



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on Natural Resources

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 080

PUBLIC PART ONLY - PARTIE PUBLIQUE SEULEMENT

Monday, October 30, 2023

Chair: Mr. George Chahal



Standing Committee on Natural Resources

Monday, October 30, 2023

• (1100)

[English]

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

Welcome to meeting number 80 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Natural Resources. Today we are meeting in public to discuss committee business.

Everybody is aware of the Zoom reminders this morning. In accordance with our routine motion, I am informing the committee that all remote participants have completed the required connection test in advance of the meeting.

I will go to Mr. Sorbara.

You had your hand up.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara (Vaughan—Woodbridge, Lib.): Good morning, everyone. Happy Monday to everyone back in Ottawa and back to work for the constituents and residents of your respective ridings.

Mr. Chair, I want to start this morning by moving a scheduling motion as a basis to begin our committee discussion today. I believe we forwarded the motion to the clerk, who will forward it on to all the honourable and esteemed members who sit on this committee.

I move:

That given Bill C-50, An act respecting accountability, transparency and engagement to support the creation of sustainable jobs for workers and economic growth in a net-zero economy, and 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, have been both referred to committee, that the committee initiate its consideration of both Bill C-50 and Bill C-49 with the following schedule:

a) That the minister and officials be invited to appear before the committee on Bill C-50, on a date to be determined by the Chair but no later than Wednesday November 8, 2023;

b) That the minister and officials be invited to appear before the committee on C-49 on a date to be determined by the Chair but no later than Wednesday December 6, 2023;

c) That members submit their lists of suggested witnesses concerning Bill C-50 by 12pm on Friday November 3, 2023 and that the Chair, clerk and analysts create witness panels which reflect the representation of the parties on the committee and, once complete, that the Chair begin scheduling those meetings;

d) That members submit their lists of suggested witnesses concerning Bill C-49 by 12pm on Friday November 10, 2023 and that the Chair, clerk and analysts create witness panels which reflect the representation of the parties on the committee, and, once complete, that the Chair begin scheduling those meetings;

e) That the Chair seek additional meeting times and that meetings be scheduled, if resources available, for up to three hours each;

f) That the Chair issue press releases for C-50 and C-49 inviting written submissions from the public and establishing a deadline for those submissions;

g) That the Committee hold at least four meetings with witnesses on C-50 before clause-by-clause consideration for C-50 is scheduled;

h) That the Committee hold at least four meetings with witnesses on C-49 before clause-by-clause consideration for C-49 is scheduled; and

i) That the Chair set deadlines for the submission of proposed amendments for C-50 and C-49 in advance of the beginning of their respective clause-by-clause considerations, but no sooner than after the completion of the respective witness meetings for each, and that the Members of the Committee, as well as Members who are not part of a caucus represented on the Committee, submit to the Clerk all of their proposed amendments to C-50 and C-49 no later than 5pm on the respective days established by the Chair, in both official languages, and that these be distributed to Members.

Mr. Chair, the committee clerk should be distributing this motion now in both official languages, French and English.

I would add that we've been waiting for the sustainable jobs legislation and amendments to the Atlantic accord acts for some time, given that they were both introduced before the summer.

On Bill C-50 specifically, our study on the topic has already made this committee well acquainted with the subject matter. Now that Bill C-50 and Bill C-49 have both been referred to this committee, it is our obligation as parliamentarians and members of this committee to move forward with examining them. That is our job. Legislation has always been considered a committee priority. The sustainable jobs act is a brief 11 pages. It is self-explanatory, and the committee is well acquainted with the subject matter. Labour groups are calling for its consideration.

Bill C-49 is a much larger bill, and a very important bill that the governments of both Nova Scotia and Newfoundland and Labrador are calling on us to advance. It is in the interests of their provinces and our country.

This motion lays out a reasonable timeline to begin consideration of both bills concurrently and to submit witness lists for both bills for the respective public panel hearings.

It would have the minister appearing on Bill C-50 first, perhaps even this week if we can vote on the motion today, and Bill C-49 in the coming weeks. As mentioned, we believe this motion lays out a very reasonable and pragmatic timeline for consideration of both bills, but if members want a little additional flexibility, we are certainly prepared to consider amendments today.

• (1105)

It includes at least four public hearings on Bill C-50 and at least four public hearings on Bill C-49, for a total, if we have two-hour meetings, of 16 hours, and three-hour meetings in addition to. It calls for additional time to be added to scheduled meetings so we can facilitate the inclusion of even more meetings.

At a minimum, we'd be looking at a month or more of public hearings, which will allow for substantial witness participation. It allows time for whatever is required for clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-50 and Bill C-49 for the consideration of amendments. It allows for this committee to strenuously and judiciously analyze both bills.

Colleagues, I hope we can allow for a vote on this matter today so that we can move forward on the business of the House of Commons, the business of our residents and the business of all Canadians with regard to this very important committee and the matters that have been referred to this committee.

I thank everyone for listening to me on this Monday morning. I look forward to hearing everybody's feedback and hopefully moving forward as expeditiously and collaboratively as ever.

Thank you, Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Sorbara, for your motion.

I will go to Mr. Angus online.

The floor is yours.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, there's a point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC): Chair, as soon as you gavelled in the meeting, I had my hand up and was acknowledged by the clerk. I'm curious how you determined the order of things in that regard, because I did not see Mr. Angus put his hand up at that point in time.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Patzer.

As soon as Mr. Sorbara moved the motion, I saw Mr. Angus's hand up—that's where I looked to next—and then I saw your hand up afterwards. That's the way I saw it, and that's the ruling I'm—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Okay, but as the meeting was gavelled in, I had a question and a point of clarity that I was seeking. As soon as you gavelled the meeting in, I had my hand up.

The Chair: I will recognize you after Mr. Angus.

If you want to challenge the chair, if that's your will, you have the will to do that, but that's what I've decided. Mr. Angus is online. He had his hand up. You'll be next.

Go ahead, Mrs. Stubbs, on a point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC): Chair, we seem to be having a consistent problem, which has developed especially rapidly in the last couple of meetings, where you're having trouble seeing what's happening on this side of the table.

I don't really know what the remedy is, but we're all members of Parliament, equally duly elected and trying to do our due diligence

and our jobs here on this committee for the people we represent and for all Canadians. I know we all come to this work with that view.

I don't know. I will admit, Chair, and having known me for a long time, you'll agree, I often find myself—

Mr. Charlie Angus: This isn't a point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: It is about to be a point of order. I want to address this issue.

The Chair: Okay, not debate, on the point of order, please.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Sorry, guys, just don't get too emotional.

I was going to say that I've been short for my entire life, so it's very normal, standing in a crowd or at tables, that people can't see me or they overlook me.

Is there something we could do with this to ensure that both you and the clerk have an easy time seeing us, and is there any other remedy that might be required? I think you need to give us one sooner than later to ensure that you're seeing the hands up here.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Stubbs.

I can see you—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Can I just finish, Chair?

The Chair: On the point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Chair, you rightfully told me not to interrupt. If I could just finish, I think we need a remedy so that everybody can have confidence in the proceedings here that the rules and the chairing are even for everybody.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you.

To the point of order, I can see you. You are sitting here. I even brought my reading glasses today, just in case I need to take them off.

Thank you. I will do my best to make sure I acknowledge everybody.

I have gone to Mr. Angus. He is online. I did see his hand go up, so I'm going to Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you so much, Chair.

The Chair: Sorry, Mr. Angus, but we have a separate point of order from Mr. Falk.

I'll ask you to hold for one minute, Mr. Angus.

• (1110)

Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC): Further to what Mr. Patzer indicated, when you gavelled in the meeting, his hand immediately went up and it was recognized. After that, Mr. Sorbara tabled his motion, at which time Charlie's hand went up. There was a previous hand up before Francesco started with his motion, which isn't being recognized. I think that's very problematic.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Falk.

We have another point of order from Mr. Aldag.

Mr. John Aldag (Cloverdale—Langley City, Lib.): I would simply say that you've made your ruling. You've given us a speaking order and you've acknowledged people from all sides—virtual, opposition, government side.

If there's a problem with that, challenge the chair. Otherwise, let's move on.

You've made your ruling and we have a speaking order. Let's move on. We have important business to get to today.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Aldag.

We have a point of order from Ms. Stubbs.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I don't think this is an issue that everyone has to be concerned or emotional about. I think that this is just a basic matter of fairness and confidence in the committee proceedings and in you, Mr. Chair.

With regard to the former chair, I mean, he.... I'm 100% confident, Mr. Chair, that you can make these decisions on your own.

The Chair: Thank you.

I will proceed with the decision that I made, and we will go to Mr. Angus.

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

As someone who has spent his life in opposition, I am well used to how, when legislation comes, it bumps the work of the committee.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I have a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: We have two pieces of legislation—

The Chair: I'm sorry, Mr. Angus. We have another point of order. If you could just hold one second.... I apologize.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: We cannot hear the member for Timmins—James Bay. I'm wondering if there is an audio issue that could be checked on here.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, I can hear you through the headset quite clearly. However, members in the room state that they cannot hear you. We'll hold for a second until we can ensure that everything is working.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Imagine that. They can't hear me. I could speak a lot louder if that helps anybody.

The Chair: Wait just one second, Mr. Angus. I can hear you through the headset quite clearly. I think Mr. Simard says that he can hear you through the headset as well.

Mr. Marc Serré (Nickel Belt, Lib.): I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

We have to hear the member in the room.

The Chair: That's correct. We are just looking at that.

Mr. Marc Serré: Okay. I just wanted to make sure of that.

The Chair: Wait just a second, Mr. Angus. Just hold your thought. We're going to see if there's a remedy to this.

Mr. Angus, if you are ready, please try again, and hopefully we can hear you in the room as well.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I am more than ready to speak as loud as I need—

The Chair: Mr. Angus, hold on one second. I'm sorry.

Mr. Angus, I would ask you to go from the top, please, just to make sure that we can hear you loud and clear.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Absolutely, and if it—

The Chair: No, hold on a second.

Mr. John Aldag: Could I respectfully suggest that we suspend until the audio issue gets fixed?

It's important that we hear our member. I don't think that we need to continue, so I'd say that we suspend, sort it out, and call us back when it's ready.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Aldag.

We will suspend until we can resolve this issue with the audio. We'll have a two-minute suspension.

• (1110) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1120)

The Chair: We are back in session, and the floor is yours, Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you so much, Chair.

I will begin from the top. As someone who has spent my career in opposition, I'm well used to committees having their work schedule thrown out of whack by legislation, which bumps other considerations.

We have two pieces of legislation that have been referred to us over the last two weeks, Bill C-50 and Bill C-49. It is essential that we get to them quickly.

In terms of Bill C-50, we had 26 meetings with 64 witnesses in the preparatory study that led up to the legislation. If you add the emissions cap study, that was 21 meetings and 53 witnesses. The emissions reduction fund was nine meetings with 16 witnesses. On energy issues, that totals over 133 witnesses, 56 meetings, over 112 hours of meeting and analysis, so I think we are all very well placed to deal with Bill C-50.

I'm willing to bring forward our witnesses but I do believe that at the end of the day we have to move this because what we learned over many months of studying this is that the world is moving dramatically fast past us in terms of a clean energy portfolio. Half the world is now past peak fossil fuel generation for power. It is going to be peak CO2 emissions in 2023 and then start to dramatically put down. In 2022, imagine this: The investment in clean tech matched pretty much dollar for dollar oil, gas and coal, and that was for the first time. Within less than a year, clean-tech investments have almost doubled that of oil, gas and coal.

If we don't move with a sense of urgency, we are going to be left behind. We cannot allow the sabotage to the Canadian economy, what Danielle Smith has done to the Alberta economy. The Americans are moving dramatically fast. The Chinese are moving. The Europeans are moving. We need to be competitive or we are going to lose out, so the longer we dither and delay and obfuscate, the more Canadian workers are going to lose out.

We've been hearing from Canadian workers again and again. They want this plan in place. There is a sense of urgency that we need to get moving on.

I would agree with my colleagues to move to Bill C-50 first, then move to Bill C-49, which is important. We see massive investments from the Biden administration on offshore Atlantic. We need to be able to compete or we're going to lose out.

I would say that at this point we have an obligation to the Canadian people. We have an obligation to workers and people who are expecting us to deliver. We have an obligation to start setting the stage for the future Canadian economy because this global capital movement of investment is moving and either Canada is going to be at the game or we're going to be left out, and we can't afford that.

I am ready to move on this. I'm ready to sit down and get the work done as soon as we can and get these bills passed. The New Democrats will be there. We will be bringing our witnesses. We'll be bringing our amendments and we're ready to get this job done.

Thank you.

• (1125)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus, for your comments.

We'll now go to Mr. Patzer.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you, Chair.

I appreciate that we have this motion in front of us. It's a new motion. It would have been nice to get notice of motion in advance. I realize because this is committee business, it isn't technically required to have notice for it to be debated. That's the way I understand it, but it would have been nice to have notice of the motion.

There was one that was debated on Wednesday.

Before we continue, Chair, I'd just like to seek some clarity from you. On Wednesday, we were debating a similar motion, and I had the floor. Standing Order 116(2)(a)—and I'm just seeking clarity from you on this, Chair—says unless a time limit has been adopted by the committee or by the House, the chair of a standing, special or legislative committee may not bring a debate to an end while there are members present who still wish to participate. I'm just curious to know how it was that meeting—I think we ran out of resources in the room—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, we have a point of order.

Mr. Angus, go ahead.

Mr. Charlie Angus: It is parliamentary rules that we cannot be discussing what was said in camera unless the committee agrees to it. Mr. Patzer would be violating that by making claims about what

was or what was not said and done in a meeting that was in camera. I think we need to make sure that he does not make reference to work done in camera.

A motion is before us. We need to address that.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus.

Mr. Patzer, make sure, because that was an in camera discussion, that you do not comment on anything that was discussed in camera.

To your question, the meeting was adjourned, and we are now into a new meeting today in public.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you.

I wanted to raise this off the top because of the reference to a speaking order. I'm not going to talk about what was said in camera, but I am just curious about the speaking order. This is why I raised my hand as soon as you gavelled the meeting in, because I was curious about that. At the start of the meeting, as soon as you gavelled it, I had my hand up to try to get a point of clarity on that front.

I respect your point on the in camera portion. Obviously we can't speak about what was said in camera.

Just out of respect for colleagues, I think it would be nice to have been given notice of this new motion in advance. That way we would have had as much time as possible to prepare for how we would want to address it.

I think at this point I will end my remarks so we can get to Ms. Stubbs here.

Thanks, Chair.

• (1130)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Patzer, for your remarks.

We'll go to Ms. Stubbs.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thank you, Chair.

As my colleague has pointed out, of course this is a new motion, an attempt to ram through scheduling, complete with dates and timelines. It presupposes the number of Canadians who must be heard and how long that will take on two bills. Of course, as we explained before, this is before all of those details are worked out, like witnesses, and until we hear from every Canadian who would be impacted by these various bills.

In the case of Bill C-49, people with many different livelihoods, and those impacted provincial governments in Nova Scotia and Newfoundland do of course want this regulatory framework. That's one reason why, of course, this should come first, including coming before Bill C-50, including the fact that it was introduced, time allocated and passed at second reading, all before Bill C-50.

Also regarding Bill C-50, I am aware that this committee did study it. I think I came into the committee on the back end of that. Given the importance, significance, and the scope and scale of Bill C-50, this is at once a plan to plan jobs and skills training, but it is actually about the fundamental economic restructuring to a top-down, central, five-year planning approach that will immediately destroy 170,000 jobs in the oil and gas sector. This will impact the livelihood of 2.7 million Canadians otherwise, and cascade through the entire economy, which is what the internal documents of the NDP-Liberal government show.

Of course, years ago we warned on the carbon tax that the same thing would happen.

These bills are extremely significant, and Conservatives can't possibly support this before we have had a discussion with all of the Canadians, who must be heard from on all of these bills. We can't ram through a scheduling motion right now that is full of dates.

Mr. Marc Serré: Point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: I have a point of order from Mr. Serré.

Mr. Marc Serré: Just quickly, I want to make sure the committee understands and get the facts out that this is not a programming motion. It's a scheduling motion. There's a difference. I had the same scenario with Bill C-13 at official languages, and the Conservative Party argued about the differences. I would suggest you understand the difference.

This is a programming motion—I mean a scheduling motion. I'm sorry. The last time with Bill C-13 at official languages, the internal filibustering lasted for about eight sessions on just that point. This is scheduling and moving legislation that's in the House to the committee, which is what we need to do.

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order, Mr. Serré, on what's being discussed here.

It's back to you, Ms. Stubbs.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thank you.

Thank you to my colleague for explaining that to me. You could see, even as you were explaining it, how easy it is to mess those up, so I appreciate that advice and that friendly and constructive criticism of what I've said here. I can certainly tell you one thing, though. The people of Lakeland definitely didn't send me here to worry too much about our navel-gazing, inside baseball or fancy parliamentary procedures. They just want me to be here to fight for their livelihoods and for their communities, and I think all Canadians do as well.

Chair, as I was saying, these are the reasons our position remains the same. Regarding the order when we are discussing these bills coming to committee and the precedence they must take, it is blatantly and blindingly obvious that Bill C-49 must be first because the Atlantic premiers want it, and then Bill C-50 must be after that. We cannot agree to timelines. We cannot agree to clause-by-clause. We can't presuppose how this is all going to unfold, because Canadians must be heard.

Of course, the most pressing and most urgent and biggest issue this committee ought to be dealing with and that, certainly, the gov-

ernment should have addressed by now.... Imagine the outcry if a Conservative government had rammed through a cornerstone, significant, wide-ranging, sweeping bill that was passed and was then on the books and then the majority of the Supreme Court of Canada said, "Hang on a second. The vast majority of this is largely unconstitutional." I can't imagine. Well, I think we all can. Of course, the most urgent issue of all for the Prime Minister—but since he won't do it, I guess we have to try to deal with it here in committee—is to deal with this decision on Bill C-69 and to fix the bill and fix all the problems that Conservatives warned about, as did all the provinces and territories, indigenous leaders, private sector proponents and municipalities—all of them—when it was leaving the House of Commons.

Then, of course, Alberta pursued a court case against Bill C-69 primarily focusing on jurisdictional division—a warning Conservatives gave on Bill C-69 would become a problem—but, importantly, Alberta was supported by seven other provinces through this charge. The Alberta court said, "Yes, Alberta, you're right. This thing is unconstitutional. Just as Conservative official opposition members said when it was in debate and just as thousands of Canadians spoke out against five years ago, this thing is unconstitutional." The Prime Minister immediately said he would appeal it to the Supreme Court. What happened a couple of weeks ago was that the Supreme Court said, "Yes, Justin Trudeau, you're wrong, and these seven provinces are right. Get this thing fixed."

On Friday, the Minister of Environment said he guessed you guys were going to get around to that in the next couple of months, but what's terrifying is that what he said he would do would be to take the approach of these interim guiding principles. Well, I would remind everyone that's exactly what they did in our first term when the Liberals froze all of the existing major projects across all aspects of natural resources development. They froze all of those applications for two years, threw the economy and the sector into utter uncertainty, disarray, lack of clarity and, frankly, fear. The consequence of that was, over the years, losses of literally billions of dollars in projects that are especially important in remote, rural, indigenous and low-income communities.

I'm getting there, Charlie.

This is how important this issue is. This was all ignored, and the Supreme Court has now said it's a big deal. Now the environment minister is saying, "We'll get around to it in a few months, but right now, we're going to do these interim guiding principles," but that's what happened the first time. It caused chaos for two years, an absolute collapse in oil and gas investment, collapses in all that investment in clean tech that's done in that sector, the destruction of hundreds of thousands of jobs and, of course, as you know, particular harm in Alberta, Saskatchewan, parts of B.C. and Newfoundland and Labrador.

• (1135)

Of course, because of the importance of the leading private sector investor in the Canadian economy, and still to this day despite all the hostility and anti-energy, anti-development, anti-private sector policy, it still remains Canada's top export. It underpins the entire Canadian economy, including, obviously, the TSX, the importance of energy stocks there.

People on Bay Street and people in Toronto also need to be worried about their jobs.

Mr. Marc Serré: A point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, we have a point of order from Mr. Serré.

Mr. Marc Serré: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I thank my colleague for her lengthy intervention.

Mr. Chair, I think we should go back to the motion itself. The Impact Assessment Act is environment. I just want to clarify that. I also want to clarify what our colleague mentioned about no limit on meetings in the motion. Maybe you've just received the motion itself, but the motion does say four meetings. There's no max. I just want to clarify the facts about what's being said.

• (1140)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Serré, for providing that information.

I'd ask Ms. Stubbs to keep it relevant to the motion.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thanks, Chair. I certainly will.

I'm sorry that it's lengthy. I'm trying to map out for all Canadians why it's important we do the first things first, and get this right, but also why it is so important to every single Canadian in every single province and region that we do this.

My colleague, Marc, and I sat together on this very committee between 2015 and 2019 when I was in my first term. He was also in his first term. During that time, I was also the vice-chair. It happened at that time under different leaders, and I was also the shadow minister for natural resources.

I remember well the introduction and the debates on Bill C-69. Of course, the fact is that bill was announced in a dual way by both the former environment and natural resources ministers involved. Since the Liberals also want to...I know Charlie does, since the NDP-Liberals want to assess Bill C-50 through this committee, and I certainly also want to do that, but the trouble with a caution about Bill C-69 being environment is that, of course, Bill C-50, the just transition—

Mr. Charlie Angus: A point of order.

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, we have a point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: —was also jointly announced by the environment, labour, and natural resources ministers.

The Chair: We have a point of order from Mr. Angus, so I would just ask you to hold on for one second.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Sure.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, go ahead on the point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you, Chair.

I've been listening very closely, but we are debating Bill C-50 and Bill C-49. We're not debating Bill C-69. We have a motion before us, and we have to address that motion. If Ms. Stubbs wants to bring another motion, and we finish the legislative agenda, we can actually deal with that, and see what we can do, but right now, she has diverted from the topic at hand. Either she moves on and lets another member speak or she speaks to the motion.

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order, Mr. Angus.

I encourage members to be succinct and keep on the topic of the motion.

Ms. Stubbs, the floor is yours.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thank you, Chair.

I apologize for the length at which I'm dealing with this issue. It's just that it is crucial to the livelihoods of the people that I represent, to my relatives and my family members in Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Ontario. I know each and every member of Parliament here takes that seriously for their own constituents, and also for all Canadians.

It might seem to Charlie that this is irrelevant, but it's not. I'll explain why.

We are talking about the order and the scheduling as Marc had pointed out to me. We are talking about the scheduling that will dictate the order by which we do our duties as members of Parliament and assess the bills that must take precedence over our already existing work.

The reason we are saying Bill C-69 must be dealt with urgently... It's, frankly, by the Prime Minister and the NDP-Liberals, and it's shocking that this hasn't actually happened in a tangible way yet, but what else is new. They're now going to add more uncertainty, and a lack of clarity.

I'm also talking about Bill C-49 and Bill C-50, because that's germane to this exact motion that has been dropped on the table here, and it is the content of the scheduling that we are discussing. Another reason that Bill C-69 is so germane to the legislation that's coming to this committee—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Point of order.

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, we have a point of order from Mr. Angus.

Mr. Angus, go ahead.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you.

The rule in Parliament is you can't do indirectly what you're not allowed to do directly.

The issue is Ms. Stubbs is making the argument that her motion on C-69 needs to take precedence, but she's doing it by referencing the motion that's there. Right now we have a motion. The motion has to be voted on. Then Ms. Stubbs can bring her motion and we can debate that—

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

Mr. Charlie Angus: —to actually override—

The Chair: Mr. Angus, we have a point of order from Mr. Patzer.

Go ahead, Mr. Patzer.

• (1145)

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I'm not sure if Mr. Angus is having problem with his Internet connection, but I think he should keep track of what we're actually talking about.

Ms. Stubbs has not moved a motion. She is speaking to the government's motion that it has put forward to schedule committee meetings. She is talking about the relevance of the particular government bills that are before us and why we, as Conservatives, as opposition, want to prioritize which bill in which order—

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, we're getting into debate.

Do you have a point of order?

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Mr. Angus should stay on point as well.

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order.

Mr. Angus, thank you for your point of order.

Once again, members, I will remind you to try your best to stay on topic and be succinct so other members also have an opportunity to participate in this debate. It's a very important one to discuss this motion.

Ms. Stubbs, it's back to you. The floor is yours.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thank you, Chair.

I appreciate that and certainly appreciate all of the input, the advice and the constructive criticism about all the intricacies of all the rules here in Parliament. You all know me well enough by now to know that I certainly do have to brush up on that stuff, and I thank everybody for their input.

I will never stop fighting for the people I represent and for jobs and for affordable lives for every single Canadian in every corner of this country.

As I was saying, I hope that I have made the case so far in response to this motion that we have received today to dictate the scheduling for this committee without the facts that we need to know in advance and why we must do it in this order.

Let me explain why the C-69 issue must be prioritized because of how it's related to C-49. I'm not sure if all members of this committee have had a chance to read C-49. It is an issue you can imagine that is near and dear to my heart as a person whose mother came from Newfoundland and whose family is there, and whose father came from Nova Scotia. In fact, my grandmother was the first woman mayor of Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, so certainly it's near and dear to this first-generation, born and raised Albertan.

Those provincial governments want C-49, but this is the problem, and this is why the government has been so negligent in not dealing with this. The government has been sitting on their hands since the Supreme Court said a law that the NDP and Liberals both voted for which is in place is unconstitutional.

Sections of C-69 are embedded verbatim, identical language, no less than 33 times in C-49. Let me say that again for why it's so important that these things be ordered in the way they are.

The Supreme Court of Canada said that the most cornerstone, most significant piece of legislation that the Liberals, the Prime Minister, the ministers at the time rightfully said was their flagship, their most cornerstone legislation underpinning resource development, which I know every member on this committee agrees.... They are people like Viviane, who represents a riding that is very dependent on natural resources development, on mining. She is a champion for those people. I know that it's important for every Canadian in every region. It's important to people in Toronto, too, for example, because of the impact of energy stocks on the TSX and the many jobs that are dependent on that.

The issue here is that this bill is still in law. It's sitting there. It's largely unconstitutional. The government is not fixing it or responding to it in any kind of efficient way whatsoever. The Friday announcement was—

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, we have a point of order from Mr. Angus.

Mr. Angus, go ahead on a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I hate to keep interrupting, but we are debating Bill C-50 and Bill C-49.

Ms. Stubbs continually wants to debate Bill C-69. That is not the issue here.

I've reached out to her office and said we're more than willing to bring forward a motion, but she doesn't have a motion. She can't off-end what's being debated now.

I would suggest, Chair, that we keep it focused. We could be here all day and all night perhaps. We have to get this motion passed so we can get down to committee business.

We're discussing Bill C-50 and Bill C-49.

• (1150)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus, for your point of order.

I'd ask my colleague to keep relevant to the motions at hand, which are Bill C-50 and Bill C-49 and to what's been presented here today.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: I have a point of order.

I'd just like to do it after Mr. Angus and before Ms. Stubbs begins. I don't want to interrupt her.

On the bills at hand, Bill C-49 and Bill C-50, and on the motion I read out—thank you, Parliamentary Secretary Serré for the differentiation between the scheduling and programming motion. It's always good to have a refresher.

We do operate here on committee and in the House under the Standing Orders. I think we all know that. There are a set of rules and within those rules we debate, bring forth legislation and do the work that our residents, who voted for us, sent us here to do.

I would agree with Ms. Stubbs on that fact.

I would actually like to ask MP Stubbs if there are amendments to be brought forward on the motion that was put forward. We can get work together to ensure we invite the witnesses that all parties wish to invite, so we can look at the legislation.

If there are things the official opposition wishes to bring forward, we're obviously here to work collaboratively to get through the legislation that the House has sent us. It is our responsibility on this committee to look at these two pieces of legislation.

With regard to—

The Chair: Mr. Sorbara, I just want to make sure we're not getting into debate, so just on the point of order...

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: I'm just asking if Ms. Stubbs would like to bring forward amendments. We definitely would like to look at them and consider them. We would move forward from there.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Sorbara.

Ms. Stubbs, I think our colleagues are asking, through the points of order, if you're going to be tabling any amendments.

The floor is yours. Once again, I'd just make sure we keep it on the motion at hand and keep it succinct, so other members have an opportunity to participate in this debate.

Just keep it focused on the motion. If there's an amendment, that's great. We'd love to hear an amendment, if there is one.

Thank you.

The floor is yours.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thank you, Chair. I appreciate that.

Of course, if the schedule hadn't been table-dropped on the same day, and we were all serious and honest about collaborating, working together, doing our job on behalf of everybody and viewing each of us as equal, with equal voices and equal roles, we wouldn't have to do this in real time in public right now, but here we are.

It's also funny. Charlie's comment is odd, because both times, didn't he...?

An hon. member: He did.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: He suggested that I didn't have a motion about Bill C-69 in his last comment. In the comment before that, of course, he said that I did. We'll just leave that there. It gets slippery sometimes. It's slippery here.

The relevance of Bill C-69 to Bill C-49 is that Bill C-69 is in Bill C-49 33 times. There's a reference to Bill C-69 33 times in Bill C-49.

This is, again, why I am saying it's the five-alarm fire and absolute priority for this NDP-Liberal government, Prime Minister

Justin Trudeau and certainly anybody from resource-based ridings. However, everybody who knows the outsized importance of all kinds of natural resources development, which underpins the economy, which gives jobs and opportunity to indigenous communities, often where there are very few, the same thing for remote, rural and northern communities.... Often, resource development is the only option people right across the country have for jobs, for businesses and to support their families. It has been the key driver for decades in Canada, and it is the key driver to close the gaps between the wealthy and the poor in Canada. It's extremely significant.

When we have these sections in Bill C-49 that reference Bill C-69 like this.... Among other provisions, there are the unconstitutional sections 61 to 64 of Bill C-69, as per paragraph 163 of the majority Supreme Court decision.

By including these parts of Bill C-69, we risk massive litigation, delays, costs and uncertainty. That's something the Nova Scotia and Newfoundland and Labrador premiers and all of those people certainly don't want to see happen. This is why they want a certain, clear and predictable regulatory framework for their provinces and for the private sector. It's also why they insisted on ensuring that provincial ministers would have a say, not only federal ministers.

Section 64 of Bill C-69 is determined by the Governor in Council's determination. Section 62 is based on section referral to the Governor in Council and section 61, as per the factors of public interest, which is section 63.

In terms of section 61 in Bill C-49, as it relates to Bill C-69, it's this. This section therefore incorporates the unconstitutional conditions of section 64 of Bill C-69 into the licensing approval and authorization process. The entire clause 62 of Bill C-49 incorporates the designated project scheme, which was found to be unconstitutional in paragraph 204 of the Supreme Court decision.

• (1155)

Mr. Marc Serré: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: In clause 169 of Bill C-49—

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, I would ask you to hold.

We have a point of order from Mr. Serré.

Mr. Marc Serré: Honourable member, I have two points. One is referring again to Bill C-69 and the Supreme Court decision.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I'm talking about Bill C-49.

Mr. Marc Serré: No, you mentioned the other one five times.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Because Bill C-69 is in Bill C-49.

Mr. Marc Serré: The government has committed to bringing legislation in to look at that.

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

Mr. Marc Serré: It's before the court.

She then mentioned the premiers several times.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I have a point of order.

The Chair: We have a point of order on the point of order. It's on the point of order.

I have Mr. Patzer on the point the order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Very quickly, I think it's extremely important that all members recognize and realize that within Bill C-49, there are no fewer than 33 references to Bill C-69. Therefore, they are intertwined.

If the government had got this right in the first place, it would have made things a lot simpler.

The Chair: Mr. Patzer—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: What she is reading is the text from Bill C-49, not Bill C-69.

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, on the point of order, let's not get into debate. I understood what you mentioned in the point of order.

I'm going back to Mr. Serré on the point of order.

Mr. Marc Serré: Thanks, Mr. Chair.

On the motion, again, we talk about Bill C-50 and Bill C-49. The member says she seems to have issues with Bill C-50 being first, and she's okay with Bill C-49.

I would remind all members that the motion itself is concurrence. We have the opportunity to bring the minister to talk about both motions. Actually, the minister could have been here today, in the next session, to talk about both Bill C-50 and Bill C-49. This is important.

Again, as Francesco mentioned, if there is an amendment to this motion, I encourage the member to do so. If not, we can move ahead on these two important pieces of legislation, which the committee has a responsibility to do. It's good for jobs, and it's good for Canadians.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Serré.

I would ask all members once again—I know I've said this a few times and I'm going to keep saying it—to focus on the motion at hand and make sure that our conversation and debate are about the relevance of the motion. Let's make sure we focus on that.

Ms. Stubbs, I know you're discussing a number of items related to the motion, but let's try to keep it within the confines of the motion at hand.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Yes.

The Chair: The floor is yours, Ms. Stubbs.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Okay, thank you.

Listen, I have to admit to everybody here—I'm sure it will surprise no one who has known me for a while—that I was one of those people where my report cards always said “very conscientious and a very good performing student, but talks a little too much”.

Please forgive me. I'm still that same passionate little...well, they used to call me a hyena because of my ridiculous laugh.

Anyway, as my colleague, Jeremy Patzer, pointed out, and I thank him, what I was doing right before the point of order was reading from Bill C-49. I'm a bit concerned about what seems to be—I want to word this properly—a lack of awareness or understanding about how all of these things are connected and the fact that they are connected.

Relative to this last-minute table-drop attempt to dictate the schedule for this committee, this is the case I'm trying to make in a thorough and comprehensive way, so I can't be, as is often the case, attacked for talking this slowly. I think Canadians want to see that their MPs actually know what they're talking about, so that's what I'm trying to do here.

I was reading from Bill C-49 to show everybody here—because it is germane to this scheduling motion—that Bill C-69 absolutely is the five-alarm fire emergency to deal with first, and then Bill C-49, which is actually the NDP-Liberals' own agenda. It reflects the way that these things were brought into the House of Commons. I don't even understand why I'm having to make the argument that we follow the script that the NDP-Liberals have already set—

● (1200)

Mr. Charlie Angus: On a point of order.

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, we have a point of order from Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Each time, we get told that the Conservatives want to debate Bill C-69, then somehow they use Bill C-49 and then Bill C-50 as their platform to discuss Bill C-69. That's not what we're discussing.

The motion is on Bill C-49 and Bill C-50, and we actually have the opportunity to bring the ministers here so they could question them. I think that would be flame to those fireworks, but this is—

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

The Chair: Mr. Angus, if I could ask you to hold, we have a point of order on the point of order.

Mr. Patzer, you have a point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I just want to make sure that Mr. Angus can hear what's being said in this room, because I know we had an issue in camera earlier. Ms. Stubbs is reading from the text of Bill C-49. It's a big bill, a long bill. There's a lot of substance in that bill.

You should maybe have a listen to what Ms. Stubbs has to say, because she actually knows what she's talking about. She has a long career and background in natural resource policy.

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

I would ask members not to use points of order for debate. This is directed to all members. This is not for one member specifically. This is for all members.

I think the point of order can sometimes go into a little bit of debate, but let's try to keep the points of order focused on the point of order and the debate focused on the debate with the individual who has the floor.

Mr. Ted Falk: Can I speak to that point of order as well?

The Chair: Do you have a point of order?

Mr. Ted Falk: I want to speak to the point of order.

The Chair: Do you want to speak to Mr. Patzer's point of order or to Mr. Angus's point of order?

Mr. Ted Falk: I want to speak to Mr. Angus's point of order because that's the point of order we're talking about.

The Chair: That's right, but I just want it to be clear.

Go ahead on the point of order, Mr. Falk.

Mr. Ted Falk: I've sat here fairly patiently and listened to Charlie Angus interrupt the committee several times on a point of order. He always talks about relevance, that Bill C-69 is being referred to.

The problem is that Bill C-69 is so intertwined in both Bill C-49 and Bill C-50 that it needs to be referenced in order for Ms. Stubbs to build a proper road map to try to explain to the committee why the schedule that they've proposed—

The Chair: Mr. Falk, we're getting into debate now, so I want it to stay on the point of order. I think you've made your point clear.

Mr. Ted Falk: My point, Mr. Chair, is that Mr. Angus shouldn't be interrupting the committee.

The Chair: All members have the right to use the point of order for a point of order.

I will once again ask that members use their time in debate on relevance, being succinct and debate the motion at hand. That's what we're here to do as parliamentarians. We are here to debate the legislation that's been brought forward on the motion that was brought forward by Mr. Sorbara.

Ms. Stubbs, the floor is yours for you to continue. Unless there are any more points of order—and I don't think there are—the floor is yours for you to continue.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I see Charlie's hand up again, so maybe he's just planning on calling a point of order before he has even decided, or maybe it's old because I always forget to take my hand down.

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

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I don't even know how to un-mike myself half the time.

The Chair: We have a point of order. I'm sorry.

Go ahead, Mr. Angus, on the point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I was just waiting to be in the speaking order. If I'm not going to get in the speaking order today, I'll take my hand down, but it is my right to have my hand up online if I am in the speaking order. However, if there is not going to be a speaking order, Ms. Stubbs, I don't mind. I can take my hand down. If we're going to go all day and into the evening, I'm willing to sit.

The Chair: I have acknowledged that you are on the speaking order, a bit away, after a few speakers. I will acknowledge you when your time comes. If you change your mind, you can let me know at that point. Thank you.

Ms. Stubbs, the floor is yours.

• (1205)

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I certainly apologize if I gave that impression. I didn't intend to suggest that Mr. Angus shouldn't be able to speak at this meeting. I just noticed his hand was up, and you had said that I could continue if there weren't any other points of order. I guess you can see it in front of you, Mr. Chair. I was looking behind your head, so I thought I would mention it. I don't have that angle.

Of course, I certainly would not, on this side of the table, vote for censorship, shutting people down or not allowing people to speak. I'm just endeavouring to make my case in a comprehensive way.

It's certainly not our job as the official opposition and the Conservative Party of Canada to fail to argue to do our due diligence to ensure that members of Parliament deal with these consequential pieces of legislation in a rush and in a hurry because others want to get their agenda through on their own timelines, which they are trying to dictate in real time to this committee. It is not our job to help that happen. It is our job to fight for members of Parliament to do their duty, to do their due diligence and to make sure that we get things right and do first things first.

Again, I'm confused about why I'm having to make the argument to the NDP-Liberals about the order of these bills' coming in to committee, which should be Bill C-49 and then Bill C-50. Of course, the NDP-Liberals introduced and time allocated and then passed second reading. In the case of Bill C-49, it was 7.5 hours, over two days, of debate—that's it—in the House of Commons, and it was passed on October 17. The Prime Minister and the NDP-Liberals used a very similar tactic with Bill C-50, the just transition, which, at the last minute, they're calling "sustainable jobs" because they're afraid of the fact that when people realize what it is, they don't like it. Bill C-50 was introduced and then time-allocated, also with very little debate on the floor of the House of Commons. That passed on October 23.

I'm actually making the case even for the NDP-Liberals' own legislative schedule and agenda in the way they brought these pieces of legislation forward. I find myself in the position of thinking, like, "Guys, just take yes for an answer. Let's do the order you've already outlined."

Again, let's go back to Bill C-69. Now, I am going to read it from Bill C-49, as there was a technical issue.

Mr. Marc Serré: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, we have a point of order from Mr. Serré.

Mr. Marc Serré: I just wanted to address my honourable colleague. When you're looking at obviously Bill C-50, Bill C-49 and the Conservative members want to bring Bill C-69 into the debate, you'll have an opportunity with this motion. This motion, as I said, would invite the minister. You'll be free to ask questions about Bill C-69 and how it intertwines with Bill C-50 and Bill C-49. Let's ask the minister those questions. Plus, as the honourable member knows, you'll be able to invite a lot of witnesses to come to the committee. She references what's happening in the House, but we have the bills. Right now one could argue that the Conservative Party is delaying the witnesses coming in to speak on Bill C-50 and Bill C-49.

I don't quite understand what the honourable members are bringing forward because we have the opportunity to bring witnesses and talk to the minister about exactly the issues you're bringing forward.

Isn't that what we want to do here as legislators in the committee?

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Serré, on the point of order on relevance on the statements being made.

Yes.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I'd like to speak on that point order then, Mr. Chair.

Again, I just want to remind colleagues that Bill C-69 is directly referenced no less than 33 times in Bill C-49, so it is relevant, and it is unavoidably part of why Bill C-49 is being discussed. Right now, the two go hand in hand. It is absolutely relevant.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Serré and Mr. Patzer, for your points of order.

Once again, I will ask members to keep the relevance and be succinct with your comments.

Ms. Stubbs, there are no other points of order. The floor is yours.

• (1210)

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thank you, Chair.

I would just note, of course, while I certainly value the input from every colleague and member of Parliament at this table, it's certainly not Conservatives who have voted for the censorship measures or the shutting down of online news that Canadians can access. Conservative have always opposed those kinds of things against the NDP-Liberals. I certainly wouldn't suggest that I would be trying to shut down or censor anyone here.

One observation would be that I probably could get through my comments much more efficiently if people would stop interrupting, but that's their right and I respect it.

Let's go right to the motion, since everybody's urging me to do that.

An hon. member: Congratulations.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thank you for congratulating me for getting to the point that you want me to get to.

I will just finish, if I could, Chair. I know you're trying to give me every opportunity. Maybe the others around here could help a guy out once you give me this opportunity that you're so generously offering.

I will just finish my explanation, though, about what else of Bill C-69 is in Bill C-49 to make the case that Bill C-49 has to come before Bill C-50.

Here's another fact about Bill C-49. Perhaps if there was more debate in the House of Commons all of this would have been wrestled out. Again, it was introduced, time allocated, debate was limited and here we are. So here we are. Bill C-49 also incorporates section 64 of Bill C-69, which was ruled unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of Canada.

Mr. Marc Serré: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, could I get you to hold that thought.

Mr. Marc Serré: Mr. Chair, I really hate interrupting my honourable colleague, but we have to get some facts on the table. The Conservatives tabled a concurrence motion to cancel debate on Bill C-50. When she talks about us stopping the debate, there was a concurrence motion by the Conservatives to cancel the debate on Bill C-50 in the House of Commons. We have an opportunity here in committee to get the witnesses and get the minister to debate the issues.

I don't understand why there's a delay here. Is this a filibuster? What's happening? Why is there a delay here to get this legislation looked at by witnesses and the minister?

The Chair: The point of order is noted. Thank you, Mr. Serré.

I'm hoping that Ms. Stubbs through her remarks will get to that.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Well, from my perspective, there does continue to be a delay in my ability to do just that because of all the interruptions. We'll see how far I get this time, Chair.

Here's another section of Bill C-69 that is in Bill C-49. This is why Bill C-69 has to be dealt with first—I'll get to that in a second—and then Bill C-49, and now Bill C-50.

As I was saying, Bill C-49 incorporates section 64 of Bill C-69, which, again, as we all know, was ruled unconstitutional by the SCC. It was called largely unconstitutional by the majority of the Supreme Court.

Section 64 of Bill C-69 is fundamentally connected to the consideration of factors set forth in section 63 of Bill C-69, which, the Supreme Court made clear in paragraph 166, "represents an unconstitutional arrogation of power by Parliament".

I'll conclude on Bill C-49, hopefully, but this is a fact: Bill C-49 has incorporated all these proposed decision-making processes and facts into several sections in Bill C-49. Given that the decision-making power and the entirety of the "designated projects" scheme are unconstitutional, the risk, and lawyers will certainly litigate this, is that components of Bill C-49 are unconstitutional as well, as written right now. This is why the government had to actually deal with the massive mistake, disaster and mess on Bill C-69 that they were warned about, that's been unconstitutional for five years and that has caused untold destruction in communities, the economy, and jobs and businesses. That's why it has to be dealt with first.

Then with Bill C-49, because that then flows to us being able to deal with Bill C-49, knowing and being confident that these sections from Bill C-69 have been fully corrected and fixed, it seems to me that there's no way we can really do our due diligence on Bill C-49 unless that part is fixed first. Of course, there's Bill C-50, because the topic is relevant, but it's not the same as Bill C-49, where literally verbatim sections and words from Bill C-69 that have been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court are in Bill C-49 as written. It was in Bill C-49 as written when it passed the House of Commons. That's why Conservatives opposed. It's in Bill C-49 right now, when it's going to come to us. This is why we're making this issue.

Now, the worst part is that Bill C-49 already had all kinds of problems even before this decision. It already had these lengthy and uncertain timelines with all kinds of opportunities for political intervention. It tripled the timeline. Bill C-49 actually triples the timeline for a final decision on offshore renewable energy as compared with petroleum.

Of course, this bill deliberately—NDP-Liberals do want to shut it down, because that's what the just transition is about—is a death knell for offshore petroleum developers due to all the uncertainty and the lack of clarity in the timelines for private sector proponents, for provinces and for workers in the sector. Those were already problems in the bill. If we'd had more debate in the House of Commons, maybe we would have wrestled all this out and known about it.

With that Supreme Court decision, which was an utter indictment of the NDP-Liberal cornerstone major legislation that impacts the entire economy and Canadians everywhere, this is now urgent. I can't get my head around how we are able to assess Bill C-49, given that it contains these various verbatim and as-written sections from Bill C-69 that have now also been declared unconstitutional.

To the scheduling motion, this is why Conservatives, we in the official opposition, who were elected by more individual Canadians in the 2021 election and in the 2019 election....

We might just remind everybody that we're not actually in a majority government scenario here. We are in a minority government—

• (1215)

Ms. Viviane Lapointe (Sudbury, Lib.): A point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:—with a costly coalition and collusion between the NDP and the Liberals—

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, please hold.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:—while the NDP is also trying to pretend that it is still an opposition party.

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, we have a point order from Ms. Lapointe.

Ms. Viviane Lapointe: I will be brief.

On the motion that we are debating, I'm asking if MP Stubbs has an amendment to make on the motion that speaks to dealing with two bills concurrently.

The Chair: Thank you for the point of order, Ms. Lapointe.

Ms. Lapointe asked in her point of order if you have an amendment that you're bringing forward, Ms. Stubbs. If you do, I would like to hear it, but also the floor is yours to be able to provide your debate on these important bills, the motion by Mr. Sorbara that was brought forward on Bill C-50 and Bill C-49.

Through your debate, if you can allude to whether an amendment is coming, that would be great. The floor is yours.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thank you, Chair.

I appreciate so much your giving me the opportunity to do this. I know in your riding in Calgary, you represent many oil and gas workers and their families, and oil and gas businesses, so I'm sure that's why you also believe that this is a very critical and crucial discussion for the people that you represent.

We're both Albertans. I have been working on this file for a long time, and I worked on these policy issues long before I was elected, as you may know. I'm certainly very familiar with Calgarians, their values, their priorities, and their deep concern about all these bills, so thank you for this, despite all the interruptions which are delaying this point, for still giving me the time to address this. Thank you.

I do have an amendment, but as you can see, I feel it's my duty, given the delay on dealing effectively with Bill C-69 I really want to make sure I'm making the comprehensive case to Canadians and to all the members here why we certainly cannot support this scheduling motion as written, and as was just brought to this committee with no notice to any of us, and seeks to dictate every single aspect of the work and the timelines of what we do in this committee.

I hope I have already addressed why failing to deal with Bill C-69 is nuts and destructive to the country. The way that Bill C-69 is in Bill C-49 certainly will open it up to litigation and delays, which no person in Atlantic Canada or the premiers want. They want a clear, predictable regulatory environment for both offshore petroleum and offshore renewable energy. That's why they want the bill and they want the provincial ministers to have a say. They don't want this all just to be cooked up on the back door by the federal representatives. I hope I have explained why those two things are linked and why Bill C-49 has to come first.

Of course, according to the NDP-Liberals' own schedule under which they brought the bills through the House of Commons, which was Bill C-49 first and then Bill C-50.... Of course, the arguments about other ministers or other ministries aren't really relevant on any of them since Bill C-69 was a joint initiative by the environment and natural resources ministers. Bill C-49 was the same. Of course, Bill C-50, the just transition, which will be transition to poverty, was also brought forward jointly by the environment minister, the natural resources minister and the labour minister.

To the schedule which the NDP-Liberals have put on the table today to dictate every single aspect of the work of this committee, here are the problems.

For Bill C-50, we have this date.... No, this one is good. If we can get the minister....

Actually, the minister hasn't been here for a while, so I really appreciate that we do have this date for him to come. Of course, he should come for a whole bunch of other reasons so that's cool beans to me.

Let's go down here. We have the minister again. That's fine. We should have the minister in, obviously, as soon as possible as this motion does outline. Definitely.

Here's where we start getting into the problem. There are dates here that are tying us based on the other work that we have to do to ensure that all Canadians who will be impacted by all of these bills will be heard. They must be heard. In the House of Commons and committee, it is our job to demonstrate our diligence, to demonstrate accountability, to do the work that Canadians expect of us to pass legislation that, for example, won't be litigated until kingdom come and won't be declared to be unconstitutional five years later. We don't want to do that again. I'm sure we all agree. This is why it's so important that we do our jobs.

One can understand that even though parties, various groups and the government have been working behind the scenes—and they have; I mean that's how things get developed—for a year or two years on Bill C-49 and Bill C-50.... For Conservatives as the official opposition, of course, our tools are to litigate that and to do our due diligence in the House of Commons and in committee.

• (1220)

We in the official opposition—Conservatives—who also did gain more votes individually from individual Canadians in 2021 and in 2019, haven't been working on this in the back doors with NDP, Liberals and various other groups for one to two years.

The only thing we can do is fight for the ability to do our jobs on behalf of the common sense of common people who have sent us here. That's our job.

I hope that this helps explain why we can't possibly support this scheduling motion that is aiming to drive through and dictate every step of what we do next on this committee.

Viviane, you asked me if there was an amendment, and there is.

Let me get to it at long last, unless members are still unclear why I am making the case that Bill C-69 is so important and that Bill

C-69 is in Bill C-49 and why Bill C-49 must come first and then we must do Bill C-50. Is anyone still questioning that?

Certainly, not to further delay, but I understand, Marc, that when you have the official opposition, who hasn't been included or involved in any of this work, and they're now really trying to do their jobs as members of Parliament, as the official opposition.... In my case it's as the vice-chair of this committee, as a shadow minister for natural resources. There are my colleagues representing the Saskatchewan riding, Manitoba riding; my colleague, Earl, who's been here, I think, the longest of any of us, and he represents an Alberta riding; and Mario, who needs to do his due diligence for his constituents.

I understand that my colleagues in the NDP-Liberals might find this inconvenient. They might be annoyed at this. I mean, this is democracy.

• (1225)

Mr. Charlie Angus: Point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I guess it's a hassle, but it sure is better than anything else, isn't it?

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, we have a point of order from Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I've been listening closely, and I've been told there was an amendment.

Is there an amendment, yes or no?

Can we move on to someone else who has something to say?

The Chair: Mr. Angus, can I ask you to put your headset down? We couldn't hear what you said.

Thank you.

Mr. Charlie Angus: How is that?

The Chair: You're good.

Go ahead, once again, on the point of order just to make sure we heard you.

Mr. Charlie Angus: My point of order is that I've been listening carefully, and I keep getting told there's an amendment coming, but it just seems to be this long, drawn-out stall.

We have work to get done.

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

Mr. Charlie Angus: People are expecting us to get this dealt with.

Every time I try to speak, the Conservatives shut me down. I'm asking if there's an amendment, yes or no.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, we have a point of order from Mr. Patzer.

We have Mr. Patzer on a point of order on the point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: At the start of his intervention, we were unable to hear him.

All of us have done Zoom committees, Zoom Parliament, and as you said at the start of the meeting, the members have all done their sound checks.

The member has dropped on and off the call numerous times. His headset has been on and off numerous times, therefore making his sound check, I would say, null and void.

I'm just curious to know at what point we say that you have to keep the headset on and keep from moving it, because you're wrecking that sound check, which causes issues for interpretation and unnecessary delays.

The Chair: Thank you for the point of order.

Every member has the ability to participate remotely.

Mr. Angus has been cleared with the pre-work for checking his headset. There's nothing wrong with his headset. Sometimes the mike just needs to be adjusted, and he's loud and clear in the room. The member does have a right to take off his headset if he needs to give his ears some air.

I would request that we respect the members online as equals, just like we do in the room.

A member does have a right to make a point of order.

Do you have another point of order, Mr. Patzer?

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I do.

I just wanted to clarify, Mr. Chair. I'm not trying to impugn the member and his ability to be an equal over Zoom. I'm merely suggesting, though, that in the interest of timeliness, but also in respecting interpretation, that taking one's headset on and off constantly and moving the boom up and down makes that approval of the sound check.... As we go through the sound checks, quite often it's a matter of adjusting the boom and making sure things are proper.

That's all.

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

The Chair: Mr. Angus, you have a point of order on his point of order. Go ahead.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Chair, it's this continual game that's being played here to drag this out.

The question was, does she have an amendment, yes or no?

If no, I think, Chair, we need to move the speaking order to people who actually want to speak to this legislation and this motion, so that we can actually get work done on behalf of Canadians and workers.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus, on the point of order.

Once again, I want to make sure we don't get into debate when we're having these points of order, because they're not meant for debate. The speaking order in debate is meant for debate.

I have Mr. Dreeshen on the point of order.

Mr. Dreeshen, there have been a number of points of order. Are you referring to Mr. Angus's, Mr. Patzer's or Ms. Stubbs'?

Okay. It's on Mr. Patzer's point of order.

• (1230)

Mr. Earl Dreeshen (Red Deer—Mountain View, CPC): A few moments ago, Mr. Cannings was in to take the place of Mr. Angus. I'm asking the clerk, had he been checked in or is Mr. Angus considered to have been on the committee for the full length of time?

He's off the line now, but my reason for asking that question is that if he has been subbed out, would that change the order of speaking?

Mr. Charlie Angus: I've been here.

The Chair: Mr. Dreeshen, thank you for that point of order.

There was no substitution made.

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: Thank you.

That's why I asked.

The Chair: Every parliamentarian, just like others in the room, has the right to be in the room.

Mr. Angus has been a member in great standing in today's meeting and in others I've seen.

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: The point is that many times when one has to leave, they have someone else who is subbed in. If that is officially done.... All I was asking is if it was officially done. If it was officially done, I believe my point of order is accurate.

The Chair: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Dreeshen.

As mentioned, Mr. Angus has not left the meeting. He's been participating since the start of today's meeting.

We will continue with the meeting.

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: My point was on Mr. Cannings and whether or not he had been officially—

The Chair: Yes. As mentioned, members do have the right to enter the room and leave the room, as many do, to follow the proceedings in the natural resources committee, because we're debating some.... Really, we're talking about some important topics and about an important motion on the floor, brought by Mr. Sorbara, on Bill C-50 and Bill C-49, which we're discussing today.

I want to make sure that Ms. Stubbs, because I think she was alluding to.... She might have an amendment or she might be wrapping up—I don't know—so others may get a chance to have the floor and others can debate. I know that others are eagerly waiting to get involved as well.

Ms. Stubbs, there are no more points of order. The floor is yours.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate that.

There was no harm, no foul on the headset and all of those things. It's just amazing. Even on Friday, I was in a call and forgot to unmute my mike. You'd think that this far in we would know these things, but here we are.

Again, colleagues, I hope I have made an effective case to you and all Canadians about the importance of this work and why we must put first things first in this common-sense approach to our scheduling for this committee, especially because it's so important to bring home affordability and combat the cost of living crisis the NDP-Liberals have caused. They've admitted this as of Friday, with their temporary sham of a relief of the carbon tax for only one area, which pits Canadians against each other. This is their MO. Obviously, all these things are interconnected, and they are extremely important. I agree.

As Conservatives, and as our leader Pierre Poilievre has always said, we want to accelerate both traditional and renewable energy development, exports and technology in Canada. We want light, green projects. We want to make Canada the supplier of choice for all kinds of energy sources and technologies for our allies around the world. We also want to bring home energy security and self-sufficiency, as well as affordable power and fuel bills, especially for people who have no other options, which is the case for many Canadians right across the country.

This is connected to Bill C-69, Bill C-49 and Bill C-50. They all work together. In different ways, they are going to hold back, road-block and gatekeep both traditional and renewable energy development, which will cause a brain drain and limit innovation as well as entrepreneurial and private sector creativity in Canada—for which we are world-renowned—when it comes to developing the fuels of the future and continuing the energy transformation that has been going on for decades among oil and gas workers, energy developers and innovators in Canada. All of these things are extremely consequential. They certainly are to our ridings individually and to the entire country as the resource development-based economy and country we are, which we should be proud of.

I have an amendment to the NDP-Liberal programming motion that seeks to dictate all of the work unilaterally, complete with dates for our committee. Again, I note it's the opposite of the legislative way they brought these bills through in the first place. It still doesn't make any sense.

I move that, before the committee consider Bill C-50, the just transition....

You'll note there was only one committee witness who called it “sustainable jobs”. It was quite clear that when the NDP-Liberals put their documents out, they had done a last-minute copy and paste everywhere it said “just transition” to replace it with “sustainable jobs”. That's because Canadians didn't know what the just transition was, at first. Once they found out, they sure didn't like it. Of course, the NDP-Liberals are masters of words and words over action, and they tried to slip that in and pull the wool over everybody's eyes. I suggest that's not going to happen here, but we'll see.

To that end, I would like to propose an amendment to this programming motion by the costly coalition. Before the committee

consider Bill C-50, that it, one, first undertake the following study on Bill C-69: 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—

• (1235)

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

The Chair: I'm sorry, Ms. Stubbs. We have a point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: This is my amendment.

Mr. Charlie Angus: That's not an amendment. That's an attempt to bring her motion, which is already out there.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: No, I'm amending. He's talking about an old motion. I'm not talking about that motion.

Mr. Charlie Angus: No, this is the same tactic she's been using the whole time.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: No, it isn't.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, your point of order is noted.

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

The Chair: Once we hear the full motion, we can have that conversation.

Mr. Patzer, go ahead on a point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: My colleague is not moving a motion. She is introducing her amendment to the government's motion. It's not up to members to determine if it's a motion or an amendment. It is an amendment. The member said it's an amendment. Therefore, it's an amendment.

She's trying to amend the government's motion. I would humbly ask all members to just listen to what she has to say and see what her amendment to the government's motion is.

Mr. John Aldag: I have a point of order.

The Chair: We have a point of order by Mr. Aldag on Mr. Patzer's comments. It's a point of order on the point of order.

Go ahead, Mr. Aldag.

Mr. John Aldag: I fully support hearing the amendment that's being put forward. I do find it really difficult to follow when it's being put in there with all of the commentary that's being added. It's colourful and it's enlightening, but it is difficult.

I would ask if Ms. Stubbs is going to put forward an amendment, that we be given the amendment. Perhaps speak to any contextual information or reasons, but I'd like to hear what the amendment is and then we can deal with it. I think that will help us keep moving the conversation forward.

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, the floor is yours.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thank you.

Let me say one thing on a personal note. I am a person who does not believe in special treatment for women. I do not believe in quotas. The vast majority of the people in Lakeland didn't elect me because I'm a woman. I think they elected me because they're principally Conservative and because, I hope, at some point I'm doing a good job for them and earning my keep.

I sure do appreciate all these older guys constantly interrupting me to tell me what to do, how to say things and what to say. I hope that after eight years I have somehow gained some kind of credibility as a substantive and fair-dealing member of Parliament in the course of my work.

I admire everybody here—

• (1240)

Mr. John Aldag: I have a point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I admire people who are speaking, but it's odd....

The Chair: Sorry. We have a point of order, Ms. Stubbs.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Maybe if the young woman can just finish her point and get to the amendment, which I was reading right before.

The Chair: We have a point of order, so could you just pause.

Mr. Angus, go ahead.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Actually, it wasn't me. I think it was Mr. Aldag.

The Chair: My apologies, Mr. Angus. I thought it was you.

Mr. Aldag, my apologies. I didn't hear your point of order. Go ahead.

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like to say if that comment is aimed at me, I take huge exception to it. All I asked for through the point of order is that we hear the amendment in its entirety so we can deal with it.

If that's being taken as a slight.... I just think it's a way of trying to move the conversation forward. That is respectfully the request that I'd make.

I think it's being completely misconstrued for perhaps another false social media clip that Ms. Stubbs loves to do about what happens here.

Let's get the amendment on the table, and we can entertain it.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I have a point of order.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Aldag.

Mr. Patzer, go ahead on a point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I find it really interesting after what has been said, that would be the comment that would come. That is presupposing what my colleague is going to do regardless of....

She was already in the middle of her motion. To presuppose that she's trying to take a dig at somebody for a social media clip is actually very low and very belittling, John. I hold you in much higher regard than that, so I'm actually quite disappointed in you for making that comment.

I'm going to cede the floor to my colleague, so she can actually get to the amendment to the motion that she's trying to make.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Patzer, for the point of order.

However, we're not going to go to Ms. Stubbs yet, because we have another point of order.

Mr. Falk, go ahead on a point of order.

Mr. Ted Falk: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Further to that point of order from Mr. Aldag, I was listening to Mr. Aldag and I was just waiting for an apology to come out, although I realized it wasn't coming. I thought that he'd made his point and he'd done it very eloquently, until he referred to my colleague, Ms. Stubbs, using this as an opportunity to present false social media content.

That's absolutely out of order, Mr. Aldag, through the chair.

The Chair: Let's not get into further debate on the point of order.

Mr. Ted Falk: His point was being well received. He had to take that little jab at the end to make a false accusation of my colleague. I think that was very inappropriate.

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order, Mr. Falk.

We have a point of order by Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you.

This is all very interesting, but what we see is this continual obstruction. We've raised the questions: Does she have an amendment? Will she read the amendment? If she reads the amendment, we can vote on it. Otherwise, we're playing games here.

I would like to hear the amendment, and that's what my colleague, Mr. Aldag, asked for. We need to hear the amendment. I believe there are serious issues with the amendment, but I'd like to hear it, and I've not been able to hear it.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus.

Folks want to hear the amendment. We've heard that on a few points of order, and we're getting many more.

Mr. Patzer, you also have a point of order, so I'm going back to you on a point of order.

Hopefully, there will be no more, and we'll go to Ms. Stubbs, so we can hear the full amendment without interruptions.

Go ahead, Mr. Patzer.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Absolutely. I hope that she's able to get to the full amendment. You might want her to start from the top on the amendment, Mr. Chair.

I'm just going to remind you, Mr. Chair, of Standing Order 117 on decorum. It's up to you to maintain that. When we have members making egregious comments, it is incumbent upon you as the chair to maintain the decorum of this committee.

I would hope and trust that you would do that in the future and not allow this committee to devolve into chaos with members saying unbecoming things of other members.

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order, Mr. Patzer.

I think all colleagues around the table here have, to their best abilities, conducted themselves appropriately. I just hope that we continue that way. I hope we can proceed in that manner, stay focused on what we're studying, which are the amendments on hand, and not pull away from the partisan, or political stuff that we sometimes hear.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Point of order.

The Chair: I do want to hear the full amendment

Mr. Angus, you have a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: This is just procedural, given that it has taken x amount of time, without hearing the amendment. We are running out of time. Will you be able to secure resources so that we could sit through question period? We could continue sitting so we could finally actually hear the amendment. I don't want us to come to one o'clock, and still not having heard the amendment.

Can you actually check with the clerk to see if we need to sit through question period? Maybe we need to sit into the evening. I don't know how long this amendment is going to take, but I'd like to know that we have the resources so we can finally hear it.

• (1245)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus, for putting that forward.

If committee members choose to sit through this meeting, and as you mentioned into question period, or through the evening, that is up to the will of committee members. If that's the will of committee members, I can ask the clerk to look at further resourcing to ensure that is available for committee members to do so. We can look into that in the meantime.

Thank you for that, Mr. Angus.

Scanning the room, I don't see any other points of order.

Ms. Stubbs, you had an amendment you were partially through when you paused, so you can continue on from where you were on your amendment.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Chair, thank you for clarifying that. I was just wondering if there was a way that we could quickly pull up transcripts or Hansards in real time, because, as you just said, I had already started reading the amendment, and it was after I started reading the amendment that my colleague, John Aldag, had his first point of order and told me to get onto the amendment. Then I responded, and then he did another point of order. You're right. I had already started reading the amendment, so I might suggest that I'm actually not the cause of the delay here. In case I have to clarify—you know this about me, Chair—I have a lot of experience in public, private and post-secondary sectors precisely on energy and resource policy. That's what I did for the vast majority of my career before I was elected.

That's certainly why I'm informed and knowledgeable about it, but it's also why I'm passionate about it. I'm particularly passionate about it because, of course, I represent about 100,000 people across

35,000 square kilometres, 52 municipalities, four Métis settlements and five first nations, all of whom depend on resource development for their livelihoods and their futures. That's why I'm so passionate about it.

I'll have to start from the top where I was already reading the amendment before I was interrupted twice and then accused of being the one who was delaying. I know sometimes it happens to young women and also to old women when they know things about a certain topic, and then men still want to tell them how to talk about it and what to say and how to say it. I would note that I thank my chivalrous and respectful Conservative male colleagues who are responding as they should in my defence. People on the other side should question themselves about their words versus their actions and their fake feminism.

I'll continue the amendment I started before, if that's okay.

John, I'm just wondering if it's okay, because you interrupted me twice before when I was already reading the amendment.

Mr. John Aldag: On a point of order.

The Chair: On a point of order, go ahead, Mr. Aldag.

Mr. John Aldag: Are comments not to be directed through the chair? It's inappropriate to be doing this. We've all said we're interested in hearing the amendment. It is up to the person speaking whether they want to continue to delay or try to deflect onto others.

We've all said we're ready to hear it, but perhaps comments should be directed through the chair.

The Chair: Thank you for the point of order.

Members, normally I give this preamble at the beginning of a meeting about how all comments should be directed through the chair. I would make sure that all comments are directed through the chair.

Thank you for the point of order, Mr. Aldag.

Ms. Stubbs, go ahead.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thank you so much, Chair.

I know everybody has to keep working on me with these rules because I'm so hell-bent on representing the people of Lakeland and just focused on the best interests of Canadians and ensuring that their lives are affordable and that they can have a country where they are back in control of their lives and they can afford their essentials and they can capture their dreams. I'm sorry to be so passionate about this and maybe a little bit light on all of the specifics about the rules, but I certainly think the people of Lakeland want me to be fighting on the issues I am fighting on.

To that point then, through you, Chair, could you maybe check with Mr. Aldag to see if he's okay with me starting again on reading the amendment that I was already reading when he interrupted me twice before? That was while also accusing me of delaying, which, of course, is gaslighting, right?

