenge that he has a right to challenge the chair. You said that a vote has taken place on that challenge, but I think clearly now maybe we recognize that the format of the vote was not proper, because the yeas in that case were considered as supporting the challenge and the nays were considered as opposing the challenge—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Come on, Mr. Chair—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —when in fact the proper format—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Can we all go for lunch rather than listen to this idiocy?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, respectfully, to the member of the NDP who thinks rules and conventions are idiocy—

Mr. Charlie Angus: The member is not respectful. He has insulted the chair. He's interfered. They shut down an indigenous chief from speaking. We had to listen to John A. Macdonald.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —I'm not entirely surprised to hear that from that member, but as a Conservative I think rules and conventions are important. They're what sustain our Parliament, and I hope the member would reflect on the value of following the rules.

Now, Mr. Chair, because the vote was taken incorrectly, I suggest we simply retake the vote, with the question stated as “Shall the ruling of the chair be sustained”, with respect to Mr. Sorbara's challenge, because the vote was not properly taken. The question was not read and the votes were inverted, and that led to confusion, understandable confusion, because you were interpreting the yeas as nays and the nays as yeas compared to what is normally the proper approach when it comes to challenges to the chair.

The Chair: I will take that, and we'll put it as a recorded vote to sustain the ruling of the chair on the new speaking order, which would therefore give Mr. Sorbara the first order of speaking.

That's what we will vote on now: that the ruling of the chair be sustained. We'll go to the clerk for a recorded division.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 12; nays 0)

The Chair: We have support for that motion, and so the decision is that Mr. Sorbara is—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Sorry, Mr. Chair. You had previously ruled that I spoke next. We just voted on Mr. Sorbara's challenge to the chair, and the committee voted that the ruling of the chair be sustained, which means I have the floor now.

Mr. Charlie Angus: No.

Come on, Chair, this is turning into a kindergarten circus.

The Chair: No, it is absolutely clear what the—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, the committee voted to sustain the chair.

Conservatives all voted in favour. The motion was to sustain the ruling of the chair.

The Chair: The floor is now Mr. Sorbara's for his motion.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Mr. Chair, I'm moving to adjourn debate on their motion.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair. The motion was to sustain the ruling of the chair.

The Chair: No, this is not a point of order. Mr. Sorbara, the floor is yours.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: The motion was to sustain the ruling of the chair. I'd like to hear from the clerk. Can we hear from the non-partisan clerk? It was a vote to sustain the ruling of the chair.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Sorbara has the floor.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Chair, can we get a roll call?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It was a vote to sustain the ruling of the chair.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: I'd like to move the motion to adjourn.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm challenging the ruling that he can move that motion.

The Chair: We have a motion—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I want roll call votes for everything, first of all, so if you're proceeding to a vote it should be a roll call.

• (1250)

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Let's go to a roll call right now.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On a point of order, you asked us for a vote on sustaining the ruling of the chair with respect to the speaking list and then you took the opposite side.

Mr. Charlie Angus: You can't debate on a vote that's been called, Chair.

The Chair: The vote's been called. We're done and we now have another vote to adjourn debate.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, we just had a very clear vote on a challenge to the chair—

Mr. Charlie Angus: The vote's been called. This is not a debate. It's not debatable.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: The committee voted to sustain the ruling of the chair. Your previous ruling had been that Mr. Sorbara—

The Chair: —was the next one to go.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Your previous ruling was that Mr. Sorbara was after me.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, we have a motion now—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Is that not what you had ruled?

The Chair: We have a motion now to adjourn. We're going to do the recorded vote on it.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, you inverted the meaning of the vote after it had taken place.

The Chair: No, you did.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No, it was to sustain the ruling of the chair.

The Chair: You tried to change the intention of that vote. Now we have a vote on the floor to adjourn debate.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, all four Conservatives voted in favour of that motion.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you for supporting it.

The Chair: That's very conciliatory of you, very conciliatory.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It was to sustain the ruling of the chair.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Clerk, can we move forward and read the names on the roll call, please?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Could we get the clerk to share what the vote was on?

