



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

---

# Standing Committee on Natural Resources

EVIDENCE

**NUMBER 079**

**PUBLIC PART ONLY - PARTIE PUBLIQUE SEULEMENT**

Wednesday, October 25, 2023

---

Chair: Mr. George Chahal





## Standing Committee on Natural Resources

Wednesday, October 25, 2023

• (1700)

[English]

**The Chair (Mr. George Chahal (Calgary Skyview, Lib.)):** I call this meeting to order.

Welcome to meeting number 79 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Natural Resources.

Today we meet to resume our study of Canada's clean energy plans in the context of the North American energy transformation. We will then proceed to sit in camera to discuss committee business.

Since today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format, I would like to make a few comments for the benefit of members and witnesses. Please wait until I recognize you by name before speaking. For those participating by video conference, click on the microphone icon to activate your mike, and please mute yourself when you are not speaking. For interpretation for those on Zoom, you have a choice, at the bottom of your screen, of floor, English or French. For those in the room, you can use the earpiece and select the desired channel. As a reminder, all comments should be addressed through the chair. Additionally, screenshots or taking photos of your screen is not permitted.

In accordance with our routine motion, I am informing the committee that all remote participants have completed their required connection tests in advance of the meeting.

I'll be using two cards: the 30-second warning in yellow and the "time's up" card in red.

I would now like to welcome the witnesses who are with us this afternoon.

From Carbon Connect International Inc., we have Al Duerr, partner and co-founder, and also Jackson Hegland, partner and co-founder, by video conference.

From Cégep de Jonquière, we have Martin Bourbonnais, from Centre TERRE, by video conference.

Thank you for taking the time to appear today. Each witness has up to five minutes for an opening statement.

We will now begin with Mr. Hegland.

Welcome to the committee. The floor is yours.

**Mr. Jackson Hegland (Partner and Co-Founder, Carbon Connect International Inc.):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[Translation]

Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.

[English]

Thank you for this opportunity. Today we'd like to focus on investment into our economy and enabling action now.

Canada's clean energy plan needs to ensure the following—no carbon leakage, no financial leakage, no jobs leakage. As it stands, the IRA threatens each of these.

To protect our economy, our jobs and our leadership position on climate action, we need certainty and stability in our regulatory system and financing mechanisms that ensure that both public and private sector capital are accessible and efficiently allocated. Our clean energy plan should encompass the tools that create an imminent need for other jurisdictions to meet our performance standards, given our history with economy-wide carbon pricing, active carbon markets across the country and multiple successful incentive programs. However, we need to streamline these financing mechanisms to incent further action.

It is clear that we need to do more, because the scale and scope of our investments are not sufficient to keep pace with the IRA. Canada's clean energy plan can create domestic jobs by greening our value chain through distributed technologies and by providing large infrastructure projects with the certainty they require to operate over the long term.

Subsequently, we need to be proud of our products like liquefied natural gas and our homegrown technologies like methane mitigation from oil and gas, as each contributes to a cleaner global energy economy. There's no doubt that we are seeing significant innovations, large and small, in Canada: in transportation, such as hydrogen, electrification; in agriculture, such as methane reduction through cattle feed additives; in the built environment, with heat pumps; in oil and gas, with methane emission reduction technologies; and in partnerships with indigenous nations.

We're seeing this permeate now into other growth sectors like lithium, CCUS, biofuels and geothermal. And let's not forget about the unicorn success story in direct air capture with the recent acquisition of Carbon Engineering, out of British Columbia, by U.S.-based Oxy Petroleum, a clear signal that the IRA is driving massive investment into clean energy solutions.

We need a suite of new financial incentives that efficiently deploy capital to our high-emitting sectors, and we must not halt programs or initiatives like our functioning offset system, which generates substantial emissions reductions. We have the data to prove it.

Please welcome my business partner, Mr. Al Duerr, to provide further comments.