• (1250)

The Chair: I had given you the floor to read your amendment. I had offered you that courtesy to do so, and the floor is yours to proceed with the rest of the amendment you had started. I believe you paused part of the way through. I just want to make sure the clerk and the interpreters can follow the amendment you are putting forward so committee members will have the ability to examine your amendment and provide good debate around it.

Could we go back to your reading of the amendment?

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thank you, Chair, for giving me that opportunity.

It's so bizarre. I know that the NDP-Liberals do favour censorship and dictating what people can say, see and these sorts of things, but it's all muddled up if you want to accuse a person of delaying and not doing a thing that they were already doing and then you interrupt them twice.

As you have just suggested I do, I will go back to the amendment that I was already reading. I'll start again:

1. First undertake the following study on Bill C-69: 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;

Even more, this is how big a deal it is. That bill's been law and unconstitutional for half a decade. I'll continue:

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; and

2. Complete its consideration of Bill C-49.

Unfortunately, I have no option except to do it this way, since this motion for scheduling was brought to us today. The Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Natural Resources did reach out to me over the weekend about planning the schedule for this committee and, of course, I got back to her. I said that our concerns remain the same and our perspective of why this must happen in this order remains consistent with what we've said before and is what we're saying today. Of course it makes sense, because it's the exact order in which the NDP-Liberals have brought in their own legislation.

The Chair: Do you have a point of order, Mr. Angus?

Mr. Charlie Angus: Yes, I don't believe that this is a proper amendment, because, again, it attempts to hijack the amendment by introducing a motion that Ms. Stubbs wanted to bring on Bill C-69 and completely circumvented—

An hon. member: No.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Let me finish. I don't believe it's in order, and it also leaves off Bill C-50, which was part of the amendment, so, in order to address this you have to—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, can you hold on a second?

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm not even allowed—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: [*Inaudible—Editor*] because Mr. [*Inaudible—Editor*] continues to interrupt. I want to get clarity on this.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, hold on one second.

Mr. Angus, I've heard. I'm going to Mr. Patzer on a point of order while I get clarity on your point of order, if that's okay, Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Absolutely, thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

Go ahead on the point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you.

There was a speaking order to the amendment and, for something as substantive as Mr. Angus is trying to do, when he has his turn on the speaking order, that point is when he can discuss what exactly it is he's trying to do.

That point of order—correct me if I'm wrong—cannot be used to do what he is trying to do, which is ruling her amendment out of order.

When he wants to have his turn to speak, he can put his hand up and he can join the speaking list, but you already do have a speaking list, and if we're going to get into substantive debate on this amendment, we need to follow that speaking list.

• (1255)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Patzer.

I think he did raise a valid point, and I've asked the clerk for clarity on that. I did want to hear what his point of order was just because it was a procedural question that he asked a point of order on, but I do appreciate your advising as well on the procedure, and we'll try to get some further clarity.

Thank you for the points of order.

Mr. Marc Serré: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Yes, go ahead on your point of order.

Mr. Marc Serré: I just want to be very specific. We have a motion on the floor and then we have an amendment to the motion. Can we ask the clerk if this is admissible, yes or no, before we go ahead?

The Chair: Mr. Serré, on that point of order, it's my understanding that Ms. Stubbs has added those items to these items as additional points of an amendment that is added on to this.

Ms. Stubbs, from my understanding you've added additional points to the existing motion that's on the floor.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: What I just did was move an amendment to the programming schedule that the NDP-Liberals brought to this table today.

What Charlie is claiming is that I am moving the same motion that I spoke to on October 25. It is materially not the same. What I am proposing right now is an amendment to the programming motion brought by the NDP-Liberals to dictate every single thing about this committee. It is not the same.

If the clerk needs it, I can certainly provide both versions of the motion that I moved on the 25th—

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

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: —and the amendment that I'm moving today to the Liberals' program.

Can I finish my sentence just for once today?

The Chair: You can, but he has a point of order. I do need to acknowledge him.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I know what I'm doing, and I can explain it.

The Chair: I know, but one second.

Go ahead, Mr. Angus, on the point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Throughout this, Ms. Stubbs has been mischaracterizing deliberately that this motion was brought by the NDP and it wasn't. We're trying to debate it. This was brought by the Liberals.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Your coalition partners.

Mr. Charlie Angus: We're going to have an issue of basic respect here. If she's going to continue to throw in these kinds of comments, I think you have to call her out. The NDP did not bring this motion. We're trying to debate this motion. We're being shut down from these constant games that are being played, but it is a Liberal motion.

Chair, you need to keep reminding her so she doesn't use this in a way that misrepresents what this is.

Pardon the interruption.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus, for your point of order.

Just as a reference for colleagues, it was a motion brought forward by the Liberal member, Mr. Sorbara, and that's what we've been debating from the onset of this meeting. We have been asked by members, and I think Ms. Stubbs also just asked, for advice from the clerk on this issue. We'll go to the clerk to get his comments on the question that was raised by Ms. Stubbs.

• (1300)

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Mr. Chair, she didn't ask for advice from the clerk. She knows what she's doing.

The Chair: Mr. Serré did ask for advice from the clerk specifically to be clear on what was stated in her amendment and how it pertains to the motion on hand.

Ms. Stubbs, for clarity, can you advise us as to where your amendment would be inserted in the motion that's on the floor? Where are you adding the insertion as an amendment specifically to the motion on the floor so the interpreters can follow along, but also so the clerk can ensure that your amendment is tabled appropriately within the existing motion.

If you could provide that clarity, it would be much appreciated just so we can ensure that it is presented properly.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thank you, Chair. I appreciate that.

Did I get all the way through the amendment? It's hard to tell now at this point.

The Chair: I believe you did, but that question was raised on a point of order once you were done.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Fantastic. It was at the end of the Liberals' programming motion.

I apologize for suggesting that this was the NDP-Liberals' motion. I hope that I can be forgiven. Of course, there's a backroom coalition agreement to prop the Liberals up until 2025, even though more Canadians individually voted Conservative in the 2021 and 2019 elections.

I apologize for making the assumption that this was from the coalition partners who are working together to drive their agenda through all aspects of Parliament.

Mr. Marc Serré: On a point of order, Chair, can we ask the clerk whether it's admissible? If it's admissible, can we make sure it's sent in both official languages?

We should suspend. We have to ask the clerk to give us his advice.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Chair, I would be okay, too, if Francesco....

I think you brought the programming motion originally, right?

Given the amendment, which now I've had to put in public because you guys brought your motion in public.... I'd be open to it going wherever you want it to go. I just thought at the end or potentially it could go after.... My colleague is saying right before section a).

Since you brought the motion in, I'd be happy to collaborate more and work with you on that, as you said in the beginning when you moved the motion.

To any colleagues who are worried about anything going on here, I don't think we have to be concerned about it at all. Of course, it's all happening in public with the full sunlight as a disinfectant. It was supposed to be sunny ways, we thought, so all Canadians can see what's happening here.

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, if we can pause for a moment, there were two questions raised on the point of order from Mr. Serré.

If members require it in both official languages to follow along was one question.

The other question was on whether it is the will of the committee to continue.

Mr. Angus previously asked for timing, and we're at about 1:03, if my eyes are correct on the clock. To the delight of members, I'm sure, we have extended time of services until 2:30. We can continue to that point.

If it's the will of the members of the committee to continue until that time, we'll continue. If it's the will of the committee to ensure that we get it in both official languages, we can make sure that happens as well, so committee members can follow along.

It looks like it is the will of the committee to continue.

Some hon. members: Nay.

The Chair: We have some members wanting to continue and some not wanting to continue. We will need clear acknowledgement from members that we want to continue.

If I could have members wanting to continue as of now until 2:30, maybe longer—we have resources to continue—would you raise your hands.

The majority of members want to continue. Anybody who does not want to continue, make your objections known now.

• (1305)

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Mr. Chair, we have a problem either way to get this done.

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, I just want to make sure that committee members know that committee members have voted to continue. We will continue until 2:30, and if we get additional resources, we can continue beyond that time as well.

My second question was, do members require it in both official languages? That was raised by Mr. Serré.

Yes, we do. We require it in both official languages.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I have a point of order on a procedural note, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Colleagues, we are working on getting it translated, and we're hoping to have that shortly.

We have a point of order.

Mr. Patzer.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Under the last chair, when we were going through reports and whatnot line by line, we had this issue of just assuming that the will of the committee was as such and then just carrying on without going to actual recorded votes. I know that you quickly just said to put our hands up for this or our hands up for that, but I'm just wondering if it would be proper to do an actual roll call vote to make sure that people understand what is actually happening.

The Chair: I think that it was quite clear to members. Everybody raised their hand that they were in favour of continuing on. I asked, to that point, if members were not in favour and had acknowledgement from the members who weren't. That was not asked for by members, so I proceeded in that manner. However, in the future, if the committee members want a roll call vote, they can ask for that at that time.

We will continue.

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

I'm sorry. I don't want to belabour things in terms of resources.

If it's being translated, should we suspend for five minutes? That might give you a chance to see if we can get resources for longer than until 2:30. I think it's very important that we get Bill C-50 debated and back to the House. If it takes longer, then maybe we need to see if we can obtain more resources, but I leave that you, Mr. Chair, and to our wonderful clerk.

The Chair: Colleagues, I will look into the further resourcing that Mr. Angus has proposed in order to go beyond 2:30. I will ask the clerk to do so.

We are working on translation.

What I propose is that we suspend for a few minutes to see what we can find out. At that time, we can come back and continue on. Folks can also take a quick washroom break if they need to. We will suspend for a few minutes, and we'll resume at 1:15.

• (1305)

(Pause)

• (1320)

The Chair: I call the meeting back to order.

We are resuming debate. For all those watching at home, we have an amendment that's been moved by Ms. Stubbs.

Ms. Stubbs, the floor is yours on the amendment you have moved.

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

I apologize for doing this as we come back from a point of order, but I just want to make sure that we've actually received the motion in both official languages. That was the whole point of pausing, and I have still not received an email confirming that we have the motion in both official languages.

I'm curious to know whether that's been circulated yet.

The Chair: The motion has not been circulated yet in both official languages. That's my understanding.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Mr. Chair, on a point of order, can we get clarification from the honourable member on whether the amendment was for the back of the motion I presented earlier this morning or the middle?

The Chair: On the points of order, I've addressed the first one.

On the point of order by Mr. Sorbara, clarity needs to be provided by Ms. Stubbs.

Can you provide clarity once again for members? There is a bit of confusion on where your amendment is to go in the existing motion that we have on the floor, which was circulated and provided to all committee members. I believe it has paragraphs (a) to (i). We just need to know to make sure that we have your amendment inserted in the right spot.

I will turn it back over to you, Ms. Stubbs, to provide that clarity so we can continue on.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Yes. Thank you, Chair. I appreciate it.

Of course, right before we broke, I suggested through you, or directly to my colleague, that I would be happy to work with him on it. However, since you want that crystal clarity from me, we would suggest this amendment:

1. First undertake the following study on Bill C-69: "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; 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"

That would go after the opening paragraph of my colleague's motion, ending with "have both been referred to committee, that the committee initiate its consideration of both C-50 and C-49 with the following schedule". It would then say "(a)" with what I just outlined, and the next one would be:

2. Complete its consideration of Bill C-49.

After that, it would be 3, and thereafter it could flow.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: On a point of order, Mr. Chair, through you to the clerk, can I ask about the admissibility of the amendment Ms. Stubbs just tabled?

• (1325)

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: On that point, Chair...

The Chair: The clerk has advised that it's inserted as an addition to what exists. It is an additional item to what we had presented.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: I have a point of order for clarification.

Is it inserted at the end of the motion?

The Chair: No. Per Ms. Stubbs, it was inserted at the beginning as a new (a) and (b) and then the following items would flow under that.

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

The Chair: Mr. Patzer did have a point of order, Mr. Angus. I'm going to him quickly and then I'll go to you.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you.

I was waiting for you to finish. I did say "on that point" a couple of minutes ago. I wanted to make sure that I had a chance to quickly speak.

The question was on the admissibility of it. From what I understand, we're talking about how it's been inserted and then there will be debate on it with a speakers list. I think allowing members to debate the amendment to the motion would help provide certainty and clarity, possibly around Mr. Sorbara's question.

Obviously, the Conservatives feel that this amendment is in order because the motion is about the schedule. Our amendment simply rearranges a few things here. I think as you go through the speakers list and as we speak about the amendment, we may be able to help provide a little bit of clarity and debate on the amendment to the programming motion.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Patzer.

Mr. Angus, go ahead on a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: As this is a substantial rewriting and in fact an insertion of a whole other piece of legislation into the scheduling motion, I think it would upend Mr. Sorbara's motion dramatically. This is not a friendly amendment.

Does Mr. Sorbara have the right to reject this amendment?

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order, Mr. Angus.

Just give me a second here.

Mr. Angus, on your point of order, the member is allowed to make an amendment although it may not be in the interest of the mover. The member is allowed to make an amendment to the motion to insert at the beginning of this motion, as I think Ms. Stubbs has said.

Do you have a point order, Mr. Falk, or do you want to be added to the speakers list?

• (1330)

Mr. Ted Falk: I'd like to make an amendment to this.

The Chair: You can't make an amendment on a point of order. You can't make an amendment until you have the floor. You have to wait until you're on the floor according to the speaking list.

Mr. Ted Falk: I think I'm number two, right?

The Chair: I'm not sure where you are, but I will take a look.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Mr. Chair, can you clarify what that speakers list looks like? I do remember all three of us putting our hand up the very second she moved her amendment.

As time has gone on and after multiple points of order, it's taken probably 45 minutes to get to that point. I would just like some clarity on what that speaking order is because I think that would help things out.

The Chair: I endeavour to do my best to follow the speaking list. We never know when an amendment is being moved until the mover moves it and then it goes into debate.

I have Mr. Patzer next on the speaking list.

Those change as some members add their names and some delete them. I go to one member at a time, and I will proceed in that order.

Ms. Stubbs, I'm going back to you because the floor was yours on the amendment. You had proposed the amendment.

Were you continuing to present the amendment or were you now debating why you think your amendment is appropriate? Are you ceding the floor to the next speaker?

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: First of all, it would be wonderful if you could clarify the speaking list as it is. Second of all, as I said multiple times, and did before I was continually interrupted.... I proposed the amendment and I moved it. What I endeavoured to do before I moved it was make the case to all of you and to Canadians for why this had to be done in this order.

I guess it's up to the mover of the motion, or whomever, to figure out how or whether they want to adopt this amendment for all of the reasons I've outlined.

From my perspective, I've made that argument, Chair. Thank you.

The Chair: I will go to Mr. Patzer in the speaking order.

You're next.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you very much, Chair. I do appreciate that.

I think this amendment is solid. We're trying to order Bill C-49 ahead of Bill C-50 with our amendment because of the at least 32 times that Bill C-69 is referenced in Bill C-49. Because the Supreme Court of Canada has provided a reference on the largely unconstitutional nature of Bill C-69 and since it is referenced in Bill C-49, that is why there is a priority by Conservatives to start with Bill C-49, but that would of course mean that we need to deal with the case of Bill C-69. The court specified that legislators had to find ways to answer to the reference—not maybe they should find ways, but they had to find ways.

We spent a big chunk of this meeting laying out the case as to why we need to do the order in this manner now that we have our amendment on. Again, it's of the utmost importance that we do it in this fashion because part of Bill C-50 talks about the jobs. This is a jobs bill. It's a just transition. It's going to kill jobs, but let's just say that the government somehow is able to be successful and transition people to jobs. They won't be, but the issue is that we have heard in this committee—I have been on other committees as well where we heard this—over and over again from the private sector, but also from the public sector, and perhaps even more importantly from indigenous leaders, that Bill C-69 is the single largest barrier to actually getting projects done of any kind of any type of energy, or any type of project they are trying to do whether it's traditional oil and gas, whether it's renewables, whether it's various projects, and we've heard it numerous times.

That speaks to the urgency as to why we need to address Bill C-69 and particularly as it pertains to Bill C-49, because this is obviously about jobs in Atlantic Canada and trying to deal with the energy situation there. It would absolutely be appropriate that we deal with Bill C-69 and the impact it has first and foremost.

There's a good note from the Supreme Court of Canada ruling that Parliament can enact impact assessment legislation to minimize risks that some major projects pose to the environment. However, "this scheme plainly overstepped the mark." That's what the Supreme Court said. Moreover, "it is open to Parliament and the provincial legislatures to exercise their respective powers over the environment harmoniously, in the spirit of co-operative federalism." That's another quote from the Supreme Court ruling.

The whole point about Bill C-69 was every single province, every single premier said there were issues, and the territorial leaders did too. It is important that is noted, that going all the way back to 2018-19 when this was debated, flags were raised over issues with this bill by members of Parliament. In particular, all three at this table on the Conservative side spoke to it. In fact, my colleague from Lakeland did multiple times, and the Premier of Saskatchewan, the Premier of Alberta, all the premiers spoke against the overreach of this. Particularly the Ontario premier very strongly stated on it.

It's important that this be considered as we look at the ordering of these bills. That is why the Conservatives have put this amendment forward, because we need to respect provincial jurisdiction, which is why the Provincial Court of Alberta made a ruling on Bill C-69, which of course the federal government challenged at the Supreme Court. We then saw the Supreme Court make its ruling in the reference case.

• (1335)

I would just like to note that all throughout the history of Canadian parliaments, any time the Supreme Court has made a reference ruling, Parliament—the government of the day—has decided to make the necessary changes to it.

For the certainty of communities and people who are looking for certainty going forward, I think it's extremely important that we address this first.

I'm going to read something from the Saskatchewan government. The first line here is, "5-2 Decision Finds That The Federal Government Overstepped Constitutional Authority And Should Be More 'Cooperative' With Provinces In The Future."

The opening statement lays out the case as to why and how co-operative federalism is actually supposed to work. It clearly was not done in this case. The rest of the quote contains kind of no-brainer points. It reads:

Saskatchewan welcomes the Supreme Court of Canada's...ruling against the federal government's environmental Impact Assessment Act, formerly Bill C-69.

“This decision is nothing short of a constitutional tipping point and reasserts provinces' rights and primary jurisdiction over natural resources, the environment and power generation,” Justice Minister and Attorney General, Bronwyn Eyre said. “It should also force the federal government to reassess other areas of overreach, including capping oil and gas production and electrical generation. The IAA has stalled everything from Canadian highway and mine projects to LNG facilities and pipelines. It has thwarted investment, competitiveness and productivity across the country. This major decision will correct course.”

That last sentence, “This major decision will correct course”, is why our amendment has been moved. That's why we feel this bill needs to be done first.

I'll finish the article:

The IAA received royal assent in 2019. In 2022, the Alberta Court of Appeal (in a 4-1 majority) held that the IAA was unconstitutional, violated the division of powers between Ottawa and the provinces, and took a “wrecking ball” to exclusive provincial jurisdiction under Section 92 and 92A of the Constitution Act, 1867. The federal government appealed the decision to the [Supreme Court of Canada].

Last March, Saskatchewan was part of the constitutional intervention, along with seven other provinces, before Canada's top court, arguing that the IAA had exceeded federal jurisdiction.

The majority recognized that the IAA is a clear example of federal overreach. Specifically, the Supreme Court majority held that the IAA's designated projects scheme, by which the federal authorities could permanently put a project on hold was an “unconstitutional, arrogation of power by Parliament” and “clearly overstepped the mark.” The majority also found that the Act “grants the decision-maker a practically untrammelled power [of] regulated projects *qua* projects.”

In 2023, Saskatchewan passed the Saskatchewan First Act to [deal with] matters of provincial jurisdiction.

My own province has made it very clear where it stands on this case and on this point. We know all of the other provinces did as well when it came to the government tabling Bill C-69 back in 2018-19.

The fact that the Supreme Court has made its ruling kind of puts us in the position we're in now, where we have a largely unconstitutional bill impacting a lot of things that the government is trying work on—multiple pieces of legislation. It's not just Bill C-49 and Bill C-50. Other issues will arise if it is not dealt with and addressed.

Quite frankly, it is hamstringing the provinces to be able to proceed with projects. We heard about LNG. We heard about simply trying to get highways built or repaired.

I mentioned earlier that some of the first nations leaders were concerned about this as well because they're looking at timelines. They're looking at how there will be opportunity for self-determination, economic participation for their residents and economic reconciliation.

• (1340)

Many of them have earmarked and flagged natural resource projects and development and also renewables, which also gets to the point though of why we have a problem with Bill C-69. They have told us over and over again that even on the renewable side, Bill C-69 is a problem. It's not even just about this being the.... It was originally dubbed the “no more pipelines” bill. This is just a “no more energy” bill. That is what we have here in front of us.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: No more building anything ever anywhere.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Yes, exactly. No more building anything ever anywhere.

I think it's important that we address the issues around Bill C-69, because we've heard from many people, many stakeholders, private, public and otherwise, that this is a problem. I think what we're going—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: The guys are worried about me interrupting you. You can maybe explain how you feel about that. The guys over there are worried about how I'm speaking to you.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Yes, exactly. They're looking like they maybe want to have a—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I'm pretty sure you would tell me to buzz off if you were worried about it.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Well, exactly. We're colleagues. We banter back and forth about things. We are like-minded. I have the floor.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: I have a point of order.

The Chair: We have a point of order, Mr. Patzer.

Mr. Sorbara, go head on the point of order.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Could you remind the committee who actually has the floor to speak at this moment in time?

I'm not too sure.

The Chair: I—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Well, just on that point of order—

The Chair: Are you doing a point of order on a point order?

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: On his point of order, yes, absolutely, because I had the floor. I was speaking. My light was on. I was the one who was speaking. My colleague was so kind as to pour me a glass of water. You know, we work collaboratively on this side, Mr. Chair.

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

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, we have a point of order.

Mr. Angus, go ahead on the point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I just want to hear the points of order, and Mr. Patzer continues to try to take the floor.

Can we just hear the points of order and get back to business?

The Chair: Once again, colleagues, I've stated this many times this morning and into this afternoon. When one member does have the floor, let's let them finish their point of order before we proceed so that I can hear their point of order. Let's not get into debate within our points of order.

I will ask you, colleagues, to have just one member speaking into their own mike, not multiple, because that does cause significant challenges for our interpreters, who need one person at a time to speak. They are doing a tremendous job interpreting our debate in both official languages, so out of courtesy to our interpreters, let's make sure it's one person at a time and not two individuals speaking into one mike, okay?

I think that addresses the points of order.

Mr. Patzer, the floor is back to you.

• (1345)

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Yes, I had the floor. I did not concede the floor. It's been mine since I started speaking, and I thank you for making that point.

Just quickly, if I may, Mr. Chair, I'm going to say hello to my son. He's back home. He's sick today, so he's home from school, unfortunately, and he is watching the natural resources committee. I just want to say hello to my son.

I hope you get better soon, buddy.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Knowing kids watch debates really points out how important it is for his future.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Exactly. He's going to get a chance to learn today how important Canada's energy future is to our generation, to his generation and to the generation that is going to follow after his and how our country is going to work.

It's an important opportunity for us to discuss the division of powers in this country as well, because Bill C-69, as the Supreme Court of Canada clearly ruled, has trampled all over that. That is why there is a priority and a precedence on our side to see that we deal with Bill C-49 first, because it directly quotes and references Bill C-69 no less than 33 times.

It is causing some grief for members on the other side that we keep talking about Bill C-69, but, because they are so incredibly linked together, we continue to hammer home this point. We want to make sure that people understand that, in order for us to properly get the best result for Canadians, we are going to start with Bill C-49, which means that we have to deal with Bill C-69 and, as the amendment that was moved states at the very end in point 2—it's a very simple line that we have at the bottom—we complete consideration of Bill C-49.

What that is doing is ordering Bill C-49 to be first. Deal with Bill C-69, as part of it ties in with Bill C-49, but we are going to complete deliberation on Bill C-49 and, at that point, at the end of the amendment, point number 3 would then be the a), b), c), d), e), f), g), h) and i) that was part of the original motion. It includes the original wording and lettering of the original motion, but it includes direction to have an order prioritizing Bill C-49 in advance. It's a very substantive amendment, and I really appreciate the wording that we have in it here, which we came up with to make sure that it was compliant and in order.

It might be worth going over that one more time. At the start of the motion, point 1 is going to be that first we undertake the study on Bill C-69. It references in the opening dialogue about the need

to do Bill C-49. We're already establishing that those two bills are going to be part of the motion.

We're going to say that we first undertake the following study on Bill C-69:

1. First undertake the following study on Bill C-69: "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; 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.", then

2. Complete its consideration of Bill C-49.

That's effectively—if I'm allowed to use the term—killing two birds with one stone here, because, when we deal with Bill C-49, we have to deal with Bill C-69. We have to start with Bill C-69 to make sure that Bill C-49 is compliant with that law that is now in place. It has been largely unconstitutional since its implementation, which the government was warned about back then and continues to be warned about now.

This is why we want to prioritize the order of the bills that we have here in this amendment.

There are a few parts to Mr. Sorbara's motion that are still going to have to be addressed and dealt with, possibly in a subamendment.

• (1350)

Before we get to that, Mr. Chair, I think we need to really discuss the impacts that this will have if we don't deal with Bill C-69.

I have read a little bit about Saskatchewan and their response to the reference case and the importance of that. I'll just remind members that at no point in history has a government ignored a reference case. They've always acted upon it and prioritized it. Let's take Saskatchewan as an example. We hear a lot about the government doing consultations and how they've been very engaging with people. Well, only about 15% of Saskatchewanians have heard of the just transition. I would suspect that if the other 85% knew what was happening and what was going on, people would have a lot of concerns.

In particular, as we have seen and heard, the government's initial attempt at a just transition of coal workers substantively and spectacularly failed. I'll get to that in a bit. People have seen their energy prices already go up. That has already happened. At this point, the shuttering of our coal plants has not fully happened just yet, but we have seen energy prices increase as the government has implemented very strong anti-energy development legislation.

Take the cost of the carbon tax alone, for example, on energy production in Saskatchewan. I've heard workers at the coal station talk about how the carbon tax might put them out of a job far in advance of 2030. This is because of the excessive costs that will be associated with producing power as the power plant is phased out and winds down. That escalating cost gets thrown on top, onto the Crown corporation SaskPower.

Then you have the case of Swift Current, where I live. They buy the power from SaskPower. In a sense, you have a doubling of costs and regulation here that is causing this issue of affordability of energy for folks. We've heard the government's own regulations speak to the fact that the people who will be disproportionately impacted are seniors living on a fixed income and single mothers. That was right in the government's own regulations, and yet they are plowing ahead with this legislation that is problematic and causing massive cost overruns for people.

In fact, we just heard on Friday that the government is going to put a pause on the carbon tax in one area of the country because of the issue of cost, but yet we've constantly been told that people receive more than they pay, so therefore it shouldn't be a problem. Well, clearly it is. This is why people are concerned with Bill C-50, Bill C-49 and Bill C-69. This is why getting to Bill C-69 first will be of the utmost importance to people.

In Saskatchewan the working population is 598,000 people, give or take. There were over 43,000 construction jobs, 32,000 manufacturing jobs, and 25,800 agricultural jobs. In forestry, mining and gas there were 19,700 jobs, in utilities about 8,500, in wholesale and retail trade 98,000, and in transportation and warehousing about 30,000 jobs. The potential just transition job impacts are 10,432 direct jobs and 131,500 indirect jobs. A lot of that can be attributed and traced back to the ripple effect of Bill C-69.

• (1355)

Ms. Viviane Lapointe: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, we have a point of order from Ms. Lapointe.

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

Member Patzer has raised some relevant issues on the need to hear from Canadians on the additional study that they're proposing in their amendment. I would suggest that the original motion also has some compelling reasons on why we need to hear from Canadians. I'm certainly ready to vote on their amendment. I would expect that my colleagues are as well.

I would simply like to ask the member to consider bringing this to a vote.

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order, Ms. Lapointe.

Mr. Patzer, if you're at the point of bringing it to a vote, bring it to a vote. If you're still debating, please continue.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you, Chair.

I thank my colleague for her respectful intervention there.

No, I've been working toward.... I've been speaking off the motion and the amendment here. I think it would be important, Mr. Chair, that, first of all....

I'm working on a subamendment here, looking at the original motion. When we order Bill C-49 and Bill C-69 ahead of Bill C-50, obviously it will cause some issues, I think, with the original motion as it is. I'm just kind of working toward that subamendment that I think will be needed to address a few things here.

I just wanted to finish a thought I had about the impact on jobs in Saskatchewan. You know, 41% of our available generating capacity comes from gas, and 26% comes from coal. We're already looking at close to 70% of our energy capacity being gas and coal. Yes, we have the just transition legislation in front of the committee, but it still doesn't lay out a plan or a path to actually do something to replace that. It's just a plan to have a plan. That's essentially what that bill is.

I think this speaks to why the priority and the precedent should be given to Bill C-49 first and foremost, so that we can deal with that issue. If we're going to change the generating capacity in Saskatchewan, we need the regulatory certainty to be dealt with, which the government is trying to ignore in Bill C-69. If we don't deal with that, how will any provinces, for that matter, whether it be Saskatchewan or Alberta or whether it be the Maritimes, as we're seeing with the Atlantic accord, deal with that?

Bill C-69 clearly needs to be the priority for this committee. That is the point we have been trying to make all along here. I think it will be important to get to those bills first, to Bill C-49 and Bill C-69, ahead of Bill C-50.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, go ahead on a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: On a point of order, Chair, it's now clear that the Conservatives will do anything to filibuster Bill C-50.

I had asked earlier about whether or not we have the resources until, I think you said, 2:30 p.m. Do we have resources to go beyond so that we can finally put an end to this filibuster and get back to the work that has been laid out in the motion?

The Chair: Yes. Currently, we do have further resources to go beyond 2:30 p.m., to 3 p.m. If we have any other further updates, or if it is the will of the committee to continue on beyond 3 p.m., we will try to get additional resources to make that happen.

But it is the will of the committee, so I will keep proceeding until we get further guidance or if we have any further questions from members.

Go ahead.

• (1400)

Mr. John Aldag: On a point of order, I'm just trying to understand: Is that a request from the chair for us to put in a request? How do we go about requesting the additional resources? I'd like clarification on that before we continue.

The Chair: As mentioned, we do have further resources. If it is the will of the committee to continue, to keep sitting to discuss this important motion and amendment, the committee should advise me so that we can make those appropriate requests as well.

Mr. John Aldag: Then I think we should make that request now so that we can get the resources in order.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Aldag.

On the point of order, that is noted.

We will go to Mr. Patzer.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Oh, thank you.

Mr. Chair, I was speaking about the fact that Saskatchewan relies on natural gas and coal for the majority of its baseload power right now. Interestingly enough, on their website for the Government of Saskatchewan—it actually lists this on the SaskPower portion of that website—you can go through and you can see where the province, within the previous 24 hours, got its energy from. You can see where all the kilowatt hours were produced and where they came from. Routinely, about 70% of that was drawn from natural gas and coal. The third highest would be hydro power there. We have a couple of hydro dams in Saskatchewan. Unfortunately, I don't know that we would actually be able to build and complete one single hydro dam in the amount of time that the government is trying to phase out fossil fuels.

We've heard about timelines for approvals. That's part of the problem with Bill C-69, and now we have the largely unconstitutional part with what the Supreme Court made their ruling on. There's also the practicality of what we are going to replace the generation of gas and coal with.

We look at how long it has taken for a few hydro projects around the country to be complete. We're talking decades. Yet the government has this plan that by 2035 there will not be any natural gas. Natural gas would be basically banned at that point in time. Coal is suppose to be gone by 2030. We're seeing some difficulty around the country in trying to get the reliability factor for wind and solar. We've seen the blocking of new technologies such as tidal power already. Now that wasn't in Saskatchewan where the tidal project was moved, of course. It's a landlocked province. I'm just speaking generally about around the country how that's going to work and how that's going to play out.

With wind and solar, solar regularly accounts for less than one per cent of the power usage and energy consumption in Saskatchewan. Wind is regularly less than 10%. It's regularly a single-digit number. Sometimes, it goes a little bit higher. Sometimes it's a little bit lower. Specifically, people are concerned about peak usage and peak demand, right?

Now, for those of you who don't follow the weather patterns of Saskatchewan, in the past week, it's been as cold as -15° already and -19° in some areas. I think it's important that people realize that this assertion that you can just throw a heat pump or two on and you'll be good in the middle of winter—I mean, already in October, most heat pumps wouldn't have worked in Saskatchewan. I think it's important that this be noted.

In fact, when I was driving home on Friday after flying home from Ottawa, one of the news talk radio shows in Saskatchewan had a conversation around heat pumps. There are people who do use them up at their cabins. The people who have them speak specifically to how that is a three-season solution, mainly because it can be used as an air conditioner in the summer. You might be able to get some warmth in late May or early May at the cabin. Certainly, September into October you can get a little bit of warmth out of it.

As I said, it's already been close to -20° in Saskatchewan. That's a common occurrence at this time of year. If you look at October, November, December, January, February, March and into April, the majority of the year, you're not even going to be able to use that as a source of heat in your home reliably.

I think that it's important to have that on the table. We talk about the issue of a supposedly just transition and where people are going to get their energy from to heat their homes, to do their laundry, to cool their homes, and we have those severe differences in our temperatures from summer to winter.

● (1405)

We can be in the plus mid-thirties or in the minus mid-thirties, and sometimes you can see that in a span of a week, depending on the time of year. It's important that people have reliable energy, reliable power.

That's why Bill C-49, Bill C-69 and Bill C-50 all need to be discussed, but it's also why Bill C-69 needs to be dealt with first: because Canada's strategic advantage over the last number of decades has been the affordable, reliable, sustainable energy sources that we have in this country.

There are many countries around the world that would be jealous and envious of the situation we have with our abundance in natural resources and also the diversity of ways in which we generate power and our energy. I think it would be important for us to make sure we keep that. Certainly, Bill C-69 has been a barrier to enabling that to continue, because our population continues to grow, which is always a good thing.... It's good to see our population growing, but it also means that we're going to need more energy.

It's interesting to note that it's not going to be very long before, in a province like Quebec, which has a very robust hydro-powered grid, demand is going to outgrow capacity. I'll give credit to Quebec. They do have one of the more robust energy...where's the specific phrase I had here for it? Its grid is one of the most extensive systems in North America. To their credit, that includes the Americans. Also to their credit, they have a very extensive system, but that doesn't change the fact that if we don't have the capacity we need to continue to grow our population, it becomes a problem. That's where Bill C-69 comes into play.

Certainly, the folks in Atlantic Canada want to see growth in their capacity to produce energy, to produce power, and that's why they want to see Bill C-69 dealt with and addressed, but because it's also tied in with Bill C-49, which is obviously the Atlantic accords, that is why we have a motion and an amendment before us here today.

When we talk about what's happened in other provinces.... For example, with the coal transition that supposedly happened, there were thousands of people who at the end of it were put out of work. They were not transitioned to new jobs. We've seen entire towns in Alberta decimated by that. Bill C-50 is the government's attempt at doing this across the entire country, which is why Conservatives talk about the hundreds of thousands of jobs that are going to be lost, eliminated, because we do have a model to go on that the government has tried.

We've heard in other committee studies about how, when there was a transition that was going to happen in fisheries, it just didn't work. Mr. Angus has talked about how workers have been left out in his riding when it comes to plants being shut down or mining projects being closed. I think it's important that this Bill C-69 that has been looming over our country for the last four or five years gets dealt with, gets addressed and gets prioritized.

Mr. Chair, when it comes to a potential subamendment, I think of one thing that would help to make the original motion work.

● (1410)

I'm just going to discuss this out loud here. I'm not officially moving anything. I just want to talk this out quickly. Some of the dates that are trying to be prescribed in this programming motion obviously are going to be problematic.

In order to make sure that this motion works, getting rid of those dates or bumping them down the calendar at least a little bit, for the flexibility of the committee to be able to properly and appropriately deal with the study—I'm just thinking out loud here—removing those dates is probably going to be best.

We want to make sure that we hear from Canadians, from employers, employees, and certainly we'll hear from the private sector unions. We're definitely going to hear from people who aren't in a union, because we have heard from many people that if we talk about what this just transition supposedly is going to do, it's going to drastically impact the work of folks who don't belong to a union.

When we talk about the indirect jobs, that number is huge as well. We have to make sure that it considers those folks.

That's part of why I think putting in rigid timelines in the programming motion is going to be problematic. It also is going to be a barrier to getting the proper ordering of the motion with the amendment in it that my colleague from Lakeland moved. It would be appropriate for us to look at removing that.

With that, Mr. Chair, I'm going to move a subamendment that in section 3, as it's been ordered by my colleague from Lakeland, there be a subamendment that we would remove the reference to the dates in paragraph (a).

Paragraph (a) would read, "That the minister and officials be invited to appear before the committee on Bill C-50". We'll just leave that open-ended so that we have that flexibility as a committee. Then (b) would say, "That the minister and officials...". I think we would have to remove (b) all together. Again, that's one that's prescribing. It's programming a set date for officials in there. We haven't even agreed to our witness list yet. We have to do that first

before we can start putting dates in there for what point officials should appear.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ): On a point of order, Mr. Chair.

Is my colleague proposing an actual amendment?

Is he thinking out loud again, as he said earlier?

I'd like him to clarify his position. I love going around in circles, and I don't want to a party pooper, but everyone's patience has its limits. If he has a subamendment to propose, then let him do it and spare us his thinking out loud.

[*English*]

Mr. John Aldag: I have a point of order as well.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Simard, for your point of order.

Mr. Patzer, I believe that Mr. Simard has an important point of order, to be clear on the moving of your subamendment for the record.

Thank you for your intervention, Mr. Simard, on a point of order.

I'll go to Mr. Aldag on a point of order.

● (1415)

Mr. John Aldag: This is a question of procedural admissibility.

The subamendment seems to be speaking to other parts of the motion than just what was moved as an amendment by Ms. Stubbs. We seem to be getting into different parts of the motion beyond the amendment. Is it allowable as a subamendment, or do we need to go with the amendment and then go to a different amendment? I'm procedurally unclear here.

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order. It's a very relevant point of order.

I'm going to chat with the clerk here momentarily and then I'll get back to you.

Thank you, Mr. Aldag, on your point of order.

Mr. Patzer, I would advise you that the amendment you were proposing was looking to amend the original motion. It's not on the amendment on the floor that Ms. Stubbs has brought forward.

Your subamendment would not be in order unless you were amending Ms. Stubbs' amendment. If you have an amendment on the main motion, you'll have to wait until we deal with Ms. Stubbs' amendment that's currently on the floor.

We'll go back to you.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Part of my subamendment is going to get to part of Ms. Stubbs' amendment. Based on what you said, I'm making sure that I'm absolutely clear on this, because I will be amending her amendment as well.

Can I do both at the same time? Is that correct?

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

There's an amendment, and to add a subamendment is to amend the amendment. You can't say that you'll do the amendment while you then do the main motion. That would be inadmissible. Either he has a subamendment to the amendment or it's out of order, and we return to the speaking order that you have in place.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus.

Mr. Patzer, you cannot, at all, amend the original motion. You can only amend, in your subamendment, what is currently on the floor that Ms. Stubbs has presented. Any amendment that touches the original motion is inadmissible. Your subamendment should only deal with the component that was presented by Ms. Stubbs in her amendment. Later on, if you want to bring forward an additional amendment to the main motion, you have every right to do so at that time.

I hope that clarifies the process and procedure.

Did I hear another point of order? I just want to be clear. I may just be hearing things in my old age.

Okay, the floor is yours, Mr. Patzer.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I'm making the case that the five meetings that we have in the amendment are going to impact the dates as part of the original motion. The amendment is substantive to the rest of the motion and needs to be ferreted out. I was under the impression that with the amendment, we had a text of a new motion to work with.

The Chair: Because we have not adopted anything, we're still in debate. The amendment, only if adopted, will impact the original motion. Because we have not adopted the amendment, there's no impact to the original motion unless you choose to go to a vote so that we can decide to adopt it or not.

You're potentially proposing a subamendment. What I've articulated is that your subamendment can only amend Ms. Stubbs' amendment. We're debating Ms. Stubbs' amendment right now, and we should focus the debate on Ms. Stubbs' amendment. If you have a subamendment to amend Ms. Stubbs' amendment, I look forward to hearing it. Other committee members, as well, are quite excited to hear your new subamendment to Ms. Stubbs' amendment.

• (1420)

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Okay. Thank you. I was getting to a part that would actually do that as well.

If you would accept my—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Indulge.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Yes, indulge.

Now we're having a back-and-forth here. It's funny how that doesn't get a point of order from other folks, but it's all good. I don't mind. It's a collaborative approach. I don't mind a little friendly banter around the table. It's respectful, so I don't mind it.

I'll indulge the committee—to use my friend across the way's term.

I guess I have to withdraw the point I was making about the dates because I guess it's out of order as far as it would go as being a subamendment. I'm trying to make the case, though, for what will need to be fixed when we adopt my colleague's amendment.

I'll speak to that point of it right there. As we go through this motion.... I'm hoping that my colleagues will vote to accept the amendment, but once we accept the amendment, we're going to have to deal with the issue of the dates. That's what I was trying to establish, Mr. Chair, and I've been corrected by my colleagues as to how to properly do that.

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, we have a point of order from Mr. Angus.

Go ahead, Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Since the subamendment is out of order, we need to get to it, but if Mr. Patzer is very focused on the subamendment, he could bring the amendment to a vote. We could vote on the amendment, and then we could either dispense or deal with his subamendment. If he keeps going back on his subamendment and how he needs to have.... We need to deal with the amendment, so I would encourage him to just vote for the amendment, and then we could deal with that.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus, for your point of order.

Mr. Patzer, continue on if you'd like to make a subamendment, and let's make it clear that it's a subamendment. If you want to move to a vote, I'm sure colleagues would look forward to having that as well. I'll cede the floor to you.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Just to help out my colleagues here, I guess, I will put my subamendment forward. I'm going to move a subamendment to the amendment, which won't deal with the rest of the motion.

I would like to amend the amendment. It would be after point b). This would be a new point c) of the original amendment, for the sake of ordering. "That the committee invite witnesses from Sudbury". That would be my subamendment, that we specifically invite witnesses from Sudbury.

That would mean point c) would become "d) report its findings and recommendations to the House", and d) would become "e) pursuant to Standing Order 109, request that the government table a comprehensive response to the report."

I think it's important to make sure we get witnesses from all across the country. That's why I wanted to move that particular subamendment. It is easy for us to focus solely on people from Cornwall, Rockglen, Willow Bunch and Assiniboia. I talk about those folks all the time.

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

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, we have a point of order from Mr. Angus.

Go ahead, Mr. Angus.

• (1425)

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm really trying to figure out what this subamendment is, but amongst all the talking from Mr. Patzer, I haven't been able to. Could he get it to us in writing? I don't know, but perhaps my colleagues would want it in both official languages. I can't really talk about a subamendment. I need to see what it is. It seems like he's moving a lot of pieces around. Could we just stop and have the subamendment brought forward in both official languages, and then we could carry on?

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus.

Mr. Patzer, I think you are done with the subamendment, or almost done. Once you are finished, and it's on the floor, we will endeavour to get it translated as quickly as possible, unless you have it already translated.

I'll turn the floor back over to you to finish presenting more closing on your subamendment.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Of course, the problem here—

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

The Chair: Mr. Angus, do you have a point of order? Go ahead.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm not trying to be obstructive, but if I can't tell what the subamendment is, I don't think it's fair, for Mr. Patzer's time, that he has to talk about something that we're all not clear on.

I'd rather see what he has, and then give him the floor so we could hear whether or not what he's saying makes sense. I'm not sure what's being talked about because I don't see the subamendment, so I don't think we can proceed until we have the subamendment, in both official languages, that we could look at. Then, we could give the floor to Mr. Patzer to explain it to us, and he may win the argument.

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, there is a bit of confusion. If you are finished with your amendment, because you said you're presenting a subamendment, could you clearly and concisely read in your subamendment for the interpreters as well? If you have it in writing, you could send it through so members and the clerk have a copy of your subamendment.

If you could be very clear on that, it would help not only members in the room but also those who are attending virtually, so we would know what we would potentially be voting on.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you.

My common-sense subamendment to the common-sense amendment was simply, after b), including this. It would be a new (c) in the ordering of things. It's coming after "for one hour each" and then "(c) including witnesses from Sudbury". That is the subamendment right there. Then the original c) would become d) and the original d) would become e) in the common-sense amendment that my colleague put forward.

The subamendment is simply "including witnesses from Sudbury", but in the ordering of where it goes in the original common-sense amendment, it is between b) and c). It would be the new c), I guess. It kind of bumps things down in order.

I apologize that I do not have it translated, of course, because we were not given notice of the motion in advance of the meeting. I know we don't have to because it's committee business and it's not required, and that's fine. Those are the Standing Orders. Those are the rules, and we play by those rules, but when we are not given the courtesy of a notice of motion in advance of the meeting, it makes it impossible for us to have pre-prepared amendments and translation done for them.

In the spirit of collaboration, I guess I would make my case to all colleagues that if, in advance of the meeting, you could submit a notice in advance, that would certainly be handy for everybody—for interpretation, translation, everybody—to know what exactly it is that we are going to be debating here today.

Mr. Chair, there's one thing before I continue. I should just get clarity from you.

Are we pausing for question period and then resuming? What's happening here?

The Chair: We have resources and the will of committee members is to continue. We currently do have resources until three o'clock, and we even may get further resources as advised and asked for by our colleagues. Unless.... It's the will of the committee to continue studying this important topic and the amendments and subamendments where we're at, so we'll keep on going.

• (1430)

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: When we did our original raising of hands, it was to continue til 2:30, and now that it is 2:30 and about to go beyond 2:30, I just wanted to make sure what the direction of the committee for today was going to be, but—

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

The Chair: We have a point of order from Mr. Angus.

Mr. Angus, go ahead.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I had requested that this subamendment be put in writing. Are we going to be getting it in writing?

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Mr. Chair, should we suspend for five minutes so we can get translation?

The Chair: I believe the clerk has received it.

If it's the will of the committee to suspend for a few moments to get the word "Sudbury" and other items translated, we can do so, but if it's the will of the committee to proceed, we will just keep proceeding, as we do have resources currently til 3 p.m. and, hopefully, momentarily we'll get it in our inboxes with the translation in place.

Mr. John Aldag: Let's continue.

The Chair: Let's continue.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I'm sorry, Charlie. I tried to get us to suspend so that you would have a chance to get the text of the motion, but I guess the government wants to continue.

Ms. Viviane Lapointe: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: We have a point of order from Ms. Lapointe.

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

Through you, I just wanted to assure my colleague MP Patzer that I look forward to inviting many witnesses from Sudbury on Bill C-49 and Bill C-50.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Lapointe, for your point of order.

We'll go back to you, Mr. Patzer.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

All these bills, Bill C-49, Bill C-50 and Bill C-69, which is from a previous Parliament, obviously have a far-reaching impact across this country.

If I recall correctly, after I moved my subamendment, I was speaking to the types of witnesses we would need and the importance of them. I moved the subamendment because we need to hear from witnesses from all across the country.

Mr. Chair, I promised you earlier that I would talk about the good people from southeastern Saskatchewan—actually, south Saskatchewan, the southeast corner of my riding. Geographically it would just be the due south of Saskatchewan there in Coronach and Rockglen and Willow Bunch. It's a great part of the province, a great part of the country.

There are going to be witnesses coming from that region for sure, but, as you know, the reason we have the subamendment is to make sure we don't forget about other parts of the country that are going to be impacted potentially by Bill C-49 and Bill C-50 but also if we do not make changes to Bill C-69. We do know this is the “don't build anything” bill, as it's now become and as we've heard numerous times in committee, whether this committee or industry or environment or any other. Even in finance we hear that regularly. I think it's important that we make sure we address Bill C-69 with witnesses from all over.

I know some of my colleagues from Atlantic Canada are looking forward to bringing witnesses as well. They are obviously going to be bringing in multiple witnesses for multiple pieces of legislation, whether it's Bill C-49 or Bill C-69. I'm sure they will be very keenly interested in Bill C-50, because the fate of Bill C-49 is going to be tied to what happens with the just transition as well, since they are from part of the country that generates its electricity largely from coal and other means. They will also be disproportionately impacted by all the pieces of legislation we're talking about in the motion, the common-sense amendment and the subamendment.

I spoke a little bit about the jobs that are going to be impacted in Saskatchewan. I spoke a little bit about what's happening in Alberta as well, and in Atlantic Canada. I think it's important that we get a good list of witnesses.

Really, people are going to be concerned and talking at length, I would imagine, about the Supreme Court ruling.

• (1435)

The Chair: I'm sorry.

On a point of order, go ahead, Mr. Sorbara.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: On a point of order, through you, Chair, we are, to my understanding, dealing with a very specific

subamendment at this point in time in the debate about bringing Bill C-49 and Bill C-50 to this committee for study, two pieces of legislation that are very important for Canadians.

I'm not too certain as to the member's comments. Are they with regard to this subamendment or are they with regard to something else?

I'm not seeing the connection there, Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Sorbara for your point of order.

I would ask you, colleague, on your subamendment, because you're on the subamendment on Sudbury, to focus the debate and relevancy of your subamendment to the amendment, which is to the main motion.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you.

The subamendment is obviously about hearing witnesses from all across the country because, as I was elaborating on, the folks from Saskatchewan.... I would definitely make the point that greater Sudbury is home to the largest integrated mining complex in the world. Mining, mining supply and mining services are key economic drivers for the community. These employ somewhere over 14,000 or 15,000 people in Sudbury. I know the member opposite is aware of that, as well. That's 15% of the population. When we talk about where we're going to get witnesses from....

This is why we have a subamendment in place that will hopefully bring in folks from Sudbury. That's why we specifically want to include it. It's 15% of the people in that area. Certainly, when we talk about regional impacts in Ontario, oil and gas is 28% of the energy sources. A lot of that would be used to provide energy for the mines in Sudbury, which is why it's important we hear from folks in that area.

We don't want the people in rural Ontario to be forgotten around the table when we're discussing what the energy transition is going to look like. I think Conservatives have done a very good job of speaking about the impacts in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Atlantic Canada. We're just getting started, Mr. Chair, on talking about the impacts this will have in Ontario, as well. I'm from Saskatchewan and we have colleagues from Alberta at the table here, again. That's why most of our time so far has been about those regions. We like to represent our ridings the best way we can. We are also going to make sure other parts of this country are not forgotten. That's why the subamendment is happening.

I know the current government has openly admitted they are more than willing to forget about other parts of the country based on how they vote. I would think, Mr. Chair, this is offensive to you, given the fact that you are from Alberta. One of your own ministers took a shot at you by saying there's no representation around the table from the west, regarding why there's no carve-out from the carbon tax. Hopefully, you didn't take that one from your own colleague too much on the chin. A little friendly fire—

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Mr. Sorbara has a point of order.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: I want to make sure we're dealing with the subamendment.

Could the member, through you, Mr. Chair, continue to focus on the subamendment? If the member wishes to bring it to a vote, he can bring it to a vote. We can deal with it expeditiously.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Sorbara.

I would ask, Mr. Patzer, that you focus on the relevancy of Sudbury. The subamendment we're focused on is one you brought forward. Once you're done with it, we can put it to a vote, if you like. If not, the floor is yours to keep building your debate and rationale about the importance of your subamendment.

I know some of your colleagues also want to interject at some point.

The floor is yours.

• (1440)

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: How rude of me; my colleagues haven't had a chance yet. I'm sure we'll get to them soon.

As I was saying, Mr. Chair... I was speaking to the subamendment. I was talking about energy and power generation in the communities of Ontario, particularly Sudbury, which is why I moved that common-sense subamendment about including a specific region of Ontario that will be part of this 28% of oil and gas used for the grid in Ontario.

Conservatives want the country to know that we care about the entire country. Just because I'm from Saskatchewan does not mean I don't care about the energy future of Ontario, Atlantic Canada, Quebec, British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba and the territories. That's why the common-sense subamendment to a very strong, common-sense amendment was put forward.

Within that 28% of oil and gas for Ontario and rural Ontario... Boy, that's 10,482 megawatts—a substantial amount of power generation out there, which will be impacted by what's going on with these bills. Bill C-50 will deal with that 28%, but if Bill C-69 is not addressed and dealt with first, there's no point in talking about Bill C-50 and what we're going to do with that 28%.

Ms. Viviane Lapointe: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Go ahead, Ms. Lapointe, on your point of order.

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

Through the chair to my colleague MP Patzer on the subamendment dealing with Sudbury, I'm going to tell you quite clearly that the people in my riding want us to talk about sustainable jobs. They want to talk about getting economic growth from a net-zero economy. Certainly, Sudbury's critical minerals will be a key element to that. There is no getting to net zero without critical minerals.

What the people of Sudbury don't want—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: This is debate.

Ms. Viviane Lapointe: —are all these delays.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: This is debate.

Ms. Viviane Lapointe: They want us to be able to get to the important work of dealing with Bill C-49 and Bill C-50.

Thank you.

The Chair: We have a point of order from Mr. Falk.

Mr. Ted Falk: On a point of order, what Ms. Lapointe is doing isn't even close to a point of order. This is debate.

You need to give her instructions: Get on the speaking list and you'll have your opportunity. You'll have all the opportunity in the world to voice your opinion, put your rationale forward and present it to the committee.

The Chair: I will ask all members, including the one who raised the point of order, to make their point of order based on the point of order, not debate, so that we can continue to have a great debate around the table.

Thank you, Ms. Lapointe, for your point of order.

Thank you as well, sir, for your interjection on the point of order.

We'll go back to—

Mr. Ted Falk: I could continue. I have more to say.

The Chair: No, you've made your point of order clear.

We'll move back to Mr. Patzer.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you.

Sometimes it's fascinating to see how certain points of order end up going and why people want to them bring up. Certainly, government talking points are not what any individuals want to see. They want to see actual results and to see things happen. They want certainty. They want to know what's going to happen to their future. They want to know what's going to happen.

Just as an aside, Bill C-50 doesn't actually have a plan for how to address that. It's a plan to make a plan. We've seen that over and over again with this government.

The Chair: We have a point of order from Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: On a point of order, I think we've all been very respectful, listening to this hour upon hour, but if we're speaking to the subamendment, then he needs to speak to the subamendment. Otherwise, he should cede the floor. That's fairness. Right now, what's happening is not fair.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus.

Mr. Patzer, your subamendment was on the inclusion of the word "Sudbury" in section c) of the amendment. I'd ask you to keep your comments relevant to the importance of your subamendment to the amendment so that we can continue on and other members also have the opportunity to debate this important insertion of your subamendment.

Relevancy is important, so let's keep it relevant.

Thank you.

• (1445)

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

As you know, prior to having the point of order, I was actually speaking about where the folks of Sudbury are getting their energy, where their power generation comes from and where rural Ontario gets it from. This is why we put that specific common-sense subamendment in place. There was a point of order while I was talking about that. I was merely offering up a quick response to the point of order because I found it quite fascinating myself, to be honest. What I was getting at was the fact that there's over 10,000 megawatts of gas and oil being used for power and energy for rural Ontario and for communities like Sudbury.

It is important, when we have a common-sense subamendment outlining the people of Sudbury, how it relates to the motion, which is its link to Bill C-69. This is because of the reference case by the Supreme Court of Canada making it largely unconstitutional. How's that going to implicate Bill C-50?

Again, let's just pretend for a moment that Bill C-50 was somehow magically going to work. It's not going to work because it's a job-killing initiative, but let's just pretend for a moment that it would. There are going to be issues trying to get the jobs and the energy transition for these workers and for these communities like Sudbury to be able to have reliable, affordable energy going forward.

In order for Bill C-50 to possibly be effective, Bill C-69 has to be dealt with first and foremost. When we see that gas and oil is 28% in Ontario for the high-voltage provincial grid, it is important that we speak to why Bill C-50 has a part to play and what's going to happen to the people of Sudbury—which is what my subamendment is all about.

Providing context to amendments and subamendments is important. That's what I am trying to do. That's the point I'm trying to make and, unfortunately, I keep on getting points of order over that.

I don't know if it's because when people hear how this is going to go and how this will be laid out...because, as I mentioned earlier, there was already an attempt at a coal transition in rural areas of Alberta. I mentioned the thousands of jobs that were lost. Workers were not transitioned into other jobs. They were certainly not given what was mentioned, which was that there would be sustainable, well-paying jobs for everybody.

Again, it's fantasyland to think that the 177,000-plus direct jobs are all of a sudden going to get the same or jobs or greater jobs that are talked about by the minister in the just transition or the Canadian sustainable jobs act.

We know it's not going to be a just transition. That's why the government has moved to try to change the name and the title of it. The Minister of Labour actually admitted that people don't like the phrase “just transition”. I think it's because people know what it actually means. It's just going to be a transition into unemployment for a lot of folks, or into a position where they are going to be out of work or be paid substantively less. We heard a witness the other

day say that 34% less is what people will be paid when and if they are transitioned to a different job.

I can guarantee that the people of Sudbury do not want to take a 34% haircut. That's not what people want. The bill actually does nothing to make sure that it is going to say...we've seen government internal documents even admit and say that this is not going to happen.

We have on the record from the government that this is going to be problematic, and we're still ramming through legislation that was time-allocated after minimal debate in the House of Commons. That's what happened back in 2018-19 with Bill C-69. It's what happened with Bill C-50. It's what happened with Bill C-49.

It's also important to talk about the energy transformation going forward for the people of Sudbury. That's why we want to have people at committee to testify to this. It's because when we see what the coldest temperature on record for Sudbury was recently, over the last couple of years, last winter, in fact, the coldest temperature was -37°C.

• (1450)

There was no carve-out for the carbon tax in Sudbury. People are going to need to heat their homes with a heat pump that only works up until -7°, which is about 30 degrees short of what people are going to need to stay warm. This is why we're talking specifically about making sure we get people from a community outside of Toronto to testify at committee.

This committee is also going to study the impact of the Supreme Court decision on the resource sector, and we want stakeholders from Sudbury to be included in that study. That's the main point of the common-sense subamendment that we have.

I think it's important that we let the people of Ms. Lapointe's riding have a say. That's why we moved this common-sense subamendment, Mr. Chair.

I'm waiting for an applause. I'm going to end my remarks there.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Patzer.

Next on the speaking list—this is on the subamendment presented by Mr. Patzer—we have Mr. Falk on the subamendment to the amendment.

Mr. Ted Falk: Thank you, Mr. Chair, for the opportunity to speak to the subamendment to invite constituents from the Sudbury area as witnesses to come to committee to give testimony as to what they think is important in Sudbury, whether it's the fact that they're paying carbon tax on their home heating, groceries and just about everything else they buy—fuel.

It's interesting. Last week, the Liberals announced an exemption to the carbon tax for home heating for folks in Newfoundland and Atlantic Canada. I guess there were some Manitobans who took exception to that and asked why they aren't getting those exemptions in Manitoba.

The Chair: We have a point of order from Mr. Angus.

Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Chair, we can't let this descend into a Conservative gong show.

We've had an amendment. Then they went to a subamendment, and now they want to start talking about carbon tax.

This is not the issue. Either he's speaking to the subamendment or he's not, and if not, then let's vote on the subamendment, vote on the amendment and get back to the motion at hand. That's how committees work.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus.

Mr. Falk, I would ask you to focus your intervention on the subamendment on Sudbury. Be succinct in your remarks, but make sure it relates back to the subamendment proposed by Mr. Patzer.

Mr. Ted Falk: Thank you, Mr. Chair, for that reminder.

Thank you to the member for Timmins—James Bay for his concern that my remarks would be addressing the issue of inviting witnesses from Sudbury—Ms. Stubbs' amendment to the motion that was brought forward earlier today—because I was getting there. If Mr. Angus had been a bit more forbearing for a few moments, he would have soon discovered why I was making the comments I was making. But I'll get back to that.

Evidently, Manitobans feel they should have been exempted from paying carbon tax for home heating as well.

Minister Gudie Hutchings' response to their concern was if they'd vote for more Liberals from the Prairies, they'd get an exemption too. Wow. The folks in Sudbury didn't get an exemption to their home heating, and I'm thinking, do they not have a Liberal enough member of Parliament to get them that exemption?

Obviously in Manitoba, Terry Duguid, Minister Dan Vandal, Kevin Lamoureux and Ben Carr were not Liberal enough to get Manitobans exemptions. I think it's important to hear from constituents of Sudbury at this committee to ask why they weren't good enough to get an exemption on the carbon tax for their home heating.

That's as succinct as I'll get for you, sir.

• (1455)

Ms. Viviane Lapointe: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

We need to ensure that this debate is an accurate one, and the exemption on home heating oil is country-wide.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I think that was debate, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you for the point of order.

Actually, Ms. Lapointe, I have you on the speaking list next, as I believe you raised your hand earlier. I just want to make sure that

you want the opportunity, because Mr. Falk has concluded, so the opportunity is yours now. The floor is yours, Ms. Lapointe.

I'll just remind you that we're on the subamendment to include Sudbury in the amendment.

Mr. Angus, I see that your hand is up as well, so I've put you on the speaking list after Ms. Lapointe.

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

Once again, I just want to acknowledge the subamendment that's been made by MP Patzer. I do want to talk about how important the work of this committee is and how important it is that we get to the motion that was tabled this morning by MP Sorbara about our dealing with Bill C-49 and Bill C-50. These bills are very important for us all across Canada, as well as specifically for Sudbury, as the subamendment has been tabled.

As I stated and will reiterate, the people of Sudbury certainly want to talk about creating good, sustainable jobs for workers. We also want to talk about economic growth within a net-zero economy. This is extremely important. Critical minerals will be a very important aspect to our reaching net zero, and Sudbury will be a key player in that. We look forward to our role in that. This committee did a study around the Inflation Reduction Act and how Sudbury can position itself in Canada, as well, around being not only competitive but also collaborative with that. It will be very important. Critical minerals present a generational opportunity for wealth for Sudbury and in turn Ontario and Canada.

It is vitally important that this committee get on with the work of Bill C-49 and Bill C-50. I look forward to doing that. I look forward to inviting some really good expert witnesses from Sudbury and northern Ontario, as well, to weigh in on this important discussion that Canadians and people from Sudbury want us to have.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Lapointe, for your intervention on the subamendment and for your advocacy for Sudbury.

We'll now go to Mr. Angus.

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

Certainly, the issue of critical minerals is essential to the Canadian economy. We know that the EV battery investments that have been put in are set to create two million cars coming off the line. That is going to dramatically change the economic landscape and the energy landscape, yet the Pierre Poilievre Conservatives get up day after day in the House to ridicule EV technology. They say that these vehicles catch fire, that they freeze. They're really doing everything they can to undermine.... The member for Sarnia—Lambton is always saying how it would have been better to give \$10 million to every resident in her riding rather than make these investments. I'm very concerned about this ongoing sabotage against a clean-energy economy.

With regard to Ms. Lapointe's concerns, however, I would certainly support having witnesses come from the base metal regions to talk about their clean-energy investments and the importance of the critical minerals strategy. However, I think that should come in a separate motion. I think that should be a study on its own. I think what we're seeing here is an attempt to hijack the motion that was brought forward to get Bill C-50 done.

We've had over 112 hours of testimony. We've had multiple witnesses. The Conservatives have interrupted time and time again. Any time that we had representatives of workers and workers from western Canada who wanted to speak about getting this legislation passed—

• (1500)

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I have a point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, we have a point of order. I'm going to go to the point of order of Ms. Stubbs and then I'm going to come back to you, but I might have to interject after the point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thank you, Chair.

Because Mr. Angus made several points this morning in the same vein, I would just make a point of order according to his own standards about what is relevant to the debate. It seems that he has spent all morning interjecting on others and now he might be doing the same thing and—

The Chair: We are getting into debate now, Ms. Stubbs. That's not relevant to the point of order you raised.

Mr. Angus, I will have to put you on hold, because we have resources only until three o'clock, so we will have to suspend until 3:30 just so we can get a transition of resources and interpreters.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm done. I was just ready to call the question.

The Chair: What I will do, Mr. Angus, is give you the floor back when—

Mr. Charlie Angus: No. I've finished.

I call the question

The Chair: Okay. I will call the question. I'll take this to a vote.

All in favour of the subamendment, please raise your hands.

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

The Chair: We're in a vote.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: No, but it's about the vote and the—

The Chair: We're in a vote, so all in favour of the subamendment, raise your hands, please.

Mr. John Aldag: On a point of order, and I hate to do this, because I know you called the vote, but I think you said we had resources until three o'clock. We're past three. I suggest we suspend. Could we vote when we come back? Unless we have resources to do it.... I'm ready to raise my hand.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm sorry. We're in the middle of a vote.

The Chair: We'll vote and conclude—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: John, that does seem reasonable.

The Chair: Thank you. We'll be done very quickly.

All in favour, raise your hands.

An hon. member: On the subamendment?

The Chair: Yes.

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

The Chair: The subamendment is defeated.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Defeated from having members from the community of Sudbury come...? Okay.

The Chair: The subamendment is defeated.

Thank you.

We will suspend until 3:30.

• (1500)

(Pause)

• (1530)

The Chair: Hello and welcome, new committee members who have joined us this afternoon. It's great to see you here at the natural resources committee.

We will go back to the amendment.

I will cede the floor to Monsieur Simard, who is next on our speaking list.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): I'm sorry, Chair, but I just have a point of order before we start. May I be recognized for that?

The Chair: Of course you may. Go ahead on a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

It is a great pleasure to be here at the natural resources committee.

It's great to see my friend, Ms. Chagger, here as well. That's the main reason I came.

Could I get my name added to the speakers list? I just want to clarify the process for that.

Thank you very much, Chair. Congratulations on your role as well.

• (1535)

The Chair: Thank you.

Monsieur Simard, the floor is yours.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I like Ms. Stubbs a lot, but I'm going to be forced to say something she won't like. We've already discussed Bill C-69. The amendment she's proposing is subject to the same objections that I had in that case. First, Bill C-69 was introduced in another parliament, and it also concerned the environment. Consequently, I don't see why the Standing Committee on Natural Resources should study it before considering bills C-49 and C-50.

Furthermore, but in the judgment rendered by the Supreme Court, deadlines were established for the government to comply with that decision. So let's let the government try to comply with the Supreme Court's judgment and set aside Bill C-69.

We've thoroughly discussed Ms. Stubbs' motion to amend. I think we've exhausted the matter, and I therefore request a vote.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you, Monsieur Simard, for your comments.

If it's the will of the committee to go to a vote....

We do have a speaking order.

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

The Chair: I just want to finish and then you can go to your point of order.

Monsieur Simard did ask for a vote. If it's the will of the committee to go to a vote, then we can go to a vote, but we do have a speaking order as well. I will ask committee members. He has proposed that question. If you believe that it has been covered, then we can go to a vote. If we want to proceed and need to debate this further, then that's your choice.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: That is part of the point of order, Chair.