Mr. Charlie Angus: The vote is called. Are we voting, yes or no?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You're not letting the clerk speak on the issue of what the vote was on.

Mr. Charlie Angus: You're not letting anyone speak, Garnett.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'd like to hear from the clerk—

Mr. Charlie Angus: I don't think—

It's in a vote. A vote's been called.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —the non-partisan official for this committee.

The Chair: This goes through the chair, and the chair is calling the vote on the motion to adjourn, and it's a recorded division, please.

An hon. member: Sorry; is it adjourn debate or adjourn the meeting?

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: It's to adjourn debate on the motion.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, this is quite unprecedented. We had a vote on a challenge to the chair. Your previous ruling was that I was supposed to speak next. There was a challenge to the chair. The committee voted to sustain your ruling, and then you gave the floor to Mr. Sorbara.

How does that make any sense? If the committee voted to sustain the ruling of the chair, then the ruling of the chair is sustained.

The Chair: That is why I clarified that the ruling of the chair was to give Mr. Sorbara the next speaking point.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: But it wasn't. You had previously ruled—

The Chair: I clarified that that's what it was.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: But you said earlier in the meeting—

The Chair: I clarified that's what it was. That's what we voted on.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Look, Mr. Chair, I want to come to an understanding here. You said previously—

The Chair: We're debating. You're debating—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You said previously—

The Chair: No, I'm done with this. I'm done with your intervention—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, you have to follow the rules here. You have to follow the rules.

The Chair: We have a motion right now to adjourn debate.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You said previously that I was supposed to speak. You said....

Look at the list. My name's higher up than his on the list. Then Mr. Sorbara challenged it. That's why we're into challenges on the chair. If you had ruled that he had the floor, there wouldn't have been a challenge, but then he challenged the chair; Then the committee voted—

The Chair: You're debating a decision that's already been made, and—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —to sustain the chair. You reversed the meaning of a vote after it took place, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: We have a motion to adjourn debate, and that is what we're on now.

Mr. Greg McLean: On a point of order, Mr. Chair, if it's confusing for you, it's confusing—

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: As a point of order, Mr. McLean, you're just providing debate. There's no point of order there.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You're not the chair, Francesco.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Mr. McLean. You're just debating. You're just debating; it's not a point of order.

Mr. Greg McLean: I'm not. I'm trying to get a point of order on where we were, because I voted to sustain—

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Mr. McLean, you're not providing a point of order; you're just debating.

The Chair: I need the clerk to read the names to vote to adjourn debate.

Mr. Greg McLean: No, I'm seeking clarification in this point of order.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Mr. McLean, you're debating. You're not providing a point of order.

Mr. Greg McLean: Mr. Sorbara, I am requesting clarification on—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Francesco wants to be the chair.

The Chair: I'm asking everybody to shut your mikes down. We have a vote that's happening. I have called it. The vote is to adjourn debate on the motion.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I want to hear from the clerk, Mr. Chair, on the vote that was taken previously and what the meaning of that vote was.

The Chair: You're completely out of line, Mr. Genuis. We have a vote that is under way.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I think the committee should be advised on what the previous vote was, because you changed the meaning of it afterwards. This is such an incredible abuse of privilege and process from a chair who is not being reasonable or fair.

Members need to know the meaning of a vote, and when the vote is that the ruling of the chair be sustained and when the previous ruling of the chair was very clearly that I should be next on the speaking list, and then you say, after all of the members vote to sustain the ruling of the chair and you reinterpret that to sustain your new ruling, which was different from your previous ruling, that's clearly pretty outrageous.

The Chair: No, what you're doing is outrageous, okay? I'm going to put that out there. We have had a number of decisions that you didn't like and that you continue to challenge, and now I'm saying we have a vote in front of us to adjourn debate—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, you don't have to like what I'm doing, but I am defended by the rules of this House. I have the rules of the House that I can stand on that protect the rights and privileges of all members, and those rules exist outside of the will of a chair to exercise arbitrary power. Those rules and privileges protect our rights as members and they protect the work we do.