**Mr. Al Duerr (Partner and Co-Founder, Carbon Connect International Inc.):** Thank you, Jackson.

I will focus on one example of how Alberta's leadership in carbon pricing and offsets has created a vehicle for substantial private sector financing for, and investment in, emissions reduction technology innovation and implementation.

Fifteen years ago, Alberta established the first functioning carbon markets in North America. Since their inception, the challenge has been to strike a balance between regulatory oversight and flexibility, ensuring stability to incent technology innovation and attract financing for implementation.

To illustrate, in areas where line power is not available in the industry, the oil and gas industry has deployed natural gas-powered pneumatic controllers and injection pumps, resulting in one of the largest vent gas contributors to methane emissions. In Alberta, offset protocols were developed to reduce or eliminate these emissions.

Annual offsets created by pneumatic pump conversions went from almost zero in 2017 to over two million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> in 2021. In 2021 alone, pneumatic replacements delivered twice the annual carbon emissions reductions achieved in a major Canadian carbon capture and storage facility. Privately funded offsets from pneumatic conversions in 2021 represented over 30% of reported upstream vent gas emissions.

However, carbon markets are fragile. As Jackson noted, risk reduction and legislative certainty are critical to attract private capital to finance our climate ambitions. Unfortunately, proposed revisions to the 2018 federal methane regulations will create significant unintended consequences. Requiring all pumps and controllers on oil and gas facilities to be non-emitting may sound like a good thing, but it effectively eliminates the potential for Alberta's highly robust and thriving carbon offset market to attract private capital to fund emissions reduction for pneumatic conversions. This will cause hundreds of millions of dollars in private capital to dry up, and it will send a chilling signal through, arguably, the most robust carbon market in the world.

As international voluntary carbon markets are being formed, Canadian leadership is essential to a world community crying for successful models to emulate. Canada can be a leader. Canada needs to work with the provinces to ensure that regulatory reforms add, and do not inhibit, functioning carbon markets across Canada,

and to then take that Canadian experience, the Canadian successes, to the world.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (1705)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Hegland and Mr. Duerr, for your opening remarks.

We'll now go to Cégep de Jonquière.

Monsieur Martin Bourbonnais, you have five minutes, sir.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Martin Bourbonnais (Chair, Centre TERRE, Cégep de Jonquière):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I thank the members of the committee for inviting us to share our thoughts on this interesting topic of energy.

The Cégep de Jonquière is an educational institution that welcomes 3,000 students a year. It is located in Saguenay-Lac-Saint-Jean, in the province of Quebec.

We are fortunate to have nine teaching programs in the field of physics, including mechanical and electrical engineering. We've been involved in applied research with companies for 40 years.

The brief we'll be sharing with you over the next few days doesn't pretend to be exhaustive, as energy is a broad field. It summarizes what we have called the 12 tasks required for the energy transition. These are listed in my speaking notes, which I have passed on to the committee. I won't go into detail on each of them now, but we can discuss them later.

Job 1, i.e. the first thing that's very important to do, in our opinion, is to prioritize energy sobriety. We need to reduce consumption at source, avoid waste and deliver electricity more efficiently. In Quebec alone, 77 terawatt-hours of electricity are lost in non-recovered industrial thermal waste. To give you an order of magnitude, this corresponds to 10 power plants like La Romaine. That's a huge amount of energy that could be recovered.

Job 2 is to ensure that each region has an optimal energy mix. Localities are different and there isn't necessarily a single solution that applies in very large regions.

With regard to job 3, it is very important to ensure the energy sovereignty of peoples. We believe that natural resources belong to the people. They must be managed for the majority by state-owned companies like Manitoba Hydro or Hydro-Québec, for example.

As for job 4 and job 5, it's all about strengthening energy production aimed at stabilizing the grid and gradually integrating renewable energies. Of course, there is always a balance between supply and demand for the grid. We need to ensure that intermittent renewable energies, such as solar and wind power, are integrated intelligently. There are ways to integrate them where there is very high penetration, but there are a lot of technical hurdles.