The Chair: All right, I'll go to your point of order now.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I'm just seeking clarity.

There is a standing order that says unless a time limit has been adopted by the committee or the House—and we've obviously extended well beyond our usual sitting time, so there's clearly not a time limit. Standing Order 116(2)(a) says that “the Chair...may not bring a debate to an end while there are members present who still wish to participate.”

As you've referenced, there is a speakers list. There are many members who still would like to participate. I do think it's not appropriate at this time to be calling for a vote.

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order.

We will proceed down the speaking list. We'll go to Mr. Falk.

Mr. Ted Falk: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Marc Serré: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

I was here four hours ago and I've come back. I see there are Jeremy, Ted and Garnett. They've all asked to be acknowledged. I just want to understand who the members across the way are. I'm just asking a question.

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

I'm subbing for Maninder, who's not here.

Mr. Marc Serré: Can we just get who's voting? Who's a member? That's all.

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order, Mr. Serré. It's a very good question.

We believe there are additional members. Ms. Stubbs, Mr. Patzer, Mr. Falk and Mr. Genuis are here as members who are eligible right now to vote on behalf of the Conservatives, and we have Ms. Gazan here filling in for Mr. Angus.

I hope that's clear.

Mr. Marc Serré: Thank you.

● (1540)

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Mr. Chair, on that point of order, I do believe that if any member wants to sit at the table as an elected member of Parliament, they're able.... To your point, there's only a certain list that can vote, but if others want to be part of the debate, they are allowed to be part of the debate.

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order. I can't accept your point of order because—

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

The Chair: There you go. I have Mr. Genuis on a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'd like to confirm that Mr. Viersen is on the speaking list.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, thank you for your point of order—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I thought of it myself.

The Chair: He is not on the speaking list as he is not a member of this committee subbing for somebody right now.

We will go back to the speaking order. We have Mr. Falk up next.

Mr. Falk, the floor is yours.

Mr. Ted Falk: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It's a pleasure for me to talk to this amendment brought by my colleague, Ms. Stubbs.

Just to bring people up to speed again, I'm going to read what the amendment actually is so that viewers watching this by television understand what it is that we're talking about. The amendment is that prior to engaging in the Liberal study motion that was brought forward, we:

1. First undertake the following study on Bill C-69: “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; 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.”, then

2. Complete its consideration of Bill C-49.

The rest of the motion that was brought forward would follow that.

Really, putting things in the right order is what this motion is doing. We've heard from the Supreme Court in their reference opinion that Bill C-69 has many parts of it that are not charter-compliant and are not constitutionally sustainable.

Bill C-49 and Bill C-50 all have references to Bill C-69 in there and, because of that—sometimes the language is verbatim—need to be studied in the light of Bill C-69, which should at least be charter-compliant and constitutionally sustainable. At the moment, it's not.

That's why I think it's incumbent on this committee to take a look at Bill C-69 and look at the reference opinion that the Supreme Court has provided. Then, in the light of that report, we're better able to deal.... Once we've done a fulsome study on Bill C-69 and the Supreme Court's opinion, we're better able, once that legislation has been modified and has become compliant, to look at Bill C-49 and Bill C-50.

What I would like to do is make a subamendment to the amendment at this time. I'd like the subamendment to be that the witness list for the study of Bill C-69, as proposed in the amendment, include representatives of the resource companies from Timmins—James Bay. I can repeat that: that the study include witnesses, that a representative of the resource companies operating in Timmins—James Bay....

• (1545)

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

I hate to interrupt my wise and learned colleague from Provencher. I'm very grateful for your indulgence, Chair.

I'm wondering if you will maintain the speaking list that was used previously for the subamendment or if we should seek to be re-added to the list for a separate speaking list for consideration of the subamendment. I know there are some variations in the practice used by chairs across the committees.

The Chair: What we've done today when there's a new motion on the floor is to have a new speaking list, which we've already begun to establish once the motion has been moved.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Then there's a new speaking list for the subamendment from—

The Chair: Correct.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I would like to be added to that speaking list.

The Chair: I've acknowledged that.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Excellent. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I'm very grateful.

The Chair: Mr. Falk, it's back to you, unless you're done.

Mr. Ted Falk: I'm going to give a very brief rationale for that subamendment. This is, in essence, the rationale.

I think it's an important subamendment. It is that the James Bay Treaty No. 9 territory currently supports 11 operating mines and has a workforce of 7,832 direct employees or contractors. The James Bay Treaty No. 9 territory has identified 13 critical minerals

that are of specific interest to the governments of Ontario, Canada, U.S.A., EU, Australia, U.K., Japan and Korea.

Even the member for Timmins—James Bay, who is a member of this committee, brought up the fact that he hasn't seen a single person in the riding receive a heat pump, and he made that comment as recently as September 27 of this year. We need to hear from people from the area of Timmins—James Bay.

Mr. Marc Serré: On a point of order, Mr. Chair, I'm a bit puzzled here. I know I missed a few hours of the Conservative filibustering here on Bill C-50 and Bill C-49.

Where in this motion are heat pumps? Clearly, there are issues here where we're looking at inviting the minister to come to speak on both Bill C-50 and Bill C-49—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: On a point of order, Chair, I think this might be debate. This is not a point of order.

The Chair: We have a point of order to the point of order.

Mr. Patzer, go ahead on the point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: This is not germane to the conversation. He's debating the member. Perhaps he should stick to the point of order at hand, or maybe you should rule the point of order as out of order. I will let you decide, Mr. Chair. That's your prerogative and not mine. He should stick to the debate at hand. This is not a debate.

The Chair: Thank you.

I want to remind all committee members not to debate during your points of order, which we've seen many members do throughout the day today. It's not from everybody. There were lots from earlier today. Moving forward, I'm sure we'll make our points of order and will get back to the person who has the floor.

Mr. Falk, the floor is yours, sir.

Mr. Ted Falk: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate your ruling on that.

The whole issue here is that we need to hear directly from people who have been impacted by Bill C-69, and the people who have been directly impacted are people in the natural resource sector, like oil and gas, like mining, and these people need a voice at the table. They don't feel that they're being represented. There are lots of not only workers there but also companies that support all those jobs. We need to hear from them on how they feel about Bill C-69.

Once we can determine that and can get Bill C-69 to the point where it is actually constitutionally sustainable and compliant, then we're much better positioned once that bill is corrected. We don't want the Supreme Court to have to look at Bill C-49 and Bill C-50 and correct those again because of all the references made to Bill C-69, which would probably make it also not compliant.

Why would we want them to do all that duplicate...? They have important cases to hear. They don't need to hear about the failures of the Liberal-NDP government having presented legislation, which wasn't compliant, to Parliament. They knew it wasn't compliant. The Conservatives argued long and hard, when that legislation was before us in 2018, that this was not charter-compliant and that this did not meet the litmus test that was required for it to be constitutionally sustainable. We weren't listened to. We were mocked, and we were criticized. Now you see what we have today, and that's the Supreme Court making a reference opinion on that piece of legislation and asking for that to be corrected.

It's incumbent on this committee—we're the natural resources committee—to study that piece of legislation. Let's help the government get it right.

Thank you.

• (1550)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Falk.

We will now go to Monsieur Simard.

My apologies, it's Mr. Patzer first.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I think you gave our friend from the Bloc a heart attack there.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On a point of order, before Mr. Patzer gets rolling, could you read out the list that presently exists for the subamendment?

The Chair: We have currently Mr. Patzer, then Mr. Simard and then you.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you very much.

The Chair: Mr. Angus is after that.

I'd like to remind members that Mr. Viersen is not a substituting member of the committee, so I cannot acknowledge him. He can sit at the table—

An hon. member: He's going to be subbing for me once—

The Chair: We will, once that substitution happens.

Right now we will go to you, Mr. Patzer.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you.

I'd like to comment on that point of order briefly.

If Mr. Viersen wants to join this debate, even not as one of the four voting Conservative members on this committee, he can do that. He's fully within his right to do that.

If one of the independent members or a member from the Green Party were to walk in and sit down at this table, they'd be able to join in this debate. This is a debate on a motion. It's not a substan-

tive part of committee policy. Right now we're debating a motion, and they'd be able to join into the debate.

Mr. John Aldag: Point of order.

The Chair: We have a point of order from Mr. Aldag.

Mr. John Aldag: Could we get clarification on whether that's factually correct?

My understanding is that's not the case. I'd like to have a ruling from the chair as to whether what Mr. Patzer is alleging is indeed the case.

The Chair: If you are a sitting member of the committee, you can speak, but if you are not....

Now that Mr. Viersen has substituted for Mr. Falk, he would be able to raise his hand and add his name to a list if he so chose. Now that he has, we will add him to the list.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: On that point again, as I understand it, when it comes to allocations of time slots in regular committee, it's parties with official status that get time allocations for committee.

When we are debating a motion such as we are here, I was under the impression.... I appreciate what you have said, but I want to clarify that since we're not in the traditional framework in which, for example, Conservatives have a six-minute slot and the Bloc has a six-minute slot, it is the case then that only the four at the table.... I want to get some clarity around that.

I understood that any member of the House of Commons actually had the ability to be recognized at a committee table outside of that.

The Chair: It's my understanding, Mr. Patzer, that a member can cede the floor to another member on the committee if they wish to, but in this case, Mr. Falk was here and Mr. Viersen was not substituting for him, so he was not able to participate or gain the floor. That's the ruling.

After getting information from the clerk, I'll stick to that ruling.

The floor is yours. You can continue on with your debate on the subamendment that was proposed.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I would like to challenge the chair on that point then, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: We have a challenge by Mr. Patzer. He is challenging my ruling on the allowance of other members in committee.

Mr. John Aldag: We need to vote.

• (1555)

The Chair: The question is this: Shall the ruling of the chair be sustained?

If you support my ruling as the chair, vote yes. If you don't, vote no.

An hon. member: I'd like a recorded vote.

The Chair: It will be a recorded vote.

Mr. Marc Serré: As per normal committee rules, yes.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Thank you. The ruling of the chair is sustained.

We have a point of order by Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, on a point of order, when a roll call vote is made, the expectation is that members cast their votes yea or nay, not that they provide rationale for their vote and the process of voting. If every member provided rationale as part of the vote, it would slow the process down considerably. I think the rules are fairly clear on that.

Mr. Serré tried to take advantage of the rules, I think, and I hope you would rule that he should not be providing rationale for his vote in the context of a roll call vote.

The Chair: On the point of order, I would remind members that when it is time to vote to just vote, and also vote with your microphones on—not have your microphone off and vote—so that our interpreters can register your vote in both official languages.

Very good. Thank you.

We will go now back to Mr. Patzer.

Mr. Patzer, on the subamendment to the amendment.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Sorry, Mr. Chair, but let me just ask a question.

On the point you just made, did I accidentally vote with my microphone off or were you talking to someone in particular?

The Chair: It was another member, Ms. Stubbs, but thank you for that clarification.

Mr. Patzer, the floor is yours.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you for that, Mr. Chair.

On the subamendment we have at hand here, as we laid out the case before, the case will be laid out again as to why we want to hear from witnesses all across the country. Certainly, we want to hear from folks who work at the mines in and around Timmins and James Bay. I think Mr. Falk highlighted very well the importance it has for the greater region and greater area—in particular, for resource development for economic reconciliation—and opportunities for all of Canada to be able to participate in the economy.

We have lots of proposals for witnesses. We just want to make sure that the area in the riding of Timmins—James Bay won't be left out and forgotten, as we found out not a single person there has received a heat pump or a carbon tax carve-out either. I think it's important to make that note as well. I think it would be good to hear from people from Timmins—James Bay. The government hasn't done much in the way of helping those folks out.

We look at how just transitions have previously gone and been attempted. We heard previously that workers have been left out in that region of the country, so we want to hear from them about what might happen when another just transition is forced upon resource workers in this country. It's not just the smaller scale of the first attempt that spectacularly failed and how that was done up; now we have a national scope and scale for a so-called “just transition”.

Conservatives put forward another common-sense subamendment to another common-sense amendment. As we know, after eight years of this government, the penchant to do things that are largely unconstitutional, as we saw with Bill C-69, is problematic.

It would be good to hear from the folks in and around Timmins—James Bay about what their thoughts are on that.

If we don't deal with the issue of Bill C-69, how's that going to play out for the folks in that area? They're obviously looking for more involvement in the development of natural resources in that area. We've heard the extensive list of critical minerals available for the energy transition—not just here in Canada, but around the world—that people want for components. Therefore, trying to get the best opportunity for people to be able to speak to what we're dealing with here at committee with this bill and getting their perspective will be of the utmost importance.

I would recognize Timmins—James Bay as another area of the country.... I was talking about the stats earlier. In Ontario, with a pretty significant amount of gas and oil that is still used for power and energy production, and without a doubt with the amount of mining that goes on in Timmins—James Bay, certainly a lot of it would be used there as well to make sure that they can power their operations and keep the work environments in a manner that is suitable for the workers.

I think it's important that we deal with witnesses from all across the country. That's why we have another common-sense subamendment here that we're looking forward to dealing with.

I want to thank Mr. Falk—I know he has left—for moving this amendment. I look forward to seeing what the good people of Timmins—James Bay have to say.

● (1600)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Patzer.

We will now proceed to Monsieur Simard, who is next.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: Thank you.

We can spend the whole day naming everyone's ridings and saying we want to add them, but I don't think that'll change much. We can also shout the words “common sense” at each other 15 times, but I don't necessarily think that's “rational”.

I see that my Conservative colleagues want to be heard. The best way to do that maybe to conduct the clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-50. If they don't agree, they need only vote against it. I personally voted against Bill C-50 in the House and did the same with Bill C-49. I'm nevertheless prepared to hear the witnesses who will be here to express their views on the bill, just as I'm prepared to hear the minister and officials tell us about bills C-50 and C-49.

I don't know what my Conservative colleagues are trying to do with this mountain of oddball amendments they're proposing to us this morning, but I know that people are watching us now. Some of them are starting to think my colleagues' conduct is a bit much. The Conservative Party leadership tells the House that people are requesting medical assistance in dying because they have nothing to eat. Some people in my riding who hear that find it appalling.

There are some MPs here today who, instead of seriously discussing a bill, are proposing oddball amendments and citing the ridings of certain members in an attempt to find an excerpt that suggests those members don't want to listen to the people. I don't think that's a serious gambit. If we're being serious today, this afternoon, we will promptly vote on the subamendment and Ms. Stubbs' amendment. Then we'll decide on the motion before us so we can begin the work we have to do on bills C-50 and C-49.

I'm telling you that even though I voted against those bills in the House. I'm prepared to hear witnesses because the mandate given to me by the people in the riding of Jonquière is to act as a legislator, not as a buffoon. I therefore request a vote on my colleague's subamendment.

Perhaps then we can move on to something else.

• (1605)

[English]

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I have a quick point of order, Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Simard, for your comments.

Mr. Patzer, go ahead.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you.

I have a point of clarity on an earlier ruling that was made.

Standing Order 119 does state that only members may vote or move a motion, but it also says this:

Any member of the House who is not a member of a standing, special or legislative committee, may, unless the House or the committee concerned otherwise orders, take part in the public proceedings of the committee, but may not vote or move any motion, nor be part of any quorum.

It actually does say that they may take part in the debate, but they can't vote, move a motion or be part of the quorum. If they want to just have their voice heard, according to Standing Order 119, they are able to do so.

I'll just leave that with you, Chair.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: It's important. That's an important common-sense [*Inaudible—Editor*].

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Yes. It's a point of privilege for members, to be honest, and it's a common-sense one at that.

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order. We'll look into what you've referenced in more detail. I'll report back once I have further information on what you've referenced—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Chair, to that point of order, it just seems extremely germane—like, this very second—to the confidence and credibility and clarity of what we're doing at this committee. I'm not quite certain how we can possibly proceed if we have a potential discrepancy here on a basic rule.

The Chair: We made a decision earlier—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: But it's the rules that govern this committee that are important in terms of what we're doing right now.

The Chair: Well, we made a ruling earlier from the information and my understanding of it. Mr. Patzer has provided some information on the standing order—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: He read the standing order. It's not “some information” on it. He read it.

The Chair: We will get further clarity. If there is more clarity provided, we will come back and provide that to you.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: It really seems to me that for confidence in these proceedings, we'd better get this clarity right now. Then we can proceed.

The Chair: That's not a point of order. If there's another point of order...but that's what I have provided right now.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Perhaps there will be another point of order.

The Chair: I'm asking the clerk to look into the matter. As soon as I get some information back, I will advise the committee accordingly.

Mr. Arnold Viersen (Peace River—Westlock, CPC): I have a point of privilege, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: We don't have points of privilege, Mr. Viersen.

Mr. Arnold Viersen: I have a point of order, then, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Yes, Mr. Viersen.

Mr. Arnold Viersen: I would just like to thank my colleague for pointing out that this is the first time that I have ever been denied being added to the speaking order while not being subbed in. I totally thought that I would be on the speaking list.

The Chair: You are in debate.

You actually are on the speaking list, Mr. Viersen.

Mr. Arnold Viersen: Now I am because I'm subbed in.

The Chair: Yes.

Mr. Arnold Viersen: I tried to get on the speaking list before I was subbed in. I know that for folks back home, Bill C-69 is something they're very passionate about. Hence, I'm here to speak to it. The fact that I was unable to get on there does seem to be limiting to my privileges as a member of Parliament.

Mr. Charlie Angus: This is a point of debate.

The Chair: Yes, we are getting into debate.

You are on the speaking list. You will have your opportunity on the subamendment.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair, on this point of order.

What we are talking about is the ability of members of Parliament here to do their democratic duty on behalf of their constituents and all Canadians. My colleague read the standing order. He did not give some information about it. He read the standing order. The Standing Orders are the rules that govern the House of Commons and the committee. They are the foundation of the democratic exercise here of elected representatives representing the common sense of the common people who sent us here to do these jobs.

It seems to me that we need to get clarity on this right now. Otherwise, the entire in-real-time proceedings of this committee and our ability to do our jobs on behalf of the people who sent us here may be compromised. I would suggest that, for confidence in these proceedings and every minute after that, we get this clarity first and then proceed.

• (1610)

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Stubbs.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I have a point of order.

The Chair: Hold on. We had a point of order from Mr. Angus. We're going to him first on the point of order.

Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm waiting to speak on this latest boutique subamendment. If they don't like the ruling, they have the right to challenge the chair. Otherwise, what they are doing is obstruction.

Challenge the chair or let's carry on.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus.

A ruling was made earlier. The chair was challenged, and the ruling was upheld, so we are going to proceed to—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I had a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Go ahead on the point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Part of why I brought up that standing order was that I am also concerned about the precedent we are setting by ignoring certain standing orders and basically effectively stripping the rights and privileges of members of Parliament—of all members, whether they are part of a party with official status or not. I am concerned about their being able to have their rights stripped from them in this situation.

I do think that we need to be mindful of the precedent that is being set here because, as my colleague from Peace River—Westlock mentioned, he was actually denied the opportunity to speak. According to the Standing Orders, he had every right to have his name on that list.

Now, he was not able to move a motion, which he was not attempting to do. He was not asking to be a voting member of this committee, which was clearly established because Mr. Falk was still here. He was merely attempting to get on the speaking list. The standing order itself does specifically state that they may “take part in the public proceedings of the committee,” and that is what Mr. Viersen was attempting to do.

I think it is very important that we make very clear what is going on right now.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Then challenge the chair.

The Chair: Yes.

Thank you for your intervention.

As mentioned, our colleague is on the list. He will get an opportunity to speak. Actually, he'll be up pretty quickly if we can move to our next speaker. Then he'll have an opportunity to provide his interventions as he wishes.

The chair made a ruling earlier—

Mr. Arnold Viersen: I have a point of privilege.

The Chair: —and I'll uphold that ruling. The chair was challenged. The ruling was upheld, I would say, by committee members. I think there are a number of committee members who supported that ruling, so we will proceed back to the subamendment. If I get further clarity on any changes to that, we will provide them.

Mr. Arnold Viersen: Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Yes.

Is it a point of order?

Mr. Arnold Viersen: Mr. Chair, it's a point of privilege. I'm going to put this—

The Chair: There's no point of privilege. If you have a point of order, you can—

Mr. Arnold Viersen: A point of privilege is....

Mr. Chair, there are two interventions you can make. One is a point of order and one is point of privilege. A point of order is when it has to do with the operations of the meeting. A point of privilege has to do with either your participation in the meeting or somebody else's ability to participate in the meeting. That's what that is.

You might raise a point of privilege if there was too much noise in here. You might say, “Mr. Chair, there's too much noise in here. Can you get the meeting calmed down? I can't hear what's going on.” That would be a point of privilege.

In this case, the point of privilege is that I was not placed on the speaking list. Therefore, my privileges as a member of Parliament were being denied. I would ask you to rule on that point of privilege as well, as to whether my privileges were denied by your action of not putting me on the speaking list.

I look forward to your ruling on that.

Thanks.

The Chair: I—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, can I—

The Chair: You need to have a point of order. If you have a point of order—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'd like to speak on the point that was raised.

The Chair: Do you have a point of order?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I believe—

The Chair: We're not debating. It's not up for debate. It's up to that—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, you are bound by the rules, as we all are. The member—

The Chair: Do you have a point of order, Mr. Genuis?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's on the same point of order my colleague just raised.

The Chair: Do you have a point of order?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's on the same point that was just raised.

The Chair: Do you have a point of order?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's on the same point that was just raised, so yes, of course.

The Chair: Okay, just say you have a point of order and I'll give you the—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's not a new point. It's on the point that was just raised.

I want to quote from chapter 3 of Bosc and Gagnon on the issue of privilege in committee proceedings, because I think there is, respectfully, some confusion—not from my colleague, of course. There is some confusion elsewhere about how privilege is supposed to be dealt with at committee. I'll read the passage. It is of some length, but I think it will help members.

It states:

Since the House has not given its committees the power to punish any misconduct, breach of privilege, or contempt directly, committees cannot decide such matters; they can only report them to the House. Only the House can decide if an offence has been committed. Speakers have consistently ruled that, except in the most extreme [cases], they will hear questions of privilege arising from committee proceedings only upon presentation of a report from the committee which deals directly with the matter and not as a question of privilege raised by an individual Member. As Speaker Milliken indicated in response to a question of privilege raised in 2003 concerning the disclosure of a confidential draft committee report: "In the absence of a report from the committee on such an issue, it is virtually impossible for the Chair to make any judgment as to the prima facie occurrence of a breach of privilege with regard to such charges".

Most matters which have been reported by committees have concerned the behaviour of Members, witnesses or the public, or the disregard of a committee order. Committees have reported to the House on the refusal of witnesses to appear

I'll skip down to this next section:

Should a Member wish to raise a question of privilege in committee, or should some event occur in committee which appears to be a breach of privilege or contempt, the Chair of the committee will recognize the Member and hear the question of privilege, or, in the case of some incident, suggest that the committee deal with the matter. The Chair, however, has no authority to rule that a breach of privilege or contempt has occurred. The role of the Chair in such instances is to determine whether the matter raised does in fact touch on privilege and is not a point of order.

• (1615)

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Simard: I have a point of order.

[English]

The Chair: We have a point of order, Mr. Genuis. I am going to Monsieur—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I am on a point of order.

The Chair: We have a point of order by Mr. Simard.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: This is a point of order.

The Chair: Yes, and he's allowed to have a point of order on your point of order.

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Simard: Mr. Chair, you made a decision, your decision was challenged, and we voted on it. Now we're going back over a decision that's been adopted.

Our rules are clear to everyone. Some members may speak when we have guests or witnesses. We may yield our speaking time to a colleague when we hear from witnesses. However, when we debate a motion, only MPs who are members of the committee may speak. That's the way it is everywhere. You said so. Madam Clerk said so too. Now we're having an entirely futile debate—I have no idea where it's headed—that's going back over a decision that you made.

Consequently, I'd like the clerk to tell me if what I'm saying is true. Can someone—

[English]

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

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Simard: Are committee members the only ones who can speak to a motion? Can all MPs speak to a motion? That means that, if there are 15 Bloc Québécois MPs, each one of them may speak to a motion. I don't think it works that way. So we're going to get some clarification and then perhaps move on to something else.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you.

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

The Chair: First, I want to address Mr. Simard's point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I was in the middle of my point of order when you interrupted me so he could give his point of order. Then you let him finish, even though I [*Inaudible—Editor*].

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, he is allowed to make a point of order, so you can wait until you're acknowledged.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Am I allowed to make a point of order?

I have a point of order.

The Chair: If you can wait, the floor will go back to you in a second.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, should we suspend or are we suspended? What's happening?

The Chair: Once again, on what Mr. Simard raised, a ruling was made earlier by the chair. The standing order referenced by our colleague earlier is open for interpretation. I interpreted it the way I did. I made the ruling here in committee, and it was sustained—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I have a point of order.

The Chair: —by the committee members.

The member who is sitting now does have the ability to participate, as he will momentarily, I hope.

• (1620)

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Point of order.

The Chair: Now I'll proceed.

Is this a point of order to Mr. Genuis's point of order?

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: No. It relates to what you just said.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm in the middle of a point of order.

The Chair: I've made my ruling. The chair's ruling was sustained by committee. We'll proceed.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On the point of order, it's a completely different matter because you made a ruling, and that ruling was sustained. That ruling violated the privileges of members. Then my colleague tried to raise a question of privilege, and members across the way claimed—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Challenge the chair or sit down.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Timmins—James Bay, I will continue. I am already seated though.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, are you challenging the chair on your point of order?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I wasn't aware the chair had made a ruling on the second matter. The second matter is on questions of privilege.

As I was reading, members have a right to raise questions of privilege at committee. Members across the way don't seem to understand that, but privilege exists at committee. It's not just a matter of the House; it is a matter of committee. Members can raise questions of privilege at committee.

You made a ruling. It was sustained by the committee, but it was a ruling that violated the privilege of members when it comes to the right to speak in committee.

A chair does not have the ability to ignore the privileges of members of Parliament, as you have tried to do, and in this context, we have now sought to raise a question of privilege, which I would think—

[*Translation*]

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

[*English*]

The Chair: You're getting into debate now.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No, I'm not, Chair, but go ahead.

The Chair: If you'll allow me as the chair, the member wished to raise a question of privilege during the committee meeting, which he did. I allowed the member to explain the situation, which the member did. Then the chair determined whether that question related to parliamentary privilege.

At that time, I interpreted the question at hand, and the committee voted on it. According to the privilege the member has, he is going to participate at our committee today. He is up, and that decision was made earlier.

We will now proceed—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Point of order.

The Chair: —to the next member on our committee.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I have a point of order.

Mr. Chair, one point for clarity would be that when I challenged you, it was just on an open comment in regard to the rights and

privileges of members. In this second go-around here, we are discussing a direct quote from the actual Standing Orders, so it is substantively different.

I read into the record the standing order that governs it. If we accept the vote that happened there, you are effectively rewriting this standing order without our actually talking about that particular standing order in that moment—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Challenge the chair.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: —so I'm just letting you—

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, a decision was made.

You can challenge the chair. You have that right. You have the right to challenge the chair if you would like to do so again.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: We're trying to help you help yourself here. You put yourself in a position—

The Chair: I have enough people to help me, and I've been advised by the clerk—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Chair, we just want there to be confidence in you at this committee.

The Chair: Well, you know what?

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: That's really important to your Albertan constituents too, for sure.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Patzer had the floor on a point of order, and that's the ruling.

The committee upheld and sustained the ruling of the chair. With that, I see that the committee members have confidence in what we are doing today and the important work on C-50 and C-49, the motion that was brought forward, the amendments and now the subamendment.

I would like to get back to the subamendment and to the individuals who were speaking so that we can continue to debate the subamendment.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Chair, just so that we can all have confidence, can you review the speaking list again?

The Chair: I can't acknowledge you unless there's a point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: On a point of order, could you review the speaking list again for us so we can all be clear? It has evolved throughout the day.

The Chair: We are on the subamendment to the amendment.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: And the speaking list is...?

The Chair: Mr. Genuis is up next on the speaking list.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Who is after that?

Mr. Charlie Angus: No, Mr. Chair, I was.

You said Mr. Simard and then Mr. Angus.

The Chair: No, we have Mr. Genuis and then Mr. Angus.

My apologies. It's Mr. Genuis, then—

Mr. Charlie Angus: You said Mr. Simard, then Mr. Angus.

An hon. member: I have a point of order.

An hon. member: I guess you can challenge the chair, Charlie.

The Chair: I'm going to ask all members....

We have Mr. Genuis and then Mr. Angus.

• (1625)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

I want to start by moving that the privilege of the member for Peace River—Westlock had been breached when the chair and the committee refused to allow him to speak on Bill C-69. That is a privilege motion, which is now properly before the committee.

I will now speak on that question of privilege, and it will be up to the committee ultimately to determine whether to forward a report on that matter of privilege to the House. That is a privilege motion and I will now speak to it.

We were undertaking a debate on an important matter, which is Bill C-69, an amendment in relation to a programming motion on Bill C-49 and Bill C-50. There was an amendment—

[Translation]

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

[English]

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —and my colleague from Peace River—Westlock was trying to speak, as he is permitted to—

The Chair: Hold on a second, Mr. Genuis.

Thank you.

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Simard: As far as I know, we can't raise points of privilege in committee.

Can the clerk tell us whether it's possible to do so? If it isn't, Mr. Genuis' entire argument serves absolutely no purpose.

[English]

The Chair: We have a point of order by Mr. Simard and a question for the clerk. I'm just going to—

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Chair, I have a point of order, please.

The Chair: Yes. Go ahead on the point of order.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Is it not the clerk's understanding—clerk, can you opine on this—that a member on this committee cannot move a privilege motion? Privilege motions are directly put forth in the House.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On that point of order, in fact, you can't raise a privilege motion in the House. That—

The Chair: I'd ask the member not to debate with the mike on. We will ask the clerk to get—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: After eight years, the NDP-Liberals don't know this. Wow.

The Chair: Colleagues, I'm going to suspend for a few moments to have an opportunity to speak with the clerk.

Thank you.

• (1625)

(Pause)

• (1705)

The Chair: We are back.

I will go to Mr. Genuis, who had the floor.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

I've moved a motion of privilege that I understand we're debating. Is that what you were consulting on? Is that what we're doing right now?

The Chair: Yes. You have the floor, Mr. Genuis, where you left off.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you.

We're debating the privilege motion that I put forward.

Privilege is important. Privilege is what protects the rights of members of Parliament to do their jobs and represent their constituents. Privilege is steeped in history and tradition in this place. Given the way privilege is colloquially used these days, it's important to underline that the assertions of privilege in the parliamentary context are very different from discussions of privilege that happen in the wider culture.

Typically when people are talking about privilege in a culture context today, they're referencing somebody claiming a particular personal advantage, something that is proper to them that they want for themselves, for their own use or benefit. Therefore, when privileged people have certain privileges, it's understandably not met with a lot of applause most of the time.

In a parliamentary context, the assertion of privilege actually has the opposite character, in that privilege is not the ability of a person to do what they want for their own benefit. Rather, it is the assertion of the responsibility of an individual to magnify the—

[Translation]

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

I'm going to let Mr. Genuis continue defining the word "privilege", if that suits him, but first I'd like someone to answer the question I raised.

What I personally understand about procedure is that we may not raise a point of privilege in committee. Chapter 3 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice* concerns privileges and immunities. It clearly states that, in standing, special, legislative and joint committees, "[s]ince the House has not given its committees the power to punish any misconduct, breach of privilege, or contempt directly, committees cannot decide such matters."

I would like the clerk or the chair to tell me clearly, yes or no, whether we can raise a point of privilege in committee. There must be a way to do it, but I don't think that explaining the Greek root of the word "privilege" will help us get there.

Can we do it or not? Once that question has been answered, Mr. Genuis can continue his diatribe.

[English]

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I can speak to the point of order. That might be helpful while it's being looked at.

The Chair: We will hold the question, if the clerk could....

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Sure. I'm happy to answer questions.

The Chair: We'll ask you to pause.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: That's fine. It's no problem. I'm sure the answer will be found regardless.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Oh, Garnett, you're a Conservative Albertan, so none of the NDP-Liberals want to hear from you.

• (1710)

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: On a point of order, Mr. Chair, I just want to thank you for taking the time to do this. It is why earlier I suggested that maybe we should suspend to get some clarity so we could all do our jobs on behalf of the people we represent. That certainly is what the elitist-sounding word “privilege” means to all of us as members of Parliament—to be able to represent the common people who sent us here and to fight for them.

• (1715)

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

I will ask the clerk to provide an opportunity for comment.

Ms. Miriam Burke (Committee Clerk): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The committee itself does not have the power to rule on a question of privilege. Only the Speaker of the House has that power. Somebody can raise the question in committee. The chair then decides whether it touches on privilege, whether it relates to privilege, at which point the committee can agree to a report to the House, where it will then be taken up.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: That's exactly correct. Thank you.

I raised the issue of privilege, which the committee does not have jurisdiction to rule on. I have raised this question of privilege because I believe the privileges of a member have been violated and, therefore—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, go ahead on a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Genuis's privileges were not affected, so for him to raise an issue of privilege on something that does not affect him is completely moot. What we're seeing is just obstruction. They are using every tool in the rule book—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm not finished.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Point of order.

The Chair: I will ask Mr. Angus to finish his point of order, and then we're going to—

There's a point of order, and is there a point of order on the point of order?

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Yes. It's on what Mr. Angus is saying right now.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, just pause for one second. We will go to the point of order from Mr. Patzer.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I think Mr. Angus needs to make sure he has his facts correct, because what Mr. Angus is saying is actually not true. That is not what the point of privilege is.

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, we're getting into a debate. I acknowledge your point of order.

Mr. Angus, go ahead on the point of order, please.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Point of order.

Chair, this is the problem we've been having all day.

Yes, Marc, it is the problem we've been having all day while we've been doing this work on behalf of our constituents, which is our duty.

Mr. Charlie Angus: This is debate.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Charlie has been flip-flopping the entire meeting. Unfortunately, what's happening with your decisions is that they are coming into question, so there's real concern about clarity and confidence in this committee's ability to do its job, which is our duty on behalf of the people who elected us.

The Chair: We're in debate now.

Mr. Angus, go ahead on the point of order.

Please, can we can focus on the point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I was trying to focus on the point of order, but I see that the pattern all day has been interruptions and intimidation.

Mr. Genuis came to this committee for the first time. His privilege was not at issue here, so when he had the floor he could not take it as an issue of privilege. He was usurping that role. He could have spoken to the motion. Instead, he tried to interfere with something that was not on his turf.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Chair, point of order.

I'm sorry, Charlie. I will wait.

I'm concerned about whether or not your headphone is working properly and that you can hear, because now multiple times you've made a claim that's not true. I will wait until you're done.

Mr. Charlie Angus: It's not his—I'm finishing my point of order.

I'm sorry, Chair, but on that—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Point of order.

The Chair: I will ask all members to let the member who is speaking speak, please.

Mr. Angus, go ahead on the point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I think it's pretty straightforward. Mr. Genuis took the floor when he was supposed to be speaking to the subamendment, which is the latest of their boutique amendments. Then he tried to claim that he was defending the rights of Mr. Viersen, who sits there. He could not take to the House a privilege that had nothing to do with him, and he couldn't use his position while he was speaking to another amendment to raise a point of privilege on behalf of a member who was speaking.

This is ridiculous. What we're witnessing is a gong show.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, thank you.

We have a point of order by Mr. Patzer.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: The whole point here is that any member can raise a point of privilege on this particular issue. Mr. Genuis has every right to raise the point of privilege on behalf of another member. That's fully within the scope here.

His point of order is not correct.

• (1720)

The Chair: Thank you.

We will go back to Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Wonderful.

With great respect for Mr. Angus, the motion I moved in relation to the privilege issue was that the privileges of the member for Peace River—Westlock had been breached. There cannot have been much doubt from the beginning about whose privileges I was speaking about.

The privileges of all members are surely a matter of concern for this committee, and I don't think we would—

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

The Chair: We have a point of order from Mr. Angus.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I doubt it's a point of order, Chair.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Chair, I asked you to rule on whether or not Mr. Genuis's taking the floor and moving a point of privilege on behalf of another member was actually relevant, or whether this was more of an obstruction.

I was looking for a ruling on whether or not it should be Mr. Viersen raising his issue of privilege, because Mr. Viersen seems to be the person who feels he was slighted, even—

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order.

You asked for a ruling, so I'm going to get advice from the clerk on what you've asked.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: This is death by delay, just like everything else the NDP-Liberals do.

The Chair: Colleagues, I am going to suspend for a few moments until the clerk can get the information back to us.

• (1720)

(Pause)

• (1725)

The Chair: I call the meeting back to order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I have a quick point of order, Chair, if you don't mind.

The Chair: We have a point of order on Mr. Angus's point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: No. It's a separate point of order, Mr. Chair. I'm just—

The Chair: Can we rule on it first, if it's separate point of order? Unless it's on Mr. Angus's point of order.... The clerk has advice for the committee based on the question asked.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: For sure.

The Chair: Okay. I'll ask the clerk to provide advice based on Mr. Angus's point of order.

Ms. Miriam Burke: So—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Mr. Chair, perhaps I could....

I'm sorry, Clerk. Thank you.

Maybe you could remind everyone what Mr. Angus's question was. There have been so many stops and starts.

The Chair: I think that will be answered.

Go ahead, Madam Clerk.

Ms. Miriam Burke: According to the book, if an incident arises within the committee's proceedings that may constitute a breach of privilege, anybody can raise it if it's considered to be an incident of the committee's.

The Chair: We have Mr. Patzer on a point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Chair, because there was lots going on here at the start, when my colleague moved his motion, I believe I had raised my hand for the speaking list.

I'm just curious whether you can confirm who the next two or three speakers are on the speaking list for this motion.

The Chair: After Mr. Genuis, it's you, Mr. Patzer.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

If there are no further points of order for the time being from Mr. Angus, I'll continue with my remarks. I'm grateful for that opportunity.

Chair, before I was interrupted I was talking about the way in which the term "privilege" is colloquially used and contrasting that with what privilege means in the particular context of a parliamentary process.

The privileges of parliamentarians, by contrast with the way the term "privilege" is typically used now, are not the assertions of individual entitlements. Rather, they are in many respects the assertion of the opposite; that is of the particular tools associated with obligations for members of Parliament, who are conduits for magnifying the interests, priorities and concerns of the people in their constituency.

We protect the rights of members of Parliament. We protect the privileges of members of Parliament, not because they are special, but because the people they represent are special and deserve to have their voices heard in the House. That is why we talk about privilege, because our ability as members of Parliament to do our job is the essential vehicle through which constituents, the people who live in our communities across the country, are able to have their priorities, concerns, etc., reflected.

We have responsibilities as members of Parliament to be representatives of the common good of our constituents, and we have tools that allow us to fulfill those responsibilities. If members fail to take seriously their responsibilities, then they will likely not continue in their roles; but if members are denied the tools that allow them to fulfill their responsibilities, perhaps because of the actions of other members of Parliament, perhaps because of other administrative or incidental factors, then the voices of the people they are supposed to be representing are absent from this place.

I would extol members, in their consideration of this question of the privileges for the member of Peace River—Westlock, to think of this not particularly as a matter in a colloquial sense of the privileges of the member for Peace River—Westlock, but rather to think of it as the just rights of the people of Peace River—Westlock, and their right to be heard in Parliament through their duly elected member. When the member for Peace River—Westlock is obstructed in his ability to fulfill his responsibilities as a member, then in fact the people of Peace River—Westlock have been obstructed in their ability to be heard.

This is foundational to every concept of representative democracy that we speak of here, not in our own right, but we speak here because we have been sent here by the people we have a sacred trust to serve as their representative. Of course, as their representatives we exercise our own considered judgment. We are not merely delegates of hostile interests, to paraphrase Burke. We owe our constituents both our industry and our judgment, and so we don't cease to be independently thinking, operating, considering individuals.

We frame our considerations of these matters with reference to the common good of our constituents, and we always consider, evaluate and work with an eye to the interests, well-being and common good of the people within our constituencies, which isn't quite the same as their interests, but that's maybe another conversation for another day.

• (1730)

I'm being particular in my choice of the phrase "common good".

This is the basis of our system of representative democracy. It's the responsibilities we have as members of Parliament and the fact that we need tools to use them. Therefore, when members of Parliament assert, "This is my privilege", "My privilege has been violated" or "I want my privileges protected", this is not the same as a private person making those assertions. Rather, it is a sense of responsibility from constituents that leads people to raise these issues.

As such, it is not only the right of members who feel their privileges have been violated to raise these matters of privilege, but they have a responsibility to do so. If my colleague from Peace River—Westlock or other members who have at times felt their privileges

have been violated would passively allow chairs, committees or incidental events to disrupt them in their ability to do their jobs, then they would be in fact denying their responsibility to their constituents.

We not only have a right to assert the doctrines of privilege when violations of privilege emerge, but we actually have, I believe, a responsibility to assert those doctrines of privilege. It is through that assertion that we protect our ability to serve our constituents.

Also, I think we are seeking to preserve the structure of our representative democracy for our future constituents and for future citizens in our areas and other areas because we see here the power of precedent. If processes unfold that violate the privileges of members and they become commonplace, are allowed to take place and are ignored, then those violations of privilege themselves become precedent that will perhaps facilitate other instances where privileges are violated. This is the process by which there can be a gradual erosion of the strength of our representative democracy and a move to something less than the authentic fulfillment of what that system is supposed to be.

Privilege, as I have said today, is not—

• (1735)

Mr. Arnold Viersen: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

Can I just confirm that I am now on the speakers list? If I'm not, could I be placed there?

The Chair: Would you like to be added to the speakers list?

Mr. Arnold Viersen: Yes, please.

The Chair: Thank you.

Go ahead, Mr. Genuis.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Mr. Chair, I wouldn't want to be accused, like I was earlier—or someone was—about not speaking into their mike, but of course the question of—

The Chair: Do we have a point of order, Ms. Stubbs?

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Yes, it's a point of order on the question about our colleague speaking. I think that's where this all started. That's great that you're putting him on the speaking list.

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order.

We just want to make sure that members acknowledge the chair if they do want to be put on the list. A member did, so it's acknowledged. Thank you.

Go ahead, Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I'll happily continue with my remarks. I'm just remembering where I was here.

The doctrine of privilege is something particular and unique in the context of parliamentary democracy. It is distinct from the doctrine of privilege—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: On a point of order, Mr. Chair.

[English]

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

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Simard: I'd just like someone to confirm which Conservative members are currently permanent members of the committee so we don't have to go through the same rigmarole as we did earlier when everyone requested the floor.

[English]

The Chair: Monsieur Simard has asked for a list of the Conservative voting members on the committee.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: On a point of order, Mr. Chair, I do believe it's all been addressed and dealt with through the clerk.

We do have our four members already identified with the clerk as to who is part of the committee.

The Chair: Perhaps I could ask the clerk to name them for the interest of the committee members and so that they are aware.

Ms. Miriam Burke: We have Mr. Genuis, Mr. Falk, Mr. Patzer and Ms. Stubbs.

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Simard: Mr. Chair, Mr. Viersen just asked you to add his name to the list. Consequently, as I understand it, he's no longer on the list.

• (1740)

[English]

The Chair: Are you asking for a ruling, Monsieur Simard, or are you clear on what was provided?

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Simard: I unfortunately don't know what happened.

I don't know if Mr. Viersen was still a member when he requested the floor or if it was Mr. Falk who was there. Assuming there were four Conservative members on the list, excluding Mr. Viersen, it seems to me he wasn't entitled to speak, as was said earlier.

If that's the case, under the rules, I would ask you to withdraw Mr. Viersen's name from the speaking list. I won't debate the matter again, but that's the logical thing to do under the rules and according to what was said earlier.

[English]

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, you have a point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: It's to the point of order.

The Chair: Go ahead with your point of order, Ms. Stubbs, on the point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Chair, I guess our colleague could challenge your ruling—others have said that they could challenge the chair—but earlier, at 3:40, you had talked about our colleague not being allowed to be added to the speaking list. You refused the participation, but then, as we came back in here, you did acknowledge him. You put him back on the speaking list and said we could proceed.

I guess if Monsieur Simard or anybody else has an issue with the decision you've made since we've come back, they can challenge the chair.

The Chair: On the point of order, earlier there was a decision made, as a member had raised that the member was not in. The chair had made a ruling and the chair was challenged. A member did raise that the member was not in. That's why the chair had made a ruling at that time, and the chair was challenged.

An hon. member: A point of order, Chair.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Monsieur Simard seems to be litigating the decision you've made since we've come back that Arnold Viersen can speak. You've made that decision.

An hon. member: A point of order.

The Chair: We're now getting into debate.

I think I provided some additional clarity. If I have not, there's another point of order that the individual can raise.

An hon. member: A point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I had raised a point of order before Charlie.

The Chair: I'm sorry. I did not hear the point of order from Mr. Angus, so we'll go to Mr. Patzer on the point of order.

We'll then go to you, Mr. Angus, if you still have a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I do.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Patzer.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I want, for the record, the actual clip of the interaction that we had back at 3:39 p.m. from MP Serré over here. He said, "I see there are Jeremy, Ted and Garnett. They've all asked to be acknowledged. I just want to understand who the members across the way are. Can we just get who's voting? Who's a member?"

In the context of the previous discussion we had, the point was raised by one of the colleagues across in regard to who was voting. That was the context in which our whole debate and everything happened earlier this afternoon.

Given that we had the whole vote go down over that, I'm just trying to make sure that we... In the context of what happened, but also based on what Standing Order 119 says, we have a member trying to just take part in the public proceedings of the committee.

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

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: He's not trying to vote, which is what was asked for by my colleague from the government. He asked, "Who's voting?" Then everything that happened from that point onward basically up until now was over the quote as to who is voting and who is a member.

Now, my colleague Mr. Viersen wants to take part in the public proceedings of the committee. You have recently acknowledged that he is on the speaking list. You added him to the speaking list so that he can take part in the public proceedings of the committee.

• (1745)

The Chair: We have a point of order by Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you.

My colleagues keep relitigating things to kill time, but Mr. Simard raised an important point. Mr. Viersen is not a member of the committee. The Conservatives had full strength. You made a ruling earlier. It was upheld by the committee.

Mr. Simard has raised an issue. I think we need to get a ruling on Mr. Simard's question, which I think is a very straightforward one, which is now, once again, that we're back to full strength on the Conservatives and Mr. Viersen is not a member of committee, based on your earlier ruling that was upheld.

Will you give us your ruling on Mr. Simard's question?

The Chair: From advice from the clerk, any member can sit at the table and participate unless there's an objection from a committee member.

Mr. Rick Perkins (South Shore—St. Margarets, CPC): On a point of order—

The Chair: We have a point of order.

Mr. Rick Perkins: —as an associate member of this committee, as I am of every committee in Parliament—our whip signed us up that way—I request that I be added to the speakers list. I believe Mr. Viersen is also an associate member of this committee.

Mr. John Aldag: On a point of order—

The Chair: We have a point of order from Mr. Aldag.

Mr. Rick Perkins: Do you not have to rule on my point of order first?

Mr. John Aldag: —in what form does that objection have to be lodged? The clerk indicated that everyone can participate unless there's an objection lodged.

An hon. member: The question is not a point of order, Mr. Chair.

Mr. John Aldag: It's absolutely a point of order. It's a question of procedure.

The Chair: The question on...? Can you clarify your point of order, Mr. Aldag?

Mr. John Aldag: I'm looking for clarification on what the ruling was: that we were just told that anyone can participate unless challenged by a member of the committee. I didn't hear what that was, and I'm wondering in what form that would need to be shown

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Aldag.

The clerk will advise momentarily.

Mr. Rick Perkins: On my point of order, Mr. Chair, I believe you have—

The Chair: We're waiting on a ruling, Mr. Perkins, on information by the clerk.

Mr. Rick Perkins: I raised it before MP Aldag did.

The Chair: He raised a point of order on your point of order. We're waiting for a ruling from the clerk.

If you can wait patiently, you'll be able to interject in a moment.

• (1745)

(Pause)

• (1750)

Mr. John Aldag: I'm happy to stand down my question if we want to get back to Mr. Perkins. It's a question that I would like to see answered at some point.

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

The Chair: Mr. Aldag, thank you for the point of order. We are looking at it.

We are going to suspend for the remainder of the evening.

[*The meeting was suspended at 5:51 p.m., Monday, October 30*]

[*The meeting resumed at 4:32 p.m., Wednesday, November 1*]

• (6430)

The Chair: I call this meeting to order.

Welcome back to meeting number 80 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Natural Resources.

Today we are meeting in public to discuss committee business.

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

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: Mr. Chair, I have a question regarding the Standing Orders.

[*English*]

The Chair: Just one second, I think we have a point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: I'd like to know which Conservative members are currently voting in committee. I'd like to say that I object to allowing MPs who aren't voting members to be on the speaking list. I think that's consistent with our procedures. I'd like to have that simple piece of information: who are the voting members?

I want to say from the outset that I'm going to object to allowing MPs who aren't voting members to speak.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you, Monsieur Simard.

The voting members for the Conservative Party are Mr. Earl Dreeshen, Mr. Ted Falk, Mr. Jeremy Patzer and Ms. Shannon Stubbs.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Sorry, Chair, but I don't think that's correct. I have a point of order.

The Chair: Monsieur Simard, have you got it? Is it clear?

Okay, thank you.

Mr. Angus, you also had a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Yes.

Just at the beginning, Chair, we are debating and discussing a very important motion, which is making sure that labour and workers have their rights heard on the energy transition.

We recognize that we have Gil McGowan, president of the Alberta Federation of Labour here, and George Soule, who represents the Steelworkers.

These are people whose members lives are on the line, and they are expecting us to deliver and act responsibly. I would put all members on notice that we need to remember why we're here. We're here for the workers, for the environment, for energy transition that works for everyone and doesn't leave people behind.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus.

Ms. Stubbs, on a point of order.

• (6435)

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thank you, Chair.

I have a point of order, of course, that is relevant to the point of order that the member just made.

Certainly I don't think we have to have a contest here about who is more passionate or more able or more consistent or more committed to advancing, expanding and protecting the livelihoods and the lives and the standard of living of—I don't know why you have your mike on to cut me off, since he just went on for a long time.

I'm going to finish my comments, if you don't mind.

I don't think we have—

The Chair: If you could, on the point of order.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

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

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Chair: Order. We have a point of order on the point of order.

Ms. Dabrusin, on the point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: But I have a point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I did not finish my point of order.

An hon. member: But I have a point of order on that point of order.

The Chair: Hold on. Ms. Dabrusin has a point of order.

Ms. Stubbs, on your—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: My point of order is on Charlie's—

The Chair: I know, but Ms. Dabrusin has a point of order, so we'll go to Ms. Dabrusin.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: How is it that Charlie can finish his point of order, but I can't finish mine?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order on Julie's point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, Ms. Dabrusin has not even started yet.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Well, can I just finish my—

The Chair: No, we have a point of order. We are going to hear the point of order—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: But we heard Charlie's entire point of order. How come we can't hear my point of order on Charlie's point of order?

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, we are going to hear the point of order from Ms. Dabrusin and then you'll have the ability to continue.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Chair, this is why Albertans are going to make a different decision about you in the next election.

The Chair: Please go ahead, Ms. Dabrusin.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: I heard Ms. Stubbs state that you were interrupting her, and I just wanted to raise a point of order to point out that I had actually not heard you say [*Inaudible—Editor*].

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: On a point of order, he turned his mike on while I was talking.

An hon. member: Point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Point of order, Chair.

The Chair: We have a point of order from Mr. Sorbara.

An hon member: What about my point of order?

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Sorbara.

You have a point of order on the point of order.

An hon. member: What is a point of order, if I can't—

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Chair, thank you for recognizing my point of order on the point of order.

An hon. member: It's a point of disorder.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: It would be quickly to add that the member from the New Democratic Party spoke up and said we are all here to represent the interests and the views of our constituents and to move the economy forward. He did not imply that any one of us was here more so than the others—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Chair: Let's not get into debate.

Mr. Sorbara, on the point of order.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: I'm sorry, but I wanted to get that point across.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Genuis, on the point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, on this point order, I'd like you to clarify how points of order work.

Traditionally, in past practices of the committees that I have been part of, when one member raises a point of order, they're able to make that point of order without being interrupted in the middle of a point of order by another point of order.

If you allow members to interrupt in the middle of each other's points of order with points of order, I fear that we will end up in a kind of infinite regress of points of order on points of order, which will prevent anyone from actually being able to articulate what their point of order is.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Genuis, on your—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: In some ways, you're demonstrating the problem, Chair.

The Chair: Now you're into debate, Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No, I'm not, actually—

The Chair: What I will say on your question is that the individual on the point of order has to be able to speak so that we can understand what their point of order is.

Thank you.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Yes. That's what I was trying to do before you interrupted, Chair.

The Chair: Thank you.

We're going to—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I have a point of order, Chair.

He's trying to do that, and you're cutting him off just like you cut me off.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Yes.

The Chair: We have a point of order from Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you, Chair.

I just want to say that—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I don't think the Liberal staffer has to be over here talking to our clerk.

Mr. Charlie Angus: —this constant attempt to undermine and intimidate is not becoming—

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

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: The Liberal staffer doesn't need to be over here talking to the clerk to help you manage things, Chair.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, can you hold on. We have a point of order by Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

I was suggesting that you provide a ruling. Actually, it's not a suggestion. It's a point of order. I would like you to provide a ruling on whether points of order can be interrupted by other points of order.

I don't doubt it was frustrating to Mr. Angus with what just happened. I would prefer that we have a system in which he could finish his point of order, Mrs. Stubbs could finish her point of order, Ms. Dabrusin could finish her point of order, and then it's all equal regardless of party or gender—

Mr. Charlie Angus: They just interrupted me and said that they cannot be—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You need to rule on this matter.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I have made a ruling. I'm going to hear one point of order at a time, and if you're interrupting, we can't hear the point of order, but we're not going to engage in debates by a point of order, okay?

Now—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, can I just clarify your ruling?

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I have a point of order, Chair.

The Chair: Mr. Angus had the floor on a point of order—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I had a point of order on his point of order. You went to me, and then you cut me off.

The Chair: You're in debate, Ms. Stubbs. You're in debate.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: No, I'm literally saying that I have a point of order.

The Chair: On a point of order, Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you, Chair.

We are dealing with issues of great importance to workers. We have people watching this, and we need to rise above this level of—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Charlie Angus: —intimidation of the chair.

Every time I speak, we are interrupted by the Conservatives who try to shout people down.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Look in the mirror.

Mr. Charlie Angus: This is about decorum. This is about respect for the chair. This is about respect for Parliament—

The Chair: Mr. Angus—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: This is not a point of order.

The Chair: —we're getting into debate—

Mr. Charlie Angus: —so I'm asking that when you speak and make a ruling, Chair, if you need to cut mikes off, you should cut mikes off because what you're being faced with is total intimidation.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: How many times did you raise a point of order at the last meeting?

The Chair: Order.

I'm going to say to all members, our interpreters need to listen and follow the conversation. When we are talking over each other, when we are not allowing other members to speak, it is very difficult for interpreters to interpret what is happening here. We need to get back to the order of business that we've been focusing on and to the speaker who presented the other day.

If there are no points of order, we will continue—

• (6440)

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I have a point of order.

The Chair: Okay, but we are not going to engage—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I'd like to continue my previous point of order.

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, if you can, go directly to your point of order and do not engage in debate so that Mr. Genuis can resume where we ended the other day.

I'll go to you on your point of order, but on the point of order, please.

Thank you.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thank you, Chair.

On the point on order on Charlie's earlier point of order about workers and livelihoods and families and communities who depend on resource development, who work in traditional oil and gas and who want to seek futures in renewable energy development and the development of the fuels of the future, let us have no contest here about who believes—

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, we're getting into debate. Can I—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: You're cutting me off, Chair.

The Chair: Can you get to the point of order, please, so that we can begin.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Sure.

I want to believe every single person around this table, but let me tell you without a shadow of a doubt that every single Conservative who has been fighting this agenda non-stop is related to and represents hundreds of thousands of those people. That's what we are doing, Chair.

Thank you.

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, we are engaging in debate. That's not a point of order, but I—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I think that if you were to view this objectively afterwards, you'd see that's exactly what Charlie did, but thank you. This is gaslighting of the truest order.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Stubbs.

Mr. Genuis, when we concluded the last meeting, you had the floor. Would you like to cede the floor or would you like to continue?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, upon serious reflection on the matter, I have decided I would like to keep the floor because I do have more to say. I will now do so.

I do want to begin, though, by recognizing the incredible hard work of our shadow minister for natural resources, my friend and riding neighbour, Ms. Stubbs, who represents the riding of Lakeland. She has clearly shown already today and will continue to show what a passionate advocate for the energy sector, for Albertans and for all Canadians she is. In particular she's also a strong voice for indigenous communities that are part of and benefiting from the energy economy, and she brings a great deal of understanding and authenticity in her discussion of those issues.

We are, however, primarily focused at the moment on the privileges of a different member, that is, privileges of the member for

Peace River—Westlock. I will just remind the committee that we are debating my motion that the privilege of the member for Peace River—Westlock was breached when the chair and committee refused to allow him to speak in the debate on Bill C-69.

Maybe a good place to start is just on the series of events that took place in committee that involved the violation of the privileges of my good colleague from Peace River—Westlock. We were in debate on a programming motion in relation to this government's "unjust transition" legislation. The context of this is very interesting, and I think this explains the eagerness of many members to speak to this issue.

The minister made an interesting admission in the House during time allocation on this bill. He actually told the House that workers don't like the term "just transition". I thought it was a prescient observation that workers don't like the term "just transition", although his solution to this was to call it something else. He said he was not going to use the terminology "just transition" anymore and that they were going to describe the same set of policies in a different way, right?

This is sort of like when I'm trying to get my children to eat their brussels sprouts and they won't eat them, and I say, "Well, let's just call them chocolate cake." It doesn't change the substance of them, though. They're still brussels sprouts, right?

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, can we just hold on that point of order, please?

Mr. Angus, go ahead on the procedural point of order.

• (6445)

Mr. Charlie Angus: The procedural point of order is relevant. The issue here is that they're debating for a member who never showed up to the committee, a member who never spoke, who never asked a single question, who suddenly had his feelings hurt when you didn't recognize him. That's the question.

The question is not on the "just transition". The question isn't on eating brussels sprouts. The question is not on children.

I would ask you to keep the issue relevant.

Are we hearing that the poor member who can't even—

The Chair: Mr. Patzer has a point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: First of all, Mr. Angus was complaining about our raising points of order, and then he raised a point of order to interrupt our member who had the floor. He is already contradicting himself.

Of utmost importance here is the relevance of what he is saying, because he, obviously—I have to be careful and I recognize this—was not physically present in the room because he was on Zoom. He could not see physically that Mr. Viersen was, indeed, in the room. I think it's relevant to say that, because he did not see Mr. Viersen trying to get his name on the list. That is of utmost importance.

The Chair: Members, once again, I'll ask everybody to pause. We need to respect the interpreters. That needs to be top of mind for everybody in this room. They're doing a tremendous job. When we speak over each other, and all of us turn on our mikes, that causes significant challenges for the interpreters.

I would ask everybody to please respect your committee members, who have taken the time to join us today, to hear out what they're discussing, and if you do have a point of order to not use it for debate, but to be very succinct on it so we can move to another.

Ms. Stubbs, you had a point of order. I want to make sure there are not a number of people yelling “point of order” at the same time so the interpreters can determine what's happening here.

Go ahead on your point of order, please.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate that.

Also, certainly with regard to the interpreters—I'm sorry; this is a segue—I do know I'm a nightmare for them because I'm a motor-mouth, so I often do try to send all my speeches and things in advance.

I hear you, and I got it.

The Chair: That's okay. Just speak to the point of order, Mrs. Stubbs.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: With regard to Charlie Angus's point of order, this certainly is not about the hurt feelings of an individual member of Parliament. What this is about, fundamentally—

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, we're getting into debate, so very procedurally, the procedural relevance....

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: —is MPs' privilege and their ability to represent their constituents, as well as every single person's being an associate member of this committee by way of being a duly elected member of Parliament, as our colleague Rick Perkins pointed out at the last meeting, too. That's my point of order.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you.

Whether they're here in person or online, every member of the committee does have a right to participate remotely and also a right to be here in person. Let's acknowledge that. However, let's refrain from pointing at each other and making remarks that members of the committee may not like or may take offence to. Let's focus on the work at hand here today. That's an important recognition for everybody here to think about and reflect upon as we move forward.

We will go back to Mr. Genuis and where he left off.

The floor is yours.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I will return to where I left off, but I do want to respond to what was allegedly a point of order but was, I think, more intended as a point of debate from Mr. Angus. I don't want to miss the opportunity to underline how absurd, incorrect and even dangerous the implications of what Mr. Angus said are.

First of all, his implication was that we shouldn't take so seriously the desire of a member to speak at committee if, in his judgment, that member hasn't shown sufficient interest in the past in the subject. I think the implication that he made about the member for Peace River—Westlock is obviously completely inaccurate. The member for Peace River—Westlock speaks frequently about the energy sector, about jobs, about opportunity. Obviously, his constituency in particular is significantly impacted by these issues.

I know for Mr. Angus that it's not inevitable, just because someone represents a constituency where energy is important, that the member would actually speak about it. However, in the case of Mr. Viersen, that's actually true. He speaks often about the energy sector.

I hope he won't mind my sharing with the committee that he and I are actually housemates in Ottawa. There are times when I'm trying to sleep that he's pacing the halls, talking to himself about the importance of the energy sector and talking on the phone to constituents who are two hours behind, demonstrating his deep commitment to standing up for energy workers. It's certainly important to him and very important in his constituency.

As I've spoken about before and, I think, will develop a little bit later on, the issue of parliamentary privilege is not principally about the privilege of members as such. It's about the tools that members have, and need to be able to have, in order to play their appropriate representative functions.

The other thing that is deeply, deeply troubling about Mr. Angus's comments is the implication that somebody's privileges, particularly in the context of their ability to speak at committee, should somehow be contingent on their having demonstrated sufficient interest in the topic in the past.

• (6450)

[*Translation*]

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

I entirely understand that Mr. Genuis leads a fascinating life. I don't know how he shares his innermost thoughts with Mr. Dreeshen, but it must be captivating. I'd like to hear him talk about it, but I'm not sure that has anything to do with the most recent matter before the committee.

So I'd like my colleague to establish how this relates to the topic of this discussion. I'm sure he has a fantastic relationship with his colleague, but I'm not sure that's what we're concerned with. Nor am I convinced that his comments about my colleague Mr. Angus have anything to do with our present concerns.

I would suggest to him in a friendly manner that we should come back to the matter before us; that might be more effective for everyone.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you, Monsieur Simard, for that point of order.

Mr. Genuis, if you could make sure of the relevance of your remarks, tying into the motion you presented.... Just be succinct so that other members in committee get an opportunity as well.

Thank you.

The floor is yours.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

I'm extremely grateful for that point, which allows me to make it obvious that we are talking about a motion regarding the privileges of the member for Peace River—Westlock. We had a point of order that was not a point of order from the member for Timmins—James Bay. He implied that we should not take this privilege motion so seriously because, based on his evaluation of the alleged level of interest, or not, of this particular member, his right to speak at committee wasn't actually so important.

In response to that, I am making the case that, in fact, the denial of the freedom of speech of the member for Peace River—Westlock is a grave and serious matter. First of all, his implication about the alleged lack of interest of this member in supporting the energy sector is outrageous and verifiably false. If the member for Timmins—James Bay is looking to identify members who have a lack of interest in issues related to the energy sector, he need only find a mirror.

The second point I was going to make was with regard to the broader issue of whether or not a member's interest in a particular topic—

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, we have a point of order.

I see Mr. Angus on a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Chair, they can attack me all they want. I don't care. My focus is making sure that workers' rights are defended.

I'm asking for relevance because we have a major piece of legislation defending workers' rights that they're trying to interfere with.

Putting all their personal attacks aside, can they keep it relevant so that we can get back to the issue of the legislation for workers and protecting their families?

The Chair: Mr. Angus, thank you for your point of order on relevance.

Once again, Mr. Genuis, I would focus on the relevance of your motion and not on personalizing this with any of the members. Focus on the motion you brought forward and the relevance and importance of doing so to committee.

Please finish your remarks—I know there are many other members here today who also want to participate in this important conversation—so that others get an opportunity to do so as well.

I will go back to you, but I want you to focus on the relevance of your motion.

• (6455)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you very much, Chair.

I want to assure you that I will remain studiously within the rules throughout this committee, which, I think, members would acknowledge that I have some passing familiarity with.

In terms of the points of order that have been raised regarding relevance, it's important to clarify for Mr. Angus, who may benefit from this reminder, that what we're debating right now is a privilege motion. We are not debating the programming motion, which the government put forward to try to ram through legislation and limit debate and opportunities for members to represent their constituents.

We are debating a motion that deals with the privileges of members. Discussions about the nature of privilege, where it applies and how it applies are centrally relevant. They are not just related to the topic; they are the topic itself.

In fact, the points I have been seeking to make through a couple of interruptions have been to respond to previous points of debate that this member has brought forward under the guise of points of order. He continues to provide me with additional material that requires a response, which may have the effect of requiring me to speak longer than I had otherwise intended. I will nonetheless aspire to be as brief as my constitution allows.

Mr. Chair, the point that I had been pursuing was around the question of whether freedom of speech for members is a contingent right or is a right as such, regardless of circumstances. There are two ways of speaking about rights—well, there are far more than two, but one simplification in terms of ways of looking at it....

What is a right? A right is something that is due to someone in virtue of justice, what justice requires ought to be due to them. There are some rights that flow from contingencies or circumstances such as a right to wages. Someone has the right to a wage if they engage in a particular task. Then there are rights that are not contingent. They are absolute. They are things that everybody should have a right to by virtue of being a human or by virtue of who they are.

In the case of privilege, we're talking about rights that are contingent in a sense. They are contingent on someone's being a member of Parliament, but they should not be contingent on any other circumstances.

Is the freedom of speech that members of Parliament are supposed to have, which is central to privilege, contingent on the activities the member has undertaken in the past or the kind of riding they represent such that someone could be denied their freedom of speech if the contingent factors were such that other members thought they didn't merit the right to speak? Is that the nature of privilege? Is that the nature of freedom of speech, or is freedom of speech something that should, in fact, be available to all members of Parliament? It shouldn't be contingent on the peculiarities of circumstance.

In preparing for today, I pulled some documents regarding parliamentary privilege off the parliamentary website. They do underline the supremacy of the doctrine of free speech for parliamentarians in Parliament, the absolute importance of that and, I think, the non-contingent nature of that right.