Some of those rules include the process by which a vote takes place, the fact that the question should be clear and that the question should be known, and that members should be able to clearly vote on a question. We had a situation in which, presumably, one half of the room thought the question meant one thing, and one half of the room thought the question meant another thing. That is a problem in and of itself, but on the face of it, I think it is very clear as well—

• (1255)

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —that when you say you are ruling that a particular person can speak, and when that ruling is challenged but your ruling is sustained, it means that the person who you said could speak in the context of that ruling gets to speak.

On that basis, I should have the floor. You ruled that I had the floor—

The Chair: No, I did not.

I have a point of order from Ms. Dabrusin.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —that ruling was challenged, and then after that, another member challenged, so—

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I want to say that we were in the middle of a vote. There has been a request for it to be a roll call vote, and I would ask that we begin the roll call, please.

The Chair: I've asked the clerk to do that.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, we had a previous vote. You have to respect the rules of this House, and you are flagrantly disre-

garding the rules and flagrantly disregarding the privileges of members.

I would like to be able to show deference and respect for your office, but the least you can do is consult the clerk and allow the clerk to advise the committee with respect to the rules and how they apply in this case, which you haven't done either.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Chair, on a point of order—

The Chair: We have a hard stop at one o'clock today. We have been told that we cannot go beyond one o'clock, so we're not going to be able to resolve all matters.

You want us to go back, so I'm going to have to go back with the clerk. I will take that review with the clerk. We're not going to get it done in two minutes, as far as the speaking order goes.

Right now we have a motion to adjourn debate, and we need to dispense with that. I've asked the clerk to do a roll call on that. Then we're going to be out of time. We're going to be either suspending the meeting or ending the meeting.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: That motion's not on the floor, because I'm supposed to have the floor, though, Mr. Chair. This is the whole issue. The committee voted—

The Chair: No—

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: As a point of order, Garnett, you don't have the floor. There was a vote and a ruling made. You do not have the floor. I had the floor—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You can't just proceed with the vote on something else when that member didn't have the floor. The vote was to sustain the chair, and the chair had ruled that I had the floor—

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: This was to sustain the chair's prior decision that was already voted on—

The Chair: You're twisting words—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It was to sustain the chair's decision, and the chair's decision was that I have the floor.

I don't know why this is complicated. If the chair says that I have the floor, and then you challenge the chair and there's a vote on that challenge and the vote is to sustain the chair, then I have the floor again. It's very simple.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: We were voting on the vote we had to sustain that vote. It's your interpretation, your world, that is wrong.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I don't understand why you're confusing it around. These are the rules. I didn't make the rules. The rules are clearly established.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: You just like to interpret the rules the way you want them to be interpreted.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: When there's a motion to sustain the chair, the chair's ruling is sustained. That's how it works.

The Chair: We'll have one person talking at a time.

Mr. Genuis, I'm asking you to stop talking.

In consultation with the clerk, where we're at is we have a motion on the floor to adjourn debate. There are other questions and obviously some confusion about speaking order. I will go back, with the clerk, to the record. I think I was clear on what was being voted on. There has obviously been some lack of clarity or confusion based on, frankly, the chaos that people have created by not respecting my role as the chair when I ask people to mute their mikes and not doing so.

We're out of time. We're at one o'clock. The speaking order is, at this point, for today, irrelevant. We will go through to figure out what happened, and I'm happy to bring that back, but for the moment, we have the motion to adjourn debate and we'll do a recorded

vote on that. At that point, we are then out of time and we'll adjourn the meeting for today.

If everybody is clear with that, we'll get the clerk to call the vote on the motion to adjourn debate, and then we will be finishing today's meeting with apologies to the witnesses for not being able to get any further into the witness testimony today.

• (1300)

We will call the vote on the question to adjourn debate.

(Motion agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0)

The Chair: With that, we are now 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>