Job 6 consists in putting dormant thermal batteries to good use. We have carried out several projects and developed new products with companies, for example a hydroelectric solar water heater, where the water tank serves as a thermal battery. The air in a house, with a solar heat pump, can also be used as a thermal battery. We often talk about electric batteries, but we leave thermal batteries far too much to one side. They already exist, they're dormant and just waiting to be used.

As for job 7, we're doing a lot of work on supplying isolated sites from the major hydroelectric grids. There are 300 communities in Canada, thousands of outfitters and logging camps that have no other option but to use diesel to generate electricity. Along with salaries, energy is the biggest expense in these places. We are currently carrying out projects with the Fédération des pourvoirs du Québec and various other people to survey the state of energy in these places. We want to help them make progress on the energy front.

Job 8 is about automation and digitization, which are must-haves, obviously. In Canada, we're currently a long way from automation, and even further from Industry 4.0 when it comes to digitization.

Job 9 involves working on the legislative front. My colleagues have talked about this. There are various issues here.

Job 10 involves training a skilled workforce. This is an issue that's particularly close to my heart, given that I'm in a CEGEP. According to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, renewable energies will create the most jobs over the next 10 years. In 2020, 12 million people will be working in the renewable energies sector, mainly in photovoltaics, hydroelectricity and bioenergy. In fact, 80% of jobs in the field were in these sectors.

The Cégep de Jonquière offers technical training programs. We are also working to offer customized training to companies. We work with provincial groups, such as the energy squad, to design new training programs. Training is very important to achieve the energy transition.

Job 11 relates to funding applied research. Technology access centres like ours, or TACs, need funding to help companies progress and meet challenges. Changes in TAC funding, which are currently tied to the federal government, could affect many TACs and have quite a negative impact on this super innovation network.

• (1710)

Finally, job 12 is about making the transition with people and for people. Transition is much more social than technical. It's everybody's business.

Thank you.

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you, Monsieur Bourbonnais, for your opening statement.

Colleagues, we'll now go to our first round of questions.

We will begin our first round with Mr. Earl Dreesen from the Conservative Party of Canada, for six minutes.

**Mr. Earl Dreesen (Red Deer—Mountain View, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Before I start, is there a guarantee that we will be going through the full round? We have only 20 minutes left before 5:30. Could you explain that before I get started?

**The Chair:** I'm hoping that we can get one full round of questions in, up until we decide to go into committee business at 5:30 or 5:32. With 24 minutes, that puts us at 5:36.

**Mr. Earl Dreesen:** If I understand, it's not one full round.

What you are saying is that it will be one person from each party, not one full round.

**The Chair:** I'm hoping we can do one from each party for six minutes.

**Mr. Earl Dreesen:** Under those circumstances, Mr. Chair, I will give my time to my colleague Mrs. Stubbs.

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC):** Thank you, Chair.

Thank you, Earl.

Thank you to all the witnesses for being here. I certainly do encourage all of you to submit comprehensive written submissions to this committee, which will be included in the final report.

To begin, Chair, I would like to give verbal notice of the following motion:

That, pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the committee undertake a study of the Supreme Court of Canada's ruling that Bill C-69, An Act to enact the Impact Assessment Act and the Canadian Energy Regulator Act, to amend the Navigation Protection Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts, is unconstitutional immediately following the completion of the clause by clause review of Bill C-49, An Act to amend the Canada—Newfoundland and Labrador Atlantic Accord Implementation Act and the Canada—Nova Scotia Offshore Petroleum Resources Accord Implementation Act and to make consequential amendments to other Acts; for the purposes of this study, the committee: (a) hold at least 5 meetings, (b) invite the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources and the Minister of the Environment and Climate Change to appear for one hour each, (c) report its findings and recommendations to the House and, (d) pursuant to Standing Order 109, request that the government table a comprehensive response to the report.

Now, Chair, I would like to move the following motion that I gave notice of on October 16. You were right about the timing then, and so now, of course, it's all in order.