I think this is well established. For instance, this is from Marleau and Montpetit's *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, chapter 3, "Privileges and Immunities", which notes:

The rights, privileges and immunities of individual Members of the House are finite, that is to say, they can be enumerated but not extended except by statute or, in some cases, by constitutional amendment, and can be examined by the courts. Moreover, privilege does not exist "at large" but applies only in context, which usually means within the confines of the parliamentary precinct and a "proceeding in Parliament". With the role of the courts to uphold the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms as well as the Canadian Bill of Rights, Members must avoid creating unnecessary conflicts with private rights and thereby having issues of parliamentary privilege brought before the courts.

● (6500)

Proceeding from there on the issue of freedom of speech, *House of Commons Procedure and Practice* notes the following:

By far, the most important right accorded to Members of the House is the exercise of freedom of speech in parliamentary proceedings.

I was even struck by this because I might have supposed that the right to vote had a greater or at least comparable status, but *House of Commons Procedure and Practice* does seem to say that the importance of the protection of speech is the most important right: "By far, the most important right accorded to Members of the House is the exercise of freedom of speech in parliamentary proceedings."

Chapter 3 goes on to say the following:

It has been described as:

...a fundamental right without which they would be hampered in the performance of their duties. It permits them to speak in the House without inhibition, to refer to any matter or express any opinion as they see fit, to say what they feel needs to be said in the furtherance of the national interest and the aspirations of their constituents.

I find that to be an important and even beautiful passage. It goes on:

Much has been written about this over the centuries in Great Britain, Canada and throughout the Commonwealth.

The following paragraph, which I'll skip, references the Australian tradition and some quotations. Then it reads:

The statutory existence of parliamentary privilege in relation to freedom of speech dates from the adoption of the English Bill of Rights in 1689. Though meant to counter the challenge of the Crown, it also prohibited actions of any kind by any person outside the House against Members for what they might say or do in Parliament. Article 9 of that statute declares that "the freedom of speech and debates or proceedings in Parliament ought not to be impeached or questioned in any court or place out of Parliament".

The Chair: Ms. Dabrusin, go ahead on a point of order.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: I'm just a bit confused because it sounds like the member opposite is speaking right now about what a person may say in parliamentary proceedings, which I didn't think was the point of privilege that was being raised on this point.

It sounds to me like it's an expression issue, about what you may say.

I may be wrong, but I thought the point of privilege was on a different issue.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Dabrusin.

Mr. Genuis, are you relating what you're speaking about to the reason you've moved your motion and the importance of the privilege of the individual?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

I'm happy to develop my argument in the direction Ms. Dabrusin suggested.

The passages I have read thus far highlight the importance of freedom of speech and of that freedom being unfettered and not contingent.

As she rightly pointed out, the issue in the first instance around the member for Peace River—Westlock's ability to speak did not flow from some objection to what he said or was expected to say. Rather, it was the view of the chair at the time that he shouldn't be able to speak at all, regardless of what he was going to say.

To restrict someone's speech or deny them the ability to speak at all is in both ways a violation of the member's freedom of speech, and I think both violate the letter and the spirit of the poetic injunctions in chapter 3 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*.

I also think it's important to point out that as this discussion has evolved, the implication for Mr. Angus is that Mr. Viersen's right to speak was in some way impacted by other aspects of his service in the House, like the things he has said at different times and his participation or non-participation in certain proceedings.

I think that is a different challenge—

● (6505)

[*Translation*]

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

[*English*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —to the idea of freedom of speech.

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

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: Being a good and charitable man, I can help my Conservative colleague resolve this impasse by noting a few parameters of this dispute.

As I remember it, the point was raised that only members of the committee may speak. When his colleague requested the floor, he was not a member. Then my Conservative colleagues began raising points of privilege.

What we understand from a procedural standpoint is that, if this point of privilege is submitted in committee, the committee will have to report it to the House to determine whether it's deemed acceptable. We're very far from doing that.

I also understand that, as a member, I may object to giving the floor to an MP who isn't a voting member. We're only debating something purely hypothetical, since, as an MP member of this committee, I intend to object to allowing an MP who isn't a voting member to have a right to speak. Anyone of the meanest intelligence watching at home will understand that this makes no sense. I don't know whether my colleague is aware that what he's asking us to do is to grant a non-member the right to speak. That can easily be avoided under our procedures.

As a member, I need only say that I oppose that. Furthermore, I don't know whether my colleague knows that the act of raising a point of privilege in committee presupposes that the committee agrees to report the matter. I don't think we'll prepare a report because my Conservative colleagues want to filibuster. It would be patently ridiculous.

Do you agree with me? I think there are other, more elegant ways to filibuster than this. Perhaps we could move on to something else and have a slightly more interesting discussion. Are the parameters that I just outlined to my colleague fine with him? Does he understand what I'm saying?

[English]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Simard.

This is a very good question that Monsieur Simard has raised.

Mr. Genuis, how do you respond to exactly what the member has raised?

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

The Chair: We have Mr. Angus on a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I don't want to interrupt Mr. Genuis. I know I give him lots of fodder, so he'll talk all night.

My colleague, Mr. Simard, had asked for a ruling that he didn't get, if I remember the last meeting. Again, someone can speak. This idea that freedom of speech is freedom of speech.... It is freedom of speech when you are recognized by the chair; otherwise, it's a mob. If somebody isn't recognized by the chair, they haven't lost their freedom of speech.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I have a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm sorry, but I'm finishing here.

Mr. Simard had asked a question at the last—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I have a point of order.

The Chair: Perhaps you could be very succinct on your point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'll be very succinct.

It was on whether or not someone who is not.... If someone objects—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I would like to be succinct. I have a point of order on this point, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Charlie Angus: —to a non-voting member speaking...whether or not they are allowed to speak and be recognized.

He asked this at the last meeting, and you did not rule on it. He's asking it again.

It's unfair to go to Mr. Genuis and ask what Mr. Genuis thinks. We need to know what the chair thinks.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus.

Rest assured everybody will get a chance. I just want to make sure that, procedurally, he got his point of order in.

We have Mr. Patzer on the point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you, Chair.

I do believe this will help remedy Mr. Angus's concern. The point was raised, and after that point was raised, you then proceeded to grant Mr. Genuis the floor, because you agreed that his point was actually in order. Therefore, this is why we are discussing this issue right now. You proceeded to allow the debate to happen. This is where we are. That was your ruling, in effect, and now we are here.

Thank you.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Point of order.

The Chair: We have another point of order by Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I don't have to draw it in big crayons. We're not debating whether Mr. Genuis has the floor. The question was whether or not someone who does not have a—

The Chair: Mr. Angus, can you hold it, please.

Once again, colleagues, I can listen to only one member at a time. I'm trying to acknowledge everybody so I can hear a point of order. I would ask all members not to get into a debate while we are presenting our points of order and also not to turn on their mikes and try to get my attention, because I can't hear the point of order then.

I will ask the member to start from the top so I can understand what the point of order is.

Please, I just want to hear—

• (6510)

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: He should not imply—

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: —that we need colouring books and crayons to figure it out, Mr. Chair. That's the issue.

The Chair: Mr. Angus—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Just because they might, it doesn't necessarily mean we do.

The Chair: —can you be succinct on your point of order and what your procedural concern is?

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

The issue is this: We're not debating the fact that Mr. Genuis has the floor, because you recognized him.

Mr. Simard asked about other members here who showed up and were heckling and playing a role as part of the gallery. Is it their right to speak if they're objected to by a voting member of this committee? That's what Mr. Simard asked.

Mr. Genuis has the floor. I don't think it's for you to ask Mr. Genuis what he thinks of that. We know what Mr. Genuis thinks of that. We want to know whether a non-voting member of the Conservatives, who are lining the room here, who starts to speak and is objected to by a voting member has a right to speak, yes or no.

That's the question.

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order.

I have not made a ruling on what Mr. Genuis has brought forward at this point.

Since we're having this important discussion, I'm going to provide some additional context and information. I would like all members to refer to page 1026 of the third edition:

The Standing Orders provide that any Member, whether affiliated with a political party or sitting as an independent, may take part in public proceedings of any committee of which he or she is not a member, unless the House or the committee in question orders otherwise. The Standing Orders specifically exclude a non-member from voting, moving motions or being counted for purposes of a quorum.

I hope that provides additional context to all members on what may have transpired previously and where we're at today. Once again, I will refer all members to page 1026 of the third edition.

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

Is the document you're referring to the third edition of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice* or the annotated Standing Orders?

The Chair: It's the third edition of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you.

I'll look forward to responding in detail to your interpretation of that section.

The Chair: That section, Mr. Genuis, is right out of the book.

I think, on the point of order, the members have made a very good point on directing what has previously occurred.

I would ask you to be succinct and continue to ensure we have opportunities for other members to participate and move forward.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I am grateful for your reflections, which I hold in the appropriate esteem.

I will observe that—

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

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: On a point of order, that's not appropriate, Garnett.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: What's not appropriate?

The Chair: There's a point of order by Ms. Dabrusin.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Seriously—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Who are you to determine the appropriate esteem?

The Chair: Look, members....

Mr. Sorbara, I apologize. I heard two points of order.

Mr. Patzer, let's not speak over each other.

Mr. Sorbara, go ahead on the point of order.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: I said what I said. The member mentioned something to you indirectly about what he wanted to do directly. It was quite obvious. It's unfortunate that the decorum of that member is in such a manner this afternoon.

The Chair: Colleagues, I've made this statement several times during this meeting.

We're all here to do important work on behalf of the committee. We want to ensure that all committee members have the opportunity to participate in debate today, in the important discussions we're having on the motion that was originally placed, the amendment that was placed, the subamendment that was placed, and now the motion Mr. Genuis has placed.

Mr. Genuis, as we move forward, focus on what your motion is, so we can hear it and make a decision as a committee.

• (6515)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you for your reflections, Chair. I will hold back on opining on them too much for fear of causing Mr. Sorbara further consternation. I will certainly continue to comport myself in accordance with the rules of the committee.

I note that in spite of my having the floor, various members—I think it's most members at this point—have nonetheless found ways to put their opinions on the matter at hand on the record. They are ways that may not be fully in conformity with the rules, but they have nonetheless been interesting.

I will go back to comment on a few of the points of debate that were made recently, and then I will return to the issues I was speaking about previously.

Mr. Angus seemed troubled by the fact that there are multiple Conservative members in the room beyond the regular members. I think you can understand that a discussion about freedom of speech and the energy sector is one that greatly interests Conservative members and has led to great interest—

The Chair: I'm sorry, Mr. Genuis. I have a point of order from Monsieur Simard.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: Mr. Chair, I just want us to review this matter from the beginning.

I have a very simple question for my colleague.

What is he trying to show with his way of speaking and acting? What's the point of what he's saying? Is his objective to make it so that Mr. Viersen has a right to speak? Is it to have the committee report to the House that we have violated Mr. Viersen's privileges? That's my understanding.

Now he's talking about freedom of speech. However, I don't think that has anything to do with the matter before us.

I'd like to be clear. I simply want my colleague to tell us the purpose of his intervention. I would point out to him once again that, if his objective is to make it so Mr. Viersen has a right to speak, I will object. The rules of the House allow me to do so. His remarks will therefore be null and void. Furthermore, if the purpose of his intervention is to have the committee report to the House that Mr. Viersen has suffered a breach of his privilege, I believe, as I look at all my colleagues, that his remarks will also be null and void.

I clearly request that Mr. Genuis tell me what he wants to achieve by his intervention, apart from telling me about freedom of expression, which has nothing to do with the matter initially put before us. I just want to know what he seeks to accomplish by his intervention.

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, on the point of order that Monsieur Simard has raised of how it ties into what you're trying to accomplish with your argument, bring it back to your motion at hand on the privilege. If you could, provide clarity on that as a reference to that point of order.

Be succinct to finish what you're presenting so that other members have an opportunity to proceed and participate, and this committee can get back to its work.

Go ahead, Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I want to clarify what I heard from Mr. Simard. I want to have this clear so that I understand it going forward.

Mr. Simard said if members, say, Mr. Perkins or Mr. Viersen, who are not voting members of the committee attempt to speak, he will object. That will mean they actually have no right to speak, because their right to speak is contingent upon the committee agreeing to let non-members speak.

Is that what I heard from Mr. Simard? It would make Mr. Genuis's point moot, but he could talk all night about whatever he wants to talk about, because we're dealing with a filibuster against Bill C-50.

On the issue of non-voting members trying to speak, if there's an objection raised, they will not be recognized.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus.

I want to be clear that members can speak unless the committee authorizes otherwise. At that opportunity, when the member gets the floor, there can be an objection from a committee member. It's the will of the committee at that point.

Hopefully, that clarifies your point of order.

• (6520)

Mr. Rick Perkins: On a point of order, Mr. Chair, could you inform me, as a follow-up to your comment before that, what the speaking list is on this, please?

Mr. Charlie Angus: On a point of order, is Mr. Perkins on the list as a voting member? If he's not, then I object to him asking that question. If Mr. Perkins is not a voting member, based on Mr. Simard's question, then I object to his question and say that we should move on.

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order, Mr. Angus. If you could, give me a moment to reflect.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: On a point of order, it's so clear that the NDP-Liberals just love censorship and shutting people down, don't they?

The Chair: Excuse me, I have not recognized any other member.

I will suspend momentarily and get back to the committee with more information.

Thank you.

• (1720)

(Pause)

• (1750)

• (6550)

The Chair: I call the meeting back to order.

There have been a number of points of order raised. I'm going to start to address those.

Standing Order 119 clearly states that a committee may determine whether a non-member may participate in proceedings:

Any member of the House who is not a member of a standing, special or legislative committee, may, unless the House or the committee concerned otherwise orders, take part in the public proceedings of the committee, but may not vote or move any motion, nor be a part of any quorum.

That is something I raised earlier today in the meeting as well.

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

The Chair: I'm going to finish what I was saying.

Given that committees are empowered to limit the participation of non-members, it is my opinion that the objections raised by Mr. Genuis constitute a point of order that does not touch on parliamentary privilege.

We will now move back to the subamendment.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On a point of order, Chair, you already deemed it a matter of privilege. We have, in fact, been discussing—

The Chair: This is not a—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Can I finish my point of order?

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Can he finish?

Mr. Charlie Angus: No, he can't.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No, Chair. It's a point of order, and you should let me finish.

It's not a point of debate. I am making an argument about a matter of order, which is a point of order. Making an argument about a matter of order is not a point of debate. It is a point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I have made a ruling. You have the right. We are going to move forward to the subamendment, unless you are challenging the chair.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I am raising a point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Mr. Chair, I'm challenging the chair.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm raising a point of order. I still have my point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm sorry, but just to clarify, if you challenge the chair, that has to be voted on. Mr. Genuis has to stop talking so we can vote.

Is that correct?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'll have my point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: If that has to happen because no one let Mr. Genuis finish, then I will withdraw. Otherwise, just let him finish.

The Chair: My ruling is non-debatable. That's it.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I had a point of order.

The Chair: We're moving forward.

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

An hon. member: Aren't we voting?

The Chair: The chair was challenged.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: No, I withdrew.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Ms. Stubbs asked for a vote. A vote has been called.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I withdrew on record. I said that so Garnett could finish the point.

Let Garnett finish the point. I withdraw the challenge.

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, you were not recognized.

I'm going to ask Mr. Genuis.

The ruling has been made.

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

Mr. Charlie Angus: No, you don't.

Mr. Rick Perkins: You overruled yourself.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Can I actually...?

The Chair: I'm going to ask you to pause for a moment, please.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Sure. We can suspend as well.

Mr. Charlie Angus: The chair has been challenged. Let's vote.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I withdrew the challenge to the chair on the condition that Mr. Genuis could finish his comment.

Mr. Charlie Angus: You can't. It's non-debatable, so we're voting. Let's vote on the challenge to the chair.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: The chair also overruled himself. There-in lies the problem.

The Chair: The ruling was made and is final on that item. We're going to proceed to the subamendment.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, I have a right to raise a point of order. I haven't even said what the point of order was.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Point of order, Chair.

The Chair: Okay, you can raise a point of order—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Point of order.

The Chair:—but be very succinct on the point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, I will be as succinct as the matter requires.

At a previous session of this meeting, two days ago, you permitted the motion to be moved with respect to the matter of privilege. At the last meeting we spent about an hour, and today we've spent an hour of committee time. We've been debating a question of privilege for two hours.

My understanding is that you are proposing now to retroactively undo your previous ruling because that is very clearly a violation of the rules. The rules provide for—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: That's correct. The rules provide for when the chair is ruling on whether a matter touches on privilege when the question is moved. They do not provide for the chair to hours later decide that the same chair's previous ruling was incorrect—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis:— and to stop the debate after having changed his or her mind.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I would tread very carefully in terms of the rules, Chair.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, we have a point of order by Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you.

The chair ruled. I want to know about the speaking order on the amendment. I believe I was up next after Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Rick Perkins: Point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm sorry, but you don't get a point of order because you don't sit on the committee.

Mr. Rick Perkins: I don't have to hold off. You can object all you want.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I object to a point of order from someone who is not a voting member.

• (6555)

Mr. Rick Perkins: You haven't ruled on the point of order we adjourned on, which was my request on the speaking order. You never ruled on that. I don't know where that ruling came from when you didn't rule on the—

Mr. Charlie Angus: I object. On a point of order, I object to him—

The Chair: Order, colleagues. Order—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Yes, Monsieur Simard's point in the last meeting where we were supposed to vote was also abandoned.

The Chair: Order. Sorry, ma'am.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: This is why the confidence in and credibility of this committee are at stake—

The Chair: Order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: —and our ability to do our jobs as members of Parliament.

An hon. member: Chair, you ruled. She asked for a vote on the—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I withdrew.

An hon. member: Does he have the floor?

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: And I've never been accused of not being heard.

The Chair: Order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I'm really short. Sometimes people can't see me, but I've never been told I can't be heard, and I withdrew the challenge.

The Chair: Order. We are going to suspend.

• (1755) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1800)

• (6600)

The Chair: We are back in session.

There was a challenge to the chair—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I have a point of order, Chair.

The Chair: —by Ms. Stubbs.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Point of order, Mr. Chair—

The Chair: We need UC, unanimous consent—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: On a point of order, if you will look at the transcript, I didn't say “point of order”, so it's actually not a thing.

The Chair: The chair was challenged, so we need unanimous consent, because we need—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: But if it's a point of order, I would have said “point of order” first, right?

The Chair: We need unanimous consent from the committee.

Colleagues, I'm speaking. We need unanimous consent from the committee—

An hon. member: How can you challenge the chair when you don't have the floor?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Point of order, Chair.

The Chair: —because the chair was challenged—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: We don't, because I didn't say “point of order”.

The Chair: —to withdraw.

Mr. Charlie Angus: That's not debatable, right?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Point of order, Chair.

The Chair: Do we have unanimous consent?

An hon. member: Begin the vote.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Point of order, Chair.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Begin the vote.

The Chair: We're going to a vote.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Point of order, Chair.

Mr. Charlie Angus: No, it's not debatable. It goes to a vote.

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

An hon. member: [*Inaudible—Editor*]

Mr. Charlie Angus: Sh, you're not a member.

Mr. Rick Perkins: I'm a member as much as you are.

Mr. Charlie Angus: No, you're not.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Point of order, Chair.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Go to the vote, please.

Mr. John Aldag: Could we use parliamentary language?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Point of order, Chair.

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Patrick Williams): The question is: shall the ruling of the chair be sustained?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Point of order.

The Chair: We are in a vote.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 0)

• (6605)

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

Mr. Charlie Angus: Point of order, Chair—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Point of order—

The Chair: The ruling is sustained.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Point of order—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Point of order, Chair—

The Chair: We will now go to a point of order—

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

An hon. member: He was first.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I've been trying to get your attention for some time.

The Chair: A vote was under way.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: A vote was not under way.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Yes, it was.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I was saying “point of order” from long before the vote began.

Mr. Charlie Angus: No, you did not. We—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You know that; I know that and anybody reviewing the tape here knows that.

I have a point of order, Chair.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, on a point of order—

Mr. Charlie Angus: On a point of order, Chair, given the fact that I've heard some very ugly language from the Conservatives—

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

Mr. Charlie Angus: —I vote that we go in camera, and that's not debatable. I vote to go in camera.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm raising a point of order, and you can't move a motion on a point of order.

He can't move a motion on a point of order.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus.

You can't move on a point of order.

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

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Chair: Okay. We are going to suspend.

• (1805) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1810)

• (6610)

The Chair: I call the meeting back to order.

We were on the subamendment, so we will go to Mr. Angus on the subamendment.

Yes, Mr. Genuis, you have a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: First of all, when we were debating the subamendment, we were in the middle—

Mr. Charlie Angus: You lost.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm sorry, but I was speaking and not Mr. Angus.

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

The Chair: We're into debate, Mr.—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Genuis is not a member of the committee. I object if he wants to speak. He needs to have—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm subbed in. I'm duly subbed in, Charlie.

Mr. Charlie Angus: He was voted down. He's challenging the chair again.

An hon. member: No.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I have the floor. [*Inaudible—Editor*] my time to speak. It's all about freedom of speech, isn't it?

The Chair: We have a point of order from Mr. Patzer.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you.

As Mr. Angus knows, the rules do actually allow for other members to be subbed into the committee, which Mr. Genuis was at the start of the meeting. For him to impugn he is not a member of the committee is, by any stretch, out of order and should not even be entertained or be allowed to be said that way. I hope he withdraws that statement.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Patzer, on that point of order.

We have a point of order from Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

I actually have a few points of order.

First of all, if we are debating a subamendment, I was up because I was given the floor, and that was the point at which I sought to move the question of privilege. Insofar as your ruling retrospectively that I could not move the question of privilege, no motion was moved, and I still have the floor on the subamendment.

I have various other objections to the way you've conducted this committee as it relates to the motion of privilege, but that aside, I had the floor, which was when I tried to move the question of privilege.

• (6615)

The Chair: We have a point of order from Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: You recognized me as having the floor. Every time I've tried to speak, I've been interrupted and attacked by the Conservatives. That is intimidation. I asked you, Chair, to let me speak. I'm here in good faith to do my job, and we have serious legislation, so I have the floor, and I will continue.

The subamendment that has been brought forth—

The Chair: Mr. Angus, please hold on.

We have a point of order from Mr. Patzer.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Let's reflect on this.

Mr. Genuis had the floor because he would not have been able to move his point of privilege, the motion he moved, if he did not have it. As we know, you cannot move motions if you do not have the floor.

The Chair: We have a point of order from Ms. Dabrusin.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: This has already been decided. There was a motion to challenge the chair. We voted on that, and we sustained the chair's ruling. Now my understanding is that Mr. Angus has the floor.

I will say, we have important legislation in front of us. It is important to workers across our country, and they want to see us working on it, rather than listening to people who are not accepting the vote and the ruling from this committee.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Dabrusin.

We have a point of order from.... Colleagues, once again, everybody can say, "point of order", but I can only hear one point of order at a time. I'm trying to....

Mr. Angus has the floor, and we've had several points of order—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order, Chair. He does not have the floor.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Yes, I do.

If you want to challenge the chair, you can be quiet and show some respect.

The Chair: I can only hear one point of order at a time.

I am speaking to the committee. If we all could speak one at a time, you would be recognized in that manner.

As before, Mr. Angus has the floor.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No. I have a point of order, Chair.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Challenge the chair.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, a decision was made. We are going to Mr. Angus.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, on a point of order, you gave me the floor, and I tried to move a question of privilege. Retrospectively, you ruled that I couldn't move the question of privilege, but you gave me the floor before I did that.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, a ruling was made and—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, you have to respect the rules of the committee. You broke the law in the last election, and now you're showing flagrant disregard for the rules in this committee.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You should have respect for the law, Chair, and respect for the rules of the committee.

The Chair: Order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: That was a choice you made.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Garnett, stop it.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Show some respect for the rules.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis.

Order.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Garnett, you are being so out of line as an MP and as a colleague, and you're embarrassing all MPs this evening.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: There are rules, and I will stand on the rules.

Francesco, the rules are the rules, and the chair is showing flagrant disregard for the rules.

The Chair: We're going to suspend.

• (1815)

(Pause)

• (1825)

• (6625)

The Chair: We are back. We will suspend this evening until we get further resources.

Thank you.

[*The meeting was suspended at 6:28 p.m., Wednesday, November 1*]

[*The meeting resumed at 11:05 a.m., Monday, November 6*]

The Chair: I call this meeting to order.

Welcome back to meeting number 80 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Natural Resources.

Today, we are meeting in public to discuss committee business. In accordance with our routine motion, I am informing the committee that all remote participants have completed the required connection tests in advance of this meeting.

When we suspended on Wednesday evening, Mr. Angus had the floor—

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

The Chair: —and we had resumed debate on the subamendment by Mr. Patzer.

Mr. Angus, you have the floor.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you, Chair. I look forward to being able to speak.

I have been—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Point of order, Chair.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, if you could hold for one second, we have a point of order from Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

I know there was some dispute at the end of the last meeting regarding who has the floor, and if you will allow me a moment, I would like to lay out precisely the rules that operate, because I think they will inform the credibility and the legitimacy of this committee going forward.

If a member is improperly deprived of the floor, they do have the right to raise these issues in the House. That has been established with the new Standing Orders. I reviewed the transcript of the committee meeting, and I want to read an exchange that happened immediately prior to when I sought to raise an issue of privilege.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, can you hold, please?

Those are confidential until published. I just want to remind you that those are confidential until they are published.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: It's all public on video.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, maybe I can just clarify.

The Chair: As long as you're paraphrasing and it was a public meeting—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Can he challenge the chair so that we can move on? This is part of the obstructionist tactics that he used abusively against you the last time and against the rest of our committee.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, I just want to clarify with respect to what I described as the transcript.

My staff watched the video and transcribed the text that I am about to read. It is a transcript, and it was done by my staff copying from the video: Mrs. Stubbs said, "Chair, just so we can all have confidence, can you just review the speaking list again?" The chair said, "I can't acknowledge unless there's a point of order." Mrs. Stubbs said, "Oh, point of order. Could you just review the speaking list again for us, just so we can all be clear of what topic—on what—because it's evolved throughout the days." The chair replied, "We are on the subamendment to the amendment." Mrs. Stubbs, "And the speaking list is?" The chair, "And Mr. Genuis is up next on the speaking list." Mrs. Stubbs, "And then who after that?" The chair, "Then...." Mr. Angus, "No, Chair. I was." The chair, "No, I have...." Mr. Angus, "You said Mr. Simard and then Mr. Angus." The chair, "We have Mr. Genuis, then Mr. Angus. My apologies, Mr. Genuis, then...." Mr. Angus, "You said.... You said Mr. Simard and then Mr. Angus." A member, "Point of order, point of order, point of order." Mrs. Stubbs, "I guess you can challenge the chair, Charlie."

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

Mr. Garnett Genuis: The chair said, "Okay, I'm going to ask all members"—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Do you want me to pause the reading?

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you.

I think this is an attempt to filibuster and stop me from speaking. As has been proven, I had the floor. You ruled on that. If Mr. Genuis wants to challenge it, he must challenge the chair. I think we need to move on because this is a tactic he has been using to be very abusive at our committee since he arrived.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, I'll—

The Chair: Thank you for that, Mr. Angus.

I will allow Mr. Genuis to finish what he was going to say, and then I have something to add to that based on procedural responsibilities.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

I am almost done, but I wanted to read the transcript because it precisely proves the point.

The chair said, "Okay, I'm going to ask all members.... We have Mr. Genuis and then Mr. Angus."

You established that order, Chair, and then you proceeded to me. I said, "Thank you, Chair. I want to start by moving that the privilege of the member for Peace River—Westlock had been breached when the chair and the committee refused to allow him to speak on Bill C-69."

At that point, you'll recall that I sought to move a motion of privilege. You correctly pointed out subsequently that it is up to the chair, when a matter of privilege is raised at committee, to determine if that is a matter of privilege or not.

I think it was unfortunate that you initially allowed the debate but then ruled later that it was not a matter of privilege. Nonetheless, that was the ruling you made, and it was upheld by the committee, which meant that no motion was moved. No motion of privilege was moved because you determined it was not a matter of privilege. Since you determined it was not a matter of privilege, no motion was moved. I had the floor before I tried to move that motion and was told I couldn't and I had the floor after I tried to move that motion and didn't.

There are various means by which the chair can establish the order, but the chair in this case did establish the order. The chair determined that I had the floor, provided me with the floor and cannot then decide in the middle of my remarks that I no longer have the floor.

Once I have the floor, I have the floor unless and until I cede the floor or if there is some other reason why I have given it up.

I think the transcript is clear that I had the floor. I was given the floor properly by the chair. No motion was moved and thus I didn't lose the floor. At no point did I cede the floor, so I have the floor, Chair. The legitimacy of the committee in all subsequent proceedings depends on your willingness to uphold the rules as they are clearly written and established in the book and in the transcript.

I hope you will rule in accordance with the rules.

Thank you, Chair. That's my point of order.

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order.

Mr. Genuis, a ruling was made and upheld by the committee. It was challenged and it was upheld. If you would like to continue, you can add your name to the speaking order as we have conversations on the subamendment.

I would like to take this opportunity to remind our committee members about some procedural responsibilities.

Chairs preside over committee meetings and oversee committee work. They recognize the members, witnesses and other people who wish to speak at these meetings. As in the House, all the remarks are addressed to the chair. That should clarify, by that passage, that the ruling has been made by the chair and the chair has the authority to do so.

I would remind all members that if you would like to speak to the subamendment—because we are on a subamendment right now—to an amendment or to the main motion, you have the right to do so. You can raise your hand. We will put you on a list and we will recognize you when your turn comes.

We will now proceed to Mr. Angus.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On a point of order, Chair, I don't understand your ruling.

Mr. John Williamson (New Brunswick Southwest, CPC): Chair, I called for a point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Williamson, I'm sorry. I did not recognize you on a point of order because I did not hear you call a point of order.

Mr. Genuis, go ahead on the point of order. Then I'll go to the next point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, respectfully, I don't understand what you're saying.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm not surprised.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I want to make this point clearly and precisely, and hopefully we'll be able to have a respectful understanding of the rules, Chair.

You had made a ruling with respect to the question of privilege.

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

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You determined at that point that the matter was not in relation to privilege. That is the ruling I think you were speaking of. You made that ruling. That ruling was upheld.

That meant my motion had not been moved. No motion had been moved. It didn't change the fact that I had the floor, and I still have the floor. I don't think you have a basis for ruling that I don't have the floor.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'm going to pause you.

We have a point of order from Mr. Angus.

Go ahead.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you.

What's very concerning is this level of intimidation of the chair to stop other MPs from speaking.

Mr. John Williamson: That's not a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I would ask, Chair, that either Mr. Genuis—

Mr. John Williamson: It's not a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: —challenges the chair or that he sit quietly and shows some respect for other people to have an opportunity to speak. This has been denied to all of us because of this behaviour. If he's not willing to challenge the chair, I suggest that you assume control of this meeting and allow everyone their role to speak, as we are here to do.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus.

Before I proceed to Mr. Williamson on a point of order, Mr. Genuis, I would remind you that the chair does have the authority to determine the speaking order as stated in the passage.

That decision was made, and the committee upheld that ruling, so we'll now proceed to Mr. Williamson on a point of order.

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

The Chair: If you so choose, you may challenge the chair.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, on that point of order, I think you are misunderstanding.

The clerk can share with the committee or with you, if it's helpful. The chair establishes the speaking order. The chair does not, once a member has the floor already, decide in the middle of that member's speech that the chair doesn't like what that member is saying and that therefore he has lost the floor. That's not what establishing a speaking order means.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, we're not going to get into debate.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No, but we're going to uphold the rules of this committee, Chair.

The Chair: A rule was upheld—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You do not have the right to show complete disregard for the rules.

The Chair: I'm sorry, Mr. Genuis; I will ask you not to speak over—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I have a point of order, Chair.

The Chair: We have a point of order from Mr. Williamson.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Could we hear from the clerk?

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I have a point of order, Chair.

The Chair: We have a point of order from Mr. Williamson. We will go to him next.

Mr. Williamson, you had a point of order.

Mr. John Williamson: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I wasn't here at the last meeting. You mentioned a ruling. I'm unclear if that ruling was made today.

Mr. Genuis did raise a point of order. I haven't heard a ruling from that.

You're absolutely right that the chair does get to set the speaking order, but where Mr. Genuis has a point is that, if he had the floor in the last meeting and that meeting was suspended, it does go back to him. The chair is not in a position to remove that privilege from him.

I would seek guidance from the clerk as to who had the floor in the last meeting. If this had been a new meeting, you're absolutely right. You'd have the power to designate anyone to speak, but, given that this meeting was suspended and that Mr. Genuis had the floor...

Let's seek advice from the clerk.

Mr. Charlie Angus: You're making that up.

Mr. John Williamson: Let's seek—

The Chair: Order.

Mr. John Williamson: —advice from the clerk on that, Mr. Chair.

That is my point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Williamson, thank you.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Point of order. Point of order.

Mr. John Williamson: Let's hear the chair, please.

The Chair: I will respond to Mr. Williamson, because he had a point of order, and he had the floor.

Mr. Williamson, that was decided on. The chair was challenged, and the committee did uphold that ruling. We proceeded on, and now Mr. Angus has the floor.

As stated earlier, and as you stated, as well, the chair does have authority to proceed, so that's what we're doing.

Just to remind folks, we have an amendment on the floor. We have a motion on the floor with an amendment and a subamendment.

I would ask of all members the courtesy to allow members to participate on the subamendment, which Mr. Angus would like to do. He hasn't had an opportunity to say more than three words, I believe.

I'm hoping we can get to him on the subamendment, and we can continue on with that so we can potentially move to a vote on that and other amendments as well.

An hon. member: Point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Can I begin to speak, or are they going to continue to interrupt?

The Chair: We're going to go to Ms. Stubbs on a point of order. Ms. Stubbs has been waiting patiently.

We're going to go to you, Ms. Stubbs. Then we're going to go to Ms. Dabrusin on a point of order, and then we'll go to Mr. Falk on a point of order.

We're going to start with you, Ms. Stubbs.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I had a point of order, as well, Chair, so you can add me to that list.

The Chair: We'll go to you, Ms. Stubbs.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thank you, Chair. I appreciate the time you're giving me.

I need to echo, of course, the comments by both Mr. Genuis and Mr. Williamson.

I'm also confused about why members are not aware of what happened and how things happened in the meeting, since all of it is in public and all of it is on video.

This isn't a theoretical discussion between us all. It's not a matter of a point of perspective or our own opinion. It's verifiable in the video footage of this meeting that is public so every Canadian can see what is going on here, as they have a right to do.

This, of course, is technically the same meeting that started last Monday when the NDP-Liberals started at the top of the programming scheduling motion to dictate to the committee what we're going to do on these bills—

The Chair: We're getting into debate now, Ms. Stubbs.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Mr. Genuis did summarize—

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

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: —from the publicly available footage of—

Mr. Charlie Angus: She is making false statements. The NDP did not bring a motion—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: —this committee exactly—

Mr. Charlie Angus: She's just making stuff up.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, I've asked you to hold.

Ms. Stubbs, go ahead just on the point of order, please.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Mr. Angus, I'm sorry. I'll just respond to that.

The Chair: Speak just on the point of order, please.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I'll just also respond to Mr. Angus.

The Chair: No, you're not going to get into debate.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I want to apologize to him.

The Chair: Speak on the point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Would you guys let me get in a word now, or do the men both want to keep shouting at me?

The Chair: Just on the point of order....

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I'll just refer to Charlie Angus, since he just made a point of order about what I just said.

I will say, I apologize, Mr. Angus. Thank you for that clarity that you were not involved in the Liberals' programming scheduling motion to dictate everything to this committee.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I just assumed we had the confidence agreement in 2025.

Now I will continue my comments.

Mr. Genuis is correct about what occurred in this meeting—

Mr. John Aldag: Point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: —and Mr. Williamson is correct about his point. All of this comes down to credibility that Canadians have in our democratic institutions—

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, I'm going to ask you to hold, because we have a point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: —and in the ability of members of Parliament to be able to represent the millions of Canadians who sent them here to do this job.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Stubbs.

Do you have a point of order?

Mr. John Aldag: Yes, I do.

The Chair: Okay, and then we have Ms. Dabrusin on a point of order.

Mr. John Aldag: It's just on what Ms. Stubbs said. She keeps calling it a programming motion, and that is not what was put forward.

I want to be really clear that this is not a programming motion. It was related to bringing forward an idea for scheduling. That's what the main motion is about. It's really important that we be factual. The Conservatives have raised several times the reference to this being a programming motion, and it's not. I just want that to be reflected in the record.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Aldag, for that.

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

I have a point of order on Mr. Aldag's comment.

The Chair: We'll go to Ms. Dabrusin on a point of order.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: It seems to me that what I'm hearing from the members opposite.... It has been a long tactic of slowing this down. We are actually on a subamendment to a motion to schedule legislation from the House, which is standard procedure for people on a committee to do.

At this moment, the chair has ruled that Mr. Angus has the floor. That would allow us to go to the subamendment and finally get to the actual motion, unless the Conservatives continue to not want that to happen.

Are the members opposite challenging the chair? If so, then let's vote on it. If they are not challenging the chair, then let's go to Mr. Angus, because that was the chair's ruling.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Dabrusin.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Point of order, Chair.

The Chair: I will remind members that a ruling on privilege was made and upheld by this committee. If members want to challenge the chair on a speaking order, they have the right to do so.

I would request, as Ms. Dabrusin has recognized, that a member challenge the chair on the speaking order, and we can go to a committee vote. That would be the committee's decision at that point.

However, I have recognized, post the ruling that was made and upheld, that Mr. Angus has the floor on the subamendment.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Point of order, Chair.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis on a point of order.

I'd ask, if it is the same point of order again, that you challenge the chair on the speaking order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, I think, respectfully, that you are confused about two different rulings.

There is the question of whether the privilege motion that I raised pertained to privilege, and you ruled—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —in the end, that it did not. That question is distinct from—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'll ask you to hold, because—

The Chair: —Mr. Angus has a point of order.

Mr. John Williamson: Point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Sure.

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

Mr. John Williamson: Mr. Falk has been waiting here patiently.

Should we not be taking points of order and running through them one at a time?

The Chair: Mr. Williamson, I'm trying to recognize members, and his point of order on Mr. Genuis's point of order, so I'm not getting into debate with you.

Mr. John Williamson: The person who speaks the loudest shouldn't be able to overrule any member who already has the floor.

The Chair: Then I would ask—

Mr. John Williamson: That's what he is doing. He's been sitting there barking into his mike thinking he gets the floor.

The Chair: Mr. Williamson, I will ask you to cede the floor.

Mr. Simard.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: Pardon me. Just for the sake of the interpreters and their mental health, would you please speak one at a time? I think they're going crazy on the other side.

If you can speak one at a time and refrain from crosstalk, I'm sure the interpreters will be quite content.

[*English*]

Mr. Charlie Angus: *Merci.*

My point of order is that Mr. Genuis continues to try to obstruct. He needs to challenge the chair. Otherwise, we have to move on.

If he is willing to challenge the chair, then he can get his way, but if he isn't, he has to stop this pattern of trying to stop other MPs from participating in the committee.

I would ask you, Chair, to ask Mr. Genuis whether or not he is actually going to challenge the chair, or if this is just a tactic to stop other MPs from speaking on some very important legislation.

The Chair: On the point of order that Mr. Angus has raised....

Mr. Simard, thank you for reminding, first of all, our colleagues and everybody here of the importance of one member speaking at a time. It is important, as stated in the last meeting. When we are all speaking into the mikes, it's difficult for the interpreters, number one, for their health and safety, but also for them to do their job. They are doing an amazing job of providing interpretation services to the committee here today and in the past and in the future. We want to make sure that everybody is working in a safe work environment.

I will not entertain any more points of order on this matter. Unless you would like to challenge the chair on the speaking order—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I was in the middle of a point of order when I was interrupted on that point of order by Mr. Angus. I was in the middle of a point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, we made a ruling at the last meeting that—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Who is “we”?

The Chair: It's the committee. The committee made a ruling that was upheld.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, can I be allowed—

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I am not going to debate with you.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Can I be allowed to finish the point of order that I was raising before I was interrupted by Mr. Angus?

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I will ask you to cede the floor.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Mr. Chair, out of respect for the interpreters, you should let Mr. Genuis finish his comments.

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, the chair has the floor. Allow me to finish, please.

We previously ruled as a committee on the ruling of privilege. The committee ruled.

If you would like to challenge the chair on the speaking order, you can do so. I will not, at this point, be taking any more points of order on this. If you want to challenge the chair on the speaking order, I would ask you to do so, and we can proceed with a vote on challenging the chair. Then it would be the committee's will to determine whether it wants to uphold that ruling or not.

I will not have any more points of order on the issue.

I will go to Mr. Angus so that he can get to his debate on the sub-amendment.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, on that matter, thank you—

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, this is not for debate. You can challenge the chair or Mr. Angus gets the floor. If you'd like to challenge the chair, I'll give you that opportunity.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you for the opportunity.

I would like to move that the committee report to the House that the chair abused his powers when he breached the privileges of the member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan—

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, you do not have the floor, and I would ask you to—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —by taking the floor away from him on the debate on the programming motion on Bill C-50 and Bill C-49.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Chair, could you cut the microphone?

The Chair: We will suspend.

● (1125) _____ (Pause) _____

● (1135)

The Chair: I call the meeting back to order.

Thank you, committee members.

I have heard arguments made on who has the floor. My ruling is that Mr. Angus has the floor.

We will proceed with Mr. Angus. We will not allow any more points of order—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Point of order, Chair.

The Chair: —on any rulings that have been made today.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Point of order, Chair.

The Chair: Yes, Mr. Genuis. Do you have a different point of order?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have moved a question of privilege in relation to the violation of privilege by the chair.

Mr. Charlie Angus: You don't have the floor to do that.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, you do not have the floor. Mr. Angus has been recognized as the individual with the floor.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: How can I raise a question of privilege when the nature of the violation of the privilege is to not allow me to speak?

The Chair: Mr. Genuis—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You're just making things up, Chair.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I have made—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You would have order if you respected the rules.

The Chair: —a ruling. I will ask you to turn off your microphone.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No, Chair. You're being a dictator.

The Chair: I am asking the proceedings and verification officer to keep mikes off until I have made a ruling and acknowledged a member to speak.

I will be very clear. All members have the right to speak when it's their turn.

I have made a ruling on the speaking order. The speaking order is that Mr. Angus has the floor.

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

The Chair: If committee members would like to challenge that ruling, that ruling can be challenged. The committee can, at that point, proceed to a vote.

Mr. Genuis, I will not be accepting any points of order on rulings that have been made—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, I move a motion of privilege.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, you do not have the floor. Mr. Angus has the floor.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On a point of order, Chair, the rules provide that I can raise a question of privilege.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I would ask you....

I will ask colleagues to pause for a moment, please.

We will proceed with Mr. Angus. A ruling has been made by this committee—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On a point of order, Chair, I do not need the floor to raise a question of privilege. I can raise it on a point of order.

The Chair: We have made a ruling, and a previous ruling has been made.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order. I'd like to raise a question of privilege.

Mr. Charlie Angus: He said he was bringing forth a motion. He doesn't have the floor. Now he keeps changing—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's a question of privilege.

Mr. Charlie Angus: He's claiming to have a motion when I have the floor.

Chair, if you will allow me to continue, because I am here to do my job as a parliamentarian to speak on Bill C-50 and Bill C-49 and the need for us to respond to the—

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

Mr. Charlie Angus: —vote that was done by all members of Parliament to have our committee undertake this work.

The Chair: Mr. Angus—

Mr. Charlie Angus: I look forward to taking that on.

Mr. Genuis, whenever he gets the floor—

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

Mr. Charlie Angus: —can do whatever he does, but he doesn't have a point of order. He said he was introducing a motion.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's a motion of privilege.

The Chair: Mr. Angus has the floor.

Colleagues, I have recognized him. If colleagues would like to challenge the ruling of the chair—

Mr. Ted Falk: Mr. Chair, you recognized me before as having a point of order, and you never acknowledged my opportunity to raise my point of order.

It seems as though when Mr. Angus decides to contribute to this conversation or discussion, he is immediately recognized, and he is given the courtesy and the privilege to speak, but—

The Chair: Mr. Falk, we're getting into debate. I would ask you, if it is on a ruling that's been made—

Mr. Ted Falk: My point of order was before the ruling was made, so I want to speak to my point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: You can look at the video.

The Chair: You have a point of order on the speaking order.

Mr. Ted Falk: Absolutely. I have a point of order.

The Chair: I've made a ruling, Mr. Falk, on the speaking order. Would you like to challenge the chair?

Mr. Ted Falk: No. I had a point of order prior to you making this ruling. I think you need to recognize that point of order. That is the rule of the committee.

The Chair: Mr. Falk, earlier I read a passage that was directly on the role of the chair.

I have made a ruling on the speaking order. The speaking order is that Mr. Angus has the floor. The ruling is that Mr. Angus has the floor.

I would like all colleagues to respect all committee members and allow them to be able to provide their interventions on the amendments that are on the floor. That is a ruling that I have made.

If a member wants to challenge the chair on that ruling—Mr. Falk, if you do, because yours was on that—I would ask you to do so, so that this committee can decide how to move forward on the specific ruling that was made.

Mr. Ted Falk: Mr. Chair, here's the deal. I raised a point of order prior to your making that ruling. I wasn't given an opportunity to be heard before you made your decision. I think what we—

The Chair: We're getting into debate now.

Mr. Ted Falk: I'm raising my point of order.

The Chair: Okay.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Chair, for the interpreters, you wanted people to finish. Could you let Ted finish?

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, I would ask you not to turn on your mike when I'm addressing—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Why don't you turn off your mike and let him speak?

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Yes.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You're just making things up, Chair.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Stop speaking so Ted can finish.

The Chair: I would tell you, if it's on a previous point of order on which the ruling has been made, you can challenge the chair, Mr. Falk.

If you would like to challenge the chair, please go ahead.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: One day you're going to be here and we're going to be there, and the rules will protect you.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Chair, I do have the floor. Is that correct?

The Chair: You do, but I just want to verify whether Mr. Falk is challenging the chair. Otherwise, we will be proceeding to Mr. Angus.

Mr. Ted Falk: Mr. Chair, this is what I am doing, and this is why I was going to raise a point of order.

I want to ask you, sir, as the chair, to follow the rules of committee, to follow the rules of Parliament and to make the right decision. Mr. Genuis before very quickly articulated the last part of our previous meeting.

Excuse me, Charlie, do you have the floor?

Mr. Charlie Angus: Actually, I do. Thank you very much. Can we carry on and actually do some work?

Mr. Ted Falk: No, he doesn't actually. The point of order has the floor.

You should know better.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I do have the floor, so thank you, Mr. Falk.

The Chair: Order.

I'm going to ask all members once again.

Colleagues, I would ask all members to respect all members through our discussions here at this committee.

Mr. Falk, a ruling has been made on who is next on the speaking order. I will give you the opportunity, Mr. Falk, if you would like to challenge the chair on that ruling—

Order.

We're suspending.

• (1145) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1210)

The Chair: Thank you, colleagues.

We are back to our meeting.

Where we left off was that a ruling was made on the speaking order. Mr. Angus has the floor.

Mr. Angus, you do have the floor. We did hear a number of points of order pertaining to this specific issue on the speaking order. It was determined that Mr. Angus does have the floor.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you, Chair, I—

The Chair: I'm sorry, Mr. Angus. We have a point of order by Mr. Falk.

Mr. Falk.

Mr. Ted Falk: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

You suspended in the middle of my point of order. I actually had the floor. We weren't up to Mr. Angus at all.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm sorry, but I don't think that's accurate.

The Chair: Mr. Falk, what I did say several times on the previous point of order and also when you did have the floor was that the ruling was made on the speaking order. Mr. Angus does have the floor. That's to your point of order that you raised before we had suspended. Mr. Angus does have the floor.

I will offer you, Mr. Falk, that if you would like to challenge the chair on this, then you have the right to do so. Then the committee can proceed to the vote.

Mr. Ted Falk: What I would like to do, Mr. Chair, is to point out how we left off at our last meeting and who actually had the floor, and give you an opportunity to follow the rules of the committee. That's what I would like to do, Mr. Chair.

Without challenging your position or authority as chair, I would like to reiterate what exactly happened here at our last meeting and have you make an informed decision. I don't think you're making an informed decision.

Mr. Genuis did have the floor. I think it—

The Chair: Thank you. We're getting into debate.

Mr. Falk, a ruling as the chair—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Point of order, Chair.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'm going to first respond to Mr. Falk.

I read this out earlier, that procedurally the responsibility is the chair's to recognize members as their turn comes in the speaking order. As you referenced last meeting, this was also discussed last meeting. It was brought forward that Mr. Angus has the floor.

If you challenge the speaking order of Mr. Angus having the floor, I would ask you to please do so, and we can proceed with challenging my ruling as chair. In my role as chair, that is one of the responsibilities. I am following that responsibility here to acknowledge members as they wish to speak.

To that point, I will offer you, if you would like to challenge the chair on the speaking order—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order on a different matter, Chair, before that.

The Chair: Mr. Falk, I want to give you that opportunity to make sure as a committee member you have that opportunity, or I will then proceed to move forward.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order on a different matter in relation to—

The Chair: Excuse me, Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Falk, I just want to make sure that we're clear. Do you challenge the chair?

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

The Chair: One person at a time, Mr. Genuis.

It's going to Mr. Falk. Mr. Falk has the floor.

I'm asking if Mr. Falk would like to challenge the chair.

Mr. Ted Falk: Mr. Chair, what I'd like to do is for you to clarify to the committee whether at the last meeting you indicated that Mr. Genuis had the floor and that's how you suspended the meeting. Could you clarify that for the committee?

The Chair: As chair, I clarified that Mr. Angus has the floor.

Mr. Ted Falk: Sir, that's what you're saying this morning. I believe at the end of the last meeting, you had indicated—

The Chair: Mr. Falk, now we're getting into debate. A ruling was made.

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

The Chair: A ruling was made.

Mr. Ted Falk: I'm just wondering whether you could clarify whether indeed you did at the last meeting indicate that you suspended the meeting with Mr. Genuis having the floor.

The Chair: Mr. Falk, a ruling has been made on the speaking order.

I am now going to go to Mr. Angus on a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order, Chair. I've been trying to get in a point of order since—

The Chair: Mr. Angus, on a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I've been trying to raise a point of order since long before he did. You've been completely ignoring my point of order.

The Chair: I will ask colleagues—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I am a duly subbed in and elected member of Parliament.

The Chair: I will go to you, Mr. Genuis, once I go to the point of order that Mr. Angus has on Mr. Falk's point of order.

Go ahead.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you, Chair.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: That's a stretch, but I'll let it go.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm now into the second day of attempting to speak to legislation that was voted on by Parliament.

I am very concerned, number one, about the health and safety of our interpreters because of the abusive behaviour of the Conservatives. Also, there's the abusive behaviour of attempting to undermine the chair to limit the right of other members to speak. You ruled that I had the floor at the last meeting. I was shut down from speaking by these constant interruptions. I am now over an hour into this attempting to do my good faith diligence on Bill C-50 and Bill C-49.

I'm asking, since you have ruled, that we shut down this obvious attempt at intimidation. I would like to hear from my other colleagues, too. We have to move on. This legislation is important to all of us, to Canadians and in particular Canadian workers, who are very frustrated by these tactics to stop us from making sure that workers have a seat at the table.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, we are getting into debate.

Procedurally we have recognized that Mr. Angus has the floor on the subamendment, which is on Timmins. I know a number of folks want to speak to this subamendment. Then we also have an amendment that was presented and then the main motion. I'm hoping we can get to that point to have that conversation. I hope that today we can get to that point.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, you said you would come to me on a point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, you do have the floor, but we do have other points of order, so I'm going to go to a point of order. Then we will proceed moving forward with you having the floor.

Mr. John Williamson: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order following Mr. Genuis. I just want to get on the list as well.

I'm trying to be respectful, Chair. I'm trying not to speak over anyone else, but I do want to be noted as having a point of order after Mr. Genuis.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Williamson.

Mr. Genuis, you have a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

There are actually three matters of order that I have been trying to raise.

The first is that during points of order, members are entitled to make arguments about matters of order. Arguments about matters of order are not points of debate. It happened during Mr. Falk's intervention that you and others suggested he was venturing into debate when he was, in fact, making substantive arguments in relation to the rules and matters of order.

Engaging in debate is when you use points of order to make points about the topic that don't have anything to do with the rules, something like what Mr. Angus just did when he was speaking about the legislation and his views on the legislation.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: That is venturing into debate, but what Mr. Falk was doing was speaking about the rules and making arguments, and that's what I'm doing now as well.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, if I may, I'll ask you to pause.

Mr. Angus, if you could, be very succinct on the point of order, please.

Mr. Charlie Angus: This is about our right as MPs to participate in debate. It has been ruled that Mr. Genuis didn't have a leg to stand on.

Either they challenge the chair or they stop obstructing, because this is what it is. It's obstructing my right as an MP to speak to important legislation. When I try and explain the importance of that legislation, they are getting up on more points of order.

I think you need to—

The Chair: Thank you.

We are getting into debate, Mr. Angus. Thank you for your point of order.

Do you have a point of order, Ms. Stubbs, on Mr. Genuis's—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Yes, I have a point of order, Chair.

Of course, the top of Monday's meeting, which is technically still this meeting, was about scheduling. My immediate response, of course, was about an amendment to add to the schedule for this committee business in the exact order that you guys brought in and passed legislation, which was Bill C-49 first and Bill C-50 after. That's what started Monday.

What has elapsed since is hours and hours of NDP and Liberal MPs trying to kick off and shut down Conservative members of Parliament on this committee who have a right to be here. That's what we're talking about now.

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, we are getting into debate, but we do have a point of order from Ms. Dabrusin.

Ms. Dabrusin, on the point of order.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: For days now, as Ms. Stubbs has correctly pointed out, we have been unable to go ahead with a basic motion that comes to all committees when there's government legislation that has been voted upon.

You have made a ruling that Mr. Angus has the floor. We have been unable to get to that.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Can you pause, Ms. Dabrusin?

Ms. Stubbs, I want to hear the point of order from Ms. Dabrusin. Then, on that point of order, we will come back to you.

Ms. Dabrusin, my apologies. Please go ahead.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: I believe that you have made a ruling that Mr. Angus has the floor on the subamendment to a very standard scheduling motion. I would ask that if the Conservatives continue to have a problem with that, they challenge the chair on that ruling, or else we go ahead and do the business that workers across this country expect us to be doing for them.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Dabrusin.

Ms. Stubbs, on the point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thank you, Chair.

We all agree about the importance of debating this legislation, especially considering both of its significant impacts. Of course, Julie would know that on Friday, October 27, at 2:58 p.m., she texted me, and said, "I'm checking in about Monday and your thoughts on getting started on the bills at RNNR committee. Let me know if you want to talk."

Of course, that was a follow-up.

The Chair: Get to the point of order, please.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: It's about this point of order. It's about the issue of scheduling.

As you know, and as you correctly corrected me, and I apologize for that, conversations did happen the week prior that I wasn't supposed to refer to. I apologize for that, and I won't do again now.

I got that text on Friday. I responded with exactly the same argument that we made here and that you all know we have also discussed.

She didn't respond to me. That's fine. She's extremely busy in her role, and that's fine with me.

The Chair: I will ask you to be succinct on private conversations you're having, Ms. Stubbs.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I will be.

I'm going to wrap up right now.

The Chair: I want you to be on the point of order, not on a private conversation you had with another member.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I am on it. It's about the scheduling. It's not about a private conversation. It has nothing to do with a private conversation. It's about scheduling for this committee.

The Chair: I'm sorry. Could you go ahead on the point of order?

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I know it's very hard for everybody to be totally transparent and say the same thing privately and publicly, or internally and externally. You all know that's a thing I do.

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

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: This isn't a private conversation. This is the truth. It was about scheduling at this committee. She has a big job and a lot of responsibilities. It's fine that she didn't respond. That happened on Friday. You guys keep talking about wanting to collaborate. At the very top of the meeting on Monday—

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, I want to know what your procedural concern is.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: —the Liberals walked in with this scheduling motion to dictate the schedule to this committee. Conservatives are saying we want to collaborate. These bills are important.

The Chair: What is the procedural issue, Ms. Stubbs?

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: The procedural issue is on being clear about what has occurred in this committee meeting, which—

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

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: —continues to be the same meeting since last Monday.

The Chair: Okay.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: It was about the schedule. It was about these bills.

The Chair: The point of order is—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: What's happened subsequently is that the NDP-Liberals spent two days trying to shut down, censor and kick out Conservative members of Parliament, who have a right to be here at this committee.

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, we are getting into debate.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Let's not bullshit anybody anymore. If we want to get on the schedule of dealing with these bills at this committee, let's go ahead and do that.

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

The Chair: I will ask you to hold. I will ask you to pause, because we are getting into debate.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: That's in fact what we were doing at the beginning of Monday. We're not going to keep participating in this charade while you guys pretend. It's also out in public for all Canadians to see that something is happening here that isn't—

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

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, Mr. Angus has a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I'm done.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Number one, we're now being subjected to what I think is some very unparliamentary and ugly language. This isn't a barroom.

The issue here—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I apologize, Mr. Angus. Of course, you dropped the F-bomb in three meetings.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, can you hold for a second?

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Mr. Angus, you dropped the F-bomb four meetings ago. Let's talk about that next, if we have to.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Chair—

The Chair: Mr. Angus, could you hold for one second? Hold your thought.

Colleagues, I made this ruling earlier. We had a conversation. We are not going to speak over each other. It is very difficult for the interpreters. We had a number of folks with mikes on at the same time. It is very difficult for interpreters to interpret, but it's also for their health and safety, as was discussed earlier today and at the last meeting.

I want to make sure that, if we have a point of order, we stick to the procedural relevance of the point of order. Don't use it as debate, because that's what we're venturing into. Focus on the point of order at hand and why you raised it.

Mr. Angus, go ahead on the point of order.

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

As I was saying, this is about our ability to do work at committee. The issue of a text message between two MPs in a previous week is irrelevant. Accusing me of swearing when I didn't is irrelevant. What is relevant here is an ongoing attempt to stop me from talking about legislation that is very important to Canadian workers.

Mr. Chair, I don't believe I heard anything relevant in that last intervention, other than an attempt to walk the clock out. I would like to ask you, Mr. Chair, to tell the members who have obstructed this committee that people have the opportunity to take the floor when they get the floor. They can filibuster then, if they want to. They cannot use these tactics to undermine, intimidate and swear at other MPs.

We're here to do a job for Canadian workers. They are watching, and people are frustrated.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus.

I ask all colleagues to use parliamentary language in all meetings and that we conduct ourselves as parliamentarians, whether we're in the House of Commons or this committee room. It's important that we use parliamentary language and respect each other as colleagues. Have vigorous debates. That is important on issues of legislation.

We have a motion on the floor today on the Canadian sustainable jobs act, Bill C-50 and on the Atlantic accord bill, Bill C-49, an amendment, and a subamendment for Timmins.

All members have a right to participate.

Mr. Angus has the floor. He was unable to participate in the debate last meeting and is unable to today. I will once again—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I was in the middle of a point of order when you—

The Chair: —for the members—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I—

The Chair: Mr. Angus, before I recognize you—

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm sorry. I'm just very keen.

The Chair: That's okay.

I will let members know that Mr. Angus has the floor. All members have an opportunity to participate and debate on all the amendments on the floor today—the motion, the amendment and the subamendment. We're on the subamendment.

If you want to participate, you can be recognized when your turn comes up. You will have an opportunity to be recognized at that point in time. At that point, you have the ability to make your interventions on the subamendment.

Now, Mr. Angus, you have the floor.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On a point of order, Chair, I was in the middle of a point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, we did have another member on a point of order before we got into the additional points of order.

I want to go to Mr. Genuis first on his point of order. Then we'll go back to you on the speaking order, once we've gone through the points of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you, Chair.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

I was in the process of raising a number of issues of order, and then there were interventions in the middle of that point of order with other points of order, so I will return to the points of order that I intended to raise.

The first, briefly, was about the legitimacy of raising arguments respecting matters of order on points of order. That is, in fact, what a point of order is.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair, please.

[*English*]

The Chair: Go ahead.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: I'll speak very slowly.

What has happened in the last two meetings is appalling. I don't want to be associated with it in any way. Can we adopt ways of proceeding that everyone can comply with? I think that's the first thing we need to do.

An issue came up here last week when we were informed that Conservative MPs who were not committee members had tried to speak. However, it is the practice of our committee to give the floor solely to its members.

Since then, Mr. Genuis has raised a raft of points of order solely on that matter. However, we resolved the issue by saying this wasn't a violation of procedure. We gave Mr. Angus the floor. Now, before raising a point of order, could we indicate the purpose of that point of order?

Depending on how we proceed, could we agree that we have an obligation to state the purpose of the point of order?

There's a first principle in logic: doing the same thing over and over again while expecting a different result is a sign of stupidity. You've probably heard that one.

Even though Mr. Genuis is exhausting himself raising points of order to say that his colleague has suffered a breach of his privilege, I don't think he's going to come up with a different result. We've already resolved that.

Now, could we agree collectively, for the proper functioning of this committee, that we must state what the subject will be before raising a point of order?

If the subject is the same as it was last week, there's no point; we've already resolved that issue. We have to move on to something else.

If Mr. Genuis still wants to raise a point of order about something we've resolved, well, he'll be demonstrating his bad faith.

We'll be able to draw conclusions at that point. Can we all agree that, before raising a point of order, we should state what it's about?

With the exception of what happened last week, I don't see any new elements in Mr. Genuis' point of order. And yet we've exhausted the issue. We've resolved it.

[*English*]

The Chair: Mr. Simard, that was very well said. Thank you for your intervention.

I think that the point that our colleague raises on points of order is being specific and citing clearly what your point of order is rather than getting into debate.

My apologies, Mr. Simard. It took me some time to make sure that I had the correct translation.

Thank you to the interpreters for doing a really good job of providing clarity on what Mr. Simard provided.

Mr. Genuis, I would ask you, considering what Mr. Simard just provided, that you be very specific on your point of order that you've raised and cite what your point of order is directly related to so you can be very specific and direct so that we can proceed moving forward.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

I'm extremely grateful to the interpreters as well for their hard work.

I raise points of order pertaining to the rules. I don't think any member here would dispute the fact that I know the rules extremely well and, Chair, I'm always happy to support your awareness of the rules in any way I can. I'm always available to provide you with guidance on rules—

The Chair: I would just ask you to be specific, Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, I had a number of issues relating to order that I felt were important to raise. The first was with respect to the legitimacy of raising substantive arguments in the context of points of order.

That was the first point I wanted to raise with respect to order. The second—

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

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'll ask you to hold that thought at "substantive arguments" specifically.

Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you, Chair.

I have been on a lot of different committees over 20 years. A point of order is a point of order on an issue.

Mr. Genuis doesn't get to write out a whole long list of grievances and present them as a series of extenuating issues in a point of order. What we're ending up with is interference by taking the floor that undermines the rights of other members to speak. We're over an hour and a half into that.

If he has a specific point of order, then he needs to say it. You rule on it and then we can move on. He can't draw up a long list of grievances and slights he's felt over the last two days of our attempts to actually do work here. I would ask you to make sure it's succinct.

I do have the floor. I am serious about getting this legislation passed. I am here to work hard. I have been interfered with constantly since I was given the floor by the chair. I think we need to move on.

The accusation by Mr. Genuis saying that I've somehow stolen the floor is just beneath us as parliamentarians. This isn't high school.

Mr. Chair, we've heard swearing and now we're hearing these kinds of base accusations. The Conservatives need to start treating this committee with the respect it deserves.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus, for your point of order and intervention on that.

Mr. Genuis, I would ask you to be on the point of order. You left off at "substantive arguments". I want you to be very clear on the point of order, so we can rule on the point of order and proceed.

I'm going to turn it back to you, but I want you to be very succinct and direct on the point of order you are raising.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Really, I've barely been able to get a word out. Mr. Angus went on at length raising a point of order, which essentially anticipated—

The Chair: Once again, Mr. Genuis, I want you to focus on the point of order, please.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Absolutely. My colleague raised a point of order, which presumed to anticipate what I was about to do when I hadn't even done it yet.

The first issue was about substantive arguments. Notwithstanding the interruptions, I think I have been more or less able to get that point out. I would welcome some clarity from the chair on that particular issue.

The second is that Mr.—

The Chair: Do you have a point of order, Mr. Angus?

Mr. Charlie Angus: Chair, since he's asked you and he said that this is his issue, can you rule on that and then we can move on?

Again, it's inappropriate to claim a big, long laundry list of slights. He raised his first issue. You need to respond to that and then we can move on.

The Chair: I would say there's an opportunity to provide your arguments through debate, but not through a point of order.

The point of order is on a procedural issue that you're raising at the moment. If a ruling is required by the chair or the committee, then raise it so we can move forward.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Chair, the issue was that I was asking you to rule on the issue he brought forward. That's why it's procedural.

He raised his complaint and then he says that he has other ones. He raised a point of order with a complaint about how the chair

handled things. The chair should respond. Then we can just decide whether or not—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Does he have some privilege that we don't, Chair? He's going on at great length, anticipating points of order that I haven't even raised yet.

Mr. Charlie Angus: [*Inaudible—Editor*] you need to respond.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus.

Mr. Genuis, we do not want to get into a prolonged conversation and debate. We want it to be strictly on the procedural relevance.

Please be on the procedural relevance with your point of order and don't get into debate. If a ruling is required or if you are not happy with the speaking order, I would ask you to challenge the chair.

If that's not what your point of order is, then I would ask you to specifically keep it to the procedure.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Also, be very direct and succinct on the procedural issue. That's what I would ask of you.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I've received more directed guidance on how to raise my points of order.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I would ask you to hold. I'm sorry.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: This is crazy. I've just been trying to raise a point of order.

The Chair: We have Mr. Aldag on a point of order.

Mr. John Aldag: I just have a quick procedural question.

Out of the corner of my eye, I caught lights flashing, so I don't know if there's a vote. We have important work to do, so if that is the case, I would ask for unanimous consent to continue with this important discussion.

My office is getting a lot of calls from Albertans who are asking us to get Bill C-50 done, so—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Unanimous consent will be available when you let members speak. No.

Mr. John Aldag: —I think we need to get as much time on the record as—

The Chair: Colleagues—

Mr. John Aldag: I'm just asking, procedurally, whether there is a vote or not.