We urge that:

The committee recognize that Bill C-69, An Act to enact the Impact Assessment Act and the Canadian Energy Regulator Act, has been ruled unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of Canada in a 5-2 decision, that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court said that Parliament has to "act within the enduring division of powers framework laid out in the Constitution," and that all provinces and territories called for major changes to Bill C-69 and were ignored by the Liberal government. It is the opinion of the committee that Bill C-69 should be repealed, and report this finding to the House in order for the House to vote on the viability of the bill given the Supreme Court's majority ruling.

For our witnesses, who have given of their time and expertise to be here today, and for all Canadians, I want to make it clear why this is so crucial.

It is, of course, because the uncertainty, the death by delay, the endless timelines, and the abilities and opportunities for political interference at many different stages throughout the assessment have not only driven out billions of dollars in traditional oil and gas development and already killed 300,000 jobs for oil and gas workers in every corner of this country but also, of course, disproportionately impacted provinces like Alberta, Saskatchewan, B.C. and certainly Newfoundland and Labrador.

The reason this is important for everybody here and for all Canadians is that Bill C-69, which now, even though the NDP and the Liberals ignored Conservatives' cautions at the time.... As you know, I am here to represent the people of Lakeland, so that's my number one job, but I have to say it's a little bit awkward because, of course, I was the shadow minister for natural resources for the official opposition during all that time. I did warn about every single aspect that the Supreme Court has now said is unconstitutional, but, of course, so did every provincial premier and every territorial leader by the time it was getting out the back end.

Here is the fact. Because of the Liberals and the NDP, a law that the Supreme Court now says is unconstitutional has been in place for five years, for half a decade. That not only will continue the flood of traditional oil and gas investment and jobs from this country to others, as a consequence of years of anti-energy, anti-resource development and anti-private sector policies, but it will also absolutely hamper and prevent the private sector investments, technology and innovation required for more clean energy, green energy and renewable energy development in the future. It will absolutely stop and is stopping in its tracks the development of alternative energies and fuels of the future, which, I would note, Liberals and NDP members say they support.

• (1715)

**The Chair:** We have a point of order from Monsieur Simard.

Monsieur Simard, go ahead.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ):** Yes, Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

I apologize to the witnesses if my intervention delays our discussion with them, but, when I read my colleague's motion, I wonder if there isn't a formal defect. That's because you can't declare a bill

unconstitutional. You can declare a law unconstitutional, but the Supreme Court won't rule on a bill.

I wonder if my colleague's motion, as currently drafted, is in order. Perhaps the clerk will be able to tell us.

In fact...

[*English*]

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** I'm talking about the Supreme Court ruling on Bill C-69, a bill that's already law. I'm not talking about Bill C-49.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Mario Simard:** ... as far as I know, a bill cannot be considered an applicable law; it's a project. We're talking about a bill from another legislature. We want to apply a Supreme Court decision to a bill from another legislature.

In my opinion, there is a formal defect.

[*English*]

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** This is—

**The Chair:** Wait one second. Excuse me, colleagues.

I have a point of order from Monsieur Simard, and I have to hear the translation. I am not bilingual yet, so I need to understand the translation, and it takes me a moment.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Mario Simard:** I can repeat it.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** When everybody is yelling or trying to make a comment, it's hard for me, and it's hard for the translators as well.

I am going to go to the clerk on the point of order.

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** Certainly no one is yelling, Chair.

**The Chair:** But it is difficult when you're—

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** No one is yelling, so let's all characterize each other accurately.

**The Chair:** That's what it seems to me.

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** I'm not yelling.

**The Chair:** I would just ask everybody to be calm—

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** I do have a loud talking voice, but I'm not yelling.

**The Chair:** —until we can get a ruling from the clerk on the point of order.

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** Characterizing a woman as yelling is as old in the book as hysteria, isn't it?

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

• (1720)

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC):** There are multiple points of order here. Charlie, you're about fourth on the list, so just hang on.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I'm not talking to you; you're not the chair.

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:** It doesn't matter. You don't have the floor, so just wait your turn.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I have a point of order, Chair, on Mr. Simard's point of order.

**The Chair:** Yes, Mr. Angus, just give me one second.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Certainly, I will wait.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:** I also had a point of order on that already, Charlie. So did Mr. Aldag, I think. There is a pecking order here, so don't worry about it.

**An hon. member:** Shh.

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:** Don't shush me.

**The Chair:** Monsieur Simard, thank you for your point of order.

I think what you said is that this is a matter for the House to deal with, but since debate has begun on the motion, we will proceed through—

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

**The Chair:** Yes, Mr. Angus.

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:** Excuse me. There are multiple people who have raised points of order before Mr. Angus, so he doesn't get to jump the queue.

**The Chair:** Hold on a second.

Mr. Angus has had his hand up, and I want to give everybody an opportunity here in person and on video conference. Mr. Angus had his hand up—

**An hon. member:** So did the rest of us.

**The Chair:** I know, but he did not interrupt on a point of order. He put up his hand, and I acknowledged his hand going up, so we'll go to him.

Then, if you have a point of order, I can acknowledge others as well.

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:** I think his point of order was on the previous point of order, though.

**The Chair:** His point of order is also on this point of order.

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** How do you know?

**The Chair:** I know because his hand was up.

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:** He wanted to speak to the motion on the list. There is a speaking list for the motion.

He raised it after. He didn't say "point of order" until after—

**The Chair:** I don't know for sure.

As chair, I have the discretion to acknowledge that point of order, and I will go to you if you have a point of order.

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** You haven't heard from him yet, so how do you know what his point of order is going to be?

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Angus, on the point of order of Monsieur Simard.

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:** Point of order, Mr. Chair.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** [*Inaudible—Editor*] and I hope I won't be intimidated by the rat pack.

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:** Point of order, Mr. Chair.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Mr. Simard placed a very—

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:** Point of order.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I would like to speak to his point. Bill C-69 was not—

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:** Point of order.

**The Chair:** Mr. Angus, can you just hold on for one second?

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** It's not a bill; it's been in law. This is what you guys have to get straight.

**The Chair:** Colleagues, I addressed your point of order.

I have not heard Mr. Angus's point of order yet because, once again—

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:** I'm raising a point of order on his comments here, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** You actually raised a point of order prior to him making his comments.

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:** It was to Mr. Simard first and foremost, before Mr. Angus—

**The Chair:** Mr. Patzer, you do not have the floor.

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

**The Chair:** You will get the floor once Mr. Angus's point of order is heard. You can object to his point of order.

Okay. That's what I rule.

I'm going to—

**Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC):** Mr. Chair, I actually raised a point of order on what Mr. Angus was saying.

**The Chair:** It's the same thing. We have to hear what he said first.

**Mr. Ted Falk:** No, Mr. Chair, first he has to correct his language. The absolute first thing we have to do is correct his language.

**The Chair:** Mr. Angus has the floor.

Mr. Angus, I'm going to ask you to speak on the point of order so you can be clear, and if our other colleagues have a point of order on your point of order, they can raise it at that time.

Let's give Mr. Angus an opportunity to say what his point of order is, because I still haven't heard it.

Go ahead, Mr. Angus.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I appreciate that, Chair. I appreciate your patience in having to deal with this.

Mr. Simard raised an important point. It's about the issue of our role as parliamentarians, not acting, as I said, in this partisan rat pack kind of behaviour.

Mr. Simard talked about what was out of order, but the Supreme Court did not rule that legislation out of order. They raised questions about certain parts of that legislation; other parts of that legislation are still intact. This motion is inaccurate and an attempt to just throw everything that was voted by Parliament into question, when it's not in question. There are certain elements that the Supreme Court ruled on, but not others.

I agree with Mr. Simard. I think it's a very reasonable position.