Can we get consent to continue?

The Chair: —the bells are ringing. There is a vote.

I would ask colleagues if we have unanimous consent to continue.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On that, Mr. Chair, if the chair is not enforcing the rules and is depriving members arbitrarily of their ability to speak—

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair. Can you—

The Chair: Yes or no, Mr. Genuis?

Mr. Genuis, I would ask you to turn off your mike.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —then there's nothing to—

The Chair: Do we have unanimous consent to continue?

An hon. member: No.

The Chair: We don't.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No, because you won't let members speak.

The Chair: We will suspend.

• (1235) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1550)

The Chair: I call the meeting back to order.

Colleagues, welcome back to the meeting. Thank you to the new members this afternoon who have joined us.

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

The Chair: Do we have a point of order on Mr. Genuis's point of order?

Mr. Charlie Angus: It's on the overall.... I'd prefer to get it done before we go further so that there's less confusion for my colleagues.

The Chair: We'll go to a point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Chair, you said to refer specifically to the point of order.

The Chair: If you can be very specific, Mr. Angus, on your point of order, we can then go back to Mr. Genuis's point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Absolutely. I'll be very straightforward, Mr. Chair.

I believe I asked you in the previous meeting about the speaking order. I was on the order, and then today, I believe I began on the order.

Do I still have the floor? I just want to make sure, in all the she-mozzle that's been going on, whether or not I still have the floor.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus, for your point of order—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: On that point of order....

The Chair: I'm going to respond to Mr. Angus first.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I think he wants to address the point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: It's on the point of order.

The Chair: No. The Chair would like to respond to the point of order, and then you can provide a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: The member has the floor.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, you have the floor.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you.

The Chair: Yes, but now you can go to the point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: If I recall, the meeting last week was suspended. Therefore, the member who had the floor at the end of the meeting, who was a Conservative member—

An hon. member: No.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: —should still have the floor. That's the way it works. It was a suspension. You did not adjourn the meeting. If you had adjourned the meeting, that would have been completely different, because that was something that happened previously, but because you suspended the meeting, it's a continuation of the meeting.

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, on your point of order, are you referring to a specific standing order on the point of order? If you could clearly identify what that standing order is....

It was provided that Mr. Angus had the floor at the previous meeting, and we continued on into today's meeting with Mr. Angus on the floor.

That is the chair's ruling. If you would like to challenge the chair, I will leave that up to you.

Mr. Charlie Angus: On a point of order, you have ruled on this, so for Mr. Patzer to appear and then make false claims.... A ruling was made that I have the floor—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I have a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: If he does not want to accept your ruling.... You've already ruled on it, so this is not up for debate.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I have a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: You're overruled. You've been challenging the rules.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus.

Yes, I ruled on it and Mr. Angus has the floor, but we have a point of order from Mr. Patzer.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: For him to say I'm making a false claim insinuates that I'm lying. You know, Mr. Chair, he is not actually allowed to do that.

At the end of the last meeting, there was a Conservative member who had the floor—it was not Mr. Angus—so it's pretty straightforward.

Mr. Colin Carrie (Oshawa, CPC): I have a point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, it's been dealt with. The chair has made the ruling. If you'd like to challenge the chair, you can do so.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: We don't want to challenge you. We want you to enforce the rules.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Patzer.

We have a point of order from Mr. Carrie.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Can I have a point of order on the point of order from Mr. Patzer before we go to the next point of order? It's on the same point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, you have to hold on for a second. I'm going to deal with one point of order at a time.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's in relation to the point of order.

The Chair: I know, but your colleague next to you has a point of order. I want to hear his point of order, and then I'll come back to you.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Okay.

The Chair: Hopefully, there are no other points of order and I can come back to you on your point of order.

I have Mr. Carrie on a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I think I had the original point of order.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Carrie.

Mr. Colin Carrie: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

As you know, I'm not a regular member of this committee, but I have been on the Hill for a long period of time. I find this very unusual.

I was wondering if we could ask the clerk to intercede and explain how things left off at the last meeting, so that we can be very clear on this before we vote on—

The Chair: Thank you for the point of order, Mr. Carrie, and for joining us today.

The chair has made a ruling on the speaking order. If you would like to challenge that ruling, you can, but the ruling has been made that Mr. Angus has the floor.

Thank you.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you, Chair, for—

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

The Chair: Mr. Angus had the floor.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I have the floor.

The Chair: You have the floor, but we have a point of order from Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have an outstanding point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Before I finish, I had the floor at that last meeting. It is false to say I didn't.

Is that not correct, Mr. Chair?

The Chair: Mr. Angus, as I've clarified, you had the floor at the last meeting—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No. You didn't.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you. I look forward to speaking on this legislation.

The Chair: We're going to the point of order from Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair. I have an outstanding point of order in both senses of the word.

First of all, to respond, Mr. Patzer had raised a point of order and you had asked for specific standing orders, so in order to support the important work the chair is doing, I do want to draw the attention of the chair to the specific standing order that Mr. Patzer was referring to.

Standing Order 116 is the standing order that generally applies. It states:

(1) In a standing, special or legislative committee, the Standing Orders shall apply so far as may be applicable, except the standing orders as to the election of a Speaker, seconding of motions, limiting the number of times of speaking and the length of speeches.

Standing Order 116(2)(a) states:

Unless a time limit has been adopted by the committee or by the House, the Chair of a standing, special or legislative committee may not bring a debate to an end while there are members present who still wish to participate. A decision of the Chair in this regard may not be subject to an appeal to the committee.

Standing Order 116(2)(b) states:

A violation of paragraph (a) of this section may be brought to the attention of the Speaker by any member and the Speaker shall have the power to rule on the matter. If, in the opinion of the Speaker, such violation has occurred, the Speaker may order that all subsequent proceedings in relation to the said violation be nullified.

What Standing Order 116 makes clear is that not only does the chair not have the arbitrary power to make up rules as he goes but also, on the particular issue of limiting the amount of time for which a person can speak or their ability to speak in accordance with Standing Order 116, that is a unique case in which a matter of privilege may actually be brought to the attention of the chair directly.

That being the case, I would urge the chair and the committee to make sure they are acting within their rules or, shall I say, that they reform their actions to align them with the rules—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —because there are standing orders, and you don't just get to make it up because you happen to be the chair.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'll ask you to pause.

I have a point of order from Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you, Chair.

Certainly, the standing order says that it can be brought to the chair's attention. The chair does rule. If they don't like it, they can challenge it.

This is an attempt by the Conservatives to stop this member, who represents the New Democratic Party, from speaking on workers.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Chair, is this a point of order? Have you asked the member to cite the standing order as you're requesting we do?

Mr. Charlie Angus: The chair has ruled on this, so Mr. Genuis does not have a credible point, because he has brought this up again and again. The chair has ruled. I will ask the chair—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: What's the standing order from the member, as you have requested of Conservatives?

Mr. Charlie Angus: —if he has ruled on this.

If you have, can we move on?

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: What's the standing order?

The NDP MP yesterday—

The Chair: I will once again remind colleagues that when a member has the floor and is making a point of order, to allow the member to finish what he is saying, because we know how difficult it is for the interpreters. Earlier today we had some challenges with a number of members speaking at the same time. It does cause significant health and safety issues for our interpreters and colleagues who are trying to follow along.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you, Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus.

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Simard: On a point of order, Mr. Chair.

[English]

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

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Simard: Thank you for clarifying that minor point regarding the interpreters, since I rely entirely on them to follow the debate.

I've listened to the 118th version of Mr. Genuis' point of order, which still amounts to the same thing. Couldn't we resolve the impasse in which we find ourselves by simply requesting a committee vote to make this clear?

The committee could rule that Mr. Angus now has the floor. If I refer to the standing order that my colleague read earlier, it concerned cases in which the committee has adopted something.

Can we vote on the fact that Mr. Angus currently has the floor on the amendment that was introduced. That way, it will be clear and we can move on to something else.

Can the committee vote on that? It will be final and clear for everyone.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Simard, for your intervention.

Mr. Angus does have the floor, and that's been identified and ruled on. I would ask my colleagues if they believe there is somebody else here who should have the floor to ask their committee colleagues and take it to a vote.

I appreciate, Mr. Simard, what you've raised as a concern.

Colleagues, if you believe that Mr. Genuis wants the floor, you can ask your colleagues to support that and he will do so.

I will also ask—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Point of order, Chair.

The Chair: Hold on, Mr. Genuis. I'm going to finish.

You've come to Standing Order 116. I'm not clear whether you're arguing about Mr. Angus's ability to speak, since he has the floor, and specifically what the relevancy is of what you identified from the standing order. You mentioned the ability of Mr. Angus to participate and speak today, so can you—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Yes, I can.

The Chair: On the point of order there are two things.

Are you arguing on behalf of Mr. Angus, so he can speak?

It's unclear to me.

What is the relevancy of what you're saying, and how does it relate to the speaking order of Mr. Angus being able to participate?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

I'm more than happy to offer further explanation. I thought reading the standing order would be clear enough but I will explain further.

This standing order specifies that the ability of members to speak is not dependent on the approval of 50% plus one of the rest of the room for them to be on the list or stay on the list.

The way the process works is that the chair creates a list. If members wish to speak, they should be added to the list. But crucially, once a member has the floor, this standing order specifies that—

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

The Chair: We have a point of order from Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Certainly, I've read 116 and it seems that my colleague is attempting to falsely claim that the speaking order that was agreed to by the chair isn't legitimate, but he doesn't have the nerve to challenge the chair because nobody agrees with him.

Chair, I think this is a specious argument, and it is actually undermining my rights under Standing Order 116 and the ability of a member to speak.

I'm invoking my rights under Standing Order 116 and ask that you would tell these members to stop this constant campaign to stop me from speaking on a bill that is very important to working people across this country. That's why I'm here. That's why I show up. That's the work I want to do. I want to speak to the amendment and to the motion at hand. They are using 116, which is my right to speak, to undermine me and undermine the work of this committee.

I'm asking for a ruling, Chair.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I'm happy to continue my point of order. I think that Mr. Angus has a debate.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, it was clearly identified that Mr. Angus had the floor. If you would like the floor—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: No, you made that up.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, if you would like the floor, you can identify to me now and we will ensure that you will have your opportunity to participate like all other members.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: And you'll cut me off partway through—

The Chair: All members on this committee—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —because you've had enough. That's not how it works.

The Chair: —have the right—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: There are rules.

The Chair: If you would like to participate, you can identify that you would like to participate and we can proceed to make sure you can when your turn comes.

If colleagues would like to change the order so that Mr. Angus is not the next speaker, then you can challenge the chair and present who it should be. This is what's been—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Chair, that's not how it goes in a 4-H meeting—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: That's not how the rules work. There are rules.

The Chair: Excuse me, Ms. Stubbs. I am—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: —never mind a standing committee of Parliament.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I have a point of order.

The Chair: We're going to go to a point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: There are rules and the chair's job is to uphold the rules.

The Chair: Order.

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

The Chair: I will ask one member at time particularly not to speak when I'm trying to provide a ruling and information to committee members.

Mr. Patzer, we'll go to your point of order. Then we have a point of order from Mr. Angus.

Mr. Patzer, go ahead.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I think it's quite clear how this is supposed to go. You shouldn't have to challenge the chair every single time there's merely a simple question around how we finished the last meeting.

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, that's not a point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: That's what it comes down to.

Yes, it is a point of order.

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

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: It sure is.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, you said one person at a time.

The Chair: Okay. I will, but—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You're yelling over people who are trying to speak.

The Chair: Excuse me, Mr. Genuis. You do not have the floor.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Let Mr. Patzer finish.

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, we're not going to engage in debate on the rationale.

A ruling was made. If you would like to challenge the chair—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: He has the ability to make arguments about order. It's in the rules.

The Chair: —you have the ability to do so.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Mr. Chair, I do not think it reflects well upon yourself that every single time we restart a meeting you're going to tell people—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Mr. Chair, the member is talking to you.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: —that if they don't agree with you, they have to challenge you on every single point.

The Chair: Colleagues, once again, I said this earlier today. If you are not going to provide me the opportunity to allow members to speak and multiple members are going to turn on their mikes—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I'm trying.

The Chair: I know, but there are a number of other members who are turning on their mikes and speaking. It is a health and safety issue for our interpreters.

Once again, Mr. Patzer, I'm going back to you on the point of order. Be very succinct on the point of order, not debate. On the point of order, be very succinct about what your point of order is and what standing order you're referring to, if you could, please.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you.

Thank you for turning your mike off, because I had the floor. The only person who turned their mike on to interrupt me was you, Mr. Chair. I think that was a bit of a problem.

Again, the point I was simply trying to make is that we do not need to have to challenge the chair every single time there's a question.

The Chair: We have a—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: We expect the chair to be able to uphold the rules of the committee—

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

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: —the rules of the Standing Orders. They're there for a reason.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Patzer.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I'm being interrupted again.

The Chair: On your point of order, the ruling has been made.

We're going to Mr. Angus on a point of order, and then I have Ms. Dabrusin on a point of order.

Mr. Angus.

An hon. member: Julie was first.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, go ahead on a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: What concerns me, now that we're into the second day of my attempting to participate—and I've been shut down consistently—is that it is devolving now into classic intimidation where Ms. Stubbs sits right beside you and yells at you. She doesn't even ask for a point of order. Mr. Patzer refuses to follow the rules. He's outraged that we have rules—challenge the chair or the rules.

I sit the furthest from you, so I'm attempting to exercise my obligations as an MP following the rules. I respect the rules of the chair. The chair has made a ruling. The chair has been challenged, but what we're seeing now is just a level of intimidation, so I'm asking you to ensure that the Conservatives are not shouting over and not trying to shut down the chair and other members who actually would like to participate.

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order, Mr. Angus.

Ms. Dabrusin, you have the floor on your point of order.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We are now, even just today, hours into a debate about.... It's literally a debate.

You have made a ruling—I've said this before—that Mr. Angus is next on the list. What we're having is multiple points of order to prevent him from being able to speak.

We are on a subamendment to a scheduling motion. It is not an unusual type of motion.

If the members opposite, from the Conservatives, would like to vote on that subamendment, debate that subamendment, that is an option. However, preventing any debate on this scheduling motion through points of order is just, frankly, disrespectful to the members of this committee and to the Canadians we work for.

The Chair: Thank you.

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

The Chair: Just for clarity, I'm going to—

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

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'll come to you on the point of order, but I'm going to ask you to hold for one second, please.

Colleagues, I'm going to remind everybody, once again, that Mr. Angus does have the floor. We would like all members to be able to participate. If a member would like to participate, he or she can let us know, and we'll make sure we get to that member as we go through the speaking order.

It is, I think, incumbent on all of us to allow members to participate when they do have the floor, and when they're finished, we'll go to the next member. Therefore, I'll ask members, if they would like to speak, to let me know, and we'll make sure.... Hopefully, very quickly we can get to you to debate this important subamendment.

I'll just remind everybody that we are on the subamendment for Timmins. We have a motion on the floor. We have an amendment, and we have the subamendment on Timmins.

Mr. Angus does have the floor.

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

The Chair: Yes.

Now we'll go to the point of order by Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I just have a really simple question for you that I think will elucidate this matter.

Who, in your view, had the floor before Mr. Angus had it?

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order.

That's been ruled on, Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No, no, I'm trying to help you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: This is not a debate.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm trying to help you get to the truth here.

Mr. Chair, who had the floor before Mr. Angus?

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, a ruling has been made—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No, who had the floor before Mr. Angus?

The Chair: —at this committee and—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: The answer is me, and I never ceded it, right?

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, thank you for your point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: This is a simple matter.

The Chair: The ruling has been made.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I have a number of other points of order that I was trying to raise before I was interrupted repeatedly by Mr. Angus, so I will—

The Chair: I'll ask you to hold, Mr. Genuis.

You just made a new point of order, so if you would turn off your mike, Mr. Angus does have the floor because that's been ruled on.

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

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

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Chair, I'm trying to remind—

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

The Chair: Mr. Angus, we have another point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: But I actually did have a point of order, so again they—

The Chair: I'm sorry. Are you speaking—

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm speaking on my point of order.

The Chair: Okay, you're speaking on your point of order.

Can you just be succinct and relevant?

Mr. Charlie Angus: Absolutely, because I'm not here to filibuster and play games. I'm here to get something done.

A ruling was made. You made it.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Charlie Angus: The Conservatives are continuing to interrupt, intimidate and undermine the committee, so I would say to you, Mr. Chair, that we need to move on.

If Mr. Genuis—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Charlie Angus: —is actually willing to participate as a credible member, he can challenge you—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: —but he refuses to challenge you because he cannot win.

The Chair: We're going to suspend.

• (1610) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1630)

The Chair: Thank you, members.

I just want to remind colleagues about the health and safety of our interpreters. It is extremely important that all members here take this seriously for the health and safety of our interpreters, who are doing a tremendous job. If we have multiple members speaking over each other during the points of order, it is quite challenging. It is impacting the health and safety of our interpreters.

I'm going to ask everybody again. When we have a point of order, we go one at a time. We wait until the person is finished or the chair has recognized the next individual before another member raises a point of order.

I hope that we've had some time to reflect and think about that for the health, safety and best interest of our interpreters.

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

The Chair: We're going to go to the point of order from Mr. Angus and then right after we'll go to Mr. Patzer.

Go ahead, Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you for that sage advice.

It's very concerning to me. I'm into four hours of being denied my right to speak.

I would like to ask you what steps we need to take to ensure that we don't have an accident, like what happen in the Senate, from MPs being abusive. The last round was extremely abusive from my Conservative colleagues.

Is the chair willing to suspend for health and safety reasons? I don't think that anyone should be put at risk, having to listen to what has descended into a gong show.

What are the parameters for making a suspension on a health and safety issue to make sure that our interpreters are able to do their job and are not being abused?

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order.

That's the exact reason we suspended previously. I will suspend again if we must.

The priority on this committee is the health and safety of everybody who is working hard and diligently to make sure this committee is doing the work its intended to do with the bills, motions, amendments and the subamendment we have on the floor.

Thank you for that.

I'm going to Mr. Patzer next on a point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you very much, Chair.

I just want to get it on the record that every single time one of us has had the floor, a point of order has been raised and then all of a sudden someone—sometimes it has been you—starts talking over one of us. That's contributing to multiple people talking at the same time, and then we see Mr. Angus jump in on top of it as well. We end up with three people yammering on the mike.

I just hope your statement will apply equally to everyone, including yourself as the chair.

I recognize that as the chair you have a certain level of authority and we do acknowledge that, but just to be fair and consistent, I hope that statement would reflect upon yourself as well.

Thank you.

The Chair: That does apply to all members.

Thank you for your point of order.

I would just ask, once again, that when we raise a point of order we be succinct and that the point of order be relevant to the conversation or the topic at hand.

That's why members interject with “that's debate” or other items that are referenced. As long as we focus on one point of order at a time.... Be succinct and make sure it's relevant to the point of order that has been raised. If we focus on that, we'll be able to forward and accomplish the important work of this committee.

Mr. Carrie, I'm going to Ms. Stubbs first on a point of order and then I'll come back to you.

Ms. Stubbs, go ahead.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thank you, Chair.

On this topic, Conservatives want to thank and acknowledge the work and the support of the interpreters, as well as all the support staff in the committee.

I certainly acknowledged last Monday, as you'll recall—although I was interrupted by you—how I am quite aware that I am just a nightmare for interpreters with my motormouth situation. That's why I try to always get my speeches to them in advance and that kind of thing.

I would just echo the comments of my Conservative colleagues here that we are fighting for the rules to be objectively and fairly applied to all members of Parliament on behalf of the millions of Canadians we represent. Certainly as Conservatives, although it might be a challenge, we will never stop fighting for the livelihoods, the workers and the best interests of every Canadian in every province and every community in all parts of the economy.

I can certainly hear NDP MP Charlie Angus urging you to cut me off and saying that it's debate, but I thank you, Chair, for indulging me to share Conservatives' values and concern for the interpreters and for all of the support staff.

Thank you, Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Stubbs.

We'll go to Mr. Carrie on a point of order.

Mr. Colin Carrie: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

As I said earlier, I'm not a regular member of this committee, but I do have the right to participate and to get the facts. I don't want to be debating things.

I was wondering whether the clerk could make available the transcript from the last meeting and provide a speaking list, so that I could interject factually on this issue. The rights of members to speak are extremely important to all of us.

My understanding is that we had a member on the floor who was speaking but was not able to continue. I think that to resolve it...I'm just offering a suggestion, Mr. Chair. It seems that you're stopping the clerk from allowing us to have that information. It would be very good to resolve this entire issue if you would allow the clerk to make that information available to everybody in a clear and concise way.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Carrie.

The speaking order issue was resolved.

As I clearly stated, Mr. Angus had the floor.

Mr. Colin Carrie: I have a point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Angus had the floor, and he is now not able to proceed because we have a number of points of order. I hope we can do that.

All members of the committee, at any point, if you believe there's another member who would like the floor, you can bring that forward to a vote. We can go through that process. Or, if the ruling of the chair is not something you support, you can challenge the chair specifically.

I will acknowledge that if a member would like to speak on the subamendments—you or others—then let me know and we will make sure you have that opportunity after others have spoken.

Right now, Mr. Angus has been waiting patiently to participate in this debate.

Thank you for your point of order.

Mr. Aldag has a point of order. Mr. Angus has a point of order. Then it will be Mr. Patzer.

I hoped that ruling would negate other points of order, but it looks like it has maybe created a few more.

We'll go to Mr. Aldag on a point of order.

Mr. John Aldag: My point of order, simply, is that we keep relitigating this. We've spent hours this morning and now hours this afternoon on it.

We had a decision by the chair—it's been sustained by the committee—on Mr. Angus being next. He deserves the right to speak. We all deserve the right to speak.

We're not able to move forward and we're not hearing from members. We're not advancing the cause. We keep, as I say, relitigating the same issue over and over. It's been settled.

I would implore my colleagues all around the table to respect these rules. There are lots of other things we can talk about. We can have a good productive discussion about how we can help workers and on other things that this legislation does.

I would like to see us be respectful in the debates. Listen to the chair when you have to interject to move the conversation forward.

Ultimately, Mr. Angus has the floor. We can talk about whatever he's going to put on the table on the amendment that's before us.

My point of order is, let's go with the decision that was made and carry on with the very important business that's before this committee.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Aldag.

Mr. Angus, on a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you.

Under Standing Order 116 and the ability of members to speak, we've had 56 meetings, 133 witnesses and 112 hours on the energy file. We're more than ready to move forward on Bill C-50 and Bill C-49.

I'm looking at the motion that was provided by the Liberals. Given that we've had this relentless gong show of interruptions, people might not be aware of what we are actually debating. I think it's important to read it into the record:

That given Bill C-50, An Act respecting accountability, transparency and engagement to support the creation of sustainable jobs for workers and economic growth in a net-zero economy, and Bill C-49, An Act to amend the Canada—Newfoundland—

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

Mr. Charlie Angus: Chair, you agreed at the beginning of the meeting, at the end of the last meeting, that I have the floor, correct?

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

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'd like to carry on with my work without being interrupted by what is obviously becoming a very childish attempt to interfere and throw rocks. I am here to read a motion and debate its substance.

a) That the minister and officials be invited to appear—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I have a point of order.

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

The Chair: Mr. Angus, we do have other points of order. I want you to pause.

I think everybody is starting to.... We do have a point of order on your point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you, Chair.

I won't speak over others because of what your ruling was, but I will continue on as soon as they stop.

I was at point a) of the motion that had been brought before us, and I'm more than ready to explain the motion and whether New Democrats are standing with it.

I'm hoping that Mr. Genuis will not have too much left in his bag of tricks, and we can get back to serious work.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus.

Mr. Patzer, go ahead on a point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I do have something that maybe the clerk can help enlighten us on. It is the issue that we seem to still be at loggerheads over, and that would be Standing Order 41, in regard to when business is interrupted.

The Standing Orders apply generally. This is a standing order that governs debate in the House of Commons. It does reference when debate happens and then we hit question period or Statements by Members, so that would be like when a member stops. It references it in Standing Order 30(5) as well. When interrupted, the business resumes after the interruption is done, and 30(5) alludes to Statements by Members and question period.

At the end of question period, all other business that happens at that point, with points of order and things like that, it is the member who actually had the floor prior to.... That would be when—

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

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: —that person resumes.

This would be the same situation in committee as it is in the House of Commons, because the Standing Orders do apply generally.

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order.

Every committee is different, and the rules of this committee are established by committee members. My job is to do my best to make sure everybody can participate.

Mr. Patzer, thank you for providing that context.

I will go back to the ruling that was made. If there is a challenge to the ruling, I would encourage you to do that so committee members know. Committee members as a group, a number of members here, can decide if they want to change the speaking order, but the established speaking order is what was determined.

Thank you for your point of order.

We have another point of order from Mr. Genuis. Then I have a point of order from Ms. Dabrusin and then Mr. Angus.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you.

Chair, in the discussion about matters of order, Mr. Angus accused me of having a “bag of tricks”. Let me be very clear. I have no bag of tricks, but I do have a book of rules.

The nature of parliamentary committees is to be governed by rules. Those are rules that all members, especially members who

act as chair, should be familiar with. I will simply invoke those rules. Those rules prescribe who speaks and in what order.

Mr. Angus is welcome to speak after the member who has the floor is finished speaking. I had the floor and did not, at any point, cede the floor.

Mr. Angus's heckling is actually useful for once because he says I had the floor, and then he says I lost the floor. Now, the only way I can lose the floor is if I cede the floor. There are other—

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

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —extraneous cases, but none of them are involved here.

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

Mr. Garnett Genuis: If Mr. Angus concedes that I had the floor and that I at no point ceded the floor—

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, could I ask you—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —then it follows that I have the floor.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, could I ask you—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I don't want to have two people talking at once because I know the implication that has for interpreters, so I will proceed.

The Chair: That's why I have asked you to hold, please.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I was speaking, Chair.

The Chair: We are getting into debate, and this is why.... We cannot debate on a filibuster.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm sorry, but debate on a what?

The Chair: I'm sorry, but we can't get into a long debate using a point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: We're talking about the rules.

The Chair: Thank you for your intervention. We have other points of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm not done, Chair.

The Chair: I'm going to the next point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Well, Chair, I have a point of order. I'm not finished.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Those aren't the rules.

The Chair: We do have other members waiting.

Thank you for providing that information on your point of order.

I would remind members, let's not use a point of order for debate. I think we have all decided that the health and safety of the interpreters is extremely important, and I really thank all members for not—

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

The Chair: —speaking over each other.

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

The Chair: I encourage members not to use a point of order to debate because the debate is what Mr. Angus has the floor for. If a member would like the floor, they can wait their turn, or they can establish a new speaking order by challenging the chair's decision. We can then proceed with all committee members deciding on who the next speaker should be through that process, which is well established.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I have a point of order.

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

The Chair: We have Ms. Dabrusin on a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You said I had a point of order.

The Chair: Ms. Dabrusin has a point of order, and I thank you, Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, you say—

The Chair: Ms. Dabrusin.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You say you don't want multiple members talking at once, and that is your basis for then starting to talk while someone else is talking and then telling them to be quiet.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, please—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: The idea of not allowing more than one person to speak at once should mean—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Chair, this is being abusive to our translators.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —you let people finish what they're saying.

The Chair: Okay.

The meeting is suspended.

• (1645) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1700)

The Chair: Colleagues, we are back.

I'm going to a point of order by Ms. Dabrusin, who had a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Then a point of order....

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

It's worrisome that we keep on having to break because of the way this is going forward, the conduct that's here on this committee and the danger it poses to the health and safety of our interpreters. I'm hoping that we can find a way to go ahead that does not pose that same risk. I appreciate that we had to have that suspension.

The point of order I want to bring is in relation to Standing Order 11(2). That's about repetition, because we have basically had now for several days the same point of order that is being made over and over again. Standing Order 11(2) states:

The Speaker or the Chair of Committees of the Whole, after having called the attention of the House, or of the committee, to the conduct of a member who persists in irrelevance, or repetition, may direct the member to discontinue his or her speech, and if then the member still continues to speak, the Speaker shall name the member or, if in committee of the whole, the Chair shall report the member to the House.

Essentially, repetition is contrary to our Standing Orders. We have heard now, like I said, for days the same point of order being made.

You have had a ruling. That ruling has not been respected. The chair can be challenged, but, otherwise, we should be moving on.

I will add that, if we had avoided these repetitions, not only would they probably have had the chance to speak, but we would have had Mr. Angus be able to speak in advance of that. We could have even voted on the motion, and we would have had the minister before us already. The delay at this point is really due to the repetition, and that is inexcusable.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Dabrusin, for your point of order.

Colleagues, I hope we can get to our speaking list. I'll just remind everybody that Mr. Angus did have the floor.

Members do have the ability to challenge that ruling. If they so choose, they can have another member speak if the committee wishes to do that.

Mr. Angus, you had a point of order.

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

The Chair: Mr. Angus has a point of order, and Mr. Patzer has a point of order.

We will go first to Mr. Angus.

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

The Chair: You've been recognized, but we're going Mr. Angus, who had a point of order first.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you, Chair.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: That's fine, but make note of the fact that I have a point of order as well, Chair, because we keep getting cut off.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Angus, on a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: To that, when we came out of the last suspension, I asked you about the issue of health and safety and making sure that abusive behaviour would not lead to a possible accident, as we've seen in the Senate. You said that, as chair, when you speak, others are to wait, and yet you had to suspend a second time because Mr. Garnett Genuis ignores you and spoke through you.

If we're going to have this abusive behaviour that puts people at risk, their health at risk, their health and safety, are you willing to suspend this committee because, again, the Conservatives are ignoring you? They don't care. They will speak over. We have a rule. You said that we should follow the rule. I'm trying to follow that rule, but you had to suspend a second time because of abusive behaviour.

On the next go-round, would you be willing to suspend committee so that we could talk to our whips' offices to get some level of dignified behaviour and professionalism? I don't think we can keep coming back in here and seeing this abusive behaviour happening, because we're talking about the health and safety of people who work on Parliament Hill and who have no stake in this except serving the Canadian people.

The Chair: Thank you.

I'm going to respond to that point of order.

Mr. Angus, we've suspended several times, and the last two were for the health and safety concerns that I have for our interpreters. I want everybody to ensure that we are not using points of order for debate.

I do want to allow members to finish their points of order and their points, but, once we get into debate, I do need to intervene to let members know that a point has been made so we can move on. I will say again that, as chair, I want to make sure that we're allowing all members to participate. If you're a member who would like the floor, you can wait your turn and get the floor. I will clearly suspend if it's required. I'm asking all members—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Chair—

The Chair: —to do that. Okay?

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm sorry, Chair.

I was asking for a ruling, not about debate, not about people going back and forth. I was asking whether or not, if people are put at risk, you're willing to suspend the meeting. That's what I want to hear a ruling on. That is a very clear question I asked—

The Chair: Okay, if it does—

Mr. Charlie Angus: As much as the Conservatives want to shout me down, that was the question I asked. Thank you.

The Chair: I will suspend if I feel that it is a concern. I will suspend as I have previously done. I will not hesitate to suspend as soon as I believe our interpreters.... Their health and safety is a priority for us, and I will do that again and again to ensure the safety of our employees, who are working diligently and hard for our committee. Thank you.

I will now go to Mr. Patzer on a point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you, Chair.

Let's just quickly let it be known also that it was Mr. Angus who was trying to shout over top of you just a few seconds ago.

My point of order is that we cannot pick and choose which standing orders we decide to follow. Either we follow all of them or we don't follow any of them. If we're going to accept the standing order that was quoted by Ms. Dabrusin, but not the one that was quoted earlier by me....

The Standing Orders are here to govern and guide this committee. I know there's leeway for committees, but the Standing Orders are actually quite clear. In fact, there is also another lovely book called *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*. In chapter 20 it says:

Every standing, legislative and special committee observes the Standing Orders of the House of Commons so far as they may be applicable, except the Standing Orders as to the election of a Speaker, seconding of motions, limiting the number of times of speaking and the length of speeches.

This means that, in principle, the number of times a member may speak in committee, and the length of his or her speeches is not subject to any limit. The member can thus take the floor as often and for as long as he or she wishes, provided the chair has duly given the member the floor.

This goes back to the point I was making in regard to the standing order that I quoted before. If we were to read the transcripts from the last meeting.... Perhaps the clerk would like to do that to settle this once and for all as to who had the floor. According to *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, chapter 20, it would clearly say that Mr. Genuis had the floor, based on who had it at the end of the meeting.

Thank you, Chair.

The Chair: Thank you for that.

That standing order does refer to rules around debate. What was clearly identified was the speaking order moving forward, and the member was given the opportunity. I encourage you once again. If the member would like to debate, they will be recognized, and they can debate after other members have the opportunity to do so.

Mr. Angus has the floor.

Mr. Patzer, I would say that you as a member—or any other member—has the right to challenge the chair.

If you would like another member to speak, you can bring that forward, and you can proceed to do that as it's been done previously over several meetings. I will say you have the right to do that, Mr. Patzer—or any other member as well.

Colleagues, again, Mr. Angus does have the floor.

Before I go to you, Mr. Angus—

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

The Chair: —Mr. Genuis does have a point of order.

I will remind all members to reference why they're making a point of order, its relevancy. Please be succinct, because we are on a point of order, and do not engage in debate while you're on the point of order.

Thank you.

Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair, for at long last allowing me to raise a point of order, which other members have done.

I did want to, on matters of order, first speak on the issue of health and safety, which is an extremely important issue. I am flabbergasted by the sanctimony expressed by Mr. Angus, while he persistently violates the rules that he purports to be concerned about.

I take, as you were saying, the importance of not having multiple members speaking on the mike at the same time. However, if that is the case, then other members should not interrupt me when I am trying to raise points of order. What we have persistently seen is this perverse inclination of Mr. Angus, as well as the chair—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —to interrupt members while they are speaking, and then to simultaneously complain about multiple members talking at once. The implication is that out of concern for health and safety, I should silence myself the moment Mr. Angus wants to speak—

Mr. Charlie Angus: It's debate.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —out of deference to him, in the process of being concerned about health and safety.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'll ask you to pause.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: We have the same thing happening with you, the chair, when I am trying to raise a point of order. You are now interrupting me. Apparently, I'm at fault for two people speaking at once, even though you are coming on in the middle of me trying to raise a point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I asked you to pause.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's flagrant hypocrisy from you and Mr. Angus, and disregard for basic fairness.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I asked you—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I am happy to have one member at a time talking, but if you don't let me talk and if you constantly interrupt and then try to make it out to be my fault when I try to finish what I'm saying, that's clearly unreasonable.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'll ask you to pause.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I hope you'll come back to me.

The Chair: As I said, on a point of order, be succinct, so we don't get into debate. Members have that right, but not to endless debate on points of order.

Mr. Angus has a point of order, so I'm going to him.

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

The Chair: I will recognize you, as well, Mr. Aldag.

Mr. John Aldag: Thank you.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Angus.

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

Now that I'm well over four and a half hours into being denied my right to have the floor, Mr. Genuis is claiming that, when you, as chair, use your rule, you're somehow interrupting him. That is false. He can accuse me of all manner of things, but I listen to the chair. The chair has the right to decide whether something is relevant or not and whether something is debate or not. The chair has the right to shut down someone who is ignoring that. That's what led to the health and safety situation the last time. Mr. Genuis decided he did not have to listen to anyone. He could talk through it. This is happening again.

I'm asking you, Mr. Chair, to remind us that someone who is not speaking on a point of order, but rather undermining the chair and

claiming the chair has no right to speak over Mr. Genuis... Whenever he takes the floor in this manner, it is not parliamentary, and it is putting the health and safety of our translators at risk.

I'd like you to rule on that, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus, for your point of order.

As chair, I will intervene and try to do so when a member pauses. However, I ask members to ensure they are succinct with points of order. Make points of order so that the chair can provide a ruling, or so we can provide more information about why the point of order was raised.

Go ahead, Mr. Aldag, on a point of order.

Mr. John Aldag: I am building on what our colleague, Mr. Angus, raised.

Chapter 20 talks about points of order and when they can be raised. It indicates proceedings can be temporarily suspended, but points of order must be considered by the chair, who determines whether the point of order has merit. The chair will generally make an immediate decision on a point of order, but sometimes the chair needs to take it under advisement.

The points of order being raised, we've been listening to them for days—for hours and hours, and for days and days.

I will make two points.

One is that we've heard the points of order. You made your decisions, including on speaking order, and we need to be able to move on. I've made that case before, but we're still stuck in this debate. I remind people that the chair, when a point of order is raised, needs to make a decision. That has happened. It's been sustained through a challenge to the chair.

Furthermore, to the point of the chair being accused of interrupting people, the chair's role is to maintain the flow and decorum within in. I challenge all members to... When the chair's microphone comes on, the respectful thing to do is pause and let the chair make his ruling and provide direction. That's the only way this committee can function. Otherwise, we have the dysfunction we've been seeing for several days now.

I ask us to abide by the Standing Orders we have. We've had enough repetition. We've had enough challenges to the chair. We've ruled on them. Let's move on. Let's debate the subamendment before us on northern Ontario and see whether we can do the work we've been sent here to do.

My office is getting thousands of letters right now from Albertans asking us to move forward with this legislation, and from Atlantic Canadians who want to see Bill C-49 move forward. This is not doing justice to why we have been brought to Ottawa.

The Standing Orders provide us with the rules needed to move forward.

I ask all members to do the work we've been sent here to do.

The Chair: Colleagues, when I turn on this mike, this red light goes on. That is an indication that as chair I would like to speak so that I do not have to cut off members. When they are making a point of order, all members need to be succinct with their point of order. Get to the point of order so the chair can make a ruling, so we can understand what procedurally your concern is with your point of order, and we can proceed moving forward.

I'm going to ask this of everybody. If you do see this light come on, I want you to acknowledge that it's on and pause. If you have one word left, then you can say that. You can pause so we can proceed moving forward.

As you will see, when I turn the mike off, the light goes off. That means I've turned the floor over to you.

Thank you for all of your points of order that have been raised. I am going to Mr. Angus now. Mr. Angus does have the floor. I want to hear what Mr. Angus has to say before we proceed to a point of order. I want Mr. Angus to be able to proceed with his right, as a member of Parliament and on this committee, to continue on from where he started as he—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order, Chair. You said you'd come back to me.

The Chair: I'm going to Mr. Angus. I have heard all points of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You interrupted my point of order. You said you'd come back to me.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Chair, your light is on. Is that right? Mr. Genuis needs to—

The Chair: Yes. I have—

An hon. member: The light is off, Charlie.

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

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, we have addressed your point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No, you haven't. You didn't even let me finish. You interrupted it to go to Mr. Aldag.

The Chair: We are going to give Mr. Angus the floor. Then if you—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you, Chair.

Mr. Ted Falk: Chair, I have a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: This is beginning again. They're speaking over me.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order. I haven't been able to articulate it at all.

The Chair: Colleagues, my mike is still on. There are two mikes on here.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I didn't turn it on. If it was turned on, then it was turned on by someone else.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: Pardon me, Mr. Chair, but we've lost the interpretation.

[*English*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis: The staff are turning mikes on and off as well.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Settle down, Garnett.

The Chair: We will suspend.

• (1715)

(Pause)

• (1725)

The Chair: Colleagues, we will suspend for the remainder of the evening and be back tomorrow.

Thank you, and have a great evening.

[*The meeting was suspended at 5:25 p.m., Monday, November 6*]

[*The meeting resumed at 4:33 p.m., Wednesday, November 8*]

The Chair: I call this meeting to order.

Welcome back to meeting number 80 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Natural Resources. Today we are meeting in public to discuss committee business.

When we suspended on Monday evening, Mr. Angus had the floor, and we had resumed debate on the subamendment of Mr. Falk.

Mr. Genuis, Mr. Angus has the floor—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I haven't started my point of order, Chair. He doesn't have the floor—

The Chair: On the point of order...

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Yes, Chair. I have been trying to raise a number of points of order respecting this committee.

If you look back at the record, I think, I have been continually interrupted by you in attempts to raise those points of order. At the same time, you've allowed other members of the committee... Well, let's call a spade a spade—

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

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You've allowed members of your own party on this committee to, at great length, raise points of order, and you've not allowed me at any point to complete the point of order that I have been trying for a long time to raise—

The Chair: I'm sorry, Mr. Genuis. I'll ask you to hold.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Here we go again.

The Chair: As Mr. Angus had the floor and you had a point of order, Mr. Angus has a point of order.

I have Mr. Angus on the point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you.

It is now probably six hours since I've been denied my right to speak.

I'm raising a point of order because of the attempt by Mr. Genuis to undermine the chair. When the chair speaks, he is not interrupting. When a chair rules, the committee either accepts the ruling or they challenge it.

Mr. Genuis speaks over the chair. He undermines the chair. He claims that the chair interrupts him when he doesn't have the floor, so either Mr. Genuis can challenge the chair or he must stop interrupting the chair, but it's the chair who sets the tone for the meeting, and the chair I would like to thank, by the way, for the respect that he shows for the process.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus, on the point of order.

I think this is a good opportunity for me to remind all committee members that when my light goes on, I want to give committee members an opportunity to pause so that we're not speaking over each other. We know from a previous meeting that our interpreters are doing a tremendous job, but when we have multiple mikes on and multiple members speaking, it makes the job of the interpreters very difficult. Most importantly, it's a health and safety concern, so I would remind all colleagues that I would like one member to speak at a time.

If I do have to intervene in certain cases, I will turn on my mike so that you can see the light come on. If I believe that you do not see the mike, I will ask you to pause so that I can interject and recognize another member if there is another member to be recognized.

Mr. Angus had the floor. We had a point of order by Mr. Genuis. Now Ms. Stubbs has a point of order on Mr. Genuis's comments, or a point of order...?

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: We'll get to it as soon as we're not conflicting with each other.

Thank you, of course, for the indulgence for me to make my point without interruption.

Just before we begin, I do want to bring attention to an important and what should be a priority issue for this committee, and just to give verbal notice of the following motion that I submitted previously: "Given that the Prime Minister has unfairly extended the carbon tax exemption to home heating oil and has not applied the exemption to all forms of home heating, and given that Liberal MPs voted against a Conservative motion"—

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

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, could I ask you to hold, please.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: —"on applying a temporary pause to all home heating, the committee immediately undertake a five meetings review of carbon tax policy in Canada"—

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, can I ask you to hold for a point of order?

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: —"and the disproportionate impact the Prime Minister's unfair carbon tax carve-out has, and that the committee find additional resources in order"—

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, can I ask you to hold? We have—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Mike Kelloway (Cape Breton—Canso, Lib.): I have a point of order.

The Chair: We will be suspending.

• (1635) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1640)

The Chair: Colleagues, before I move to the points of order, I'm going to begin. As I began this meeting, I thought I'd made myself quite clear that for the health and safety of our interpreters we were not going to turn on our mikes and speak over each other.

Just like in the House of Commons when the Speaker rises, when I turn on my mike and I attempt to speak, I expect all committee members to ensure they are not speaking, so that we can address and make sure this committee functions well and that all members have an opportunity to participate.

I would remind members that points of order are regarding a procedural issue: if there's a procedural issue and you want to raise a point of order.

Ms. Stubbs, you raised a point of order, but Ms. Dabrusin has a point of order on your point of order, so I'm going to Ms. Dabrusin.

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

The Chair: Ms. Dabrusin, you have the floor.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I was just saying that I don't believe a person can bring a motion on a point of order. That's what my point of order was. It was a matter of the rules.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Dabrusin.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: On a point of clarification....

The Chair: Ms. Dabrusin, you are correct. A motion cannot be moved on a point of order.

We do have a point of order from Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Genuis, you have the floor on a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I do want to point out that, before you suspended the last exchange, you and Ms. Dabrusin both had your microphones on at the same time and were speaking at the same time. I appreciate the injunction around not having multiple microphones....

I mean, there are a few other things going on around the microphones—

The Chair: That is not a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —such as right now. Also there have been a number of instances where the mikes have been turned on. I understand that it's the common practice at committee for staff to turn on members' mikes when they start speaking, but that does create a little bit of a challenge when someone is trying to raise a point of order and there are other people who are speaking.

I would ask the clerk, maybe, to clarify—if you'll allow the clerk to speak—just the issue of providing notices of motion on points of order. I genuinely don't know the answer to this question, but I know there have been many other committees where notices of motion have been provided on points of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: It's happened on this committee, actually, under the former chair.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: From what I thought, the practice of verbal notice of motion is fairly informal because you're not actually moving a motion. You're just providing notice that a motion is coming, so that can happen on points of order, during rounds of questions, or in other instances.

I do think it is an important point—whether Ms. Stubbs' motion was put on notice or not—because, to my understanding, there is a precedent even at this committee for that having been done in the past. However, I will acknowledge that, in terms of whether this is spoken to specifically in the rule book, I don't know.

Mr. Chair, I wonder if you would.... I had an original point of order that I was raising, but before I get back to that, I wonder if you will allow the clerk to weigh in on that.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Genuis. A point of order is for a procedural issue, not to move a motion.

Thank you for your point of order.

I'm going to proceed to the next point of order.

Mr. Angus, you have the floor on a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's not moving a motion, though.

The Chair: Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order—

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I allowed you to speak on a point of order. I gave you the time to do that. We will move to Mr. Angus on a point of order. Then I have others, as well, on the same point of order.

Mr. Angus.

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

You raised a concern a number of times at the last meeting that literally the health and safety of staff who are working for the House are being put at risk by the behaviour of Ms. Stubbs, Mr. Genuis and Mr. Patzer. However, what we see already—you raised it once—is that they're interrupting you.

This is an issue of health and safety. We have people who are using their mikes to undermine the work of the committee, and this is all about denying me the floor. Therefore, I would ask you, Mr. Chair, to reiterate the necessity of making sure that our House staff are not subjected to this kind of abuse. They can abuse their other colleagues, but they can't abuse the staff in this manner.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, thank you for the point of order.

Mr. Patzer, I'm going to come to you next, but before I do....

I'm looking around the room. Partway through the last meeting, we actually started to work quite well on respecting each other, on not speaking over each other, and on waiting. As I acknowledged, I know that sometimes you're not looking, but when I turn this mike on, you'll see this red light come on. I don't want to interrupt you, but I must, at some point, if you do not see or if we do not make contact. I want to allow all members to participate. I want to allow all members the ability to make a point of order if they have one, to make sure they have that opportunity. However, it can't be all of us at the same time because it is very difficult for the interpreters to follow the interpretation. It's also for their health and safety concerns.

I'm going to keep raising this point. If I believe that their health and safety is being compromised by the work of this committee, I will not hesitate. I will not—let it be clear—hesitate to suspend.

I think, Mr. Angus, that was a part of your point of order.

This was stated last meeting as well. I will state it again very clearly here.

Mr. Patzer, I have you next on a point of order. The floor is yours on a point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you.

On Mr. Angus's point of order—and actually this applies to several issues here, and I think this would help with the interpreters—when one of us, a Conservative member, has the floor and somebody else raises a point of order, we are immediately cut off by the chair.

Mr. Angus was speaking. I let him go for a little while, and I had a point of order I wanted to raise. I wanted to let him finish, but there came a point when I thought, no. I had a point of order on what he was saying, and respectfully—you saw me—I didn't hammer my microphone. I wasn't yelling into my microphone. I put my hand up, and I said, "Point of order, Chair," respectfully, and you just kind of put your hand up and just let him go on and on and on.

Equal and fair treatment of all members by the chair is a general and accepted rule of practice by the chair. I read it multiple times in multiple instances in Bosc and Gagnon that it's standard practice. We expect the chair to be equal and to be fair.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: We do.

The Chair: I'm going to interject because I gave you a time to pause.

Mr. Angus, on the point of order, all members, as I stated, have the right...and I do appreciate you, Mr. Patzer, for putting up your hand and signalling to me.

As Mr. Angus looked toward me, I asked him to finish the point of order. I did interject and allowed you to speak, and I'll allow other members to participate in the same manner, but if multiple people start saying, "Point of order," I'm not sure who's point of order is raised before another's, and I do my best job to ensure that all members have that ability.

I recognized you, and I'm going to recognize another member.

Now I'm going to a point of order by Ms. Dabrusin, and then I'm going to the next point of order.

Ms. Dabrusin.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: She can go now, but I wasn't finished.

The Chair: If it's a different point of order, I understand—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: She can go now, and then, after she's done—

The Chair: If you have another point of order, we can go.

Ms. Dabrusin, on a point of order.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Once again, my understanding is that Mr. Angus has the floor.

We have a scheduling motion in front of us, and there is a subamendment. I'm just trying to bring this up because all of this happened actually a week ago, so we are talking about a subamendment to a scheduling motion so that we can go forward on legislation that was voted on by the House to send to this committee, and all of these points of order just keep happening, but at this point, we haven't been able.... We could have had the minister in front of us already if we had just managed to get through the subamendment, and then the motion.

I would say, unless the Conservatives are challenging the chair, your ruling has been that Mr. Angus has the floor. Can we please continue with the debate?

An hon. member: I have a point of order.

The Chair: Yes, and I will recognize you in a moment.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Can I finish my point of order now?

The Chair: I think I have addressed your point of order. If you have another point of order, I'll ask you—

Once again, colleagues, I don't need a number of people to tell me who's next or who's not. I heard a point of order on your point of order. I've addressed that. If there is another member, I will address them.

I want to remind colleagues that we have a motion on the floor by Mr. Sorbara. We have an amendment by Ms. Stubbs. We have another subamendment on Timmins, for which Mr. Angus last had the floor. He is our next speaker, who hasn't been allowed to speak.

Colleagues, we all discussed last meeting the importance of this bill and the amendments. I hope today we can get through this subamendment on Timmins, go through our speaking order on Timmins—all the members who want to debate this important component of the subamendment—so we can get to the amendment that Ms. Stubbs brought forward. We can debate that and we can get to the main motion.

I'm really hoping that we can work together as a committee, the Standing Committee on Natural Resources, studying the motion that Mr. Sorbara brought forward on Bill C-50 and Bill C-49 and

then the additional amendment that Ms. Stubbs has brought forward.

This is the work of this committee, which Canadians expect us to do. If we can work together, everybody will have an opportunity to participate in debate and we can move forward.

I need all members to be very clear on where we are.

Ms. Dabrusin, you reminded us, and I should remind committee members of where we are as well, so there is no confusion.

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

The Chair: Hold on. We had a point of order on Mr. Patzer's point of order by Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Genuis, on Mr. Patzer's point of order, you have a point of order, and then there's another point of order.

Go ahead.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, I had an earlier point of order, but I want to raise a point of order in the particular context of your comments.

Your present framing is as if the operation of a committee is difficult. The running of a committee is not normally difficult if the chair is guided by the rules and with basic fairness toward all members. I think you are creating a problem by treating members in radically different ways.

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

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I suspect we're about to see exactly how that happens.

The rules provide that every member should be treated equally and that members have rights and privileges as members of Parliament. That means when a member has the floor—

Ms. Viviane Lapointe: On a point of order—

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'm going to cut you off there.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Yes, you are.

The Chair: I'm not sure I understood your point of order and what the point of the point of order was, but we have two points of order now.

We'll go to Mr. Angus on the point of order.

Colleagues, once again, I would encourage all colleagues not to use points of order as points of debate. Be specific. Be succinct, procedurally, on what your point of order is referring to, so that we can get out of points of order and get back to the committee's business.

Mr. Angus, you raised a point of order on Mr. Genuis's point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you.

Chair, it is about six hours since I've been denied the right to speak as a member of this committee.

The reason I objected is that Mr. Genuis continues to undermine your decisions but he doesn't have the respect for this committee to make a challenge to the chair. If he doesn't have the respect to make a challenge to the chair, he needs to sit down and let the committee do its business. He continues to interrupt. If he has a challenge to the chair, he can bring a challenge to the chair.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Charlie Angus: Once again, we see this turning into a circus. We need to have respect for the committee.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, thank you for your point of order.

Colleagues, I would also state that we've discussed the chair's rules previously.

Ms. Viviane Lapointe: I have a point of order.

The Chair: It was upheld by a ruling of this committee.

If you would like to challenge the chair on a decision, on a specific ruling, as committee members, you have the right to do so, and then it's up to the committee to decide.

Please, I would ask committee members, if you would like to challenge a ruling that I have made, please challenge the chair and have your committee members make the decision accordingly.

Now, I want to go back to the point of order by Ms. Lapointe.

Ms. Lapointe, thank you for waiting patiently.

Ms. Viviane Lapointe: Thank you, Chair.

My point of order is around the unparliamentary behaviour and remarks that we see from our Conservative colleagues. The remarks from MP Genuis would seem to indicate a lack of respect for the chair. We have to understand that the chair is not just another member of this committee. He has responsibilities to preside over the proceedings of this committee. We cannot continue to speak over him.

I also find it difficult, even when mikes aren't on, for comments to be made when someone does have mike and is speaking. I'm trying to listen attentively. It is very difficult.

I will ask everyone around this table to please respect the proceedings, respect the chair. We are here, several days and hours later, to try to get to some very important legislation.

This legislation, I can tell you, is important to the people of Sudbury. We need to get on with the work of this committee.

The Chair: Ms. Lapointe, thank you for your interjection and your point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Can I just have a point of order?

The Chair: I'll address that in a second. I will give you an opportunity, Mr. Genuis.

Ms. Lapointe does make a valid point on the point of order that it is difficult for members to focus and participate when our microphones are on—and it's very difficult for the interpreters for health and safety concerns, as I previously mentioned—but also, when a number of us are talking across the floor, it makes it difficult to focus on the subamendment, the amendments and everything at hand.

Members, I would ask all of you to whisper if you are having a side conversation with one of your colleagues, so we all can focus on the important work we are doing here.

Now, Mr. Genuis, I have you on a point of order on Ms. Stubbs' point of order. Is that correct?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I wanted to raise a point of order in respect to Ms. Lapointe who—

The Chair: I'm sorry, I meant Ms. Lapointe. My apologies, Ms. Stubbs.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: She'll be sitting on that side of the table after the election, but not before.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, please be succinct on the point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: You're not allowed to joke; you're a Conservative.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Ms. Lapointe called out that my alleged language was unparliamentary. She didn't cite specific language—

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'm going to ask you to pause for a second.

Ms. Dabrusin, go ahead on a point of order.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: It's about decorum again. Mr. Chair, it's about the amount of disrespect.

Again, you've made a ruling and we haven't been able to stick to that ruling because the Conservatives are not challenging the chair. They're just interrupting so that Mr. Angus cannot take the floor.

On your ruling, Mr. Angus has the floor. Are the Conservatives going to challenge the chair or are they going to keep interrupting? When they do it, the heckling and the way that they're speaking completely lacks respect and decorum for other members. It's very unparliamentary.

I think that people and workers who are watching and hoping to see us actually work on this legislation would be shocked to see the level of disrespect that is being shown by our Conservative members right now.

The Chair: Colleagues, please.

Mr. Genuis, if you are succinct on the point of order, it's back to you. I have other members on points of order who have been waiting patiently and I want to get to them.

Go ahead very succinctly on the point of order, so I can move to the next point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I'll be as succinct as my good colleagues across the way have been. I will expect the same courtesy from the chair as you have shown to members of your own party.

Ms. Lapointe suggested that I had used unparliamentary language. I take that accusation very seriously, and I would ask her to cite what language I used that was allegedly unparliamentary. That is important to me and it's something that Ms. Lapointe should respond to.

As for the implication that I do not think the chair of this committee is doing a good job in discharging his function, I will happily assent to the fact that I do not think the chair of this committee is fulfilling the functions of his office in a remotely proper way in accordance with the rules.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Genuis—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I say that out of respect for the importance of that office. If I didn't think that office was important, I wouldn't care. The reason I care is that the rules in this place protect all of us. They protect every member and every party.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, thank you for your point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: She wants to respond, I hope.

The Chair: I have several points of order.

I'm asking all members to use parliamentary language.

As we conduct the business of this committee, we focus on doing our work on the amendments and the subamendment that we're working on. All members should not use unparliamentary language as a part of the proceedings of this committee.

Thank you for raising your point of order, Mr. Genuis.

I'll go to Mr. Simard on a point of order. He's been waiting very patiently.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: I apologize for the confusion. I don't have a point of order.

We already have an endless list of points of order; I won't add to it. Mr. Chair, I just want to ask if we can focus on one thing, which is what we said the last time: would it be possible to identify what the point of order being raised refers to?

If the point of order being raised refers to the fact that my Conservative colleagues don't agree with a decision reached by the chair, we'll be going round in circles until Christmas if we don't get past it.

I want my Conservative friends to be aware that there are people at home watching what we're doing. I don't think they can use this to say on their social media that we're doing a good job of defending our fellow citizens. Right now, we look like anything but legislators.

Consequently, I would encourage my Conservative colleagues to identify up front what they're talking about in their point of order; if

their objective is just to waste our time, they'll have to answer for that to their fellow citizens watching this sad comedy, one that's boring and serves absolutely no purpose.

Mr. Chair, as our operating method, could we perhaps adopt the idea of identifying what the point of order that we're raising refers to. If it still concerns the speaking turn that Mr. Genuis thinks he has but doesn't have—a decision has been made on that point—it will be clear to everyone that what Mr. Genuis is trying to do is waste our precious time.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you.

First of all, I'm going to address Monsieur Simard.

Monsieur Simard, I was listening very diligently to what you were saying. Thank you to the interpreters for interpreting so well.

Where we are is we're on the subamendment on Timmins. Mr. Angus was given the floor to proceed after the committee upheld a previous ruling. After the chair was challenged, a previous ruling was upheld.

We have proceeded with Mr. Angus, who has the floor. Mr. Angus has been waiting patiently for the number of hours he's stated.

We have Mr. Angus on the floor.

Colleagues, I'll remind people, since we started the motion and the amendment and the subamendment, that if you would like to speak to any of these, raise your hand. We'll put you in the queue to participate in this important debate on the subamendment on Timmins.

If you do not want to debate the subamendment on Timmins that Mr. Falk brought forward, we can proceed and committee can decide on that subamendment. But if we are not allowing members to participate, we cannot move forward into that subamendment.

Mr. Angus, before I go to you, we have several other points of order that I want to go through, as these members have been waiting patiently on their points of order.

We have Mr. Angus next on the point of order and then I have another member. I will go to the other member when Mr. Angus is done on the point of order, but I will also remind colleagues to use your point of order and please identify procedurally what your issue is. Be succinct. It's not an opportunity to get into a lengthy debate, but please be succinct with your point of order so that it's clear.

We will go to Mr. Angus on the point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you, Chair.

I had raised earlier my concern about the health and safety of the staff, but what equally concerns me now is that I sit the furthest from the chair, so I'm trying to hear the rulings and my right to participate is interfered with by what is turning into what sounds like a barroom mob action and bating members on the other side doesn't help. While the chair's trying to speak, I hear a number of Conservatives heckling, picking fights, and then saying that they don't respect the chair.

It is interfering with my rights.

I'm asking, Chair, that you actually tell the Conservatives that they have to show respect and stop interfering and heckling so that I can do my duty.

I can't even hear you half the time because the Conservatives are turning this into a mob.

The Chair: Mr. Angus—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: A mob is a dangerous criminal organization.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus, for that point of order.

Colleagues, all members want to participate on this committee without interruption. I'm doing the best I can to navigate through everybody here. If you raise that you do want to speak, like members have, I will acknowledge members to the best of my ability.

Everybody's getting an opportunity to participate here.

Mr. Angus also wants to participate in the debate on Timmins—I believe Timmins is in his riding—which Mr. Falk has brought forward an amendment on and other members around the table here would also like to participate on this important amendment.

Once again, I'm hoping we can move forward and let all members participate.

Look, before I go to the point of order—and we are raising points of order on everybody's points of order here—I do remind colleagues to be very succinct.

Mr. Aldag, I have you next but Mr. Patzer has a point of order on Mr. Angus's point of order, so I'm going to give Mr. Patzer the floor.

Mr. Patzer, I'm going to ask you to be as succinct as possible and identify what your point of order is.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you.

I'll be very, very succinct.

I just think it would be beneficial for the committee to be aware that over the three previous meetings Mr. Angus has raised no less than 57 points of order, so when we want to talk about who is actually interrupting and preventing members from speaking, Mr. Angus is leading the charge.

In this meeting alone, he's added no less than five points of order.

The Chair: I would ask that we focus on the task at hand.

Ms. Dabrusin, I'll go to you on a point of order, and I want to go to Mr. Aldag, who has been waiting patiently.

Mr. Aldag, you will have to wait patiently a little longer.

Ms. Dabrusin, go ahead on the point of order.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Mr. Angus has the floor by the chair's own ruling, which keeps on getting interrupted. The idea of saying that he is interrupting his own ability to speak is ridiculous. He is not interrupting his ability to speak. He has the floor. That's the ruling of the chair. I say to the members opposite to challenge the chair if you disagree with that ruling or to let Mr. Angus speak.

The Chair: Once again, Ms. Dabrusin, thank you for your point of order and the reminder. This committee has proceeded with Mr. Angus having the floor. I have previously stated that if a member would like to participate, to acknowledge that. We'll put them on the list, and when their turn comes up, they can participate in the debate. Every member will have the opportunity to participate.

Mr. Angus, as Ms. Dabrusin has correctly identified, does have the floor. If there is a challenge to Mr. Angus's having the floor, I would ask a member to challenge the chair on the right of Mr. Angus to have the floor. No member here is challenging the chair on that ruling, but members are, unfortunately, impeding the work of this committee if we do not let Mr. Angus participate in his debate on Timmins.

I'd like to reset and I hope that with a bit of a thoughtful reset from all of us, we can think about allowing the member to move forward on his debate and then we can all have an opportunity to interject on the amendment and move forward.

I'm going to go to Mr. Aldag, who has been waiting patiently. He has a point of order. I'm going to recognize Mr. Aldag on the point of order, and then I'm going to go to the next member, who's been waiting patiently, on a point of order.

Go ahead, Mr. Aldag.

Mr. John Aldag: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I have been waiting patiently in accordance with how you set out the speaking order on points of order. We've seen a continued deterioration in respect for the chair, and that's very concerning for me. In order to have a functioning committee, the chair needs to be able to make rulings on things like points of order, which you are attempting to do and you are continuing to be interrupted. We have decisions being made, rulings you have made, that Mr. Angus has the floor on a subamendment that was put forward related to Timmins.

I'm sure that Mr. Angus wants to speak to it. I would like to hear him speak to it, but we have to have an effectively functioning committee with the chair being respected and the chair's rules being followed, so I would just ask all members to move beyond the points of order. Games are being played now. Let the chair rule on points of order as they are raised, but then get back to where we're at, which is actually with Mr. Angus having the floor to debate the subamendment.

That's what I am for at this committee.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Aldag, for the point of order.

I will remind everybody again that Mr. Angus does have the floor. We are on a subamendment on Timmins. It is Mr. Angus's time to speak as the member of Parliament for that constituency, which I've never been to, on the subamendment. I'd like to know more about what Mr. Angus's concerns are in this subamendment and the importance of it to the amendment and to the main motion.

If you would like the floor, we can offer any member on either side of this table to participate. All you have to do is to let us know. You'll go on the speaking order on the subamendment and you'll be able to participate in the debate.

Now, I'm going to go to a few more points of order before we get back to where we were.

Mr. Kelloway, welcome to our committee. Thank you for joining us. You have a point of order.

Mr. Mike Kelloway: Thanks, Mr. Chair.

It is actually great to be here. I know you're probably thinking, "What did he have to drink before he came here", but I certainly didn't drink anything.

Number one, I'm hoping I get to hear Mr. Angus take the floor, but I also want to highlight how important the motion and Bill C-49 and Bill C-50 are, if I may. In Atlantic Canada, in Nova Scotia, and in particular in Cape Breton—Canso, where I'm from, the amendment to the Atlantic accord—

The Chair: Mr. Kelloway, I'm going to ask you to halt, because I have a number of people once again. I just want you to focus—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Common decency means following the rules.

An hon. member: I have a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Can you stop this intimidation?

The Chair: We will suspend.

• (1715) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1725)

The Chair: Colleagues, before I proceed to any more points of order, I'm going to start by reading a small passage for all members to reflect on, to consider and to think about because I believe this is a very important passage on where we are with this committee.

This is in chapter 20 on page 1058, if anybody wants to write that down and follow along.

This is in the section "Committees and Questions of Procedure and Privilege", under "Disorder and Misconduct":

Disorder and misconduct in a committee may arise as a result of the failure to abide by the rules and practices of a committee or to respect the authority of the Chair. Disorder and misconduct also include the use of unparliamentary language, failure to yield the floor or persistent interruption of the proceedings in any manner.

This is a very clear statement on page 1058 in chapter 20.

All of us here on committee, as committee members, should take a moment to reflect on that and think about how we want to proceed moving forward because it is quite clear in this passage what our roles are as committee members on this committee.

Now, I am going to go back to where we left off where, Mr. Kelloway.... I had suspended, and I want to remind folks of the reason I suspended. I read this passage because I found there to be a number of people speaking across the floor and having conversations that were interrupting the business of this committee.

Mr. Kelloway, my apologies earlier for cutting you off to suspend this meeting. I did believe that for the best interest of committee members and the health and safety of our interpreters we needed to take a pause for a few minutes.

As we're back, Mr. Kelloway, I will ask you, on the point of order, to be succinct and state the procedural relevance of your point of order.

Mr. Mike Kelloway: The procedural relevance is, by hearing Mr. Angus, we can get moving on the motion, which is absolutely critical for my part of the world, Atlantic Canada.

It's important to jobs and economic development and in terms of new green energy opportunities in Atlantic Canada, so my hope is that we can get moving on this, move to Mr. Angus so that we can get to work on the amendments that need to be made that are going to impact not just the people in my riding of Cape Breton—Canso but in all of Atlantic Canada.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Kelloway.

Colleagues, Mr. Kelloway is a new member to this committee. He's been waiting patiently. He's had his ability to speak.

Thank you for providing your point of order, Mr. Kelloway, on the importance of allowing the member who has the floor to be able to participate.

I'm now going to proceed. We have several points of order, and I'm going to proceed to Mr. Genuis on a point of order.

Mr. Genuis, I would ask you to be succinct on your point of order, on your procedural concern, so that we can move forward to the next point of order from one of our colleagues who is also waiting to provide a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

In the time these proceedings have been going on, I have not at any point been able to finish a point of order.

In every case, when I've raised points of order, they have been in relation to matters of order, unlike the last one.

I do have a number of matters of order that I wish to raise. I know Mr. Angus—sanctimonious over there—is interrupting with heckling, which I'm not too particular about, honestly, but I just think it should be noted, given how—

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'm going to ask you to pause.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I haven't even started.

The Chair: Well, we're getting into debate. We're getting into other....

We've talked about ensuring that we respect each other on this committee, that we not engage in debate and be succinct on the point of order.

I will go back to you, Mr. Genuis, but I do want to hear the next member, Mr. Falk, on a point of order, who's been waiting very patiently.

Be succinct on your point of order, and then we can proceed.

Mr. Genuis, on the point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

On decorum, I was pointing out that I was being heckled by Mr. Angus, despite Mr. Angus describing in the most dramatic terms any instance of someone having a side conversation while he's speaking.

It continues.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I want you to focus on the point of order. Don't debate what a member has said or not said.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, that is the matter of order.

The Chair: Can we go directly to your point of order, please.

I want to give you the opportunity to state your point of order, but we do not want to engage in debate.

What is the procedural concern that you would like to raise through your point of order?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, first, as a procedural matter, making arguments about procedure is a point of order. It is not a point of debate. It is a point of order to make arguments about procedure, as I was just doing.

Second, questions around Mr. Angus's heckling of other members is a matter of order. It is definitely a legitimate point of order to raise, especially given that he calls out others.

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

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Third, points of order—

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'm going to ask you to pause right there on the point of order.

I'll ask you to continue on your point of order that you've raised in a moment.

Mr. Angus, go ahead on a point of order, please.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm sorry, but he's using his platform to make personal attacks, just as he did against Ms. Lapointe. That's not a point of order. It's an attempt to put falsehoods on the record.

I'm here to do my job. I've been denied, for over six hours, the right to speak on issues of workers. We know that they shut down workers when they came to speak. They've never allowed workers to speak. He cannot be using his point of order to make personal attacks and falsehoods about me in an attempt to insinuate it into the record.

He needs to focus. Either he has to challenge the chair or he has to allow other members to participate. He has obstructed that for six hours.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, thank you for your point of order.

Mr. Genuis, before I go back to you, Mr. Patzer has a point of order.

Colleagues, I just read out a passage on disorder and misconduct. I'm not sure if we've effectively taken the time to reflect on that passage. It's a very important passage that members should take seriously to make sure that all members can participate.

Respect is the key word. It's a very important word that we all should focus on—respect of each other in how we conduct ourselves in this committee.

Mr. Patzer, go ahead on a point of order on Mr. Angus's point of order.

Be as succinct as possible on your point of order, so I can go back to Mr. Genuis to finish up his point of order and then I can move on to the next member. Refrain from engaging in debate through your point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I was actually planning to agree with you and echo your words because you read about persistent interruptions. Again, I will note that's the seventh time Mr. Angus has interrupted one of my colleagues today.

In the last three meetings, he has point of ordered Conservative members 57 times. If you want to talk about persistent interruptions, there's one member who's guilty.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Patzer, on your point of order on a part of that passage.

I would also like to remind colleagues that Mr. Angus does have the floor.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you, Chair.

The Chair: His inability to participate in this debate should be of concern for all members. He has not had an opportunity, I think, to even provide a sentence to us yet on the subamendment by Mr. Falk on Timmins.

A number of people want to speak to the subamendment to include Timmins in the main motion that was brought forward by Mr. Sorbara.

For all the folks who are following along, we had a following amendment by Ms. Stubbs, which we still need to debate, and now we have a subamendment by Mr. Falk, who suggested a subamendment for Timmins.

As we last left off, Mr. Angus had the floor. I would remind colleagues that there was no challenge to the chair's ruling of Mr. Angus having the floor. Mr. Angus has not been able to participate in his debate on this, nor have other members. I know other members are patiently waiting.

I'm going back to Mr. Genuis very quickly because I know another member has been waiting very patiently.

Thank you, Mr. Falk, for your patience. I'm going to go to you right after Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Genuis, go ahead on the point of order, please. Be succinct and direct on your points of order so we can move forward.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I've been trying, Chair.

I want to front a number of serious matters of order that I think require redress.

First of all, Mr. Angus just accused me of lying, and that is clearly unparliamentary, and he should be chastised for that.

Am I allowed to say anything here?

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, we do not want to use this platform of the committee to make accusations against members.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: He just did. He just made an accusation. It's on the record. You can't call someone a liar, and he just did.

The Chair: Colleagues, I have a number of members speaking at the same time.

I appreciate, members, that you're all speaking to me, but the mikes aren't on. I think that's important for the health and safety of our interpreters, but it does make it difficult for me to proceed when we have this disorder. I'm asking all colleagues once again. If you would like to proceed to challenging the ruling of the chair, which every member has the right to do, I encourage you to use your right to do that and to challenge the chair.

Mr. Genuis, I'm going to allow you to proceed very quickly before I move to another member, but we're not going to engage in debate. We've engaged in debate and not succinctly provided the point of order you're referencing. I'm then going to move on to the next speaker, because a number of other people are waiting on the original point of order.

Very quickly provide your point of order so we can move forward, because we do need to move forward as a committee.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, it is very clearly a matter of order that in Parliament or in committee a member cannot accuse another member of lying. Mr. Angus just explicitly did that and now he's suggesting that I'm maligning him by pointing out the fact that he just on the record accused me of lying. That is a violation of the rules.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I will ask you to pause. I've asked you not to engage in debate and accusations against other members.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: But everybody else can?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: That is a matter of order.

Put on the clerk. Let me ask the clerk.

The Chair: Okay.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Can we hear from the clerk?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Can we hear from the clerk please, Chair?

Mr. Charlie Angus: Chair, this is disorder and misconduct.

The Chair: Colleagues, I'm pausing here and I hope I don't have to move forward again. Let's have one member at a time and have the opportunity for members to participate.

I'm going to move to Mr. Falk on a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I was in the middle of my point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I've given you a number of opportunities. If you would like to make your point of order, please do so succinctly.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: My point of order is that I was accused of lying by another member, and that is a violation of the rules.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I would ask you to turn off your mike, because I have not recognized you at this point. Could you pause?

I'm going to give you an opportunity to make a succinct point of order so we can proceed with the proceedings of this committee.

Mr. Genuis, you have the floor. We have another colleague waiting on a point of order. Mr. Genuis, I will now go to you on your point of order so you can complete your point of order. You brought one forward, and we have another one and then we can proceed.

Go ahead, Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, I do have a number of points of order, but I do want to focus on the very narrow point of the rules specifying that it is unparliamentary for a member to accuse another member of lying. Mr. Angus did that. That is a matter of order, and you as chair have an obligation to enforce the rules and to call him to order.

Ms. Lapointe accused me of using unparliamentary language. I asked her to clarify what she thought I said that was unparliamentary, and she has thus far expressed no interest in responding to that request for clarification on that accusation. You, Chair, have not followed up on that whatsoever. You have a responsibility to make a ruling.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'm going to ask you to pause right there to give Mr. Angus an opportunity to respond. There was an accusation made by the member. Mr. Angus has an opportunity to...

Mr. Charlie Angus: The issue here, Mr. Chair, is this. The member has denied that I had the floor, which is a falsehood. The chair has ruled on that, but he will not challenge him. The chair has ruled. The ruling of the chair has been sustained.

Now we see his attempt to drag out a fight with Ms. Lapointe, who I think has held herself with dignity.

This attempt to personalize it with me is.... I am somehow a problem for being denied the ability to participate by these constant attempts to interfere.

I would ask, Mr. Chair, to move on, because I have the floor.

I am certainly ready to start speaking to the motion regarding Bill C-50 and Bill C-49, because I have workers who depend on us doing something. If Mr. Genuis's feelings are being hurt because he's being called out for his behaviour, misconduct and disorder, as you said, that is his issue. My issue is speaking for the workers of this country.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a right to raise points of order and—

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, as I mentioned before—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Are you going to rule on the point of order?

The Chair: I've given you an opportunity to present your point of order. I've given Mr. Angus an opportunity to respond. I'm going to ask you to hold for a second.

Thank you for the point of order, Mr. Genuis. I do not find Mr. Angus's intervention unparliamentary, not from what he said and just restated. Clarification was provided.

I will ask all members once again to not use unparliamentary language in this committee room with one another. Focus on the work we are here to do in committee, not on making accusations and using unparliamentary language against one another, whoever that may be. We've had a number of meetings. We should not be resorting to using unparliamentary language. Canadians from coast to coast to coast are watching our deliberations today.

Focus on the task at hand. I will remind everybody that the task at hand is the motion on the floor by Mr. Sorbara regarding Bill C-50 the Canadian sustainable jobs act, and Bill C-49, the Atlantic accords bill. The motion was moved by Mr. Sorbara. An amendment was moved by Ms. Stubbs. Then a subamendment was moved by Mr. Falk. That's where we are.

Mr. Angus has the floor. The chair's ruling has not been challenged. This committee is at the point where Mr. Angus has the floor to debate. We have other points of order. I'm going through the other points of order.

Mr. Falk, you have a point of order. Thank you for waiting very patiently.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On a point of order on your ruling.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, it's not debatable.

An hon. member: Members are allowed to call each other liars?

An hon. member: I want you to clarify your ruling.

The Chair: Turn off the microphone, please.

An hon. member: They're talking over you, Chair.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis.

An hon. member: Members like to call each other liars.

An hon. member: We need to hear from the clerk.

The Chair: I will ask members, if they do not like the ruling I've provided, to challenge the chair.

An hon. member: What was the ruling?

The Chair: The chair will now move to Mr. Falk.

Mr. Falk, you had the floor on a point of order previously. Go ahead, please, on a point of order.

Mr. Ted Falk: On your point of order—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Why won't you let the clerk speak?

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: We do want to fight for the free speech of the clerk.

The Chair: Mr. Falk has a point of order.

Ms. Dabrusin—

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: I believe that Mr. Genuis has just challenged the chair, and I actually agree that we should vote to sustain the ruling of the chair.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I think we should vote. He did challenge the chair. I heard it.

An hon. member: I heard it.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: No, he didn't. This is amazing gaslighting.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's incredible.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: He actually didn't say those words.

The Chair: We are suspended.

• (1750) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1800)

The Chair: Mr. Falk, I'm going to you on a point of order, but before I do, sir, for committee members, I'm going to give a quick reminder on some important reflections I've had over the last few minutes.

On page 1058, in chapter 20, partway down the paragraph on disorder and misconduct, it states, "If a committee desires that specific sanctions be taken against those disrupting the proceedings, it must report the situation to the House. The House may then take such measures as it deems appropriate." Then it says, "In the event of disorder, the Chair may suspend the meeting until order can be restored." That's what I've done on several occasions today.

In previous meetings and in this one, the health and safety of our interpreters with members speaking over each other with many mikes on was a concern, and it still is a concern. Today, I'm very delighted to see that we have not gone down that path. I know that our interpreters are very grateful for one mike at a time, and I'm very grateful that we are taking the health and safety of our interpreters seriously. I hope that will continue. As mentioned, I will suspend the meeting if I feel that the health and safety of our interpreters is being jeopardized.

Under "Decisions of the Chair and Appeals" on page 1059 of chapter 20, it says, "Decisions by the Chair are not debatable." It says that very clearly here. It also says, "They can, however, be appealed to the committee."

Colleagues, every member of this committee has the right to participate in the proceedings of this committee. If you feel that a decision that's made is not one that you believe is the right one, you have the right to challenge the chair and the ruling—not to engage in debate but to challenge the chair. That is a clearly stated rule. I would encourage members to use that if you deem it's necessary.

I would also encourage members to allow members to participate. An important part of this committee's proceedings is that members who have the floor are able to debate the motions that are presented.

I'm going to remind everyone, for all those folks sitting at home who may have just tuned in, where we are. We have a motion on the floor presented by Mr. Sorbara regarding the Canadian sustainable jobs act, Bill C-50, and the Atlantic accords bill.

We then have an amendment that was brought forward by Ms. Stubbs.

We then have a subamendment that was brought forward by Mr. Falk, which we are currently on, and we are debating. On that subamendment, Mr. Angus has the floor and, as a member of this committee, has not been given the opportunity to participate in debate on an important subamendment that is actually related to his constituency.

I hope that provides clarity to all members. I know that Mr. Falk, who has brought forward this subamendment, would like to see it presented and debated. I know that Mr. Falk also has a point of order.

Before I go to Mr. Falk on a point of order, I would ask members, on points of order, to please be succinct and let's not engage in debate. I want to give you the opportunity to make your relevant points of order.

Mr. Falk, you have the floor, sir, on a point of order.

Mr. Ted Falk: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Yes, I've waited a while to make my observations here and discuss my point of order.

First of all, I want to start off by saying that when the meeting was suspended during the debate on the subamendment I made, Mr. Genuis had the floor and should have been given the floor at the subsequent meeting.

The Chair: Mr. Falk, I'm sorry, but I'm just going to remind you that the chair had made a ruling. That ruling was made. There is the ability of committee members to challenge the chair, so we're not going to engage on a point of order in debate of that ruling. If there's a challenge to the speaking order in a ruling, you can challenge the chair, sir.

I would ask you, on the point of order that you are now bringing forward, to say what the point of order is and present that, please, and not engage in debate on a previous ruling that's been made. I'd ask you to use your point of order to bring forward the procedural concern that you have on the point of order that you've raised, I believe, on a previous point of order that was made sometime back. If you could bring us back to the point of order that you had....

I'd like to acknowledge that you have waited patiently on the previous point of order, because we've had many other members who had points of order as well on that point of order, so I'll ask you to proceed and not engage in debate, but speak specifically to the point of order at hand that you're raising right now.

Go ahead, sir.

Mr. Ted Falk: Okay. Yes. Thanks, Mr. Chair.

Just to be clear, I was actually not debating. I was clearly just making an observation, which I believe the chair should consider. It's not a point of debate, but just my observation of my recollection of that meeting.

My point of order is this. Mr. Genuis got cut off when he was expanding on his point of order. What I have noticed is that whenever Mr. Genuis is making his point of order, he frequently is interrupted

with other points of order for which you immediately stop his point of order and defer to the other points of order. But in the case of when Mr. Angus or Mr. Kelloway were making points of order, there were points of order interrupting their points of order which you did not accept and you allowed them to continue to make their points of order.

My suggestion would be, if you want to maintain a little better decorum here, that you not allow some members, some parties, to be able to interrupt points of order and others not, and—

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Ted Falk: No, I'm not actually quite finished.

The Chair: We are engaging in debate. I recognize what you've stated on the point of order, Mr. Falk.

The ability for members to make a point of order and to be heard one at a time is something I've tried to do, but all members have a right to participate, so I would thank you for your point of order. I would remind colleagues to allow members to participate.

I'll ask you to finish your point of order and not engage in debate, but speak specifically to the point of order so we can move on to the next point of order.

Mr. Ted Falk: Thank you. I was going to remind you that you didn't interrupt Mr. Kelloway or Mr. Angus when they were making their points of order, but you just interrupted me. I just want to point that out. I want the audience to be able to observe that, the behaviour of the chair.

My point of order is this. Mr. Genuis in his point of order asked Ms. Lapointe to clarify exactly what the unparliamentary language that she referred to Mr. Genuis as using was so he could address that. I'm sure, if there was legitimate unparliamentary language being used, that Mr. Genuis would love the opportunity to apologize, if that really is the case.

The Chair: Mr. Falk, thank you for your point of order.

The chair previously ruled on unparliamentary language that may have occurred during this committee and previous committees. I've reminded members of our duties as members.

Mr. Falk, you raised an important point on a previous interruption that was made when Mr. Kelloway had the floor and was part-way through his point of order, where disorder occurred in this committee and when I, as the chair, had to suspend.

An hon. member: Are you sure this isn't debate?

Mr. Ted Falk: Mr. Chair, you—

The Chair: Once again, colleagues, we are not going to use a point of order to engage in debate.

As the chair—I would ask you respectfully, sir—I had to suspend the meeting previously because a member was interrupted and a number of members conducted in disorder, which led me to suspend this meeting. As mentioned earlier, I will not hesitate at any point....

As committee members, it's our duty to respect each other, to work together, to follow parliamentary rules that are in place, which I previously stated, to ensure a good working environment for everybody who supports us at this committee. Whether it's our clerks, our analysts, the health and safety of our interpreters, we must take that very seriously.

We are going to move to Mr. Sorbara on the next point of order.

Mr. Ted Falk: Mr. Chair, to finish my point of order—

The Chair: Mr. Falk, you've addressed your point of order.

Mr. Ted Falk: But I wasn't finished.

The Chair: There's another point of order.

I'm going to move forward. I thank you for raising a point of order, sir.

Mr. Ted Falk: You let Mr. Kelloway finish his complete thought before you interrupted.

The Chair: As chair, I've ruled on your point of order.

Mr. Ted Falk: I wasn't even finished.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I think there's a challenge to the chair.

Do I hear a challenge to the chair?

The Chair: I'm moving to Mr. Sorbara on his point of order.

Mr. Sorbara, can you wait one moment, please?

Mr. Charlie Angus: He just challenged the chair.

An hon. member: You have to give every member the chance—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Let him finish his point of order.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Mr. Falk, kindly finish your point of order and then I'll go just after you.

Mr. Ted Falk: That sounds like a very common-sense solution.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: It's a very gentlemanly thing to do.

An hon. member: It's common sense and gentlemanly.

An hon. member: United for our common well-being.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Sorbara, for offering that, but, Mr. Sorbara, decisions are made. I'm going to move to you on the point of order.

Mr. Ted Falk: Wow.

Your point of order was allowing me the floor, I believe.

The Chair: Mr. Sorbara, I would ask you to be direct and succinct on your point of order so we can proceed with the next point of order.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Chair, I very much wish to be quite brief.

I put forward a motion, I believe a regular scheduling motion, for our committee to go over Bill C-50 and Bill C-49.

It is November 8 today, if I am correct. We would have had the minister here with us today at committee looking at two important pieces of legislation for all Canadians and for all parts of the country. I believe there's an amendment on the table, or a subamendment on the floor, if I could get clarification.

There's a subamendment that is being debated right now. I would hope that all parties can get to a point where we can vote on the subamendment and then vote on the revised amendment.

The Chair: Mr. Sorbara, I would ask you just on the point of order—

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: If we can go down that tangent as quickly as possible, Bill C-49 is important for Atlantic Canadians and Bill C-50 is important for all Canadians.

The Chair: Are you asking a procedural question on where we are?

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: I am most certainly asking a procedural question on where we are.

The Chair: Colleagues, I want to provide a reminder once again. We had a motion on the floor by Mr. Sorbara on the Canadian sustainable jobs act, Bill C-50, and the Atlantic accords, Bill C-49. We have an amendment brought forward to Mr. Sorbara's main motion by Ms. Stubbs. We have had a subamendment brought forward by Mr. Falk.

We are on the subamendment by Mr. Falk. Mr. Angus has the floor on the subamendment with many other members waiting.

We have a few folks on a point of order. I'm going to go through the points of order of a few people.

I'm going to go to Ms. Stubbs first on a point order. Then we'll go to the next member after Ms. Stubbs.

Ms. Stubbs, as I reminded other committee members, please be succinct on your point order.

The floor is yours on the point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Mr. Chair, I have two points of order.

What would you like me to address?

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, I'm not sure what your point of order is, but I would ask you not to get into debate but to present your point of order so if we need to make a ruling, we can make that ruling. If it's a point of order of concern, you can raise it. Just be succinct on your point of order so we can proceed with other members and their points of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thanks, Chair.

I would just point out that I thank Mr. Kelloway for his participation here. I do look forward to his support of my subamendment, which of course is asking for Bill C-49 to be studied first, as it was introduced, passed and time allocated through the House of Commons. Of course, Mr. Sorbara's scheduling programming motion puts it second. I just want to clarify that.

Chair, to the point of order related to chapter 20, we had asked to hear from the clerk on a number of issues. I just want to quote chapter 20.

Is that okay?

You've addressed chapter 20 a lot, so I'm going to too.

As a non-partisan and independent officer, the clerk serves equally all members of the committee as well as representatives of all parties;

The clerk advises all members:

The Clerk is at the service of all Members, regardless of party affiliation, and must act with impartiality and discretion.

Of course, there are a lot more words than that. I'm sure the clerk can advise you.

We on a number of occasions have asked for the clerk, who serves us equally and in a non-partisan way and who would respond to us all as MPs who are duly elected and equal in our capacities here on behalf of the people who have sent us here to do these jobs.... Although it's a pattern, I guess, of censorship and shutting down free speech, I just wonder why we can't actually have the clerk address us on a number of issues we're raising that relate to a lack of confidence and credibility in the chair's own equal and impartial enforcement of the rules.

Why is it that we can't hear from the clerk when we've asked to hear from the clerk?

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Stubbs.

I appreciate the confidence of—

Ms. Dabrusin, I will go to your point of order, but I just want to comment and rule.

The chair has been elected by committee members to work on behalf of the committee.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Chair, I asked about the clerk. I asked about the clerk.

The Chair: If there is a challenge to the chair on a ruling, committee members have the right to challenge the chair. I have yet, at today's meeting, to hear a challenge of the chair. If there's a ruling that members do not like or if they do not like the speaking order that's in place, then as has been the case previously at this committee, they have the ability to challenge the chair. The chair is here to work on—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Mr. Chair, I didn't ask about you; I asked about the clerk and hearing from the clerk as a non-partisan servant of this committee and all members of Parliament despite our partisan affiliations.

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, I would ask you not to turn on your mike until you are recognized.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: You would understand that one feels one doesn't know how else to be heard.

The Chair: I would ask colleagues to challenge the chair.

Once again, as members of this committee, you have elected me as your chair.

Thank you, Mr. Angus and others.

I would ask all members, while I have the floor—when the red light on this mike is on, it means I have the floor—allow me to finish what I'm saying so the interpreters can clearly interpret what I am saying.

What I am saying is that this committee has elected me as the chair of this committee. If a member does not like my ruling, a member can challenge the chair. I would ask members to challenge a decision if you do not believe it's a decision you like. Members of this committee have the power, through that mechanism, to vote to uphold and sustain the ruling of the chair or overturn the ruling. That is the power that members of Parliament have on this committee.

Ms. Dabrusin, you had a point of order. I will go to you on the point of order.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Mr. Chair, I believe that each time the members opposite say that they have lost confidence in the decision of the chair and actively say that they do not....

I have heard the members opposite say that they disagree with your ruling that Mr. Angus has the floor, which is a ruling that you made days ago now. If they are not respecting your ruling, I believe they are challenging the chair.

If they are not challenging the chair, I would say let's give Mr. Angus the floor so we can continue with the subamendment.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: On that point of order, Chair....

The Chair: Is there a challenge to the chair's ruling?

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: No. I have a point of order.

The Chair: I have a few points of order here and I'm trying to get—

Mr. Patzer, do you have a point of order on Ms. Dabrusin's point of order?

As I've stated to all members, I would ask you to be direct and succinct with your point of order, so we can move to the next point of order.

Go head, directly on the point of order that Ms. Dabrusin made, please.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: It's building off a point that she had made. I think this might help provide clarity, so that we can proceed. I think it's in the best interest of the committee, I would assume.

It goes all the way back a couple of meetings. A point of privilege was raised. The words from your mouth were that you granted the point of privilege to Mr. Genuis.

If you read a little bit further in chapter 20—

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, we're not going to get—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: This is not about whether—

The Chair: A ruling was made previously and upheld by this committee.

An hon. member: You made a ruling regarding the—

An hon. member: This is important.

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, I'm going to ask you to hold for one moment until all members....

You've raised a point of order on Ms. Dabrusin's point of order. I want you to be clear. We don't want to engage in debate. What I want you to do is just be clear and succinct directly on what Ms. Dabrusin's point of order was, which is what you raised a point of order on.

Go ahead. You have the floor on the point of order on what Ms. Dabrusin said.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you.

It's on a point that she had made and I think this helps to provide clarity.

I am reading and quoting from Bosc and Gagnon, so I am not debating her.

House of Commons Procedure and Practice says, "If a member wishes to raise a question of privilege during a committee meeting, or an incident arises in connection with the committee's proceedings that may constitute a breach of privilege, the committee Chair allows the member to explain the situation."

Charlie, it's page 1060, if you want to read along.

The Chair: Mr. Patzer—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Please let me finish because it's—

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, I've given you a number of opportunities. This does not have anything to do with what was raised by Ms. Dabrusin on the point of order.

Ms. Viviane Lapointe: Point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, we have a point of order by Ms. Lapointe on your point of order.

Ms. Lapointe, please go ahead on the point of order.

Ms. Viviane Lapointe: My point of order is on the disorder that's occurring within this committee with not yielding the floor and persistent interruptions. I'm going to ask again that we each respect the person who has the floor, and that we also respect the chair. I have seen cross-talk, talking over the chair, talking over whoever has the mike.

Can we please try to conduct ourselves in an orderly way and respect the proceedings?

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Chair, it's now turning into a mob against Ms. Lapointe again.

The Chair: We will suspend.

● (1825)

(Pause)

● (1830)

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, first of all on your point of order, that was on something that occurred a few days ago that was ruled on and sustained by this committee. Colleagues, we are at time for the committee meeting today. I know we're having an engaging debate this evening and we're going to endeavour to get further resources for tomorrow. I look forward to seeing you all upon that happening.

The meeting is suspended for this evening.

[*The meeting was suspended at 6:30 p.m., Wednesday, November 8*]

[*The meeting resumed at 11:04 a.m., Monday, November 20*]

The Chair: I call this meeting to order.

Welcome back to meeting number 80 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Natural Resources.

Today we are meeting in public to discuss committee business.

In accordance with our routine motion, I am informing the committee that all remote participants have not successfully completed the required connection tests in advance of this meeting, but we do have quorum here fully today with everybody here in attendance.

When we previously suspended, Mr. Angus had the floor and we had resumed debate on the subamendment by Mr. Falk.

Mr. Angus, you have the floor.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you, Chair.

I think we're now six meetings into my attempt to have the floor so that I can carry out my basic function as a parliamentarian, which is to participate in legislation, legislation that was voted on in the House and passed to our committee, and so, it's a priority for our committee to address the motion.

Being that we've had so much monkey business, people might forget what we were actually discussing. I'm going to read the motion and then explain why we need to address these.

The motion that was brought by the Liberal government for debate by the parties was:

That given Bill C-50, An Act respecting accountability, transparency and engagement to support the creation of sustainable jobs for workers and economic growth in a net-zero economy, and 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, have both been referred to committee, that the committee initiate its consideration of both C-50 and C-49 with the following schedule:

a) That the minister and officials be invited to appear before the committee on Bill C-50, on a date to be determined by the Chair but no later than Wednesday November 8, 2023;

I will stop there. November 8 has passed because of the monkey business that was going on with the Conservatives. The minister who could've come and explained his position was not given that opportunity and I, as an opposition member, was not given the opportunity to cross-examine the minister.

b) That the minister and officials be invited to appear before the committee on C-49 on a date to be determined by the Chair but no later than Wednesday, December 6, 2023;

We haven't crossed that date yet, but it's moving up on us.

c) That members submit their lists of suggested witnesses concerning Bill C-50 by 12 pm on Friday November 3, 2023—

—which we have done as New Democrats—

—and that the Chair, clerk and analysts create witness panels which reflect the representation of the parties on the committee and, once complete, that the Chair begin scheduling those meetings;

d) That members submit their lists of suggested witnesses concerning Bill C-49 by 12 pm on Friday November 10, 2023 and that the Chair, clerk and analysts create witness panels which reflect the representation of the parties on the committee, and, once complete, that the Chair begin scheduling those meetings;

e) That the Chair seek additional meeting times and that meetings be scheduled, if resources available, for up to three hours each;

f) That the Chair issue press releases for C-50 and C-49 inviting written submissions from the public and establishing a deadline for those submissions;

g) That the Committee hold at least four meetings with witnesses on C-50 before clause-by-clause consideration for C-50 is scheduled;

h) That the Committee hold at least four meetings with witnesses on C-49 before clause-by-clause consideration for C-49 is scheduled; and

i) That the Chair set deadlines for the submission of proposed amendments for C-50 and C-49 in advance of the beginning of their respective clause-by-clause considerations, but no sooner than after the completion of the respective witness meetings for each, and that the Members of the Committee, as well as Members who are not part of a caucus represented on the Committee, submit to the Clerk all of their proposed amendments to C-50 and C-49 no later than 5 pm on the respective days established by the Chair, in both official languages, and that these be distributed to Members.

That's what we set out to discuss, I believe, six meetings ago.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, if you could just pause for one second, we have a point of order from Mr. Patzer.

Go ahead, Mr. Patzer.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you, Mr. Angus, for reading the original motion.

I'd also remind committee members that there is a substantive amendment to the motion from the Conservatives.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I have point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Do you want me to read that in as well, so we can get that in there?

The Chair: On the point of order, we have a point of order by Mr. Angus.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I thought we were going to finish points of order before we got to the next point of order.

The Chair: Yes, if your point of order is directly on the procedural issue—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: It is. It's about—

The Chair: —you can raise it and then we can move on.

We do have a point of order and I appreciate you pausing because the member has also initiated a point of order based on what you've just said. I'm going to ask you to hold for one second so we can hear the point of order by Mr. Angus.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Wow.

Mr. Charlie Angus: The fact is that I have the floor, and as I have the floor—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: And I raised a point of order. It's not a big deal.

An hon. member: Shush.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Don't shush me.

The Chair: Colleagues, I'm going to ask everybody to hold right now because this is extremely important.

Multiple mikes turning on at the same time for debate on who or who does not have the floor is an issue. At previous meetings, I've clearly stated that the chair will recognize the speaker. When my mike turns on, this red light turns on. I really try to pause and wait so I don't have to cut you off.

We cannot have multiple mikes and multiple committee members speaking at the same time. I'm going to remind everybody why. It's for health and safety concerns that I have as chair. I know all of you committee members have concern for interpreters who are doing a tremendous job. It is a challenge for interpreters to interpret effectively, but it can also pose a risk for the health and safety of the interpreters.

Before we proceed, I thought this would be a good time to provide this intervention specifically on this issue. I'm hoping that everybody on all sides of the table.... As a reminder before we move forward, when I turn on my mike, the light comes on. Try to get my attention. When I get the individual to pause if there is a point of order, I will recognize the individual. I won't have my mike on while others have their mikes on. I am going to do the best I can to make sure that I recognize members. If I do turn on my mike and I do not get your attention, I will have to ask you to pause.

Based on that, Mr. Angus, I'm going to ask you to finish your point of order on the procedural issue and then we have a point of order from Ms. Stubbs.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Then do I get to finish my point of order?

The Chair: Once again, I will recognize a member to come back to, but Ms. Stubbs also has a point of order.

Mr. Angus, go ahead procedurally on the point of order, then I'm going to go to the point of order Ms. Stubbs has on Mr. Angus's point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: It's very simple, Chair. I have the floor, so I'm discussing the motion. Mr. Patzer is attempting to interfere and undermine by saying that he wants to talk about something else.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I have a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm sorry. I need to finish this because of the abusive behaviour of Mr. Patzer and his immaturity.

I have the floor.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus, for your point of order.

I'm going to Ms. Stubbs on a point of order first and then I'm going to go back to Mr. Patzer on a point of order.

Go ahead.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thank you, Chair.

I guess you'll enlighten me as to whether or not I'm asking this question appropriately.

Certainly Conservatives support and value the expertise and the objective service of our clerk, the interpreters, the analysts and all of the support staff for committees. We are, of course, also deeply concerned about any impacts on health and safety in the workplace.

Could someone clarify if the logistical challenge is the ability to translate comments when mikes are competing? Is there a distinction between the ability to deliver on the core function of interpretation versus concerns about physical health and safety in the workplace?

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Stubbs, for your point of order. If you give me a moment, I'll get clarification.

When multiple mikes are on, it is difficult for the interpreters to translate effectively for the committee. It also does pose a health and safety concern. It's a concern both for interpretation and for the health and safety of our interpreters when multiple mikes are on.

Thank you for your point of order. That deals with that point of order.

Do you have another...?

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I do, and it's related to that, Chair.

We, of course, have heard different information. We have heard that the primary challenge is the ability for interpreters to effectively translate and therefore do their jobs effectively. We all know they are 100% dedicated, too. Is there a way for us to have written clarification from the Clerk of the House of Commons on this issue?

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Stubbs, for your point of order.

We have a point of order from Ms. Dabrusin.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: I believe the issue is that it's disrespectful to the interpreters. From my perspective, I think we can all agree that we shouldn't be speaking over each other. I don't think we need to go far down that road.

Mr. Angus has had the floor now for, I believe, almost three weeks. We've been trying to get through his argument on a sub-amendment. He was going through that, and I would really like the opportunity to hear from Mr. Angus and finally give him the floor. If no one is challenging the chair on the fact that Mr. Angus actually does have the floor 16 hours in, I believe it's time that we went back to Mr. Angus and allowed him to complete his argument.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Dabrusin.

I do have a point of order by Monsieur Simard. Monsieur Simard is raising a point of order on Ms. Dabrusin's. Mr. Patzer, I do have you recognized on the original point of order from Mr. Angus, but we're in a whole other list of point of orders.

Monsieur Simard raised a point of order based on what Ms. Stubbs and Ms. Dabrusin said, so I'm going to go to Monsieur Simard. Then I'm going to come back.

Go ahead, Monsieur Simard.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: I just want to intervene and perhaps inform my colleague Ms. Stubbs.

You don't get the real experience when you listen to the interpretation in French because I'm the only francophone here. I don't think I can shout over my own voice.

When four or five of you speak at the same time, it's only logical, and you can easily understand, that it's impossible for someone providing simultaneous translation to interpret the remarks of five or six persons shouting at the same time. It's hard enough for the interpreters to interpret the remarks of the person who has the floor.

It's simply a matter of logic. For these people to be able to do their work with the skills they have, it would be more intelligent to yield the floor to the person named by the chair than to shout in the background. I can't hear what you say to each other. When more than one of you speaks, I can't hear what the others say because it's impossible for the interpreters to do their work.

I don't think we need any more information because it's logically inconceivable for anyone to interpret the voices of six individuals simultaneously.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you, Monsieur Simard.

We have a point of order from Ms. Stubbs, and then we'll go to Mr. Patzer.

Go ahead, Ms. Stubbs.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Chair, I just want to thank you for offering the opportunity for clarity around interpretation and translation, and also Monsieur Simard for his clarity about, obviously, the complications. It does make common sense, as he says, that it would be difficult to interpret multiple people talking at the same time in multiple mikes.

You know, I myself experienced childhood physical abuse. Of course, after eight years, all of you will know that I'm a strong advocate for victims of crime, victims of abuse, and I am particularly concerned about the health and safety of individuals, vulnerable women and vulnerable people everywhere.

I just want to raise this concern because I'm deeply concerned about the use of abusive language and abusive behaviour, as well as any potential concerns about the health and safety of interpreters, particularly in light of that work and from my own personal experiences as well. I'm sure we all have loved ones who have faced different degrees of violence. I also lost a childhood best friend to murder in 2011, after she faced repeated violence and physical abuse from a domestic partner.

I am raising this issue because it is one that Conservatives are concerned about deeply in terms of health and safety in the workplace, as well as the language that is being used here—in my view, in a very casual way—about members of Parliament in this developed country and this free democracy, as we all seek to do the best that we can in advocating for the people who have elected us and for the public interest of Canadians right across the country.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Stubbs.

From a previous point of order and also just on one that's been raised by many, the interpreters will let us know if they have concerns about their health and safety as they arise through a meeting when multiple mikes are turned on. Several meetings ago, I raised this with committee members, and I constantly remind committee members of this health and safety concern because it was raised through conversation we had with interpreters several meetings ago.

I would like to say that for today's meeting, I think, so far, we've moved very well. It's nice to have that reminder because I know all of us have come off a constituency week where we were and where we're moving forward.

I appreciate all committee members' concerns about health and safety, and we will proceed forward.

I want to go to Mr. Patzer because he had a point of order. Then, I hope to resume our debate on the subamendment, which we were on when Mr. Angus had the floor.

Mr. Patzer, go ahead. Finish your point of order, so we can go back to where we were.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: This is a separate point of order from my original one.

Building off what my colleague Ms. Stubbs just said in regard to using the term “abuse” so flippantly as Mr. Angus is doing here, we are simply here as elected members of Parliament doing our jobs. Because I had a simple point of order, it does not mean that I am engaging in abusive conduct towards the member for Timmins—James Bay. When he alleges that, he is directly and deliberately undermining people who are actually legitimately suffering and going through abuse this very day.

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

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I think it's absolutely appalling that he would dare to bring that language into this committee. He needs to apologize and withdraw that. I know he doesn't agree with me on my point of order, which is fine, but because he simply disagrees with me does not mean that I am being abusive to him. I think that is absolutely ridiculous.

Mr. Chair, I would ask you to be judicious in the way you monitor this committee and to make sure that members are not belittling and undermining people who are legitimately going through and suffering from abuse.

Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, thank you for your point of order.

Mr. Angus has a point of order.

Mr. Angus, you do have the floor, but I want to go to you. Thank you for being patient.

Mr. Charlie Angus: No, Chair. How about this? I have the floor. I will speak. I don't need to keep engaging with what is turning into a gong show. It's like a Monty Python sketch without the humour.

I've been, over six meetings, attempting to speak to a motion. I have the floor. I will continue to speak. I don't need a point of order to speak when I have the floor. Is that not correct?

The Chair: You do have the floor, Mr. Angus, and Ms. Dabrusin does have a point of order on Mr. Patzer's point of order. I just want to go to Ms. Dabrusin—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Go to Ms. Dabrusin, and then we'll come back to me.

The Chair: Let's go to—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: You're not the chair, Charlie. Just remember that.

The Chair: All right, folks. Once again, I know the mikes were off, but let's work together as committee members here. Talk to your colleagues, but let's not engage in conversations across the floor, just so we can all focus on the work at hand.

Ms. Dabrusin, please go ahead on your point of order, if you still have a point of order. Then we can go back to where we were.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Mr. Chair, we're nearing 16 and a half hours now that you made a decision that Mr. Angus had the floor, and he has yet to be able to take the floor to complete his argument.

I would say, once again, if the members opposite want to challenge the chair's decision, they are free to do so. We are, at this point, engaging in all sorts of side conversations that are not getting us closer to what we really want to do, which is to make sure that workers have a seat at the table when we talk about sustainable jobs and the Canadian economy, and that we develop offshore wind in our Atlantic provinces to create jobs for Atlantic Canadians.

That is important for our economy. It's important for workers. I would ask that we go back to Mr. Angus, please, and let him have his say on the subamendment to the motion.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, before you proceed, if I could ask you to hold, we had an original point of order that was point of order. I just want to give Mr. Patzer an opportunity.

Mr. Patzer, if you would just focus on the procedural aspect of your point of order, we can return back to the order we were in with Mr. Angus having the floor. Please, go ahead on your point of order, if you had anything else to finish when the point of order occurred.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Yes, absolutely.

Mr. Angus started the meeting with the floor. He was not interrupted until he finished reading the motion, but he conveniently left out the amendment the Conservatives put forward to make sure that Bill C-49 is actually given precedence. We want to undertake a study on Bill C-69, but of consequence, we want Bill C-49 to go ahead of Bill C-50, for the sake of ordering.

I just want to make sure all committee members remember that Bill C-49 should come ahead of Bill C-50, and we would like to see Bill C-49 first.

Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, that's not a point of order procedurally on where we are.

I do want to remind committee members where we are, though. I think this a great opportunity for a quick refresh.

We had a motion brought forward by Mr. Sorbara. That's where we started. Then we had an amendment placed. Then we had a subamendment placed. Currently, we are on the subamendment by Mr. Falk on the importance of Timmins. That's where we are now.

Mr. Angus does have the floor. He did start today on providing his rationale for the subamendment. Now that we've gone through all the points of order, I think the stage is set for where we are, moving forward. Everybody has a clear understanding. We are on the subamendment.

I will proceed to Mr. Angus on the subamendment.

I am hoping, colleagues, unless you have a procedural issue, that we don't use points of order for debate but we focus on the procedural issue that you may have.

Mr. Angus, the floor is yours.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you, Chair.

I have to say I'm absolutely not surprised that I was interrupted, even trying to read the motion, because this motion instruction is about getting, number one, Bill C-50, which is very important legislation about having workers at the table for the transition that is happening. Every time we have tried to bring workers here, we have seen gong show tactics from the Conservatives that have stopped them from speaking, so I'm not surprised that they're trying to interrupt this important work now.

When the carpenters' union came we had a Conservative gong show and they didn't speak. The International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers came and there were gong show tactics from the Conservatives. They didn't let them speak. They represent so many people in the oil patch, and they have so much to say, so I'm not surprised that we're dealing with these constant games to stop legislation that is about making sure the workers have a right to be here, because they have stopped workers speaking every moment.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, I am going to have to interrupt you. We have a point of order from Mr. Falk.

Mr. Ted Falk: This is a point of order, Mr. Chair.

You very clearly outlined where this committee was at, which is there was a motion on the floor by Mr. Sorbara, there was an amendment made, and then there is a subamendment. That subamendment is that we invite representatives from the riding of Timmins—James Bay to come to committee and be witnesses here.

I think Mr. Angus is forgetting the subamendment that we are actually speaking to at the moment. Could he actually use his time instead of criticizing everything that we've done up to this point and speak to the subamendment, which is about bringing the witnesses to the committee?

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Falk, for your point of order.

Mr. Angus, you do have the floor on the subamendment. You've heard the point of order pertaining to your having the floor and focusing on the subamendment.

I'll give the floor back to you.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you, Chair.

It's interesting, because, again, we have not been able to discuss this at all without the Conservatives losing their minds on this, interrupting, demanding that I speak on what they want me to speak about.

I am here to speak about important legislation, two pieces of legislation, Bill C-50 and Bill C-49. It is essential that we move Bill C-50 forward. What we've seen is interference by the Conservatives to discuss other things, to move ahead, to ignore something that was moved in legislation. Bill C-49 is absolutely essential, because we are dealing with the need to be able to compete on the maritime east coast when we're losing out to the Biden administration. That is something the Conservatives don't want us to talk about, so I'm not surprised they are interfering and attempting to, again, play gong show games here.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, I will ask you to hold. We have a point of order from Mr. Falk.

Mr. Falk, keep the point of order to the procedural issue at hand.

Mr. Ted Falk: On the procedural issue, and I'll say it again, Mr. Chair, you've outlined very clearly to this committee what it is that we are to be debating at this moment. We're debating the subamendment to the amendment to the motion.

Mr. Angus is consumed with speaking about everything else but the subamendment. The subamendment pertains to bringing witnesses in from his riding to speak to the whole issue—

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Falk.

Mr. Ted Falk: I keep getting interrupted.

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order. You made the same point of order previously.

I will ask the member to—

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

The Chair: I'm going to first.... We have a main motion on the floor. We have an amendment and a subamendment to the main motion. The member has the floor to make his argument on the subamendment and how it relates to the main motion on the floor.

I would ask you, colleagues, to use your time effectively to make your argument on why you support or don't support, potentially, the subamendment, and to provide your arguments so that committee members have the rationale, which may also impact their decisions on why they want to support or not support this subamendment.

I ask all members to allow the member to continue and finish his debate on this issue, so we can move to other members, who may also want to add to and provide debate on this.

Now, Mr. Patzer, you had a point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Yes, I absolutely did.

You've talked to all committee members at length about being respectful to their colleagues, and while Mr. Falk was talking, Mr. Angus was yelling at him from that end of the table...over top of him.

I want to make sure we put that on the record, because he is quick to point out that members are being abusive, but he is the one who is yelling at other members.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Chair—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I want to remind you, Mr. Chair, that the rules apply to everyone. I would ask that you make sure Mr. Angus is not the one who also—

The Chair: Mr. Patzer—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: —provides crosstalk and yells over top of people.

Thank you very much.

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, thank you for your point of order.

Colleagues, I have asked all members to, number one, not speak with multiple mikes on. I know many of you like to converse with each other. You can do that, because you have the right to do that, to converse with your colleagues, but keep the decorum of this committee and focus on doing the work for Canadians on the motion, amendment and subamendment we provided today.

We should not engage in debate that does not pertain to what we're doing. Focus on that.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Chair, can I get a ruling from you?

The Chair: Yes, I'm going back to you, Mr. Angus. Go ahead.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you.

I have the floor, but what I'm seeing is a continuous attempt by the Conservatives to get falsehoods on the record, to make stuff up and undermine, so I want a ruling.

Was I yelling in this committee?

The Chair: You asked about yourself, Mr. Angus. I have not heard you yelling. When I commented earlier, it was not about you or any one member specifically, unless I stated it was specifically about a member. I have not.

What I've asked all members to do is avoid turning on their mikes, speaking at the same time, speaking loudly into the mikes when multiple mikes are on, or having debate that is louder across the table when their mikes are off. It makes it difficult for committee members to focus on what the member who has the floor is saying and doing. I think that's something we can all abide by in order to keep the tone of this committee focused on the work at hand: the motion presented by Mr. Sorbara.

We're going back to you, Mr. Angus. You had the floor. I'll ask you to continue your arguments on....

We have a point of order from Ms. Stubbs.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I have a bit of confusion over how to get some evenness in terms of committee members' responses for decisions.

I recall at a recent meeting our colleague Garnett Genuis was accused of lying and unparliamentary language when he asked for clarity, much like Mr. Angus just did. Out of a certain level of self-awareness, I want to put on the record that I have a high threshold for volume because I am a loud talker, as you all know.

My colleague Mr. McKay is nodding his head in agreement, I think.

I wonder why Mr. Angus's request for subjective clarity from the chair was answered immediately, but our colleague Garnett Genuis couldn't seem to get similar support for clarity on allegations of lying and unparliamentary language, when he simply requested specificity about a response.

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order.

Ms. Stubbs, I don't recall from several meetings back the specific issue that you have brought forward.

I would remind members that implying that a member is lying is unparliamentary, and we should refrain from doing that. We should be courteous to each other here at our committee and try to work together. If there are challenges we have, I think there are ways to do that within our parliamentary procedures and processes.

We have Mr. Angus and Mr. Patzer.

Mr. Patzer, I have you first, and then I'll go to Mr. Angus on the point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you very much.

Multiple times Mr. Angus has tried to imply that we have been lying over here, providing misinformation and things like that.

I would ask that you be judicious in making sure that it applies to all members, especially as it pertained to me just a couple of minutes ago here, Mr. Chair.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Patzer.

I'll remind colleagues. That's why I wanted to clarify and make that statement. We should not be accusing members here of lying. We should be courteous and focus on the work at hand. Thank you.

Mr. Angus, do you have a point of order? I just want to make sure that it's on a point of order. The floor is back to you now.

Mr. Charlie Angus: If I'm allowed to speak, I will continue to speak.

The Chair: The floor is yours, Mr. Angus. You can proceed.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'll begin by thanking you, Chair. I did feel that it was important to get that ruling. I do believe that deliberate falsehoods are being put on the record to monkeywrench this committee.

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

Mr. Charlie Angus: I was very pleased that you ruled that I had not made a false statement, as was claimed by my Conservative colleagues. I thank you for that, because the public record is important.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, we have a point of order from Mr. Patzer.

Mr. Patzer, go ahead on the point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Let's just be clear. When Mr. Angus alleges falsehoods and things like that, we know what he's doing. He's deliberately saying that we are lying. Now, there's no falsehood that was said, yet here he is right there deliberately defying what you just told him literally 20 seconds ago, to not accuse people of lying.

I just ask, Mr. Chair, when members do that, that you make sure they are stopped and asked to apologize. We know they're not allowed to do that in the House of Commons. We know that whenever somebody accuses somebody of lying, they're not allowed to continue until they apologize.

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, I've acknowledged your point of order. That point of order was raised by Mr. Angus. I clarified what Mr. Angus asked for a ruling on. I gave him back the floor.

I've told all members once again not to target other members or say that they are lying. Members do have the right through their debate to debate the motions at hand. Mr. Angus did get the floor back. I did provide a ruling. He did get the floor back on the ruling that was provided. Now he's proceeding back to his debate.

Mr. Angus, I will go back to you now on debate, because we've addressed the point of order. If colleagues do want clarity, once again, I think I've provided it multiple times on that ruling and decision. If you want clarity, then I can provide it again. I think committee members do understand where we're at.

Go ahead, Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you, Chair.

We will continue to push forward on this. This legislation has to be passed.

This committee had 56 meetings with 133 witnesses and over 112 hours of testimony. We know what the energy file is. We know what the sustainable jobs issue is. We need to get this legislation passed.

We are hearing from labour groups across the country who are very concerned. I'm hearing from investors who are looking to shift investment to the United States because they are seeing that Canada is becoming a gridlock, with the Conservatives blocking Bill C-49, when there are such opportunities.

To that, this motion that I read, or my attempt to speak to this, was referred to us because two pieces of legislation were referred to our committee. As someone who has been in Parliament for multiple years and in opposition for all that time, I don't always agree with how government works. I know that when government moves legislation to the committee, it becomes the priority of the committee. The committee has to address that legislation.

What we saw from the Conservatives was an attempt to monkeywrench that motion on Bill C-50 and Bill C-49 by introducing another study on top of that. I reached out to the Conservatives. I said that I'd be more than willing to look at that study, but that study would have to come in order. It doesn't get to pre-empt the work that has been given to us by Parliament. There is a timeline ticking on this. We need to get this done. This is what we're hearing from labour.

We have a series of these amendments that are very... First, it was Sudbury. Suddenly, we're going to have people from Sudbury. It wasn't really clear who we were going to have from Sudbury, but we were going to get somebody from Sudbury. The Conservatives suddenly were really fascinated. It's funny. They didn't have anybody come when the coal transition happened. It was the New Democrats who brought representatives who went through the coal transition. They didn't bring anybody. Suddenly, they wanted someone from Sudbury.

I believe the motion was that they wanted representatives from the mining industry in Timmins, which I think is a great idea. I would love to have a set of meetings with representatives from the mining region of Timmins, maybe Val-d'Or, maybe Sudbury, but outside of this meeting on Bill C-50 and Bill C-49, because it would certainly be a huge education to my Conservative colleagues.

If they think that the mining representatives from northern Ontario are going to come down and back their climate-denying anti-investment in EV technology, I think they're going to be in for a big surprise.

We have Alamos Gold in Matachewan that's running 8,000 tonnes of gold a day underground. That's massive. When I go underground at Alamos, we talk about the really important need to move from diesel to electric trucks. That's a huge investment. Those ITCs will be huge for being able to move those kinds of underground pit trucks to battery power.

There's the Newmont mine. I would love to invite Newmont to come and talk about Borden. Borden is a mine that's running almost entirely green now. It is possible.

Again, this is something my Conservative colleagues would not probably know anything about. When you work underground in a diesel environment and work with oil from the drills, the lung cancers and stomach cancers are enormous, just from what you're breathing.

When you go into a clean battery-driven mine, the air is so much cleaner, and it drops your costs enormously. What you pay in battery investments, you actually make up in less cost for underground fans. When you have to run fans, let's say at Creighton, deep, 9,000 feet underground, you're pumping a lot of cool air down at those depths. When you run diesel motors at that depth, you have to run really heavy fans.

I talk to mining representatives, and I'm sure they would love to come to this committee to talk about how ITCs would help in those investments so that we could make switches. For example, I believe Vale, which is not in my region, but is in Ms. Lapointe's region, is running 72-ton haulage trucks now on batteries. That's a really transformative moment. People didn't think that was possible. Certainly the flat earth EV deniers would say that you couldn't run trucks that big. What they can do now, because of how they've tied the batteries to the braking energy on those pit trucks, is run from six hours to 10 hours. A 10-hour shift on a battery hauling 72 tons of ore is a major transformative moment.

I would love to have them come and talk about that technology and why they are absolutely committed to the clean-tech future, because they see the opportunities for mining.

Whenever I talk to people in the mining sector, they get it. If we're going to be competing against China and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, where there are horrific human rights abuses, we need to have a supply chain that is free of the abuses that are happening in places like Congo, but also that has a clean energy footprint. We can't say we're going to be a clean energy superpower and get critical minerals unless our mines are able to start running on clean energy.

That leads to questions on the grid.

I know, Chair, when you were sitting as just one of the members, we were going to study the grid, something my Conservative colleagues don't seem to want to deal with. But the grid is important, because we actually can't move some of this battery technology for big industrial projects without dealing with issues of the grid.

I think it would be really great to have representatives of the Timmins mining industry. They would also explain to the Conservatives that Bill C-69 has really nothing to do with how mine projects are developed. I know Conservatives are going on that it

takes 10 to 15 years to get a mine up and running, and they blame the Liberal government for that. Well, it always takes 10 to 15 years for a mine, because when you're talking about a multi-million dollar investment underground, you have to make sure you really know where you're putting your infrastructure. If you put the shaft in the wrong place, you're going to go bankrupt pretty quickly, and you're not going to be able to raise the money on the international market until you've done all the important steps that are necessary.

Take Doug Ford. He announced he was going to run a bulldozer through the Ring of Fire. Well, that didn't go so well. I wouldn't be betting any money on the Ring of Fire right now, because it was Conservative politicians who shot their mouths off about the Ring of Fire. If you go to Neskantaga First Nation, they're saying, "It ain't going to happen, because it's not done properly." To build a mine properly, you have to have a proper environmental plan, a proper financial plan, the support of first nations, because when you have the support of first nations, things move a lot quicker.

For example, we had representatives from the Timmins mining region come—

The Chair: Mr. Angus, I'll ask you to hold.

Ms. Stubbs, go ahead on a point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Mr. Chair, relative to your points earlier about being judicious and accurate in our comments about each other and our work here in the committee, Mr. Angus would know that we supported the study that is ongoing on the electricity grid, on efforts for decarbonization. In fact, Conservatives have proposed more work, as a first step, on the progress of inter-ties among provinces and north to south. I wouldn't want to accuse a fellow colleague of spreading falsehoods, but that allegation about Conservatives not interested in the work on the grid is such.

Second, the claim that you won't find a first nation that supports the Ring of Fire is just absolutely flagrantly false, given that, for example, there are two first nations communities—

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, we are getting into....

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: —that are proposing infrastructure specifically to be able to access the Ring of Fire. There are a number of first nations—

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, I'd ask you to hold.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: —that led proposals in the Ring of Fire, and of course that's all being held up by the red tape—

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, I'd ask you to hold.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: —the development of the regional assessment plans, which aren't complete yet.

Again, I wouldn't accuse colleagues of spreading falsehoods here at the committee, but that claim is false too.

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, I don't want to cut you off.

Let's not use points of order for debate. If you would like to debate, Mr. Angus does have the floor to debate the subamendment.

As a reminder, I want to make sure that all colleagues make their point of order on the procedural issue they have. If there is a procedural issue, make your procedural issue, and then we can move back to what we were discussing.

I do have Mr. Patzer on that point of order, Ms. Stubbs, and then I'll go back to you on the point of order as well.

Mr. Patzer, go ahead on the point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm going to say that I am paraphrasing, because I do not have your direct quote in front of me. At a previous meeting, you said that when a member has the floor on a point of order, as Ms. Stubbs did, that we were not going to be interrupting them, because of the issue of crosstalk and the fact that there are multiple problems that come with this.

You had asked us previously—and I would be happy to stand corrected by you if I am wrong here—that we would let points of order finish, and then proceed to the next one so that we could maintain order. This would also allow members to finish their points of order without being interrupted, because there's been a point of emphasis from you to make sure that we don't have crosstalk, excessive noise and things like that.

When Ms. Stubbs was giving her intervention, there were multiple attempts to try to cut her off and not allow her to finish her point of order.

I would like to know what's going on here.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Patzer.

I, as chair, did turn on my mike to allow Ms. Stubbs to finish her thought, but I did want to interject to let her know to use the point of order as a point of order, not to go into extensive debate.

I, as chair, will do that. I do not want to interrupt members mid-sentence. They can finish their thought, but I also want to make sure that we follow the rules and procedures we have here at committee. The chair acknowledges the speakers, but makes sure that a point of order is focused on a point of order and it is not used for further debate. At times, I do have to interject.

Colleagues, once again as a quick reminder, what I normally like to do, when I feel like it's getting into debate, is turn on my mike, as a first. I know sometimes folks have their heads down looking at their notes or are speaking to colleagues around the room and I do not get your attention right away. That's where I step in to ask you to pause. I will continue to do that. I'm hoping that's a good process that works.

I think today it has been working well, so I know we can all continue to make sure that happens.

I have Ms. Stubbs on a point of order and then I have Mr. Angus.

I'm going to Ms. Stubbs on the point of order and then I'm going to go to Mr. Angus.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thanks, Chair.

Given your comments and also from the comments of my colleague, I did want to clarify my aim in that the point of order was specifically related to what you had been talking about procedurally this meeting about alleging falsehoods and lying among members. I don't think my interjection was that extensive, although I suppose we could start timing so that we have proof for it.

I only used the examples that are publicly verifiable that, of course, Conservatives do support the work on assessing all of the existing gaps as well as required grid capacity towards electrification. There is the reality that first nations communities also support development in the Ring of Fire. Bill C-69 is holding back the Ring of Fire because of the gatekeeping requirements for the regional assessment.

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, I will ask you to pause—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: They are still not complete, which is what's holding back the development in that region, which is very strongly supported by both indigenous and non-indigenous communities for those opportunities and jobs there.

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, we do have a point of order.

Ms. Dabrusin.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

As for the point of order, first of all, I am noticing a repeated issue. I do not see certain committee members respecting the fact that when your microphone is turned on, they must stop. That is something you have ruled on and warned us about now several times, yet time and again I see people continuing to speak even after your microphone has turned on. Ms. Stubbs just did it twice.

I'm going to ask again, out of respect for our interpreters, that this stop.

Also, points of order are being used to debate points that were raised, where people might disagree with the person who has the floor.

That's why we have a list of people who will be speaking in debate on this subamendment about bringing witnesses from Timmins. I believe that's what the subamendment is. We do not get to jump in on a point of order to talk about the subamendment itself.

Mr. Angus has the floor, and I would suggest that we try to move along so we can actually vote on that subamendment, hopefully as quickly as possible.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Dabrusin.

We have a point of order from Mr. Patzer.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Based on what Ms. Dabrusin just said, but also by Mr. Angus's own admission, he was talking about somebody outside of Timmins—James Bay, so he wasn't speaking to the actual motion either. He was not on point. He even admitted that himself.

The other part is we were making sure that Mr. Angus was speaking on facts. My colleague was simply pointing out what Conservatives have actually done, such as a motion that is in front of the committee. It's not the one that's being studied, but we want Mr. Angus to have the facts.

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, thank you for your point of order.

Colleagues, if you want to debate the merits through the time you have on the floor when you do get the floor, please go ahead. Debate the merits of the motion and counter any arguments that may have been placed today, when you have the floor. You can raise your hand, we can put you on a speaking list and we can get you on to participate moving forward.

I want to make sure that colleagues can finish their arguments, but if you do have a point of order that relates to a procedural issue, we can identify that and deal with it at the time. If you do want to engage in debate, do that when you are recognized and have the floor.

Now we have a point of order from Ms. Stubbs.

Ms. Stubbs, I would ask you to just focus on the point of order and try to avoid engaging in debate.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thanks, Mr. Chair.

Related to your procedural comments earlier about respecting each other and not alleging, allying and falsehoods—Ms. Dabrusin emphasized that and so have you—then I won't belabour it at this point. But as my colleague, Mr. Patzer, just articulated, the issues we raised previously, and that I did just immediately, so that your direction could be delivered here about not alleging, falsehoods, or lying, how is it...?

I just gave three instances, which are not matters of opinion but they're in fact publicly verifiable, just to prove to colleagues that I'm not just making this up as I go along. There were three specific and very concise examples that are publicly verifiable facts. They're not matters of opinion or subjectivity. I endeavoured to do that, not to get into the substance of the debate. You're surely right that there will be lots of opportunity for that, and we'll certainly exercise that time and that ability and responsibility we have as members of Parliament as well as the official opposition. If we are to help you deliver successfully on your ruling about not alleging, allying, then how would you like that to be done?

I just thought that the really short three examples of publicly verifiable facts would be a way to show that, since we also do seem to face untrue allegations of partisanship and so-called monkey business.... That's just why I had endeavoured to give those short points.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Stubbs, on your point of order.

The only thing I'd say is focus on the point of order and note the arguments that you may have, and place those arguments when you

have the floor and you can engage in that debate, but not use points of order to do that—to engage in debate.

I am going to Mr. Angus, but before I go back to him, I'm going to go to Monsieur Simard on a point of order.

Go ahead, Mr. Simard.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: I have a very brief point of order. I would just like to make one thing clear for everyone.

I see that the voting members are Mr. Dreeschen, Mr. Falk, Mr. Patzer and Ms. Stubbs.

According to one procedure, if the committee agrees, only voting members may speak. Since many points of order are being raised, this is a long and laborious process. I'm going to object to the idea that an MP who isn't a voting member may speak, even to points of order. I think that's a guideline that the committee can follow. I would therefore like to propose that voting members be the only ones allowed to speak so we can promptly move forward.

I want to emphasize that the committee's proceedings haven't advanced at all for nearly a month, since October 30. I would ask that my colleagues co-operate, and I would just like to remind them that we aren't sitting in camera. This meeting is public, and I think that anyone watching this later may see that certain individuals have acted in bad faith several times by repeatedly raising points of order.

I don't think it reflects well on the legislative function for us to be proceeding in this manner. To sum up what I just said, I want us to move forward smoothly. I'm going to object to the idea that all individuals who aren't voting members may have the floor. I think the committee can decide the matter.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Simard, for your point of order.

I will just hold for a quick second here.

I'm actually going to suspend for a moment at this point, and we will continue shortly.

● (1200)

(Pause)

● (1210)

The Chair: Colleagues, we are resuming our meeting.

We had left with Monsieur Simard who raised a question on a point of order, which I am going to address.

A member can move when a member has the floor, but it cannot be moved on a point of order. Members who are participating who are voting members of the committee are allowed to participate in a vote. Members can participate, and if there is an objection from a committee member, they can raise that when they have the floor and not through a point of order. At that time, the committee can decide based on the objection that's raised by the committee member.

I hope that provides clarity specifically on that.

Mr. Patzer, has a point of order.

Is it a point of order on the point of order, or on Mr. Angus's...?

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: No, it's on your....

The Chair: Go ahead.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Also, the Standing Orders say that members who are not voting members but they are maybe an independent member or a non-official party status member or other colleagues who aren't the main voting members are allowed to participate in a public committee meeting but may not vote. That is what the Standing Orders allow for.

Also, there is the other point that maybe we're going to be subbing in members to speak and they want to get a spot on the list, but maybe we want to sub those members in before they get the floor and other members don't know that. I just want to make sure that we're protecting the rights and privileges of all members regardless of political stripe or whether they are a voting member or not.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Patzer, on that specific point of order.

Members have the right to participate, and members have the right to be subbed in and to participate as well. However, once a member of the committee has the floor, they also have the right for a non-member, who is a non-voting member at that time, to object to participating in debate. That's if they so object and the committee supports that. That's a conversation. If that's needed, I would ask committee members to do so at the appropriate time when they have the floor.

Thank you for your point of order, Mr. Patzer, and for asking for the clarification and providing your context.

I have a point of order from Mr. Genuis and from Mr. Angus.

Mr. Genuis, are you on Mr. Patzer's point of order?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No, it's a different point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, are you on—?

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm on Mr. Patzer's—

The Chair: Okay, I am going to go to Mr. Angus on Mr. Patzer's point of order and then we'll hold there.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you.

Since I have the floor and have been recognized, then I have the right to object. I'd like to know whether Mr. Genuis is subbed in. If he isn't, then I would object to his point of order.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus.

I'm going to Mr. Patzer on the point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: You literally just finished telling committee members that they cannot do that on a point of order. Mr. Angus raised the point of order, which meant that he does not....

Within that context, he does have the floor for the motion, but you granted him the mike on a point of order, not on returning to the debate of the substantive motion at hand, right? Therefore, Mr. Angus is not actually able and allowed to do that, because it was

only on a point of order and now Mr. Genuis has a point of order separately too.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Patzer.

For clarification, so that there is no misunderstanding on what I provided a ruling on earlier, it was that we cannot move a motion pertaining to a member's participation who is a non-voting member at the committee on a point of order. We have to have the floor. We would have to get back to the speaking order, and whoever has the floor, or any other member at that time, if they feel it necessary, can move that motion, but not from a point of order.

I hope that clarifies, just to make sure that everybody is up to speed, because I did go through it quite quickly. I hope that's now clarified.

When a member regains the floor, they can proceed with doing that.

With that clarity, Mr. Genuis, you have a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

I had wanted to participate earlier, but I was having some technical issues. Now that I'm not virtual and I'm here in person, I want to raise a point of order with respect to the important issue of the health and safety of interpreters.

You presented some information to the committee alleging that having multiple microphones engaged at the same time causes health and safety risks for interpreters. It is my understanding that this is inaccurate.

I wonder if the clerk could clarify—

[*Translation*]

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

[*English*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —whether it is a health and safety issue for interpreters to have multiple microphones engaged at the same time. I hope to get accurate information.

The clerk is allowed to speak to the committee on that important health and safety issue, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Genuis.

Welcome to the committee today.

I know of your earlier attempts to participate online, so thank you for joining us in person.

Monsieur Simard, go ahead on the point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: I would just like to inform my colleagues that we had that debate earlier. I don't know if he was en route from the airport to Parliament Hill, but we've exhausted that issue. I stressed—

[*English*]

The Chair: Monsieur Simard, we don't have translation. Perhaps you could hold your thought until we can all hear.

Monsieur Simard, start with a few words, so that we can make sure—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: Yes. I wanted to inform my colleague in a friendly manner that we had that debate earlier. I don't know if he could hear us speak while en route from the airport to Parliament Hill, but we've already had that debate.

If we want to be effective and efficient, we won't revisit our debates every five minutes because a new MP is joining us. That would be ridiculous. I think we can move on to something else and yield the floor back to Mr. Angus.

[*English*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I was listening the entire time. I'd like to hear from the clerk.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'll ask you to hold until you're recognized. Thank you.

Monsieur Simard, thank you for raising that.

This was addressed previously at this meeting today. We have had concerns from our interpreters at previous meetings that when multiple mikes are on, it does pose a concern and a hazard to health and safety, which I have brought forward to this committee.

We had this conversation earlier today. It was brought forward to committee members. We had a lengthy conversation about this. I think, on that issue, we're going to move forward.

I'm going to—

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

I want to hear from the clerk, because what you're saying isn't true. That's why the clerk should be—

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, we are not going to use a point of order to debate me as the chair. We have provided the context and information to committee members. That was addressed earlier this meeting.

Now I will go to the point of order from Ms. Stubbs.

We have Ms. Stubbs and Mr. Sorbara on a point of order.

Go ahead on the point of order, if you still have one.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thanks, Chair.