Mr. Simard and I don't always agree on everything, but he comes to this table as someone who takes the work of Parliament seriously. The work of Parliament is about legislation. The work of our motions must reflect our larger obligations to the system that we are—

• (1725)

**The Chair:** Mr. Angus, we're getting into debate now.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I'm not debating. I'm just wrapping up.

I think that Mr. Simard's point is important, in the light that this motion was written improperly—which doesn't surprise me—and what it claims to cover it actually can't cover.

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

Now, do you have a point of order on Mr. Angus's point of order?

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

It goes to the conduct of the member: using words like “rat pack”, thinking that it's okay to be all belittling and saying “shh” to different members. In a previous meeting, he told my colleague here to grow up—a very strong, competent woman who's also been very accomplished in public policy on natural resources for a very long time.

That's not to mention that last week, when my colleague here moved her motion, somebody from that end of the table used an expletive, which started with “f” and rhymed with “yuck”. I'll let you figure out what word was uttered. I know that it was not the member from the Bloc because of the language it was spoken in—we can rule him out—so we know where it came from.

There's a pattern of conduct from the member from the NDP that is very unbecoming. I wouldn't say the entire committee...but we have members from the other parties who are enabling this kind of behaviour for him. I think it's extremely ridiculous. Given that this

is supposed to be the most feminist Prime Minister ever, we have a party sitting over there that is doing absolutely nothing to try to prevent this from happening.

**The Chair:** Mr. Patzer, on the point of order—

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:** No, it's about the way he is conducting himself here. He wants this committee to try to be all cordial and whatever, but it's his behaviour and his tone and the language he has chosen to use to belittle and berate my colleague over here, and other people are aiding and abetting that. I've just had it up to here with that.

I would ask you, Mr. Chair, to please make sure.... I know we all disagree and we all get a little bit animated from time to time, but there is still a certain level of respect. The way he has treated several members, especially my colleague from Lakeland, is extremely inappropriate and very unprofessional.

I would ask, Mr. Chair, that you would, now and in the future, do something about it.

**The Chair:** Thank you for your point of order.

I would ask all colleagues to work in committee with mutual respect, not interrupt each other, not talk over each other and not use any language that could be harmful to others. That's a request I'm making to all of you, so we can work together in this committee to accomplish what we're here to accomplish on behalf of Canadians, which is to work through the studies and the reports and to listen to our witnesses who take the time to come.

I'll ask that of everybody. We're not going to get into a debate on who said what, because I did not hear any of those comments specifically from one member to another.

You've raised your point of order today. Thank you for your point of order.

Mr. Falk, you had a point of order on the point of order.

**Mr. Ted Falk:** I did. It's similar to the comments from Mr. Patzer.

Charlie has gone out of his way to be rude and antagonistic in this committee. He's been name-calling again in this committee. He's been antagonizing—

**The Chair:** We're getting into debate. This is specifically on the point of order.

**Mr. Ted Falk:** My point of order is that you're not calling out this unruly behaviour. When he can berate my colleague, Mrs. Stubbs, and ask her to grow up, and when he can tell someone else to shush, that is a very demeaning type of behaviour. You, as the chair, sir, need to call out that behaviour. If you're unwilling or incapable of doing that, you should just tell us, “I don't have the ability to recognize those things” or “I don't have the ability to make tough decisions.” Tell us that.

As far as this—

**The Chair:** Now we're getting into debate, so stay on the point of order.

**Mr. Ted Falk:** The point of order is that you need to address the behaviour coming from Charlie Angus.



**The Chair:** Okay, I will address the behaviour of many members on this committee who have become disruptive. I have not heard any member call any other member anything that you've suggested. If we do hear that as a committee member and we think it's out of order, then we will.... I am trying to chair a committee and listen to our witnesses. That's what I'm trying to do as the committee chair, to allow all of you to have an opportunity to participate.

Now we will go to Mr. Simard.