On that note, I think the reason Mr. Genuis is raising this issue is that I did ask earlier about the distinction between people speaking into mikes at the same time and its impact on the ability for translators to do their job function well, which I know they all want to do as they serve us, as we represent our constituents and Canadians here. I think what Mr. Genuis is concerned with is that there has been repetition subsequent to that conversation relative to these claims about health and safety, which is a distinction I asked to be drawn earlier.

We have been advised that there are no impacts on health and safety through competing voices in mikes. The problem, as Mr. Simard also articulated well earlier, is about the ability for transla-

tors to do their jobs effectively here, as is their expertise and their responsibility.

Again, in the context of us all respecting each other and our work here, maintaining order and not unnecessarily inflaming each other or drawing objective, non-partisan servants of this committee of all kinds into what is our responsibility for our function as members of the committee on behalf of our constituents and all Canadians, I think that's the clarity Mr. Genuis is looking for.

We have been advised, including by extremely senior officials and professionals in this regard here in this organization, that it is in fact a matter of the ability for translation to happen seamlessly.

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order.

It does pose a challenge for interpretation. That is one. I've raised this and clarified this earlier. In a previous meeting, it was raised as a concern by the interpreters, so that's why we brought it forward. It is a health and safety concern. That's been identified. That's been stated clearly at today's meeting and previously. I think we're good on this issue.

We're going to move now to Mr. Sorbara on a point of order.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Mr. Chair, as it is commonly known, many of us have worked on committees for many years. My understanding, in terms of the decorum—I don't know if it's in the procedural rules—is that the floor is given to a member when the chair recognizes an individual, independent of political party and who the chair might be.

It seems to me that on occasion—it has happened today—folks like to say “point of order” and then start speaking before they're even recognized by the chair.

I would hope that type of behaviour stops. People can make their points of order when you recognize them via the clerk and the clerk has written down their names and let you know. I think we need to continue on that front. I think we all understand those rules and that decorum. It allows our interpreters a flow of information.

I would like to go back to the motion I put forward. Unfortunately, it wasn't adopted that day. I think in normal times it would be adopted quite easily and we would move on to both bills, one of which is very important to the Atlantic provinces and to the people of Atlantic Canada. The second one is very important to all workers across Canada in all our ridings.

I believe the CPC has put forward a subamendment with regard to my motion. I would love to see that brought to a vote on the floor of this committee, so we can move on that.

I'll finish up. We all know that committees have minds of their own—or at least they should. We can go in that direction. However, I do want to raise the first point on the decorum. People should not speak until they are recognized by the chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Sorbara, for waiting patiently to have your opportunity on the point of order.

That is what I have asked of everybody. We do our best to make sure we recognize all members. When you raise your hand, we'll get you down. I'm not perfect by any means. I try to do the best I can to look across the floor to give everybody here an opportunity to participate.

I would remind colleagues at this point once again that points of order should be used only for procedural issues and not for debate on what you believe a member has said or not said. It's to be used for a procedural issue, not for debate on the motion at hand. Try to be succinct on the point of order. That's an important piece, because we can sometimes verge into debate as well. Use a point of order to be succinct on the specific point so we can move forward.

If you do want to participate on the subamendment, let me know. I'll acknowledge you. I'll put you on the list and you'll have your opportunity to debate the subamendment on Timmins that's on the floor.

We do have another point of order before we go to Mr. Angus, so he can wrap up his points on the subamendment and others can speak. We do have others on the speaking list as well.

I'm going to Mr. Patzer on the point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you.

There was a soft allegation put out there about decorum. I think we've all done a good job of raising our points of order and waiting to be acknowledged. I just want to make sure we're not impugning the integrity of individuals around here.

I just want to make it clear that we've done, I think, a very good job of making sure we are respectful of the order and, as we raise the points of order, waiting for you to acknowledge us, Mr. Chair.

I look forward to hearing Mr. Angus's closing remarks.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Patzer.

I think that was a reminder that from that perspective, I think we've learned in today's meeting. We had the constituency week to think about the previous meetings. Sometimes a bit of a break at home helps us refocus. I do appreciate everybody's effort here, from what we've seen today, to work in the appropriate fashion.

I'm going now to Mr. Angus, where we started this meeting today, to finish his remarks.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you.

An hour and a half in, I hope I will finally be able to finish.

To that point, I certainly support the subamendment, but I would carve it out after we do this.

If the Conservatives are serious about dealing with mining, indigenous and clean energy issues, I think representatives from the regions I represent would be more than willing to correct the record in terms of the Ring of Fire. It's not Bill C-69 holding it up. It was a decision by Doug Ford to exclude the Eabametoong and Neskantaga first nations that caused the trouble, which resulted in a \$95-billion lawsuit by Treaty 9 against the Ontario government. It is very problematic, because we have multiple mining projects that are set to go ahead and will go ahead with good programming.

To end my comments—

The Chair: Mr. Angus, before you end, we have a point of order by Ms. Stubbs.

Ms. Stubbs, go ahead on the point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Mr. Chair, I am mindful of what the Speaker has been saying in the House of Commons, over the last little while, about ensuring issues and comments raised in the capacity of our roles as federal members of Parliament have to do with actual federal government policy. Certainly, there is example after example of this government's anti-private sector, anti-development, anti-energy and anti-resource policy holding back clean tech, critical minerals and LNG.

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, I would ask you to get to your point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Perhaps you have some comments to share about boundaries around comments made about different levels of government that aren't our purview here, in a federal committee.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Stubbs.

The subamendment is on Timmins. The importance of what the member said on the mining industry.... He's tying it into mining.

If the member would like to conclude his remarks, I'll turn it over to Mr. Angus to finish up.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you, Chair.

Yes, it's now past 12:30, and I'm still trying to say that I am concluding without being interrupted. I am concluding.

As I give up the floor, which I still have, I support my colleague Mr. Simard in that non-voting members should not be recognized to speak without the unanimous consent of the committee.

I believe that is a non-debatable motion. We should vote on that.

The Chair: Okay.

What Mr. Angus has brought forward is that members who are non-voting members and who aren't subbed in are not able to participate in the proceedings of the meeting, unless there is unanimous consent to do so through a vote.

The member has asked for that. He has the right to do that, and it goes right to a vote.

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

That's a substantive motion, not a dilatory motion, as far as I understand it.

The Chair: We'll go to a vote.

It was a procedural motion raised when the member had the floor. It can be raised.

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

Where in the book does it say this is a —

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I would ask you not to turn on your mike.

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

The Chair: There is no point of order. The member has asked for a vote and we will proceed to a vote.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Yes, there are points of order. Mr. Chair, you're making things up again. It's a point of order.

An hon. member: It moves to a vote. You called for a vote.

The Chair: We can go by the raising of hands on this.

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

You're bound by the rules.

The Chair: On the point of order, Mr. Genuis, because we have not started the vote.

On the point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

The motion that Mr. Angus has put forward I believe is clearly a substantive motion. You've said it's a dilatory motion. I would like to know where this allegedly dilatory motion is listed in the rules.

House of Commons Procedure and Practice provides a pretty clear and limited number of dilatory motions. I think you'll find them on page 1168, but I'm working from memory there, so I might be off a little bit. I believe it's on page 1168. There are motions like proceeding to a certain matter or adjourning debate. In any event, even when it is a traditionally dilatory motion, with a condition attached to it, for instance “adjourn debate until tomorrow”, as soon as you attach a condition, it becomes a substantive motion.

Mr. Angus provided a series of conditions in association with his motion. Frankly, although his motion would normally be substantive anyway, the attachment of conditions to it clearly makes it a substantive motion, which means it's debatable.

Again, Mr. Chair, if you are seeking clarity on this, I would suggest you suspend or allow the clerk to speak on it. You can't just make this up as you go along here. There is a rule book. You have to follow it. It makes it pretty clear that Mr. Angus's motion is a substantive motion, not a dilatory motion.

I would love to hear from the clerk. I would love to hear the sections of the book cited, and I'll leave my comments there for now.

Mr. Marc-Olivier Girard (Committee Clerk): I was telling the chair that, indeed, given the fact that Mr. Angus moved that motion but added something like, except by unanimous consent of the committee members, one can make the point that it makes the motion more debatable. It adds a requirement.

That was what I was telling the chair at this very moment. Thank you.

The Chair: So—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you. Chair, I'd like to be added to the speakers list on this motion.

The Chair: Hold on.

To clarify, Mr. Angus had the floor. We have a number of points of order. I would ask members not to turn on their mikes. A member can move a motion when they have the floor, as long as it's procedurally correct in how it's....

It's not a substantive one. That's procedurally where we're at, based on that.

I want to go to the other points of order that are in place. We had a number of people with points of order and I don't see the folks....

Ms. Stubbs, go ahead. I just wanted to make sure, because I think another member had a point of order as well.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Yes, maybe they did.

Thanks, Mr. Chair.

I don't know if you'll have the clerk clarify for us further, but of course Mr. Genuis asked for actual references from *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, Bosc and Gagnon, or wherever else. There may be applicable Standing orders.

We await that, but we understand, of course, “A dilatory motion is a motion designed to dispose of the original question before the committee, either for the time being or permanently.” They “do not require notice, nor can they be amended or debated....” “If a dilatory motion is accompanied by a condition, it becomes a substantive motion. It is then subject to the rules on the admissibility”, at which point it does become “debatable and amendable.”

Perhaps the clerk can expand specifically on rules or citations, as Mr. Genuis originally asked. We would also ask for an example of a precedent in this regard, whether moving that a non-member be unable to speak has ever been voted on as a dilatory motion.

The Chair: We will go to the other points of order before we respond, because I think the clerk has provided that clearly in his remarks in a moment.

We will go to Mr. Angus on the point of....

I want to make sure, because....

Mr. Angus, before we go to you, I'm going to go to Mr. Patzer.

Mr. Patzer, go ahead on the point of order.

Then, we'll go to you, Mr. Angus.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Further to that point, on page 1065 under “Substantive Motions”, it says, “A substantive motion is a separate, self-contained motion.” I think Mr. Angus’s motion fits that description quite well. It says, “It does not arise from another motion”—which also fits the description. “Generally, a substantive motion is debatable and amendable.”

It’s quite clear based on the text found in *House of Commons Procedure and Practice* on page 1065 that what Mr. Angus said fits the very definition of what a substantive motion is. Therefore, it is debatable and is not a dilatory motion.

The Chair: Correct. Thank you, Mr. Patzer.

That is the ruling from what the clerk has provided the committee. The way it was phrased, the motion could not be placed in that fashion. That’s what the clerk did provide for clarity.

Mr. Angus, I’m going to you. You still have the floor on the point of order.

Are you on a point of order?

Mr. Charlie Angus: I’m just finishing, because I’ve been interrupted multiple times.

The issue is that, as you’ve said, for us to make reasonable complaints about certain parties trying to bring in as many members as possible getting on there has to be some rule. The rule was that when someone had the floor they could raise that as an objection. I raised an objection. A simple objection is that non-voting members not be allowed to be recognized.

That’s what I would go for. That’s simple and it’s within my right to ask. That would be a simple dilatory motion.

Mr. Ted Falk: I have a point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, you are correct on how that was placed. There was a difference on how the motion was placed. That is correct on the motion you have placed.

Colleagues, that motion is correct and has been placed. We will proceed to a vote on that—

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

What is the motion, exactly?

The Chair: Once again, Mr. Genuis, I have not recognized you and you’ve turned your...

The motion is that non-members not be allowed to participate in the public portion of our meeting. That is what the member has asked for.

Yes, go ahead.

Mr. Charlie Angus: You had asked if I was on a point of order or the floor, and I said I still had the floor.

I was clarifying that the motion is that the chair does not recognize non-voting members to speak. It’s simple and dilatory.

The Chair: Colleagues, we will suspend for a few minutes.

● (1240)

(Pause)

● (1255)

The Chair: Colleagues, based on what’s been presented, at this point, I’m not ready to rule on this today. I will come back at the next meeting once we can work with the clerk to do a bit more research on the specifics of what was moved and proposed.

I want to be clear on that, just so we make sure we are correct in what we’re doing. The clerk does need a bit more time to go into the details and provide information to the chair.

I’m going back to Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I want to get back to the main motion, so I withdraw my motion.

The Chair: Do we have unanimous consent for the member to withdraw his motion?

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: We’ll make our decision based on the procedural clarification.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order. The motion is not moved unless you allow it to be moved. A withdrawal is not required. The motion has simply not been moved. To say you need unanimous consent to withdraw the motion implies that the motion was moved. You’ve said you haven’t ruled whether that motion could be moved, yet you want to suspend your determination.

I’m comfortable with Mr. Angus proceeding without the motion being moved, but it is an important point for the precedent we establish that the motion is not being withdrawn. The motion was not moved and therefore, no unanimous consent is required.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Genuis, for your point of order.

The interpretation you have provided is correct.

Mr. Angus, you still have the floor.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I’m done.

You can go to the next speaker.

The Chair: We have a point of order by Mr. Dreeshen.

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: I wanted to wait until Mr. Angus was finished.

I’m wondering, Mr. Chair, because we’ve had discussions with the clerk and so on, if we could hear from our clerk as to whether or not he’s been informed by the head clerk regarding the crosstalk. Is it actually a health and safety issue or is that a term we are simply using, because it seems, perhaps, logical to use? I want to know for sure if there has been any discussion between the clerk and the head clerk with regard to that.

If we use terminology that is inflammatory, that causes some grief. I don’t need to have the answer today, but I would like to hear from the clerk at some time with regard to that.

Thank you, sir.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Dreeshen, for your point of order.

I'll remind colleagues, before I move to Ms. Dabrusin, who is next.... It might be next meeting, Ms. Dabrusin. Thank you for your patience.

This was raised previously and is for all members. Number one, for the interpreters to be able to interpret, there needs to be one individual speaking at a time, so it's clear for them to hear what's happening. At a previous meeting, when asked, the interpreters raised this as a concern. As chair, I want to make sure that everybody who works here in this committee is working in a safe environment, particularly the interpreters, who are doing a tremendous job of interpretation, and that it's clear for them to hear and we don't get a number of people speaking at the same time. Concerns have been raised previously.

I think I'm clear on that. If the clerks get any more information, they can provide it to me moving forward, and I will bring it to committee.

Folks, we're approaching our time.

Thank you for working hard at today's committee.

Thank you, Mr. Angus, for your patience while concluding your remarks.

We will proceed at the next meeting with Ms. Dabrusin, who will start us off.

Have a great day. The meeting is suspended.

[*The meeting was suspended at 1:01 p.m., Monday, November 20*]

[*The meeting resumed at 4:36 p.m., Wednesday, November 22*]

• _____ (Pause) _____

•

The Chair: I call this meeting to order.

Welcome back to meeting number 80 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Natural Resources. Today we are meeting in public to discuss committee business.

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

Before we proceed to resuming debate on the subamendment of Mr. Falk, I would like to address the concerns expressed by some members at the last meeting in relation to suspensions due to a concern for the health and safety of the interpreters. Some committees, including this one, have been experiencing episodes of disorder in recent weeks. It is not uncommon for members to speak over each other or to open their own microphone without waiting to be recognized by the chair.

As I mentioned, the question arose as to whether this could constitute a health and safety problem. By default, I have been on the cautionary side of things. However, the House administration has

consulted the translation bureau and multimedia services, who confirm that disorder in committee is not itself a health and safety issue. A feedback incident or someone banging on a microphone could contribute to risk, but this is not the case with many people speaking at the same time.

This type of situation can, however, affect the ability of interpreters to provide interpretation if they are unable to keep up with the flow of conversation. When this happens, there will be an interruption in service. The interpreters will inform the committee when this happens, as they already do in cases where the sound quality of remote participants is not good.

As chair, I will remain vigilant. I want to make sure that interpretation is available to ensure equal and fair participation of all members in accordance with the Official Languages Act and the Constitution. I would like to remind members that there should be no situation where several members open their microphone and speak all at once. Only the chair has the authority to recognize the member who has the floor. At no time are members allowed to open their microphone and speak without first being recognized by the chair, either in the course of a debate or on a point of order.

In the case of disorder, the chair is still allowed to suspend the meeting, as I have mentioned previously, and as stated at pages 1058 and 1059 of the procedural book.

Thank you for your attention and co-operation in this regard.

Mr. Genuis, go ahead on a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

On a point of order, if I understand the information you just shared with the committee, you have in past sessions of this meeting repeatedly provided false information to this committee about health and safety risks. Despite Conservative members regularly trying to correct your false information, you doubled down in the assertion that having multiple mikes open was a risk to health and safety, which it clearly was not, which we knew it wasn't, and which I believe the clerk knew and told you it wasn't.

You've described your actions as taking a cautionary approach, but you in fact presented false information to this committee, information that you should have known was false about the health and safety of interpreters. I think it would be more appropriate for you to actually offer an apology to the committee for your past statements and acknowledge your personal responsibility for what took place.

An hon. member: A point of order.

The Chair: Thank you.

We have a point of order from Monsieur Simard.

Mr. Angus, I have you recognized, and I will acknowledge you afterwards.

I'll respond right now to Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Genuis, concerns were raised last meeting regarding health and safety concerns by some members. At a previous meeting, it was advised that some members of interpretation did have a concern. We did ask the House interpretation and multimedia services to provide us with further context on where their concerns could arise.

I will be diligent if we do have concerns from the interpreters. If they're unable to do their work and they do have concerns, we will do whatever we can to make sure they can do their very important work to the best of their ability.

Thank you for your point of order.

I will now proceed to Monsieur Simard.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm somewhat surprised at the point of order raised by my colleague Mr. Genuis, who actually just told us that we can talk over each other with the chair's consent. That's what he just said because the points that you made, Mr. Chair, concerned the din that we had in committee.

For about a month now, we've spent our time trying to determine whose turn it is to speak in arguments that go on ad infinitum, and what Mr. Genuis is telling us is that we should keep it up because it has no impact on the interpreters' health.

Personally, in the past few weeks, I've seen—

[*English*]

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: No, that's not what he said.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: Let me finish. I know you have a right to heckle. Just let me finish. It'll be for your benefit too.

In the past few weeks, I've seen Conservative members make and distribute videos as though they had been denied the right to speak during committee meetings.

I just want to point out to everyone that we are legislators. We aren't YouTubers. Our objective here is to advance legislative measures, and we can discuss those legislative measures even if they don't agree with our ideological beliefs. We all have a chance to do so.

What I've seen in the past few weeks is disgraceful. What my colleague Mr. Genuis just requested is that we allow that behaviour to remain disgraceful because it won't harm the interpreters.

I hope that someone watching us at home sees that today and holds my Conservative colleagues accountable.

[*English*]

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

An hon. member: [*Inaudible—Editor*] point of order.

The Chair: No, I will go to one point of order at a time.

I know that Mrs. Stubbs....

Would you like to queue on the point of order?

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: It's not on this one. I had a—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: My point of order is on Mr. Simard's comments.

The Chair: Okay, colleagues.

Mr. Angus, I have acknowledged you, and I'll come to you. I had Mrs. Stubbs prior to you, so I'll go to Mrs. Stubbs and then you.

Mr. Patzer, go ahead on the point of order of Monsieur Simard.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: There we go.

I just think it's extremely important to note that sometimes the banter that does happen in this room is when the microphone isn't on. To insinuate that members are shouting into the microphones as a means of disrupting each other on purpose.... No one is turning their microphone on so that they can chirp somebody on the other side. If somebody is having a bit of banter back and forth, then quite often, probably about 99% of the time, it's actually with the microphone off. It's just individual banter between the two people.

Mr. Chair, when we're having our interventions, as we are right now, it's important to have the microphone on so that it can be interpreted for everybody to hear. But let's say John and I were having just a bit of banter back and forth. Before you were chair, sometimes we would do that.

Mr. John Aldag: [*Inaudible—Editor*]

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Yes—just like that right there.

I mean, that's not abusive or offensive to the interpreters when you just mention a quick little whisper. I don't really care that you do that. You didn't say it in a rude and angry way. It's kind of fun and good-natured. It's not, "Oh, no, now he's glaring at me"—

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, I would ask you to stay on the point of order, please.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: The point is that, look, we're all grown-ups. We can have a little good-natured banter back and forth on some of the points. Obviously, many of us have different views and opinions on things. Sometimes, to avoid blasting into the microphone on people, we just want to say, "John, nice haircut!" We don't want to cut somebody off or interject over top of somebody just to say that to John.

You have a nice haircut today too, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, and thank you for your point of order.

Colleagues, I would remind everybody about the statement I just made about multiple microphones being on. On many occasions over a number of meetings we have had multiple microphones on. It is very difficult for the interpreters to be able to interpret when that occurs. I think last meeting everybody focused on working together to ensure that we didn't do that. I think we had a much more successful meeting overall, because we accomplished quite a bit compared with previous meetings.

I encourage everybody to focus on the statement I made to ensure that when your microphones are on.... When you're acknowledged, turn on your microphone and go ahead and make your debate or point of order. When not, have your microphone off. We make our best efforts to make sure that everybody gets a chance to participate and be acknowledged.

Thank you for your point of order, Mr. Patzer.

I'll go to Mrs. Stubbs on the point of order, and then to Mr. Angus right after that.

Mrs. Stubbs, go ahead on the point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thank you, Chair.

Can I get on the list again after? I had asked for my point of order earlier on a different topic, but I will speak to Mr. Simard's point of order now.

Conservatives certainly agree with Monsieur Simard's assessment of what we are all here to do. It is, of course, why Conservatives made a good-faith amendment on the scheduling motion three weeks ago. On behalf of my colleague, Garnett Genuis, he actually didn't make the claims or say the words that Monsieur Simard was suggesting at all. What he said was that he was looking for clarity on what is obviously repeated misinformation regarding the health and safety of interpreters. It was indeed us who asked at the last meeting for clarity on that because of our deep concern for the health and safety of all of the objective, expert, non-partisan public servants of this committee and all of us as we do our duties on behalf of the people who elected us.

I just wanted to clarify that.

Certainly my colleague, Garnett Genuis, has demonstrated his capacity and ability to be extraordinarily eloquent and articulate in his own right and probably doesn't need me to make this point on his behalf. It is just the case that while we agree with Monsieur Simard's assessment of our core functions here, and Conservatives have clearly been trying to engage in good faith on both principal and procedural items here, his assertions were not at all what Garnett Genuis said.

The Chair: Thank you, Mrs. Stubbs.

I will just remind colleagues on the health and safety issue, just for clarity. Interpretation is difficult if multiple microphones are on. On the health and safety concern for interpretation and multimedia services, the concern has to do with the potential for banging—even a banging of your mike. I would encourage everyone to refrain from doing that.

That's the information that has been provided to us. I think that's just a good heads-up for everybody who's participating to make

sure that we don't do that. Thank you for your understanding, assistance, patience and co-operation.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thank you for that clarification.

I accidentally did that in the House of Commons yesterday, too. I hit my desk and someone said the same thing. I was like, "Oh, no!"

The Chair: Thank you, Mrs. Stubbs, for acknowledging that.

Mr. Angus, thank you for being patient. Go ahead on the point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you.

Speaking of patience, we're now 21 minutes into it and once again we've heard a whole series of objections from the Conservatives, led off by Mr. Genuis. I thought that was a drive-by smear at you, Chair.

I think the role of the chair is to keep a meeting going. Having multiple people speaking over the mics is an abusive tactic. If Mr. Genuis demands an apology of you, he's challenging the chair. Either Mr. Genuis can challenge the chair or the rest of us are ready to move on. I certainly supported your decisions and your attempt to keep this committee focused on what's at hand, which is legislation.

If there's a challenge, that's fair play. Otherwise, can we get down to business? I will certainly support the work of the chair in going forward.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus.

We'll go to Ms. Dabrusin on the point of order.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

What I take from what Mrs. Stubbs was saying is that the Conservatives are eager to talk about the legislation we have before us.

As I understand it, I am the next one who has the floor at this moment. I would appreciate being able to speak to the subamendment.

We have been taking a long time on the subamendment. In fact, I believe Mr. Patzer talked about Mr. Aldag's hair. This is the second haircut he has had while we have engaged in this long-winded discussion that has not allowed us to actually get to a vote on the subamendment.

I would ask, Mr. Chair, if I can have the floor and finally begin the debate on this.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Dabrusin, for your point of order.

Mr. Genuis, you had a point of order.

Colleagues, I just want to remind everyone—I think this is a good opportunity—that we do not use points of order for engaging in debate. If you'd like to debate and talk about the subamendment, please let me know. I'll put you on the list, and as we go through speakers, you'll have your opportunity to fully engage on debate.

Where we are on debate is with Ms. Dabrusin. As she mentioned, does have the floor on the subamendment moved by Mr. Falk.

Just to remind everybody who is at home watching across Canada, coast to coast to coast, we have had Mr. Sorbara place a motion. We had an amendment placed to that motion, and now we have a subamendment on the floor, which was moved by Mr. Falk. Ms. Dabrusin has the floor.

If there is still a point of order on anything, I want to go to the points of order, but I would like to proceed, then, to Ms. Dabrusin getting the floor.

Before you begin on your point of order, Mr. Genuis—this is not to you or any other member—I would ask all members, as a reminder, to use their point of order as a point of order and not to engage in debate within their points of order.

Go ahead.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

I would like to be added to the list.

By the way, just ever so briefly, Mr. Angus accused me of a drive-by smear, and I think that's very offensive. I think my criticism of the chair was actually quite direct and pointed and did not have a drive-by quality. I haven't driven away. I'm still here, and I still think you should apologize for presenting false information to the committee during previous sessions.

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order.

A ruling and information has been provided to the committee, and it is quite clear what it was. I thank everybody for their co-operation and patience from the last meeting and the previous meetings to get this information that was requested by members.

Mr. Dreeshen, you had a point of order.

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: Yes, I did, Mr. Chair.

At the very end of the last meeting, I had a point of order where I asked if the clerk could give us information as to what he has heard from the head clerk with regard to committees when it comes to the issue of health and safety. I appreciate the fact that you relayed, perhaps, what you had heard, but my point of order was directed to the clerk—for him to be able to bring back information. I appreciate the fact that you have done so. It has perhaps put you in a bit of position because of that, but nevertheless I'm still awaiting the clerk to let us know what he had heard. Now when you have that information, it perhaps makes it a lot more understandable why you would have made the pronouncements that you had.

My point at the very end of the last meeting was simply that sometimes we use words like “health and safety”, and so on, that do not fit the actual definition, and therefore it becomes a problem. I would ask, as I had mentioned in my point of order of the last day, at the very end, if the clerk could inform us of the position that the head clerk has for committees with respect to the concept of crosstalk versus health and safety.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Dreeshen, for your point of order.

I clearly provided the committee information at today's meeting that the clerk had gone to make sure that the appropriate individuals

were contacted—such as multimedia services, the translation bureau and the clerk's office—and that this information was provided so I could provide this.

I would like to remind committee members that several meetings ago.... We've had different clerks, and the clerk advised, based on consultation at that time with our interpreters, that they had concerns. I relayed those concerns to committee members to make sure that we operate here with mutual respect among each other and that we refrain from causing any potential health and safety concerns that may arise, as the clerk advised me.

I provided that information, and I will continue to provide and relay information to committee members.

For the interpreters to do their job effectively, we have to make sure that we refrain from multiple members speaking at the same time, so that they can provide accurate and timely interpretation.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On a point of order—

The Chair: The ruling has been made, Mr. Dreeshen. The information has been directly provided and relayed to committee. If there is something that was not provided.... What you have asked for has been provided to the committee through the clerk.

Thank you for your point of order.

I am going to go to Monsieur Simard on the point of order.

Monsieur Simard, go ahead.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: I invite Mr. Dreeshen, Mr. Falk and all my colleagues to listen to this.

It probably won't happen, but if one day 10 francophone MPs start talking at the same time, Mr. Dreeshen won't hear anything because the interpreters won't be able to translate the remarks of 10 individuals simultaneously.

What Mr. Dreeshen wants is to waste our time. I know it. I agree, but he could do so in a much more interesting way than he's doing it now by asking you a question that I consider absurd. I don't know that his question is absurd—I don't want to make him angry—but it seems absurd to me. He's asking if this undermines the interpreters' safety. It's quite simple: if 10 of you speak at the same time, you aren't using the interpretation, unless I'm the one speaking. I'm the only person speaking French here. The interpreters can't do their work if you talk at the same time. Every time 10 of you speak simultaneously, they tell me that interpretation is impossible.

The point of order that was raised concerned only that. You can ask the chair to apologize for mistakes that you feel he has made or for any harm that might have caused, but the Conservative Party doesn't understand the basic principle regarding interpretation: the committee has to be accessible to everyone, and everyone must have access to what is said in committee.

The main problem is that I can't understand anything when everyone speaks into a microphone at once. It's as simple as that.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you, Monsieur Simard, for providing that point of order. I was listening very carefully.

I hope I'm one of those members who will be able to engage with you and others *en français* in the near future, as many members do a tremendous job in both official languages. People like me are trying to work hard to be fully bilingual.

Colleagues, what I would say is that a ruling has been made and the information has been provided.

Ms. Dabrusin has the floor.

I have made a ruling and provided the information. If there is a concern, committee members—and we've heard from many members—you have the right to challenge the chair. We can proceed with the committee if they believe in a different ruling and the chair's ruling is not supported.

I think we're all looking to work on the subamendment. We've had a great debate for many meetings so far, and we would like to proceed.

Ms. Dabrusin has waited very patiently for several meetings to get the floor. I would ask colleagues to allow Ms. Dabrusin to now engage in her debate so that others can participate as well.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I have a point of order.

An hon. member: There are three more points of order.

The Chair: Okay.

Mrs. Stubbs, if your point of order is on a different point of order, other than health and safety, or anything that has not been stated.... Otherwise, we are going to move forward.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I would like to respond to Mr. Simard because, of course, we agree. The point of order at the top of the meeting is still the one that we haven't gotten to yet.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I also have a point of order on Mr. Angus's comments.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I don't want to move us backwards.

Thanks for the heckling about how I'm backwards and how we're backwards and all of the things from over there, from the peanut gallery, the high-carbon hypocrites. Here they are being hypocritical again.

My point of order at the top of the meeting is related to when we move on to Ms. Dabrusin, but I would also like to just set the record straight on Mr. Simard's claims.

The Chair: Mrs. Stubbs, I apologize. I just want to be clear. Is your point of order on Mr. Simard's point of order or on a different point of order?

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: There are two, because we still haven't gotten back to my first one at the top of the meeting, and—

The Chair: This is why, colleagues, I would like to deal with one point—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: —it's related to the subject at hand. What I'm asking you is what order you want me to do that in, be-

cause, of course, now Mr. Simard has made comments that have compelled me to respond.

The Chair: If there's a procedural issue.... If it's debate, I can put you on the list. You are more than welcome to debate the subamendment. If it's something that's procedurally relevant to the conversation that we've had, I can put you on the list.

If it's on interpretation, health and safety, and everything I discussed in my opening, I think that everything has been discussed, and I've made a ruling on that. Therefore, I would ask members to move on from there. If we still want to engage in the issue of health and safety or anything to do with interpretation that has been stated, then I would ask, colleagues, that you challenge the chair so that the committee can rule on how it would like to proceed.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I had a point of order on Mr. Angus's comments earlier.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: So, we're still missing going back to the point of order.

The Chair: Colleagues, I have a list of acknowledging, and if you do not acknowledge and I don't catch your attention, or the clerk, I'm not sure when or what you might have a point of order on.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Well, we're trying not to barge in.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Right.

The Chair: I am monitoring this. If it's on health and safety, on the interpretation or on the information provided, that ruling and decision has been made. Therefore, I will ask anybody who has a point of order on something related to something else that has been brought forward procedurally to state your concern so that we can deal with it and move on to other members and their points of order.

Mrs. Stubbs, I will go to you if you have a point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I will just give it a whirl, and you can make your decisions as the chair.

I know that all members here, except for Conservatives, are fans of censorship, so I guess we'll see how this goes.

First of all, at the top of the meeting on Monday, I was the person who asked for the distinction between the health and safety concern and the job function concern. This is not for you, Mr. Chair, because you have already clarified this today.

My comment to Mr. Simard is that, of course, we already agree, which was exactly the argument that we made yesterday, and it's also what we've emphasized today.

Now, I did make a point of order at the beginning of the meeting, and it is related to moving on with Ms. Dabrusin. Could you just outline—since we are technically in the same meeting—the existing speaking list that will proceed when Ms. Dabrusin starts speaking to her point?

The Chair: Yes, I have acknowledged members who are on the speaking order. If you would like to get your name on the list, let me know, and I will put your name down. However, I do have Ms. Dabrusin up next.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Mr. Chair, I want to know what the existing speaking list is.

The Chair: The chair will go, one at a time, to members and will provide members...because members do change their minds. After Ms. Dabrusin, I will acknowledge the next speaker I have. I'm going to go one at a time.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I would say that the way for there to be credibility in this committee is through transparency. One piece of advice is that the clerk could just email the information from the head clerk to all the members here about the interpretation issues. That would be transparent. The next thing is that, for transparency right now, you should outline the speaking list that was the list from the last meeting. Then we will all have a functional committee where we know what's going on, where there is transparency from you and the clerk. That's how you're able to run a meeting where people work together in good faith with credibility in the process.

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order.

As mentioned, Ms. Dabrusin is next on the list. We have several people on the list. The list does change, and the chair does acknowledge who is on the list. Mr. Genuis did put his name on the list. If other members would like to put their names on the list... I have Ms. Dabrusin, Mr. Simard, Mr. Aldag and Mr. Genuis. I do have a number of members on the list. If other members would like to put their names on the list to speak, I can put their names on the list.

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: I was on the list prior.

An hon. member: Why wouldn't you be on the list, Earl?

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I mean, we're in the same meeting.

An hon. member: Why isn't Earl on the list? Earl was on the list.

Mr. Ted Falk: I have a quick point of order, Mr. Chair. I have a point of order on what he just said.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: We're technically in the same meeting, so the speaking list from last meeting should apply today.

The Chair: Colleagues—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I've already talked about moving to you, Julie. I'm asking for the speakers list after you.

The Chair: We will suspend.

• (1705) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1715)

The Chair: Colleagues, we're back and resuming our meeting.

I want to clarify why I suspended earlier. We did have multiple mics on. I'm not sure if that was intentional or unintentional, but I wanted to make sure that we all could just take a few deep breaths and pull away and be able to start fresh.

We are going to move forward with Ms. Dabrusin, who has the floor. I'd like to give Ms. Dabrusin the floor so she can start on her debate on the subamendment that's been presented.

I will ask members, if they have a point of order... If it's related to health and safety or interpretation or anything that I've previously brought forward, that has been ruled on. If it's a point of order on something else, then, Mr. Patzer, I can allow you to make a succinct point of order and then I'll proceed to Ms. Dabrusin.

Go ahead.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I have two separate points of order. Which one do you want me to go with first, the one on the comment you previously made before you gavelled us out or the one prior to that?

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, I'm not sure. Just begin with your point of order so I know what point of order you're on.

I'm not sure what comment was made prior. You had a point of order from earlier. We have a number of points of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Well, I'll do the current point of order.

The Chair: I'll just say that we are doing the best we can to manage the various points of order. That's why I made the remarks on the ruling that's been made. That's been made. If it's on a different point of order, please proceed.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: First of all, you made a comment that the list keeps on changing. I imagine you understand how problematic that is. I do not recall any of my colleagues asking to be removed from a list. Yes, names get added to the list, but we certainly have not been removing ourselves from the speakers list. I have not heard anybody else around the table removing themselves from lists, so I don't know how the list keeps on changing.

There's also concern because you alluded to the fact that we've had multiple clerks. Who is keeping the list? Who has the actual list here?

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, thank you for your point of order.

As mentioned, the clerk assists me in maintaining a list on the points of order. On the list on the motion, I've been tracking who the speakers are. We have had members come into the meeting and leave the meeting. Some members may not be present, so the list changes.

Mr. Genuis has put up his hand today to speak, so he is on the list, as he did in the previous meeting. Mr. Dreeshen has also added his name.

If there are other members who would like to go on the list, you can ask if you're on the list. If you're not, I can add you to the list, as I've been doing. Ms. Dabrusin has been the list for several meetings. I've had Ms. Dabrusin there. Mr. Simard has also been on the list.

We have the main motion and we have the amendment. Then we have the subamendment, and what I'm referring to right now is the subamendment.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: There's also the issue that members who might not physically be present in the room but were on the list before have not told you that they do not want to be on the list. There's nothing to say that I'm on the speakers list when I have to go to the bathroom and I get up and leave. Well, Mr. Patzer is not in the room, so even though my turn might not be immediately next, that doesn't mean that I remove myself from the list.

I think we have to be careful what we're doing by saying that the list is constantly changing here. I recognize that we have had Mr. Genuis in the meeting quite a bit. He's also left the meeting already today. He wasn't one of the voting members of the committee, but there's nothing to say that he didn't put himself on that list with the full intention of returning to speak to whatever the thing is. I don't even know what the list contains. We've been trying to find what that is from you anyway.

The Chair: I'm just going to respond very quickly and then I'm going to you, Mr. Angus, on a point of order.

Just before you go ahead, after members speak, they are moved off the list. That's one way a member will be removed off a list. Mr. Genuis has been added to the list and Mr. Dreeshen has been added to the list. If the turn of the member comes, they will be acknowledged, as we've arranged the order.

Thank you.

I'll go to you, Mr. Angus, on the point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you.

I don't mind chipping in to provide a basic parliamentary guide for Mr. Patzer, but I don't think it would help him. This is again an attempt to interfere and undermine. The fact is that it took six meetings for me to even be allowed to speak because the Conservatives have obstructed, interfered and used abusive tactics again and again. Now Ms. Dabrusin has the floor, and they are attempting to stop her from speaking.

Mr. Patzer wants to know who's on the order. She's on the order. She has the floor. He doesn't. She keeps getting interrupted by his behaviour.

I would ask you, Chair, to restore order and to remind the Conservatives that their tactics are interfering with and undermining the rights of other members of the committee to participate.

When Ms. Dabrusin is finished, the next person gets the floor. This is basic parliamentary reality. This is how it's been done. The Conservatives can jump up and down and interfere and play games,

but they are stopping the work of our parliamentary committee that must go forward.

Chair, I continue to support you. If the Conservatives don't like it, they should challenge the chair; otherwise, they should grow up, start respecting their colleagues and let people speak.

I would like to hear what Ms. Dabrusin has to say.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus.

I'm going to go to Ms. Dabrusin on a point of order.

Go ahead.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Thank you, Chair.

I believe that we are now about an hour into this meeting. I have had the floor but have been unable to speak. I don't think we need to delve further down into the list, because we know who's next: It's me. I would ask that I be given the floor so that I can speak to this piece of legislation that is so important, not only to the economy in our Atlantic provinces but to workers right across our country.

They have been waiting to see us deal with these two pieces of legislation. I believe it's been three weeks and 19 hours, and we have yet to complete even this subamendment to be able to move along. I would ask that I have the floor, please.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Dabrusin. Yes, you do have the floor, and I am going to go to you, but I do have Mr. Dreeshen on a point of order that was just prior to you, and another point of order. After Mr. Dreeshen, I will recognize the next individual.

Mr. Dreeshen, go ahead on the point of order.

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: Thank you.

There are a couple of points.

First of all, you indicated that I asked to be on the list. However, I felt that I was already on it and always had been on it. That is the issue that happens when we don't have clarity. I have been in committees for 15 years and I have never seen a situation of the chair not giving a heads-up as to who would bespeaking next on a subamendment, an amendment or a motion. It's not necessary to go down the whole roster, but certainly to give a heads-up to the next person up to speak I think is fair.

The second and last point I want to make goes back to the comment I made earlier. Mr. Simard did not hear that which I was talking about because it had nothing to do with his comments, in which he had taken a run at me, but if an MP asks the analysts, for example, to give information, we expect that the analysts will give us information. If we ask the clerk to give us information, we expect the clerk to give us information. That is what I asked for at the very end of the last meeting. It was for the clerk to give us that information.

Mr. Chair, you chose to take that information and, I submit, somewhat editorialize. Therefore, we get to this stage where people are concerned about it. I don't understand why the clerk couldn't answer the question as I had posed it to him. Had that happened, that would have been over as far as I am concerned. That is my point of order.

Again, as far as the lists are concerned, I believe we all have the right to know what it is at various stages. As for our interactions with the clerks, the analysts and so on, I believe that if we ask them for a statement, we should have it directly from them.

Thank you very much.

The Chair: Mr. Dreeshen, thank you for your point of order.

I will just remind all colleagues that the information was provided to me by the clerk and that I brought it forward to committee members. The clerk has advised that he has nothing else to add regarding the specific information that was provided.

Now, on your speaking order concern, Mr. Dreeshen, you are correct. You are on the speaking order from earlier motions. I do have you listed to speak on the subamendment after other speakers as well, but I did add you to Mr. Falk's subamendment, because previously I did not have you acknowledged on the subamendment. I have been keeping track. I have acknowledged that you are on the list.

I hope that today maybe we can deal with the subamendment. You will have an opportunity to debate if we get to you today. Hopefully, we will. You'll also have an opportunity to fully engage in debate today on the subamendment, and once we get back to the amendment, you'll get to do the same again, just like all members of this committee have the right to do.

If you would like to be acknowledged to participate in debate, please let me know, and I will add you to the list.

Mr. Ted Falk: On the subamendment....

The Chair: You would like to add your name. Okay.

Mr. Dreeshen, do you have a point of order?

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: Yes.

The Chair: I have Mr. Dreeshen on another point of order.

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: It isn't particularly a point of order, but I do need to get your attention to do this. Because we had asked who was on the list and in what order, I removed my name from the discussion on the subamendment. Now you've indicated that I do have a position on the other one. That's all I was asking for. It was for you to give us—

The Chair: Okay. You know what? I keep the names on the list. As Mr. Patzer provided earlier, sometimes members step out to maybe use the washroom or to get a glass of water. They may not be here, but they're still on the list. If their turn comes up and they're here, we'll acknowledge those members. I want to make sure that those members do have the ability to participate in debate.

Mr. Dreeshen, I'm still going to keep you here. When that comes up, I can take you off at the time. You can decline at that point in time and another member can proceed who has raised their name after you. Thank you for your point of order.

Now, we have dealt with all these points of order.

We have a point of order. I want to go to Mr. Patzer on his original point of order so that we can finish that. Then we will have dealt with all the points of order, other than Ms. Stubbs' new point of order, and we can proceed with Ms. Dabrusin having the floor.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you, Chair.

Mr. Angus was using language earlier, not even in his most recent point of order but in one prior to that, probably half an hour ago, for which I initially tried to flag you on a point of order. It was something that we had brought up at a previous meeting, the issue of Mr. Angus insinuating that he is being abused in this committee.

We made the point that there are people who legitimately, actually, have experienced abuse or are currently undergoing abuse. When he insinuates that he is being abused because members of Parliament are simply doing their job, I would like you, Mr. Chair, to make a ruling. Is Mr. Angus actively being abused in this committee? Do you share his opinion?

It's a real point.

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, you've made a point of order. Mr. Angus, as mentioned, in several meetings, was trying to speak on the debate. The member did have an opportunity to speak in the last meeting, and he has moved on from that point.

I don't have information on how any member here feels unless you provide it through debate or an exchange. I'll let colleagues determine how you feel or how you feel about the comments others may have made and how they impact you and your debate.

Thank you for your point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Just on that, Chair, because—

The Chair: I am going to ask you to hold, Mr. Patzer. We are not going to engage, as I mentioned earlier.

A point of order is for a procedural issue, not for debate. I do have you on the list. At the time when you have the debate, if you would like to debate on the subamendment, you'll have the opportunity to do so, but we have dealt with the point of order.

I've already dealt with the issues of committee disorder earlier in my opening remarks. I think colleagues are quite aware that I've had to suspend many meetings over the last several weeks because of disorder, and I have done so again today.

I would ask members throughout the meeting to allow other members to participate, and to use parliamentary language, because as honourable members we all have the honour and privilege of being on this committee to do important work for Canadians. We'll remind everyone we have a motion on the floor by Mr. Sorbara on the Canadian Sustainable Jobs Act, Bill C-50, and on Bill C-49, the Atlantic accords. We also have an amendment placed by Ms. Stubbs and we now have a subamendment placed by Mr. Falk on Timmins—James Bay. That is where we're at.

I have Ms. Dabrusin. I know you've been very patient. Thank you.

I have one more point of order by Ms. Stubbs and then we will proceed to.... We'll go to Ms. Stubbs on a point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would just suggest that the consideration that you've been asked to give around language will be a key thing in terms of decorum here and certainly it ought to be evenly distributed.

I would just say, in the case of Mr. Angus' words, as I addressed last meeting, I have been picked up by the scruff of my neck and thrown onto the ground. I have been knocked off my feet and had a wooden swing belted at me because I didn't water all the —

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: —I have been held under the water until I couldn't breathe—

The Chair: Ms. Stubbs, I would ask you to hold.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: I am sorry, but I think that there should be a trigger warning for everyone in this room. We do not know the experience of everybody—

The Chair: We are suspended now.

● (1730) _____ (Pause) _____

● (1755)

The Chair: We are back from our suspension and we are resuming.

I want to inform committee members that we will be suspending for this evening.

Have a great evening. The meeting is suspended.

[*The meeting was suspended at 5:58 p.m., Wednesday, November 22*]

[*The meeting resumed at 11:07 a.m., Monday, November 27*]

● (68305)

The Chair: I call this meeting to order.

Welcome back to meeting number 80 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Natural Resources.

Today we are meeting in public to discuss committee business.

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

When we suspended on Wednesday, November 22, Ms. Dabrusin had the floor. We had resumed debate on the subamendment of Mr. Falk.

To remind colleagues, we have a motion on the floor. We had an amendment that was moved. We now have a subamendment by Mr. Falk. We are resuming through our speaking order.

Ms. Dabrusin, the floor is yours.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm happy to be able to take a moment to speak about this subamendment that was proposed, as you said, by Mr. Falk. The subamendment is to add specificity to witnesses being called from one riding as part of a study that's proposed within an amendment to our study.

I trust that all members of this committee will make decisions to call everyone we need to be heard as part of our study of offshore wind and Atlantic accords in Bill C-49 and sustainable jobs in Bill C-50. I don't think that we need to be naming specific ridings. There are 338 ridings, all of which may have really important witnesses to call.

I will not be supporting this subamendment. I think that we have, throughout all of our studies, been very able to call the witnesses who need to be heard for a study. There's a process for that.

I was trying to figure out where the location for this meeting was. I realized I had to look back to October 30. This is actually a continuation of our October 30 meeting. That's basically a month that we have been at the stage of continuing to debate, essentially, the subamendment. It has been a long wait. I'm happy to see that today I have been given the floor.

I know that people in our communities are eager to see us study offshore wind in Bill C-49 and sustainable jobs in Bill C-50. This is a moment for us to move forward. Both of them provide economic opportunities for our country.

This is a really nice morning to see us actually get into the debate on the subamendment and talk about how we could move forward with a concurrent study of these two bills. I'm looking forward to doing it, and I'm hoping that we can keep this pace going so that we can all move forward with these very important bills.

● (68310)

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Dabrusin.

We'll now go to Monsieur Simard.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I have a quick point of order, Chair.

I'm just wondering if you could enlighten the committee as to who the next four or five speakers are for the subamendment here. That would be beneficial to the committee.

The Chair: Colleagues, as mentioned previously, the speaking order can change if members are present or not present, or if people waive their place in the order at that point in time.

After Ms. Dabrusin is Monsieur Simard, and then I have Mr. Aldag, Mr. Genuis and several others. I believe everybody from your side is also on the speaking list.

Monsieur Simard, the floor is yours.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: Thank you.

As my colleague Ms. Dabrusin pointed out, we've been caught up in a never-ending tangle since October 30. We've spent a month trying to determine who should be able to speak. We spent a month discussing a subamendment that is perhaps there just to frustrate Mr. Angus. I may not be Mr. Angus's greatest admirer, but the purpose of this subamendment is simply to annoy him by saying that he's not prepared to support witnesses from his region and his riding. It's a political ploy like any other, but I don't think it contributes at all to the public debate.

I have a confession to make, Mr. Chair. My son is a political science student who listens to our debates. The idiotic things he has tuned into in recent weeks were discussed in one of his courses, in connection with how elected representatives can paralyze the democratic system, sometimes, I believe, with questionable intent.

Mr. Chair, I'm telling you this because people do watch the debates we are currently having. I know this because I've taught political science and studied politics for over 20 years. People are getting more cynical about politics. What they might be watching here over the past month would do nothing to reduce the level of cynicism about politics. I don't agree with anything in Bill C-49. Nor do I agree with anything in Bill C-50. In fact we voted against the latter in the House.

On the other hand, on what grounds could I possibly express my disagreement with these bills by attempting to obstruct committee studies? I believe that in doing so, I would be acting irresponsibly. I won't be taking that approach, and would rather try to improve the bills to make them acceptable to me. If that proved to be impossible, I would just vote against them. That's the straightforward democratic principle.

I am therefore hoping that we'll be able to quickly finish debate on this amendment, because I don't see what it has to offer. We can invite anyone we want to testify before the committee. It's up to the members to suggest which witnesses they would like to hear from. I don't see what that would contribute, other than causing us to waste valuable time. I would ask my colleagues to show their integrity. People can disagree with bills that are introduced, but at the very least, we can hear what the witnesses have to say and allow the democratic process to proceed freely.

I would ask you to vote as quickly as possible on this amendment so that we can return to what's on the table, meaning the study of two bills that are, after all, rather important, even though we may disagree with them. That's what I encourage everyone to do.

I'll conclude by pointing out that everything we do has an impact, and that people are watching us on TV. People can see what has been going on for the past few weeks. It has been a free-for-all shouting match over whose turn it is to speak next. I don't think that this is helping to advance the democratic process.

Let's be responsible. Let's say what we think about the amendments before us and stop wasting everyone's precious time.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Simard.

[*English*]

We'll now go to Mr. Aldag.

Mr. John Aldag: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

It's a wonderful thing to be able to speak. It's something we haven't had a lot of opportunity to do. I am grateful that we are able to weigh in on the subamendment we have today, as well as the amendment and, ultimately, the main motion.

Like my two colleagues before me, I would like to encourage us to move forward as expeditiously as possible. We have two very important pieces of legislation before us. I'm hearing from thousands of Canadians in my constituency office about the importance they see in Bill C-49 and Bill C-50. There's an appeal that we get on with this, and in large part, that we make room for labour at the table.

I need to reflect on the fact that it is interesting how our Conservative colleagues, particularly the leader, talk about being friends with labour; yet, every chance that the leader and his caucus have to prevent things from moving forward, they seem to take that opportunity.

We're seeing it with Bill C-58 and Bill C-50. I really would hope that.... We have these important pieces of legislation before us, and I'd like to see us actually move forward for the benefit of Canadian workers.

We've heard a lot of discussion about whether this is a programming or schedule motion. I'd like to remind all my colleagues here that the original motion, when we finally get to it, will allow us to deal with both Bill C-49 and Bill C-50 concurrently. I think that's a really wise way to go. It would allow us to have witnesses, the minister and others to deal with both pieces of legislation, so we can get them back to the House in a timely manner.

I won't take up a lot more time. I'm ready to move forward with the vote on the subamendment and, hopefully, a vote on the amendment, so we can get to the main motion as soon as possible. We can build on the work that our committee did previously when hearing from many witnesses on Bill C-50 and Bill C-49. We have the provinces of Newfoundland and Labrador and Nova Scotia asking us to move forward with those pieces of legislation as well.

The motion we have from my colleague is a very good motion that will help us advance both pieces of legislation and, ultimately, get them back to the House, so the House can do its job and move forward with the legislation.

That's my intervention on the subamendment we have before us this morning.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (68315)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Aldag.

Ms. Jones, do you have a point of order?

Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador, Lib.): No, I don't. I just want to get on the speaking list to speak to the amendment and move forward with the bills we need to debate.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Mr. Chair, I have a quick point of order.

Obviously, Mr. Genuis is not here. I'm curious to know.... You alluded to the fact that the next speakers after him were, it seemed, all on our side here.

Could you give us the breakdown of who the next three or four speakers are?

The Chair: Because Mr. Genuis is not here, the next speaker is Mr. Dreeshen. After Mr. Dreeshen, we will go to Mr. Falk and then to you, Mr. Patzer. After that, I have Mrs. Stubbs and some others.

Mr. Dreeshen, the floor is yours. Thank you for waiting patiently.

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I, too, have been waiting for this opportunity to speak and to discuss some of the significant aspects of what we have before us, including, as other speakers have just mentioned, what the order should be as far as Bill C-49 or Bill C-50.

Of course, I think many people are aware of the major concern with Bill C-69, which of course affects all ridings. It affects Timmins; it affects my riding, and it affects every one of the 338 ridings in the country where the Supreme Court has found that there are aspects of Bill C-69 that are unconstitutional.

We then look at Bill C-49, which has, at initial count, 33 references to the points in Bill C-69 that have been deemed unconstitutional. Therefore, the suggestion is made that maybe we should actually look at that which the Supreme Court said was so egregious before we as a committee...or for that matter before the government decides to push forward with legislation that it knows is formed on something that has been challenged.

This, I believe, is the critical aspect of the discussion. When we say there is something that the people in each of those 338 ridings need to be aware of, it is the court's decision on those parts of Bill C-69 that have already been made to the citizenry. How then can we justify dealing with legislation until that has been dealt with?

How is the government planning on dealing with that?

We listened to the Minister of the Environment basically saying that he doesn't think they're right, so we'll just kind of shuffle it around a bit so that we don't have to worry about that.

Well, that isn't exactly what the Supreme Court suggested as the solution to the fact that these points were considered unconstitutional.

We have seen the same attitude since then. The point I want to make has to do with attitude. That is with the plastics ban. Again,

the Federal Court is saying that this, too, has remnants that are unconstitutional. The suggestion is just that we'll run roughshod over this, too. It's not an issue.

Of course, then we come back to the stage where we say that this is natural resources, so the fact that the Minister of the Environment chooses to get engaged in that discussion and so on.... Maybe we should just deal with what the Minister of Natural Resources has to say. Of course, we've made reference to having both of them, and even others, come to speak to the committee.

I made a very significant point, when I was on the environment committee, of looking at the mandate letter of the Minister of the Environment. Then, when I moved here to natural resources, I made a special point of looking at the mandate letter of the Minister of Natural Resources.

I challenge people to find where the major differences are. When we have a Minister of Natural Resources who has not been charged with finding the very best opportunities for every one of Canada's natural resources and when he is using the same set of metrics he had when he was environment minister or when the new environment minister came into play, how does that become significant as far as natural resources are concerned?

• (68320)

We have heard, through our discussions in the past, that parts of their legislation have been unfair. It has been unfair to regions. It has been unfair to provinces. Quite frankly, after the many years I spent on aboriginal affairs and northern development, I know it has been unfair to our indigenous communities, because they have a lot of money already in the game of natural resources.

We talk about some of the other features of how the government looks at our natural resources and how we, as a country, can manage them.

I'll go back a number of years to a meeting with the OSCE in Berlin. At that time, there were discussions and different things taking place. Of course, the environment, science and technology were some of the main features there. The contribution Canada brought to the table in an amendment to one of the major supplementary items being discussed on the floor among this group of 50-something countries—it is beyond the European Union—was that.... They wanted that group to more or less rubber-stamp the fact that Canada believed a carbon tax was the very best solution for managing environmental concerns. That was our contribution to the discussion. We had others: some workings on helping women be involved in parliamentary associations and that type of thing, and on helping out journalists who were being attacked. There were a lot of other things there, but that was our contribution—

• (68325)

[*Translation*]

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

[*English*]

The Chair: Mr. Dreeshen, we have a point of order by Mr. Simard.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: Out of curiosity, I'd like to know what Mr. Dreeshen's comments have to do with the subamendment.

I'd like him to tell us, because I can't see how what he just said is related to the subamendment. I'm just asking. I simply want to remind him that we're discussing the subamendment.

if he wants to speak about something else, he can wait until we have finished with the motion.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Simard, for your point of order.

I would ask colleagues to keep the debate relevant to the motion at hand.

Mr. Dreeshen, the floor is yours, sir.

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: Thank you very much.

I guess I could go back to the point where I said that we have 338 ridings where this is significant. We need to talk about the concerns that Canadians have, that regions have and that provinces have about how things are dealt with. We need to look at how industry is managing this, and the only way you can do that is to talk about the way the government has put obstacles in the way of industry and set up barriers where one part of the country is working against another part of the country. That is my rationale, and that is where I will continue from.

This contribution we had in Berlin was probably one of the first times where I had to sit there and say that I have to speak against this, because this was not the best way. It was obvious that it was simply presented to the group as window dressing to say, "Hey, this is what we're doing, so we'd sure like to have this other group on our side to do this." It did pass, especially at that time—that was about six years or so ago. They were about as Conservative-minded as they are now, so it did pass. Therefore, we could merrily come back and say that the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe also believes the carbon tax is a significant part of this.

We have that in a couple of different regions. For example, if you are going to be in the club of the European Union, you have to commit to some sort of engagement with and development of a carbon price, which kind of ties into what Canada said a number of years ago in Berlin. I can't see why Canada would be the one pushing it, but I can see where that discussion would come into play.

We can fast-forward to a McKinsey report that came out in 2019 and talked about carbon pricing in Europe and the engagement associated with that. I believe it was Poland that was at the rate of \$1 per tonne at that time. I think Sweden was at \$159 or \$179 at that time, and we had Ukraine at 38¢, so that was it in 2019. To be fair, in 2019, Canada's carbon price was \$20, so there was a 56:1 ratio

involved there. Yes, Ukraine said, "Okay, to be part of this group, we're part of the carbon tax."

If you look at where we are now, it is \$60, and I believe Ukraine is around 83¢, so that is probably closer to a 75:1 ratio as far as the tax is concerned. Where does that put us? We know we want to help. That's what the OSCE was about. It speaks about food security and energy security, and, at that particular point in time, with Russia's incursions into Georgia and other places, and Crimea as well, all of those things were discussion points.

We can fast-forward to Birmingham in 2022, and we have similar arguments, except this time Canada came with a plan for the transition away from hydrocarbons. Again, it's very confusing as to why the greatest developer of hydrocarbons on earth would go there with its hands up and say, "Handcuff us. We're ready to show just how committed we are, because we know how committed our environment ministry, our natural resources and our Prime Minister are to respecting a signature that says if something is going to be done, it's going to be done by us first, and we will lead the charge."

• (68330)

At the meeting where we were presenting this, the Czech Republic presented a motion, more or less saying, "Well, that's great. We want to talk about that. However, we would like to have respected the types of energy sources that we have in our boundaries, so that we are not bound by such stringent rules that indicate how great it would be if the world could get off hydrocarbons and how quickly they could get off hydrocarbons." It was presented.

Once again, in order to make the changes that were associated with this amendment—and there were a few other changes there—the only way would have been if they had unanimous consent to do so.

I feel bad, but I had to make sure we did not have unanimous consent to do that. I know that people I care about a lot probably looked at me and asked why I was doing that. The reason is that you had the Czech Republic, along with many other countries in Europe, saying, "With the conflict that we have here in Europe, we need every sort of fuel we can get. We need to go back and reconsider the plans to mothball nuclear. We know that we're going to be doing more deforestation. We have those areas that had oil and gas."

They didn't want to upset the organization they were with, but they wanted to be respected. That was the rationale and the reason for doing what I did.

It's difficult when you're put into that position, and it's more difficult when you come from a part of the country where, in the 15 years that I have been a member of Parliament...

I remember the very first time, when I was just running.... This guy came to me and said, "I want you to know that Alberta's and Canada's oil and gas industry is the very best in the world." The only place that was coming close to it, he said at that time, was Australia. He said it was because they had taken what we had done and implemented that into their procedures and regulations. That made me proud.

It made me proud to stand up for our indigenous groups who were engaged with oil and gas. It made me proud to stand up for those in my community who work so diligently on oil and gas. Quite frankly, it gave me a sense of pride. I knew that I could go to other parts of this country, as a member of Parliament, and speak highly about what we did and therefore speak highly about what they do. We could all work together. As Canadians, we are experts in that field, as we are experts in other fields.

That's what we're dealing with right now.

It saddens me to look at the last five or six years and see serious division. I've seen division between groups. The biggest thing we do in this place.... When I first got involved in politics, I said that the worst thing you can do is to label people, label groups, label organizations. That's cheap and easy, and it doesn't show that you actually care about knowing more about what is taking place.

• (68335)

When we think about Canada and how we can take our natural resources.... I remember being part of ParlAmericas, and I remember going to Mexico. I believe we were in Mexico City. We had, at that time, the Bloc with us, and we had the Liberals with us and the NDP with us.

I might have said some things that were not exactly nice about the government in Europe. I suppose I learned that from some of my Liberal colleagues who were with me in Mexico City. However, leaving that aside, I remember a person from the Bloc. What they said was, "I love Canada"—

The Chair: Mr. Dreeshen, could I ask you to pause for a moment, please?

I have Mr. Sorbara on a point of order. Go ahead, Mr. Sorbara.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: I just want to ask Mr. Dreeshen.... I am very much enjoying hearing your thoughts on a lot of issues, but I want to ask on this tangent here what the relevance is, please.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order, Mr. Sorbara.

I would ask colleagues to ensure that we are staying focused on the subamendment at hand and to make sure that the debate is focused on that.

Mr. Dreeshen, the floor is yours.

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: Thank you very much, Chair.

Again, as we speak about various parts of the country, whether they be provinces, regions or each and every one of our constituencies, this is the point I wish to make, and I'm about to make it with regard to the dear friends from the Bloc that I had with me in Mexico City.

As I said, the public comments were these: "I love Canada. I love Quebec. Two great countries." I didn't see eye to eye with that part, but nevertheless, that was what was being said.

I realized that they wanted to make Canada strong because it gave them an opportunity to be strong within a Canada that was going to be able to go around the world and be beneficial and that then they would be able to work well within that in their aspirations on sovereignty and so on—because it was the Bloc—and that it would have gone someplace for them.

Now when I listen to my friends from the Bloc, their commentary is this: "This country is so dysfunctional that we can't wait to get out of here." It's quite a change in 12 years from "We love this country, we love your country, and we want to work together because we can see that it's positive" to the labelling and the pitting of one group against another. Believe me, it has done a lot of damage to this country.

I can see what the Bloc would do with that and how they would simply ask, "How do you expect us to want to be part of this group? You guys can't get along. It's east against west."

Let's talk about a language against this and about the different types of energy. I would love to for us to be able to work through with the energy we have. Getting back to the natural resources side of it, I am happy that we have the great ability of this country to have so much of our electricity coming from hydro power. The point that gets me—and many people have heard me say this—is that those dams didn't just happen. The environmental damage that is associated with flooding vast sections of Canada in order to ensure we have electricity is something.... I've always said that you have to measure the environmental impact from the first shovel you use to dig something up to the very last shovel you use to cover it up.

Now, when it comes to hydro power, it's going to be a long time before we cover it up, but we should recognize that which is there. I can go through all the scientific aspects of it. I know a little bit about science. I can go through all of that, but that's not my point. My point is the metrics of analysis. When we then talk about, for example, nuclear energy.... Again, I'm dealing with this because we're part of natural resources.

Thankfully, with all of the discussions we have had over the last number of months as we've had the nuclear industry here and they've been chastised for all of the different things and so on, finally they got some recognition, recognition that if we want emissions-free electricity, then we shouldn't be damning the nuclear industry in the same way that we're putting the oil and gas industry in the crosshairs. Thankfully, that has happened. I'm happy to see that, for many different reasons, but we still have this....

I constantly hear from people I know, who know better, that what we must do is minimize and get rid of our hydrocarbons. Well, when I fly to Vancouver, I take a look at where they load all of the coal. I know where it's going, as does anybody else who flies in and out of Vancouver.

● (68340)

That's okay. However, if you fly over Fort McMurray, it's not okay. All this oil that has been seeping into these rivers in northern Alberta for millennia.... We've now put a stop to it. We collect it and sell it around the world, but this has been demonized. I keep telling people that the oil and gas industry hurt itself with this. It felt, "Well, anybody would understand what we're doing and how much better we are doing it than any other place in the world." They didn't do a very good job of selling that. Therefore, it was easy for groups, especially from Europe—although we certainly have groups here in Canada—to say, "You know, the tar sands campaign"—of course, tar is something you get from a process, not what we have there—"will be something we can get a lot of money out of." That is exactly what took place. It took place for decades. It's pitting one group against another.

I know the massive dams on these rivers are going to look like that for hundreds of years. When a pit has been completed in Fort McMurray, within 40 years, you cannot tell the difference between it and any forest that would be there. Actually, after 20 years, you can't tell the difference, except the Alberta government won't allow a complete reclamation—or whatever the term is—until after 40 years. That's what you get in Alberta. You don't get that in Venezuela. You don't get that in Nigeria. You get it in Alberta.

I have to listen to different groups demonize the oil and gas industry in my province—and worse than that, in my country. That's the part I believe is very important, which is why, when I look at what is happening with Bill C-69, I believe it is rather important that we respect that process and work from there. Those are some of the things I believe we should be paying attention to.

Talking about our own constituencies, I know oil and gas found disfavour, because it was easy for environmental groups to get money to demonize it.

Look at our agriculture area. I've been a farm kid since I was born, and I still continue to farm. I know we have a tax on agriculture as well. We do a great job. That's why, when I was at the OSCE, we talked about food security. When I went to Asia Pacific and the ParlAmericas and so on, food security was critical. I could tell them what we do in agriculture—the significance of Canadian agriculture and of what we sell. I also tied in how that's what we do with oil and gas.

The next part of it is this pass we seem to give the mining industry. Here we have an opportunity to do mining for rare earth minerals and that type of thing. We believe the people who made all their money going against oil and gas and conventional agriculture are going to let mining get this great pass.

● (68345)

When we talk about what is happening in Timmins or in Sudbury or in my riding, it's "Don't worry about that. That's for the greater good. That's for electric vehicles or that's for some other type of thing we have. We'll be fine. Just you guys stop with this hydrocarbon development, because we believe that's a problem"—"we" being the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Natural Resources.

That is the reason I am so concerned about the way we are going in this country. We are looking at ways that we could pit one group against another. I do not believe that it will change with this present administration, and that is something that bothers me.

I would think that somewhere along the line, people could look at what we do and what Canada does, be proud of that and speak about the things we do together, rather than people such as me having to go to international fora. I listen to our government talk about how embarrassed they are that we are a major oil and gas-developing nation and that with any luck they will be able to come up with another plan. Those are the things that concern me.

There are other aspects when we speak about Bill C-50 and the transition away from traditional oil and gas jobs, about how things are going to be so much better if we can just tie into the new world order that we see and be prepared for all of us to use a new energy source and change our way of doing things.