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

**The Chair:** Mr. Simard, you had a point of order.

• (1730)

[Translation]

**Mr. Mario Simard:** As I pointed out earlier, I wonder if this motion is in order. Not only are we talking about a bill, but we have to be aware that this bill comes under the Department of the Environment. I don't see how the Standing Committee on Natural Resources would be empowered to say that a bill that falls under the Department of the Environment should be repealed and would have to signify this to the House.

In my view, the motion is not in order, since the Supreme Court ruling in question applies to a statute, not a bill. Even if the motion were in order and a committee were to examine this, it would be up to the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development to do this work, since the bill in question, i.e. Bill C-69, falls under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Environment.

I'd end by saying that perhaps it's best to move on. My advice to my Conservative colleagues is to either rewrite the motion, or submit it to another committee.

The respect my colleagues are talking about applies to everyone, starting with the respect we must show the chair. If everyone listened to the chair's statements without heckling, we'd have a much more interesting committee than what we've experienced in the last few minutes. I don't think that's a great example to set for the witnesses we're currently hearing.

[English]

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

I'm going to go to Mr. Angus on a point of order. We are running to the end of our time for this first hour.

Mr. Angus, go ahead.

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

I just want to say that I respect the chair and I always abide by the chair's rulings. That's why when the chair speaks, I stop and listen. I appreciate your rulings here. I'm not going to get involved in this back-and-forth about who said what, because I don't even know, half the time, what's being said about me, except that I intervened to support Mr. Simard, who had a very reasonable position. I think it is our role as parliamentarians, and I'll continue to do that work.

My point of order is.... It's 5:30. Since the Conservatives did not want to let the witnesses speak and since they did not allow them to

be questioned by other opposition members, should we not go in camera now, and then we can move forward?

I move that we adjourn this part of the meeting. Then we can go in camera and actually start planning what we need to do. We're not getting anywhere with our witnesses—

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** But, Chair, I have the floor.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** —so I move to adjourn.

**The Chair:** Mr. Angus, we can't move a motion on a point of order.

I am going to ask quickly, on the point of order... I have Mrs. Stubbs and then Mr. Patzer, very quickly on the point of order.

Before I go to you—this might help with your point of order—I'm going to ask the clerk to provide some information to committee members because it might clarify and answer your point of order. If your point of order is still there.... I want the clerk to be able to comment on Mr. Simard's and Mr. Angus's comments regarding—

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** I need to clarify that I didn't move a point of order. I have the floor because I moved a motion.

**The Chair:** Yes, but we had a point of order—

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** But I can also.... Given that I've been responsible for the official opposition on the natural resources file—you know this well, George, because people in Alberta are well aware of me and—

**The Chair:** Mrs. Stubbs, I am going to the clerk first.

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** I can actually answer Monsieur Simard on the relevance.

**The Chair:** Mrs. Stubbs, I'm going to go to the clerk first. You're not the clerk. The clerk will answer, and then we will proceed. That's what we're doing.

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** Okay. I will listen while a man explains a thing to me that I can also explain for myself.

**The Chair:** Mr. Clerk, please go ahead.

**The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Patrick Williams):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The motion calls for the committee to report to the House. It is true that Bill C-69 was already adopted in the 42nd legislature. It's not before the House right now, which means that if someone tried to concur in the report in the House, the House would likely not be able to act on the content of the report. At that point, the Speaker might rule that the motion to concur in the report is out of order. Whether or not.... There could be a procedural issue in the House, but it would be up to the Speaker to rule at that point.

**The Chair:** Colleagues, I think that's pretty clear.

We are out of time for our first hour.

I'm going to suspend the meeting so we can move in camera.

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** No, I have the floor, Chair.

I have the floor. That was wonderful input from the clerk, but I have the floor—and I'm not yelling, in case men want to characterize me as that.

• (1735)

**The Chair:** Are we ready to move in camera?

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Yes, we're ready.

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** I have the floor.

**The Chair:** I've made the decision. We're going to move in camera.

*[Proceedings continue in camera]*

---







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>