Depending upon which way the earth is turning, it takes me four hours on average to get from Alberta to Ottawa, which is about the same amount of time it takes if I want to fly to Mexico. We have six time zones in this country. When I look out the plane window, I see the amazing things we have, the natural beauty and the water. I know that we have minerals there. I know the other things that are associated with it, and I am proud of every part of this.

My wife's family came from Prince Edward Island. They were there in the 1800s. They were mariners. I have a great sense of pride for that part of the country and for the Maritimes. I have friends I went to school with who are from Quebec. They are great, hard-working people. Then there's Ontario and all of the western provinces.

In my role with indigenous affairs and northern development, I have met some amazing individuals in that community. Believe me, I would tell people that if they wanted to find a CEO to come and work in their company, they should talk to these people. They understand what's going on. They know what is taking place.

My thought when I became an MP was that we would find ways of bringing this country together and be proud of it, rather than finding ways of dividing. Sadly, we seem to make sport of that. That is something that I feel is not standing us in good stead.

● (68350)

I've been fortunate in that I've spent time on the agriculture committee. I've spent time on public accounts, so I understand how the funding of government goes. I also understand what happens when things go awry with government. I've also been on international trade, so I know how important it is to trade our goods around the world. I know how well respected our goods are around the world.

I've been in South America, talking to mining companies there that are Canadian. We have a lot of Canadian mining companies. Yes, sometimes they take over a mining operation that was not looked after very well, so we have groups here in Canada that will attack them.

I remember one group—I believe it was in Colombia—that basically made a point. They said they needed consultants. Here's how they were going to use consultants: They weren't going to take some American consultants who came down, or somebody from Canada. They were going to go to the local colleges in these countries and bring these people to be their consultants so that they could have respect and talk to the priests, the community leaders, the government, the environmentalists, the farmers and everybody. That's how they were going to deal with that.

They brought the groups together. These Canadian mining companies basically said that they needed to do that to gain trust, so that's what they did.

At the same time, I remember that here, we had motions coming to the floor from the Liberals that were basically criticizing our mining companies around the world. By extension, then, that would include these that were doing a great job.

It gets a little frustrating when the mindset is, "Let's be critical". The mindset is to look at these things and find out just what to do to minimize the efforts of expert Canadians.

I suppose I'm going back to my 34 years as a teacher in math, physics, biology and chemistry—primarily math and physics. The problem is that we have preconceived notions of what is happening in the world.

One book I've been looking at is called *Factfulness* by Hans Rosling. He was a medical doctor as well as a statistician. He goes through a series of questions that he would ask the public. They're simple types of things. I'll just take an example. I think you'll be curious to see this.

In all low-income countries across the world, how many girls finish the first five grades of school? Here are the options: (a) 20%; (b) 40%; or (c) 60%. In low-income countries around the world today, how many girls finished the first five grades of school? I'm not a teacher anymore, so I'm not going to make a test out of it. It's 60%.

That's not what the results were when they gave this question to the general public, to people we depend on in different world-wide organizations or to academics. They got less than what it would have been if they had randomly chosen it.

Another question is, "In the last 20 years, the proportion of the world's population living in extreme poverty has...". The options are "almost doubled", "remained more or less the same", or "almost half". Well, most people think poverty is getting worse, but no; it's half of what it was before, because of different things that we've done.

• (68355)

For life expectancy in the world, they had a) "50 years"; b) "60 years"; and c) "70 years". This is in the world. It's 70 years. That's what it really is.

I don't want to belabour it, but my point is that people like me have these preconceived notions of what is taking place. I grew up in the sixties, and these were the things that we were all bombarded with. We teach teachers—the older ones teach the younger ones. This is our preconceived notion of what is taking place in the world, so that is something we present.

However, when we look at it statistically, we see that we've been wrong. Governments bring together their sayers of sooth, but they're wrong, and we make decisions and policies that are related to that. The only thing on which they agree with us is the 13th question.

Actually, I want to go to the 12th question. It asks, "How many people in the world have some access to electricity?" The options are 20%, 50% or 80%.

Well, it's 80% of the world that has access to electricity.

Another one asks "How many of the world's 1-year-old children today have been vaccinated against some disease?" Option a) was 20%, b) was 50%, and c) was 80%.

The answer is 80%.

We don't think that way. We don't look at those statistics. We believe the things that we are told through social media, through reports that we see on various news agencies. I won't go into the ones that I think are somewhat off.

The only one on which it seems that we have it right says, "Global climate experts believe that over the next 100 years, the average temperature will: a) get warmer, b) remain the same, or c) get colder."

Well, it is true that global climate experts believe that it will get warmer.

Again, I mentioned that it was the sixties when I grew up. It was a little before that when I was born. However, I remember all of these different stages—here is the next ice age; here is what is going to happen with our ozone layers; this is going to happen here, and everything is going to be flooded. It was all of these problems. We are going to have massive hurricanes. We are going to have massive forest fires. We are going to have all of these types of things. If you believe that narrative, then you are prepared to make statements that say that the Earth is boiling and you will believe somebody who says that.

The facts don't bear it out. The sad reality is that one of those other groups that have been criticized for not doing their job has been forestry. Of course, forest communities live around the forests. They have not done those things that were necessary for them to be able to protect themselves. The opportunities are there, but they just have not used them.

How can we here, in Canada...? We've had some terrible things, and I know people who have lost homes and so on. We have people who categorically will state that it is all because of climate change. Well, the U.S. doesn't have a carbon tax, and this last year has been one of the least severe fire seasons ever—with no carbon tax.

I know that this correlation doesn't make sense, any more than the correlation makes sense that if you charge a carbon tax, you're going to be able to solve these problems.

● (68400)

The correlations don't make sense, but they sure make good clips in the House of Commons. They make pretty good clips when you say, "This person here is a climate denier." I've had that accusation.

All I simply said is that I remember going to Drumheller Valley and looking at a sign that said that 10,000 years ago, we were under a kilometre of ice. Yes, there has been global warming. At that time we were only under a kilometre of ice. Montreal was under two miles of ice, so they had even more hot air there as things changed.

I don't know how many people know about Lake Superior. It wasn't there about 15,000 years ago. It was carved out of the glacierization. The fact is that as massive dams of ice broke as the climate started warming, the Great Lakes were formed. That's the reality we have, but nobody pays attention to those things because they'd sooner talk about somebody being a climate denier or this sort of thing. There are all these things that nobody pays much attention to, so it's important that if we're going to make up policies, we take a look at all politicians who give that simple argument as to how this can happen and how that can happen.

In our case, it's how far down the road we are going to be before we can fix some of the problems we see, and there are a lot of them. The main one is that we have such wealth in this country. We have so many unique innovators in this country. We've heard—and I can't remember whether it was here in the natural resources committee or back in the environment committee—about a group who built hovercraft in Ontario. In order to get funding to proceed, they had to go through the U.S., and where did they get their funding from? It was Canada pension plan. That's where the money came from when they went to the States to be able to develop the programming they had.

It seems a little odd to me that we can't figure out a way to make those types of things happen. Nevertheless, that's what we are dealing with when we have ideologically driven leadership, because they stop thinking.

We talk about how every one of our communities is affected by the IRA in the U.S., which Biden has signed on to. We are expected now to change all of our rules for our investments and all of the things that are taking place.

The first thing that the Biden administration did when they came in was to shut down Keystone XL. When they realized that they needed a little bit of diesel and they needed a few other things, they asked where they were going to get this from. They made deals with Venezuela to get their heavy oil.

Again, not a lot of people understand the science of all of this, but heavy oil has all of the different things you need. It has what

you're going to use for asphalt and it has what you're going to use for diesel. It has the gasoline, and you have the propane. You have all these things.

It all comes out of one pot. It's how you deal with it that is important, but we seem to forget that. We seem to forget how much of what we do and what we use is actually coming out of the hydrocarbons that we have. That's why these different regions get a little upset when someone does not respect those parts of the country that champion these new technologies.

● (68405)

Before people just say, "You don't like the concept of a carbon tax" and all this other kind of stuff—because I know I'll get that—Alberta has had a fee for heavy emitters for close to 20 years. There was no way that each and every one of those businesses could take an amount of money and efficiently fix or change their industry, so they put it together into a fund, and that fund, as it grew, was then able to fund industry-wide solutions, such as carbon capture utilization and storage, such as taking nanoparticles of carbon and putting them into different types of products, whether it was steel or whatever. Those are the things that are done if you are wise.

How do you get to the stage where you can afford to be wise? You take a product you have, make it the best in the world, sell it and get tax dollars to build schools and hospitals in your province. You have tax dollars that go to helping other provinces in this country. You have tax dollars to help with all the needs the federal government has, and you have tax incentives and dollars to make the environmental aspects of what we have in this country even better. What can you do with that? You sell it around the world.

What are we going to do with things the way we have set it up? We will chase that innovation out of this country, similar to the hovercraft, and then we will buy it back from others around the world. Where is the logic to have other provinces suggest that Alberta is doing all this damage to the world and that they are going to do all they possibly can to stop it? Where is the advantage to having political parties that believe it worked for Greenpeace and for all these other groups? Lots of money comes in if you fight them, so that's what they will do again. Where is the advantage? How does that build a nation?

As I mentioned earlier, I can see where the Bloc would look at it and say, "Who cares? We don't want you guys to build a strong nation. We have an exit strategy." However, it should matter to my friends in Quebec. It should matter to my friends in the Maritimes. It should matter to my friends up north. It should matter to my friends in Ontario. It should matter to my friends in the west, and it should matter to my friends whom I have met and have spoken with for many years around the world when I say, "If you would just come to Canada, and if you would just look at what we produce, how we produce it and why we would do it this way, you will be impressed." That would mean there is no better place for you to invest. Certainly, if you need products, take a look at Canada and what Canada has to offer. That's where I'm going with this.

● (68410)

I believe that such an amazing country, with 338 ridings at this point in time that depend so much on oil and gas and its byproducts... We look at the things we have around this table and at the things we wear. All of those things are critical. Why would we want to go someplace else or not have that opportunity to at least sell and buy that product? Those are some of the things that I'm extremely concerned about.

As I've said, on the world stage, we have lost our way. I can't believe the way in which we are portrayed around the world at this point in time. I have friends who have been in India, Asia and so on, and when I was on the international trade committee, we spent time with the ASEAN countries and talked to them. This was at about the time when the Prime Minister went to India with his family and sort of embarrassed things a bit. Maybe some people didn't think so. Nevertheless, even Liberals who were with me on that committee—I won't name names—were scratching their heads as to what was taking place.

We had the same sort of thing happen with trade developments. When we talked about CETA, the ball had already been hit out of the park. All this Prime Minister had to do when they brought it back to home plate was to put his signature on it. That is how far CETA had been. Then, of course, he decided, "Well, there are a few other things I'd like to see added to this thing, so let's open this up."

The same kind of thing happened in Vietnam in the meetings there: "If I show up on time, it's probably because I've been working on these great things to add a few more letters to the agreements." The people who were there would look at it and say, "Well, why? Why would you do that? I thought we were talking about trade. I thought that was the rationale. I thought that was the reason we had."

Again, on this latest issue they're trying to say, "Don't you know that Ukraine has a carbon tax?", and all of this kind of stuff, thinking that they've really found something special to hang their hat on. Well, when you go from a 56:1 ratio to an 80-some-to-one ratio, of course people knew that they had to sign on to an agreement to be part of the EU, but when you take a look at the other aspects of it, again, it's back to the history of what happened in Berlin.

Canada was saying, "Hey, we're going to do this carbon tax, so why don't you guys get on our side and make it so much easier?" In Birmingham they said: "Well, we've even gone a little further because we have a Minister of Environment and a Minister of Natural

Resources who just love this stuff, so we're going to say that as Canadians we are going to do all we can to limit the expansion of hydrocarbons, even though it's here in our country and it would really hurt us more than anybody else."

That's really where we're at. Those are the reasons I am so concerned about how each one of our ridings is going to deal with the issues that are taking place. Again, I go back to what I said about from the first shovel to dig something up to the last shovel to cover it up.

● (68415)

I know that there was a great discussion having to do with biodiesel or ethanol and those types of things as farm products. All I can say is, that's great. I know we can do these things. As a matter of fact, probably 30 years ago I was approached by a group to commit about 500 acres of barley to a project that would have turned the barley into ethanol. Then you would take the ethanol and move it off, and then you would take the mash and you would feed it to animals. Then you would take the methane you would have from those animals and that would help run your system.

There were two things.

First, it would have probably been useful. The only thing was that they said it would work dependent upon subsidies that we could get from the Alberta government. Well, I look at subsidies as "that's my tax dollar" and "that's my neighbour's tax dollar". I can't do something just because it came from my neighbour's tax dollar. It has to do something on its own.

It would have been a neat thing to do, but I didn't feel that it was right. It got to the stage where we talked about zoning and how we would do all of this stuff, and how it was a "good idea", but it wasn't the right thing at the right time.

If I were going to deal with what I was getting out of this, I would have had to look at how much fuel I was going to use for this 500 acres of barley that I had to commit, so I would have had to treat it in exactly the same way and manage it and analyze it in exactly the same way I would if I were selling it for cattle feed. I'd have to do that. I'd have to then look at the cost of the facility and the cost of everything else associated with that, as well as the trucking. Those were some of the metrics I looked at.

We need to do that for everything else we do. When we say, "Oh, I think we'll go to Timmins and we'll start digging up there, and everybody's going to be happy." Well, that's not likely. We can try to find all of the rare earth minerals around Canada, and it's not that we can't do it, but at what cost?

Right now, we're still sending coal to China, and if they're producing and mining in their country, where are we going to buy these things from? We're going to buy them from them, because they are part of that supply chain. With them as part of that supply chain, we will not be able to compete. We will not be able to compete with the way in which they have taken over African countries and the way in which they get cheap labour in order to produce these products that we all seem excited about having.

We're going to say we're going to do it and we're going to say because the U.S. is doing this, we have to make sure we get in on it as well. Again, as I mentioned before, sometimes we hear things and we think that we know everything, so I'm going to preface some of this.

When we hear that companies in Europe—GM, Ford, Stellantis and so on—are actually cutting back on their electric vehicles because of the supply chain, the costs, the high electricity rates, then we start to think that yes, this was a good idea, but how do we make it work? How do we measure the environmental impact as we do the mining in our region and do all of the other things that are there?

We, as Canadians, go over and above everything to make sure that we have satisfied any group that wants to send in a brief or have a discussion, and we do that. We encourage it, so we should actually listen to them when they come.

That's the issue we have right now. That makes it kind of difficult for us to proceed.

• (68420)

As I mentioned before, if you have billions of dollars of subsidies to these companies, even if they're suspect as to how they might get built and by whom, still it's \$15 billion from Canadians for this kind of a project. Wouldn't it better to look at the strengths we have and take vehicles, as we have, that have gone from 10 or 12 miles per gallon to 30 miles per gallon? Wouldn't that be a better way?

As we purchase this fuel that we have, we then put that money into our schools, our hospitals and our national defence and into all of the things that Canadians need. We help out those provinces that for some reason or other have a different way of analyzing their balance sheets. I would think that would be a wise thing to do.

How do you do that in a country that pits one group against another? How do you do that when the mandate letters for the Minister of the Environment and the Minister of Natural Resources just cut and paste from one to the other? How do you look at a department?

I understand government. They are beholden to the thoughts and ideology of a government. I understand that's how it's done, but how do we find our way through when this is what we are doing to this wonderful nation of ours?

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (68425)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Dreeshen.

We will now move to Mr. Falk. Mr. Falk, the floor is yours.

Mr. Ted Falk: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to thank my colleague, the member for Red Deer—Mountain View, Earl Dreeshen, for a wonderful explanation of why we need to consider this subamendment. He really created a great platform to help Canadians who are watching on TV understand what this is really about, the importance of the work this committee does and the importance of the order in which we do things in this committee.

Thank you, Earl, for doing that. You've helped, I think, all of us around this table, and certainly viewers who are watching, to understand the importance of the work that we're doing here, as well as the importance of the sequence of the work that we're doing.

Getting back to the subamendment, which was to make sure that this committee will be hearing from witnesses from Timmins—James Bay, someone might ask questions. Why Timmins—James Bay? What is so important about Timmins—James Bay? Why do we need to hear those witnesses?

It is quite simple: There is a lot of natural resource activity in that particular constituency of the country.

I acknowledge that there are 338 constituencies in Canada, many of which have natural resources. Mr. Dreeshen talked very articulately about the natural resource sector in northern Alberta, but Timmins—James Bay has forestry and lots of mining. Some of the bigger mines there are the Alamos Gold project and the Victor Mine. We hear lots of the big names fairly regularly. They come to Ottawa and solicit tax dollars for consideration, but there are a lot of others.

The concern is that we're going to be looking after labour there. That's why they want to discuss these bills, both Bill C-50 and Bill C-49. They cite the concern of wanting to make sure that labour is properly addressed there. We know there is labour involved in mining activities.

I also want to point out to folks who are watching, and to this committee, that there are lots of junior miners we never hear about that also have employees who also need to be able to count on that paycheque coming every two weeks so that they can feed their families, heat their homes and put fuel into their vehicles. These are all things that have been very negatively impacted, Mr. Chair, by a carbon tax. We've seen the price of all of those things significantly increased by a carbon tax.

It's interesting that this Liberal government carved out a geographical area of our country and gave it a carbon tax exemption or holiday. It's very interesting, because apparently it's an ideological platform of this government to have a carbon tax, and now it's carved out for a geographical area—Atlantic Canada—a carbon tax exemption to make life more affordable there.

None of the other areas of Canada received that same exemption. They didn't receive it because they're heating with more fuel-efficient methods, like hydroelectricity or natural gas from Alberta. They experienced the same cost increases due to the carbon tax, yet they did not get the benefit of that carve-out exemption that was provided to Atlantic Canadians.

We know the reason that happened. It's because the Prime Minister's polling numbers were plummeting in Atlantic Canada, and he tried to address that by throwing them a bone, as we would call it in the industry. Maybe it was keep them happy and get their support inside.

There are people in Timmins—James Bay who have experienced the same increased cost of living in heating their homes, putting fuel in their vehicles and buying groceries at the grocery store, all of which have been impacted by the carbon tax. That's no small matter here. I think this committee should be seized with the cost that carbon tax has added to everyday living.

I want to list some of the junior miners that find themselves domiciled in Timmins—James Bay. I went on the Internet to get a list of the junior mining companies in Timmins—James Bay. I would like to make mention of them, because they're why we need witnesses from these mining companies.

They include Patriot Battery Metals, Osisko Mining, Li-FT Power, Critical Elements, Lithium Royalty, Brunswick Exploration, Fury Gold Mines and Arbor Metals.

• (68430)

As well, we have Azimut Exploration, Benz Mining, Power Nickel, Midland Exploration, Vanstar Mining, Max Power Mining, Superior Mining, Champion Electric Metals, Ophir Gold, Consolidated Lithium Metals, Hertz Lithium, Comet Lithium, Sirios Resources, FE Battery Metals, Targa Exploration, Harfang Exploration, Quebec Precious Metals, Canadian Critical Minerals, Lithium One Metals, ALX Resources, Stelmine Canada, Dios Exploration, Niobay Metals, Medaro Mining, Opus One Gold, Green Battery Minerals, Mosaic Minerals, Stria Lithium, Genius Metals, SPOD Lithium, Metalex Ventures, Battery X Metals, TomaGold, Clarity Metals, SLAM Exploration, Durango Resources, Lancaster Resources, Rockland Resources, Arctic Fox Lithium, K9 Gold, QcX Gold, Bullion Gold Resources, Victory Battery Metals, Brigadier Gold, Lithium Lion Metals, Musk Metals, MegaWatt Metals, Fabled Copper, Nordique Resources and Q2 Metals.

That's the listing that you can find on the Internet, Mr. Chairman, about junior mining companies in the James Bay area. There's a whole host of them there, and all these mining companies have employees who work in that area and are dependent on their paycheques. What we do in this committee matters. It matters greatly, and that's why it's so important to hear from them.

However, we also need to go back and look at the platform this premise is based on and why we need to reconsider, very carefully, whether we're addressing things in the right order here. We know that the Supreme Court issued a reference on Bill C-69, which is the impact assessment legislation this government passed, which has also been referred to in the industry as the "no more pipelines" bill. We know that there was a referral that struck down about 80%

to 85% of that bill as being non-charter compliant or constitutionally challenged.

This committee should be absolutely seized with getting that legislation back here to committee and identifying the areas that the Supreme Court has referred to as not being compliant with the Constitution. We should be looking at those areas and correcting them, if they can be corrected. I suspect that in a lot of instances we're going to have to just discard big segments of that bill, because it just doesn't pass the litmus test.

I think it would be very wise of us to conduct a study on that bill first and to bring in witnesses from Timmins—James Bay and see how that particular piece of legislation has impacted their companies and impacted their employees, because the Supreme Court says that it doesn't work. Then, also, the Federal Court recently ruled that the ban on single-use plastics also wasn't constitutional. I know that the NDP-Liberal government is moving ahead with contesting that further and challenging that decision. I know it is a very welcomed decision from the Federal Court.

Mr. Chairman, I get into my riding very late in the evening when we're done here in Ottawa, and I like to treat myself. I swing through McDonald's on the way home and pick up a strawberry milkshake. I have about an hour and a quarter drive to my home from the airport, so I do that quite frequently. I was reminded again last week when I went home that I put that paper straw into the strawberry milkshake and started sucking it. Well, that just doesn't work so well. You have to look at the cost-benefit aspect, and with a paper straw, the suction that you need to get that triple-thick strawberry milkshake from McDonald's up the straw and to your palate takes an incredible amount of work. We very much welcome the decision from the Federal Court to strike down this plastic straw ban.

• (68435)

That decision is going to be welcomed by Canadians as they go to have their strawberry milkshakes, which are an important staple here in our Canadian diet. Both of these decisions are important to this committee. Our committee should be consumed with addressing these two pieces of... One is a regulation that came out of cabinet, I suppose—the plastic straw ban—but certainly the decision of the Supreme Court on Bill C-69 is something this committee should be bringing back and studying.

Why is it important to prioritize that? It is because both Bill C-49 and Bill C-50 reference Bill C-69, which the Liberals have proposed as the next pieces of legislation on our work schedule here at this committee. If they're referencing a flawed piece of legislation, we know in turn that this legislation is also flawed. That gives us many reasons that we should be prioritizing the study of Bill C-69 over Bill C-49 and Bill C-50. Let's get Bill C-69 right, or let's actually recall all of Bill C-69 and discard it and present legislation to this committee that will give Atlantic Canada a regulatory platform for tidal power.

We could talk more about Bill C-50, which was at one time called the just transition, and then industry referred to it more as an unjust transition, which probably more adequately described the intent of that bill. The Liberal government, in an effort to try to save face, renamed that bill “sustainable jobs”, when the sustainable jobs were already there. They're in oil and gas. They're providing above-average income levels for the families involved in that industry, and in the production of the world's cleanest and safest fuels by way of diesel fuel, gas, aviation fuel and liquefied natural gas.

When this Liberal government came to power back in 2015, there were 18 LNG projects on the board. Do you know how many of them have actually been built and are in production at capacity? Zero. Zero projects have been completed. It's important for Canadians to know that. The Liberal government has either been the cause of these projects being cancelled or of their not being completed.

Meanwhile, the Americans, whom we refer to a lot around this committee when we talk about the IRA.... To folks watching on TV, the IRA is the Inflation Reduction Act that President Biden has implemented in the United States. It's a massive spending bill. We always seem to want to compete with that piece of legislation on the Canadian side. I don't know why we're so eager to race to the bottom with Joe Biden, but for whatever reason, that's the direction the Liberal government has decided to pursue.

In spite of the IRA, and in spite of the massive spending and tax credit regime the Americans have created south of the 49th parallel, they have still built and completed almost half a dozen LNG projects. Canada had opportunities in Europe and Japan to sell our liquefied natural gas, coming from the cleanest processing plants the world has ever known. Our gas and oil industry has the cleanest and safest energy model. Instead of our being able to capitalize and sell to countries like Germany, the rest of Europe and Japan, our clean LNG products are now being sold by the Americans. That's another opportunity that has been missed by the government, while at the same time it wants so desperately to compete on so many levels with the American government on its IRA.

● (68440)

I guess another example of that is the massive amounts, the billions of dollars—I think it's close to \$31 billion—that this government has committed to large multinational corporations that want to build battery production facilities here in Canada. We're going to be giving them \$31 billion of taxpayers' money.

I think Canadians need to understand what this Liberal government has committed to here, because it is no small sum. It will create some jobs, but by the way, 1,600 of them, we're told now, will come from Asian countries in the form of temporary foreign workers. When Canadians were first told about the investment into these lithium battery manufacturers, I don't think they were told that these temporary foreign workers were going to be the mainstay of the employee workforce. That's something on which we haven't seen complete integrity and openness from this government, but it's come to light now. Many of these workers who are going to be employed in these battery plants that are being built on taxpayer dollars here in Canada are actually going to be foreign nationals. That's another aspect of trying to compete with the Americans on

their IRA, on their Inflation Reduction Act. I think, Mr. Chairman, that's just a race to the bottom.

I think we, as Canada here, are incredibly blessed with our God-given natural resources, whether it's oil and gas, whether it's in our mining sector, or whether it's in our forestry, all things that this committee should really be studying. We need to develop these resources. They weren't given to us just to keep in the ground and stay buried, covered in a pile of dirt.

No, we have these resources, and we've been given these resources to be good stewards of them. I think the mining industry and the oil and gas industry have shown that they're responsible and that they are good stewards of the resources that we have here in this country. We have a phenomenal amount. We're the envy of the world.

We also have clean water. We probably have the largest amount of clean water resource on the globe, and I think our natural resources companies have been great stewards in protecting the integrity of our clean, fresh water resource that we also have here.

However, there's mining that needs to happen, and we know that Bill C-69 has made mining very difficult. It's happening in Timmins—James Bay with the regulatory process that's necessary to open up new mines and to continue to develop existing mines. It's very difficult, and that is something that needs to be studied.

Just recently someone pointed out to me—and it's not a recent fact but an age-old fact—that when we look at the air that we breathe, the composition of that air.... We hear so much about carbon and the need to reduce the carbon input and we hear that we're responsible for creating all this carbon pollution everywhere. It was pointed out to me that 78% of the air that we breathe is nitrogen and 21% is oxygen, so 99% of the air that we breathe is nitrogen and oxygen. The other 1% is comprised of argon and carbon, and 0.03% is carbon.

I don't have the data to show that it's true, but some folks say that the impact of the carbon in the air could be manipulated by about 20% by human activity. If that's true, then it would be 0.006 of 1%. That's six one-thousandths of a per cent of impact that all human activity could actually have on the quality of the air we breathe in relation to carbon. Those are things that we need to consider before we light our hair on fire talking about carbon pollution.

Do we still want to reduce pollution? Absolutely, we do. Do we still want to find out more efficient ways to burn hydrocarbons? We've seen the industry really step up and do that. We've seen miles per gallon per vehicle significantly increase in the last two decades.

I remember growing up in the 1970s. I'm a little behind my colleague Earl here, from Red Deer. He grew up in the 1960s and I grew up in the 1970s. I was really fond of muscle cars.

• (68445)

Some of the muscle cars that I owned at that time.... The very first one I ever bought was when I was 16. It was a 1970 Mustang Mach 1 with a 351 Cleveland automatic. It had a shaker hood. It had the louvres on the rear window. It was blue with black accents. It was a wonderful car. I would have been very lucky in those days to get 15 miles to the gallon—very lucky. I had an awful lot of fun burning that gallon of gas for every 15 miles I drove.

We have cars being produced today with the same amount of horsepower, or more, that will get 30 miles to the gallon. That's a testament to industry, to how far technology has come. We've reduced the amount of hydrocarbons we consume for the same amount of horsepower that we create, whether that's in gasoline-powered engines or diesel-powered engines. We know this carbon tax is particularly burdensome to our transportation industry, which has some of the heaviest users of diesel fuel in our country. We know that every semi truck driving down the highway is burning diesel fuel. The construction industry also is consumed with heavy equipment that—

[*Translation*]

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

[*English*]

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

Mr. Simard, go ahead.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: Just out of curiosity, I'd like to ask my colleague Mr. Falk a question.

I learned that he likes to drink his milkshakes with a plastic straw and that he likes shiny cars, but what has that got to do with the subamendment?

Perhaps my colleague could tell me what the connection is between the subamendment and plastic straws and muscle cars. I don't quite get it.

Maybe I'm a bit dim. I don't know. Can Mr. Falk explain it to me.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Simard, for your point of order.

Mr. Falk, I would ask that you keep it relevant to the subamendment. I know you've been passionate about a lot of things over the years, but keep it to the subamendment that you actually brought forward.

Thank you. You have the floor, sir.

Mr. Ted Falk: Thank you for focusing me again, Mr. Chairman.

The fact that Mr. Simard brought up my muscle cars just made me think back to the 1970 Challenger Hemi that I bought, which I had for a period of time, and the big-block Chevelle convertible, which was just phenomenal. Then I bought a Chevrolet Vega that somebody had wedged a little 327 Chevy into, and that thing just went like a bandit.

That really refocused my thoughts, my little diversion there on muscle cars, and what that has to do.... The fact is that the industry

we have here in Canada that is using our natural resources is becoming more and more efficient. I was talking about the amount of hydrocarbons that I was burning back in the seventies. Now, with the technology that we have today that is making the same amount of horsepower, we're using about half of the fuel that we did before. That's amazing. Why is that important? It is important because if we're burning half the fuel, we need to produce half as much, or we can sell that much more. Whether it's in the oil and gas industry, whether it's in the forestry industry or whether it's in mining, which is what we have in Timmins—James Bay, we know that if we can become more efficient users of the natural resources that we have, they're going to last longer. They're also going to create lower emissions.

I think that creating targets that are reasonable and sustainable is important. We know that this Liberal government, in spite of the carbon tax, which was supposed to be a cure-all for everything, hasn't met any of its emissions targets—and that's unfortunate—except for the one year during COVID when nobody was driving or moving anything.

What we need to do is protect our natural resource industry. I know there are a lot of advances in technology. I know that solar and wind are important, and I know that this is the direction that Bill C-50 would like to take the natural resources industry in here in Canada. It was interesting, because we had industry on the Hill here last week, and there were industry representatives. I went to one of the receptions and was talking to one of the producers there. They were boasting about how their whole facility was solar powered. They showed me the rows upon rows of solar panels. I told them that was very interesting. They said that they have a connection to the grid in the case of the solar system not being able to provide enough energy to properly run their plants. The question I asked this young lady was this: If there wouldn't have been a subsidy to have installed these solar panels up front, would it be economically viable to be using solar energy versus the hydro energy that we have in Manitoba? The answer was no. The only way that a lot of this stuff works is if we take tax dollars and subsidize it. I think we have to look seriously at whether that's the direction that we need to go. Do we want everybody else to pay to subsidize our reduced energy bills? I don't know if that's fair. I don't think it's the right way to do it.

My point in talking about muscle cars and where that whole industry has evolved to today is that as time moves along, industry and technology advance to the point where we become more efficient. I think that over time, that happens in the energy industry as well. However, when we force it to happen this way, there's nothing efficient about it, and it takes huge amounts of tax dollars to achieve the results that we get. I believe that we'll get the same results at the end of the day if we allow these things to naturally progress, if we allow industry and technology to use our resources responsibly to create our desired results while using less of our resources, and I think we can do that.

We know that there are a lot of things that we need to consider when we're studying these bills here at the committee. I think that if we get representation in here from the mining industry, in particular from the Timmins—James Bay constituency, we're going to hear reports from these miners and company owners about how difficult it is for these junior miners to start up and how absolutely necessary the products are that they produce.

• (68450)

I listed several of the junior mining companies in the list that I provided for committee just a few moments ago. You could see that several of these mines are lithium mines. Lithium is a project that's required in the production and development of the batteries that need to power our electrified economy, and in these batteries that we want to make in Stellantis and Volkswagen. I think Ford is considering something as well.

It's important that we hear from witnesses from Timmins—James Bay about how they'll feel about it, and not only on the labour side. I think the labour side is very important. We want to make sure that Canadians can bring home powerful paycheques, and that they can keep a higher percentage of those paycheques in their pockets and not have to pay them through increased costs related to the carbon tax—with the higher cost of groceries, the higher cost of home heating, the higher cost of fuel in their vehicles. With powerful paycheques, we're going to build a powerful economy that is going to continue to drive the welfare of our country.

We're also going to be able to see our export markets expand. We know that Europe has a huge market for us. There are 500 million people as part of the CETA trade pact that we have access to with the free trade agreement. We can access these people with our natural resource products here. We have lots to offer them, whether it's LNG or whether it's our clean hydrocarbon diesel fuel and gas, whether it's forest products, or whether it's the lithium that comes from the mines—the cobalt, uranium—all the stuff that we need and other countries need that we have. We have that here.

We need to be responsible with how we're going to develop these resources. Bill C-69 was an abject failure in that regard. It got nothing done. It made it burdensome for the industry. It created an untenable situation for anything to happen in the natural resource sector. I think that's something we can improve on.

There's a reason this committee should be looking at Bill C-69. It should also be looking at the decision on plastics, like I said before, because of the importance of milkshakes and other things.

This committee needs to be working on legislation that the courts have said is not constitutionally compliant. It's absolutely important we do that, especially if we think we should be studying legislation that references failed legislation. We need to get it right on Bill C-69. We need to get it right on the regulation from the Liberal cabinet on single-use plastics. I think those are the issues this committee should be seized with and should be studying.

Mr. Chair, I think I've made my point, and why it's important that we hear from witnesses from Timmins—James Bay in forestry, in mining, because of the products they produce and also because of how important it is to our studies.

With that, Mr. Chair, I think I've made a good argument.

I've heard from several committee members on why they're not going to support my subamendment. I don't know why they wouldn't want to get witnesses in from Timmins—James Bay. What do these folks have against folks who live in Timmins—James Bay? Why wouldn't we want to hear from them and hear what's important to them?

• (68455)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Falk, for your intervention on this important debate on the subamendment.

If anyone has lost track of where we are, we've had a motion presented on the floor by Mr. Sorbara. We had an amendment placed after that, and we've had a subamendment placed about Timmins—James Bay by Mr. Falk. He has just concluded his intervention on that.

Colleagues, we are approaching 1 p.m.

Mr. Patzer, you're next on the floor to engage and speak, but because we are very close, I do not want to interrupt you once you begin.

Colleagues, I think we should suspend the meeting for the remainder of today. We will continue with Mr. Patzer having the floor on Wednesday.

We are suspended.

[The meeting was suspended at 12:58 p.m., Monday, November 27]

[The meeting resumed at 4:43 p.m., Wednesday, November 29]

• (73640)

The Chair: I call this meeting to order.

Welcome back to meeting number 80 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Natural Resources.

Today we are meeting in public to discuss committee business.

When we suspended on Monday, November 27, we had resumed debate on the subamendment of Mr. Falk.

Just to remind everybody, Mr. Sorbara has presented a motion that's on the floor. We had an amendment, and now we have a subamendment by Mr. Falk. As we concluded our last meeting, Mr. Dreeshen had finished and then Mr. Falk had finished and completed his intervention, and Mr. Patzer now has the floor.

Mr. Patzer, the floor is yours, sir.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you.

Right off the top, it's probably worth mentioning that it was nice, at the last meeting, how things just went along. Everybody was respectful. The points of order.... Only a couple of them happened, and they were, I think, received well. I can count on one hand how many points of order we had last meeting, so that was quite nice and a bit of a change of pace.

I want to welcome Ms. Zarrillo to this committee, as well. It's nice to see her here.

On the point about the subamendment to bring witnesses from Timmins—James Bay, my colleague Mr. Falk did a great job talking about a lot of the mining companies that exist in that particular part of the country. It's important to have people from there speaking at the committee. I think they would generally be concerned about what is going on. One way to find out, obviously, is by inviting them. I think they would be concerned about the development of multiple pieces of substantive government legislation being ruled on and referred to as largely unconstitutional—in particular, the Impact Assessment Act and the way it's going to impact mining as we go forward. I think those mines, especially the ones Mr. Falk was mentioning, will play a big role in Canada going forward. I don't think it matters whether you think everybody should be mandated to drive an EV or not. We're going to need these resources one way or another.

As we continue to develop new ways to generate power and new technology.... It goes outside energy production. It's just technology, generally speaking. The technological advances we have seen, certainly in my lifetime, have been remarkable. Sometimes it almost scares me when I think about the kinds of technologies we're going to come up with, which my kids are going to see as they grow up and enter the workforce—the kinds of things they're going to have at their disposal. The advances in things are going to be quite remarkable.

Those minerals or elements will come from mines in Timmins—James Bay and lots of other places across the country. The problem we're seeing right now is that it will be pretty difficult to get more and more of these mines and projects built when we don't have laws that are constitutional. The certainty required for investors to make investments in Canadian energy, development and exploration.... I know the government said it made the IAA to create certainty, but the problem is that, practically, this has not been the case. It has not been the reality of the situation on the ground.

Given the importance of mining to Canada's strategic positioning in the energy world, globally.... Again, the potential for our country, generally speaking, beyond what we have by possessing all these rare earth minerals here in Canada, which are still largely untapped and not being developed.... We're seeing investment fleeing Canada, or not even looking here at all, because they know they can build projects more quickly, get a return on investment faster and make more money elsewhere. That means jobs are elsewhere. The tax dollars needed to maintain, build and even create new communities are so important.

I think we need to hear from these folks, because they're going to bring a valuable perspective.

● (73645)

I was in a meeting the other day with some folks who were representing some of the port authorities on opposite sides of the country. One of the fundamental concerns they have, and part of their budget submissions, was to figure out a way to reduce timelines for major projects for approvals, because for them to expand their ports or to do any major projects, they have to wait a minimum of five years to get approval. I asked them if that was for the Impact As-

essment Act, and they said yes. They had been waiting five years to get an approval.

This is important because, as much as we would like to have all of our rare earth minerals mined in Canada and then turned into products in Canada, the reality is that we're going to be exporting a lot of them. We're going to be exporting them through our ports.

The folks from Timmins—James Bay, much like the people from Cypress Hills—Grasslands, rely on those ports to be able to get our products, our commodities, out to the global marketplace. When we have largely unconstitutional laws in this country, it severely impacts what we're able to do and get done.

I think it's important to note that on this side of the table we want to make sure that we're passing laws that are constitutional and will withstand that challenge. I think we have outlined previously some of the issues we have with the potential constitutionality issue of Bill C-49 because of its 33 references to the Impact Assessment Act and, in particular, the parts that were referenced as largely unconstitutional.

It would be important to hear from these mining communities and the workers about how this has impacted them and their ability to do their jobs but also to have that certainty long-term knowing that their jobs are going to be there for them tomorrow, next year, and the year after that and make sure that there is a future for their jobs and for their communities. I think that's an important perspective that we will look forward to hearing from witnesses and, particularly, hopefully, from people from Timmins—James Bay.

Part of that, too, is that, when you meet with people in mining and in construction, even at the ports and other places, they talk a lot about the layering on of regulations, and the layering on of costs that continue to pile up and create problems for them. They are just looking for a streamlined process. I know that the people in Timmins—James Bay would benefit from having a streamlined process, the un-layering and unpacking of all of these layers upon layers of regulations and costs.

We know that Canada has some of the highest standards for how we develop our resources. We know that if the rest of the world adopted our standards, the world would have a much lower greenhouse gas emission footprint, yet we still seem to see the need from this government to continue to layer and pancake on regulations rather than trust the process and trust the industries that have really been world leaders at the forefront of the development of this to do what they do, rather than putting them through the gauntlet of regulatory death, basically.

● (73650)

We've seen that multiple times on multiple projects, where they're waiting for approval, waiting for approval, and it's delay, delay, delay. Then, finally, the proponent withdraws the proposal because they know they're either not going to get the approval or the uncertainty and the delays have cost them so much money they'd be better off to cut their losses at that point and run. That's not a situation we want Canada to be in, particularly as we have all the resources in this country that the world wants and needs.

I think we need to make sure that we are prioritizing people who can speak well to these things. That's going to be people who are working in the industry in Timmins—James Bay. They're going to want that certainty.

When Mr. Angus was still here.... He likes to talk a lot about the union jobs, which is fine. It's good that he does that, but what's important is that there will be no union jobs if there are no new projects, if there is no certainty, if there's no investment, if there's no streamlining of regulations or even just making them compliant with our constitution. I think that's of utmost importance.

Part of the reality with rural and remote communities, and with our indigenous communities as well, is that sometimes the only source of jobs is just resource development. That's the opportunity for them. That's where they see the ability for them to have self-determination, to have fair and equal economic participation in the economy. It comes from resource extraction and development and refining.

They also want certainty. They want to know that when a project that's going to be good for their people is proposed, it's not going to take 10 years to get approvals or to finally get a shovel in the ground and start building something or developing a mine or developing the resources they have available to them. That's why Conservatives want to see some witnesses from Timmins—James Bay who can bring that perspective. I think that would be very valuable.

I think part of what's going on with this committee, with this government, with the policy objectives and the multiple court rulings that have gone against the government in recent weeks.... Part of what the government is supposed to do is set the tone for how industry is going to be, set the tone so that there is a sense of optimism.

That's what Brad Wall did so well in Saskatchewan, to turn Saskatchewan from a have-not province to a have province. He set the tone by saying it's good to be from Saskatchewan. We don't need to apologize for being from Saskatchewan. He set the tone because he knew that Saskatchewan had the potential to be so much more than what it was under the NDP for years and years. Many people who left Saskatchewan found a home in Alberta, next door.

You're welcome, Mr. Chair.

They all came back to Saskatchewan because they saw the opportunity because of the tone that was set by the premier. That started in the mid-2000s with him saying that it was good to be from Saskatchewan, that Saskatchewan had what the world needed. It had what our country needed, and we were going to do what we could to provide the goods and services that were needed, both here and across the world. For the next number of years, we developed our resources in a sustainable, environmentally friendly and beneficial way. That has allowed economic participation by people from all across our province.

● (73655)

We have uranium developments in the north. We have potash developments all across the province. We have a lot of oil and gas extraction and development, quite frankly, all across the province, as well, particularly a lot in my riding. That comes because the gov-

ernment set the tone. It set out a framework for how it was going to be done, and we got things done.

The federal government then decided it was going to put a stick in the spokes, with policies like the carbon tax and the Impact Assessment Act, and really gummed up the system in the process. All of it was done under the guise that it was going to save the environment from these crazy people who were developing resources. It's really unfair to the provinces and the industry, which have done a great job of trying to make the processes better.

They have quite often done that without the government stepping in saying, "This needs to happen, that needs to happen, and that needs to be done, or else." Definitely, taking a sledgehammer and holding it over an industry is not the way to work collaboratively, as we hear from the government a lot. Rather than working with industry to figure out how it can best figure this out, there's the stick approach instead of the carrot approach. The folks in Timmins—James Bay would agree with that, as well. As they do a lot of resource development and extraction there, it would be important to hear their views and perspectives on that, as well.

We're starting to see the provinces take matters into their own hands, yet again. That's because of the way the government has decided to set the tone. It has decided to set the tone in a way that is combative, oversteps boundaries and oversteps jurisdiction. We now see multiple provinces telling it to back off, because it is their jurisdiction, their area, and they are doing the best they can. That is why the provinces are passing a Sovereignty Act and the Saskatchewan First Act. I think our colleague, Mr. Simard, could tell us about the viewpoints of some people in Quebec about how they feel, especially regarding provincial jurisdiction.

Our provinces shouldn't have to constantly be putting the shields up and drawing their swords against the federal government, one that talks about collaboration. It says it's going to work collaboratively, and then it dumps burdensome, unconstitutional regulations and laws on top of the provinces. It then acts all surprised when the provinces are all of a sudden saying, "Excuse me", and, like porcupines, they get their quills up, and their tails are ready to swing. That's where the provinces are at right now. They have their quills up, because they know they are being threatened by the federal government with regulations, laws, and the tone that's coming from Ottawa toward them. It is harmful to the provinces. It is harmful to their objectives and what they are trying to do.

● (73700)

We know the folks in Atlantic Canada want to develop their resources. Obviously, this is why the government prioritized it first in the House of Commons and passed it first. That's something we would like to see, the Atlantic provinces having the ability to develop their resources, and we're looking forward to getting to Bill C-49 first, hopefully. At that point, we will also be able to have a good, fulsome conversation and discussion around the former bill, Bill C-69, which has caused large amounts of investment to leave Canada. It's a healthy part of the job losses that have impacted non-unionized and unionized labour. It's impacted our indigenous communities, our rural and remote communities, from being able to develop their resources and being able to offer jobs and employment to their people and their residents.

It's important that the federal government deal with matters that are deemed unconstitutional. That, you would think, would be priority one, trying to resolve that. That would be my hope, that it would be resolved, and there has been no indication that will actually be the case. There were some soft words that it would work to make those sections compliant, but we've heard nothing. We haven't seen any urgency to try to get that done and get that dealt with. Certainly, on our side, we would like nothing more than to get that sorted out and dealt with.

That's part of the main motion—sorry, the main amendment to the motion that we have put forward. Of course, we're on the sub-amendment for members to hear from people from Timmins—James Bay, and I think they would also like to see the certainty that prioritizing the Impact Assessment Act and fixing that would bring for them, for their jobs, for their industries, for their communities. I think they would really appreciate that, so I hope the government will take that seriously and actually consider what it is that Conservatives are trying to work on when it comes to the Impact Assessment Act, and what industry has been saying and what community leaders have been saying on this. It would be a great way to do something that's good for the entirety of the country, for once. I don't think that's asking too much.

I know that our provincial counterparts would appreciate it as well, as they are looking at how best to provide more affordable, more reliable power and energy for their citizens, as that is their provincial responsibility, and having the certainty within the Impact Assessment Act would help bring that for them. I know that in Saskatchewan, for example, there's a lot of conversation happening now around identifying sites where we could build small modular reactors. They would definitely appreciate having an approval process in place that is going to be expeditious and fast, and there will be some certainty provided in it. We know the province wants to do this because they want to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but they also want to make sure that we have reliable power that's generated right in Saskatchewan. We have some nice inner ties with Alberta, Manitoba and Montana.

● (73705)

When you look at the SaskPower website, you can see which direction power is flowing—if we are sending power out of province, or if we are bringing power into the province through the inter-ties—but the Saskatchewan government wants to be able to develop uranium deposits further. Certainly, our rural and remote indige-

nous communities in northern Saskatchewan want to see that development as well, because it means jobs and opportunities for them, much like it would mean jobs and opportunities for the folks in Timmins—James Bay.

I think across the country, there will be a lot of demand for Saskatchewan uranium. I think these are the SMRs. Even if they were to build another CANDU reactor, for example, if somebody were to do that one day, it would be beneficial, and Saskatchewan uranium could be the ticket for that, to be able to get it done. It's a good Saskatchewan resource for good, truly clean, zero-emitting power that for years the current government has said it doesn't want and we can't have, but we know it's up to the provinces how they are going to develop their resources and provide power for their citizens. Getting this right would be the least this committee could do.

The former member for Sudbury, when we talked about this in a previous Parliament, was adamant: “No. We fixed the assessment. It was your process that was flawed. That was the problem. Ours is perfect. Ours is good. It's not the problem.” We have been hearing—and we've done multiple studies across multiple committees—that this is just not the case, and the Impact Assessment Act has caused extra delays, extra uncertainty and problems for getting projects developed.

I'm sure Mr. Lefebvre would agree that getting the process right this time around would be a good thing, after his assertions in the previous Parliament that everything was fine and that wasn't the problem. Now that it's been proven that it is unconstitutional and creates problems, I think he would agree that we should make sure we get it right this time around. I won't put words in his mouth. I know he is not here to defend himself on that, so I won't do that to him. However, the reason why I said that is that I think it's worth noting the position over multiple Parliaments that the government has had on this particular issue and its refusal to admit that there are problems.

That's what brings us to where we are today, once again talking about the Impact Assessment Act, how it's going to be a problem for Bill C-49 and how it will absolutely be a problem for Bill C-50. This is because, again, the whole just transition plan by the government is to transition workers out of the.... For sure, it's to make sure that there's no more coal in this country, but for the oil and gas sector, it would be a supposed just transition or, as we call it, an unjust transition for these workers that's going to happen.

If the government is successful in ramming this unjust transition down the provinces' and the unionized and non-unionized workers' throats.... They're not going to be okay with being janitors, as some of the briefing notes that have come to light have indicated or hinted at, and they're certainly not going to be okay with a 34% pay cut to go and work in the renewables sector right now. We heard that witness testimony a little while back. That's not to mention the fuel, the energy and the power that will have to be developed to replace the losses from those plants being shut down. That will be of the utmost importance.

• (73710)

It's interesting to note that in the so-called clean electricity regulations from this government, a power plant could operate for 450 hours if it's emitting after the deadline comes and goes. That amounts to less than 18 days. It's around 18 days. My quick math might have me off by a day or two. Forgive me for that. If somebody decides to fact-check me, I admit that I might be off by a day or two.

The point is that in Saskatchewan, for close to seven months of the year, it's below zero degrees. A large amount of our power in Saskatchewan comes from coal and from natural gas. It's about 73%, on average, on a daily basis. In Alberta, I think it's 85%, or somewhere around there, largely in natural gas.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Alberta is the country's leader in renewable energy.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: It is the leader in renewable energy. That is absolutely right. It has the most wind capacity as well, I believe, as a province, with lots of solar developments and a few other things going on there.

It's worth noting that a couple of days ago, when it was a cold day in Alberta, the total net-to-grid for wind and solar was basically a couple of megawatts, out of the thousands of gigawatts of capacity that they have. Without the reliability and certainty of the grid that you have with natural gas...and even right now with coal, although I recognize that coal is on track to be phased out by 2023. There is an amount of reliability and affordability that you get from coal and natural gas.

Saskatchewan in particular has done a lot to develop natural gas alongside Alberta. If this government is going to transition everybody to powering their grids with wind and solar, it doesn't matter how much capacity you build: If the turbine isn't spinning, the sun isn't shining, and you have next to nothing for total net-to-grid, there will be some huge problems.

We saw the devastation in Texas when they had a little bit of snow and cold weather. They were totally unprepared for it because of their pursuit of trying to run their grid on renewables. I don't say this lightly. People died. This past summer, we had a billet who played with the Swift Current 57's. He was from Texas. We talked with him about what was happening down there. He talked about that particular week when that happened and how crazy it was—the blackouts, the devastation in communities with no power, the pipes that were bursting, the issues from the cleanup after the fact, and the disaster in people's homes, let alone the devastation it brought when people were literally freezing to death.

That was in Texas, where it's usually a lot warmer 12 months of the year than it is in Saskatchewan. That's a shocker, I know, but seven months out of the year we are below zero, on average, below freezing.

• (73715)

I drive to Regina to fly out to Ottawa. I drive down Highway 1. I drive past some of the most recent wind turbines that have been put up in Saskatchewan. Even on days when there is a good wind, and when I have a nice tailwind pushing me into the Queen City, it's

amazing how many turbines aren't spinning. To be fair—I don't know—maybe they haven't been fully commissioned yet, but I know I've seen most of them, at very different times, in operation.

The fact is that if they're not spinning, they're not producing. It's usually pretty windy in Saskatchewan, but there are a lot of days when there's not enough wind to generate wind power reliably. There are days when it's cloudy. In the winter, the days are shorter. You only have a couple of hours of peak power-producing sunlight to generate the power you need to keep the lights on and furnaces running. That creates problems.

If you start to think about the amount of capacity it will take, we know we're going to have to increase the grid capacity by two and a half times at least and probably to well over that. You'd have to times it by three at least. That's the route this government wants to go on. How much land is going to be taken out of production to build more and more wind- and solar-chasing capacity? How many tax dollars are going to be spent subsidizing the development of this in the pursuit of an unattainable mandate from this government?

If we're going to be powering mines in Timmins—James Bay, they want reliability. They want certainty. They want affordability as well, because powering these mines is not cheap at the best of times. To massively increase the costs and uncertainty for these companies, which are doing the best they can in the circumstances they find themselves in, wouldn't be fair. It wouldn't be right.

I'll go back to my point about setting the tone. At the very least, the Impact Assessment Act needs to be prioritized and fixed before anything else can proceed. I hope that somewhere in the nation's capital here, whether it's the minister, his staff or all the people who work in those offices, somebody is working on that, because we haven't heard anything since the brief statement about making sure it is compliant. We haven't heard anything, so what's happening? How are we going to provide certainty for people if we're not doing that?

I think our committee has a great chance to be the ones who set the tone for that. However, if we're just going to have a seven-to-four vote on whether or not we do anything with the Impact Assessment Act, this committee will rob itself of the potential to set the tone on this, to make sure we get it right and to make sure we provide certainty, clarity and reduced timelines for proponents who want to develop our resources—develop the goods and things we have in this country and can offer the world. The good folks of Timmins—James Bay would surely appreciate that as well, I would imagine.

• (73720)

I really hope we'll be able to get to a point where that can be the priority for this committee, because we know that there are going to be some problems with Bill C-49 if we don't address it and deal with it. We want the good folks in Atlantic Canada to develop their resources as best they see fit. We know that Bill C-49 is the tool they need to do that, but imagine giving somebody the tool they need to do their job but it's completely disassembled and you took a few components out of it and said, "Here you go. This will work."

That's basically what's happening here by sending out a bill that has no less than 33 references to the unconstitutional part of the Impact Assessment Act. That's going to be a problem, and it will be a problem for the folks in Atlantic Canada to have the certainty they need to get this done. The last thing they want to see are court challenges arising from a piece of legislation that could end up being deemed unconstitutional because of certain elements in it and because of its affiliation to the Impact Assessment Act.

The government is on a bit of a losing streak with court challenges lately too, which also doesn't set a very good tone. What we are finding out is that—

• (73725)

The Chair: We have a point of order from Mr. Aldag.

Mr. Aldag, go ahead.

Mr. John Aldag: I would like to call the question of relevance to the subamendment. We've been here for almost an hour, and although it's been very interesting, we're well off the subject of the Timmins—James Bay witnesses. Some of this may be more appropriate for the main motion and for the amendment, but I don't find that there is any relevance to what is being debated right now.

I would encourage the person with the floor to bring it back to the subamendment or we should move on to the next speaker, because as I said, it's been an hour and I'm not feeling that my life is enriched for future debate on this through what we've been listening to. We should speak to the subamendment.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Aldag.

I will just remind committee members to stay focused on the subamendment on hand and ensure that, as you debate, you are relevant to the subamendment that Mr. Falk so kindly presented at an earlier meeting.

Mr. Patzer, with that, I'll turn the floor over to you.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you.

What I am doing is talking about the importance of setting the tone for the workers and the employers in Timmins—James Bay and why this matters.

The subamendment is to call people from Timmins—James Bay on the amendment to the motion, which sets out the order in which we go here. If you follow the order, you'll understand why all this is relevant and why it matters. If we don't have certainty for our producers and for our workers, there will be nothing but problems for the people in Timmins—James Bay.

I would humbly suggest that, for the number of times that I have said “Timmins—James Bay”, I think my Open Parliament web page is probably going to have “Timmins—James Bay” creeping up as one of my commonly used words.

I would obviously rather be talking about all the amazing things that happen in Cypress Hills—Grasslands, but that would be off topic. That's why I'm talking about all the things here that will be important for the folks of Timmins—James Bay. I sometimes wander down the path of some of the good things that we do in Cypress Hills—Grasslands because I think there are a lot of similarities between the people of Timmins—James Bay and the people of Cy-

press Hills—Grasslands. In my neck of the woods in southwest Saskatchewan, our industries are very similar to those in parts of Timmins—James Bay.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: It's like a message of unity.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: It's a message of unity, of national unity, of what it could truly look like when we have multiple regions of the country all being treated fairly at the table. Whether you're trying to develop resources in northern Ontario, in northern Saskatchewan, in southern Saskatchewan, in central Alberta or in Atlantic Canada, you need some certainty. You certainly need the federal government to be working with you and working for you, not making unrealistic, unattainable demands, with the pancaking of regulations and costs on top of all of these projects.

I think there are currently seven advanced exploration projects in the Timmins district. Four of them are for critical minerals. The seven projects in the Timmins district include three gold projects. There are four that fall under the critical minerals list: the Canada Nickel Company's Crawford nickel project, EV Nickel's Shaw Dome project, Fox River Resources Corporation's Martison phosphate project and—I hope I'm saying this right—Niobay Metals' James Bay niobium project. A couple of the gold projects will be going into production shortly.

There's a lot of good work happening and looking to be done in those areas. If we want more projects like those to happen, they're going to be looking for improved, expedited timelines. That way, they will be able to increase the output of our minerals and resources in Canada, whether it's in Timmins—James Bay, in Cypress Hills—Grasslands, in Lakeland or in Newfoundland and Labrador. It doesn't matter where you are; you need the certainty for these projects. Whichever province and whichever riding it's in, that certainty needs to be there. I would like to see more projects like these seven that I listed here in development across this great country.

• (73730)

It's definitely worth noting that our indigenous communities are looking for partnerships. They're looking for equity in these projects. They've been denied equity in these projects—not these ones in particular. I'm not speaking about these seven that I listed but other projects that have been cancelled in the past. They're looking for economic reconciliation. They're looking for self-determination. They are looking for opportunities for their residents, for their people, and that's what natural resources can bring.

That's where having a partner in the federal government that works with and for the people to make sure they can achieve their outcomes.... Let the provinces and the first nations set and determine what their outcomes are going to be, and the federal government should work alongside them to attain that.

The Chair: Mr. Sorbara, do you have a point of order?

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Yes, I do. I'm very much enjoying listening to Jeremy's intervention today about the ongoing need for collaboration among government, industry and labour, and I would love to hear from him about Dow's investment today, the announcement of the \$11-million project in the province of Alberta. If he would elaborate on that, I would love to hear the specifics on that project and the jobs and business going to the province of Alberta and about how all levels of government are working together, including the Province of Alberta, on that project.

• (73735)

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order, Mr. Sorbara.

I remind colleagues to remain focused on the topic at hand regarding the subamendment and use their time to debate the subamendment for everybody watching so we can get back to the amendment and hopefully back to the main motion, maybe even at today's meeting. If we're lucky, we can get there. If we focus on that, we can continue. Thank you.

We have another point of order from Mr. Aldag.

Mr. John Aldag: I have a question. How are we being broadcast today? I was under the impression that we weren't in a televised room. When you said those "watching", is that those listening or watching?

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Aldag, for the point of order. It's my understanding that it may just be audio today. We may not have a full visual component of today's meeting. The audio is there, and everybody across Canada who is tuned in will be listening very intently. I did say "watching" and it is "listening." My apologies for that.

Mr. Patzer, we'll go back to you on the subamendment. I would just ask you, as I ask all colleagues, to make sure that you stick with the relevance of the subamendment in your comments to the subamendment.

Go ahead, Mr. Patzer. The floor is yours.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I appreciate you reminding colleagues to stick to the subamendment and talk to the subamendment. I would love to learn and hear more about this project in Alberta, but unfortunately Alberta is not in Timmins—James Bay, so we'll have to save that for another motion maybe on another day or in another study. I guess we'll get there at a different point in time.

This kind of gets to a point that I find kind of ironic and funny. Over the last several meetings, we had the member for Timmins—James Bay whining and complaining about not being able to speak. He wanted to speak, and his allegations that—

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, I'll ask you to hold on. We have a point of order from Ms. Dabrusin.

Ms. Dabrusin, go ahead.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: I've been happy to hear Mr. Patzer speak about this subamendment with such fervour, but it's truly improper and unparliamentary, when speaking about another member of this committee, to say they've been whining. It's unflattering and it's unparliamentary.

The Chair: Colleagues, I would remind everybody from previous meetings that I think we're in a good place today with the tone and language we're using. Let's ensure we are not making any accusations or using any unparliamentary language.

Thank you for the reminder, Ms. Dabrusin.

Mr. Patzer, the floor is yours. Go ahead, please.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: That was an interesting intervention, because over the last four or five meetings, again, it was the member from Timmins—James Bay who kept on saying, no less than 15 times—actually, I think it was closer to 20 times—that he was being abused by Conservative members. I didn't hear a single objection from anybody on that side of the committee room to him using that kind of language, which was very unparliamentary, not to mention the fact that it completely undermines people who are legitimately, this very second, experiencing abuse. There was no objection to that, and that's disgusting.

The fact that Mr. Angus went on and on about not being allowed to speak means that saying he was whining fits. It was appropriate. When he finally did speak, he didn't even talk about Timmins—James Bay. He didn't talk about the motion either. He spent his whole 45 minutes not even talking about it.

I spent my whole hour and a bit talking about how this is going to impact projects in Timmins—James Bay. I listed seven projects that are currently under way in Timmins—James Bay, not one in Alberta. That was brought up by somebody else. I've been speaking about the projects in Timmins—James Bay and how the Impact Assessment Act is going to be, if it's not fixed, a problem for them. That's what I've been talking about. That's what I spent my time talking about.

I've been telling you why we need to prioritize the Impact Assessment Act so these projects in Timmins—James Bay can continue to go ahead and so more projects like them can be proposed in Timmins—James Bay and in other parts of the country. That's what I've been talking about for over an hour and a half and that's what Mr. Angus was not bothering to talk about for the hour that he had the floor—nor were any other members who were saying they were not being allowed to speak. When they finally got the floor, they didn't even bother to speak to the subamendment either. I am speaking to the subamendment and I am using and will continue to use language that is parliamentary.

It's important that the federal government set the tone. The point I was about to make before the last couple of points of order was that the rules matter. Whether it's the rules of this committee, the laws of this land or our Constitution and the way it's set out for the provinces within Confederation, rules matter.

I mentioned earlier that the federal government is on a bit of a losing streak in the courts as of late. Most recently, it was the plastics ban and the regulations around it that were unconstitutional. In particular, the Impact Assessment Act was ruled largely unconstitutional. When the government deliberately sets rules and laws that are unconstitutional, it creates disorder and issues.

We've seen the provinces, as I mentioned earlier, draft legislation to shield themselves from overreach in the federal government and to reassert that they have jurisdictional authority over provinces. By the way, I'll make note that in Saskatchewan it was supported unanimously by the NDP. It's because they know what's happening with this federal government. Even the provincial NDP in Saskatchewan know the federal government in Ottawa is overstepping its bounds. Generally, they are quite aligned with the federal government, but even they are starting to see that the federal government is offside.

● (73740)

It's true of the NDP in Alberta too. They're starting to wise up to that as well. Despite their desire to try to please the federal government, even they are now starting to see and realize that was probably not the best idea. Now we also have the UCP government in Alberta and the Saskatchewan Party government in Saskatchewan actively working to shield themselves from the overstepping of the government.

That's the tone this government has decided to set. It's decided to say, "This is the way we're going to go. We don't care what you think. You're going to have to do this." Not only do the provinces say no, but the Supreme Court did too, and here we wait for the government to act, to do something and to remedy the situation.

We know it is a usual practice for the government to create a problem for people and at the same time think it's creating the solution. This is one of those few times when we say the government has to provide the solution, but the solution is going to be undoing the disaster it created in the first place. That's what we are hoping to get to, start with and prioritize in this committee. That way, more projects in Timmins—James Bay can happen and more projects across the country can happen.

Again, we have the Atlantic accord legislation, Bill C-49, here with us as well. That needs to be done and dealt with, and the government prioritized that over Bill C-50. For some reason, the minister decided to wait over a year to do anything with it. We've also seen Auditor General reports talk about how the government has basically done nothing, particularly over the COVID years. For two years, it did absolutely nothing to get people and communities ready for 2030. They are still waiting for the coal transition funding they were promised by the government.

Over 3,400 or 3,500 workers were impacted by the microtransition that happened in coal in Alberta. Entire communities were devastated. Who knows? Maybe the Liberals will put forward a subamendment to hear from people from Hanna, Alberta. I think they would probably want an opportunity to speak to this as well and how the just transition worked for them. However, we're talking about Timmins—James Bay, so we'll see if the Liberals want to move that subamendment later.

Just looking at the list of the projects going on in Timmins—James Bay, I see that one of them is a phosphate project.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: It's not even on the critical minerals list.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Yes, that's another point. It's not even on the critical minerals list, but it should be added. My colleague has been out at the front asking for that for months. Mining and developing

phosphate in northern Ontario is a nation-building project, with the applications that phosphate can be used for in agriculture, for example. There are lots of opportunities there. Going forward, for food production in this country and around the world, there will be a need for more and more phosphate. It's going to be needed but it's going to be tough to develop more projects in Timmins—James Bay or wherever else it might be if we don't fix the Impact Assessment Act.

● (73745)

If we don't deal with it, we're not going to see the proper development of resources in Atlantic Canada. They're not going to do the things they need to do, which, by the way, support the industries in my riding, Cypress Hills—Grasslands. They rely on the Atlantic provinces to either import or export agricultural commodities. Right now we have to import certain things for agriculture that we could probably develop and do in our own country, but because of regulatory uncertainty we don't because it's cheaper for companies to do it elsewhere around the world.

We could change that if we prioritized the Impact Assessment Act. We could change it so that we are world leaders in some of these projects involving critical minerals and other items that should be added to the critical minerals list. We could be world leaders if the government got out of the way and respected the fact that we already have some of the best and highest standards for environmental responsibility in this country. It's the multiple layering that continues to suffocate jobs and development in all parts of this country but particularly in Timmins—James Bay.

I hope I have been clear that we need to do the Impact Assessment Act, because it will directly benefit the people and the projects in Timmins—James Bay. I strongly feel that the committee should be prioritizing the Impact Assessment Act. We could come to a position where we do Bill C-49 quickly and pass it and then fix the Impact Assessment Act after. Maybe we could do that, but if the government isn't giving any indication that they want to fix the Impact Assessment Act, then, as I said, I'm worried there would be a seven-to-four vote in committee on prioritizing the Impact Assessment Act. That just leaves us at square one, or square zero, as it may even be behind square one with the way things are going.

I think we have an opportunity as a committee to do the right thing and fix the Impact Assessment Act. That way the Atlantic provinces get the certainty they need to develop their resources, whether it be renewables or oil and gas, whatever they want to do. If it's tidal power, they should have the freedom to do that. I recognize that we need to pass Bill C-49 for that to happen, but passing an unconstitutional bill would be problematic. That's why we need to prioritize the Impact Assessment Act.

Mr. Chair, I think that I am coming toward the end of my remarks. Do you want me to keep going? Okay, I'll keep going. I can't believe you shook your head.

I know Mario would have a problem if projects were being delayed and denied in Quebec and if there were issues with companies getting the certainty they need with the Impact Assessment Act, so—

• (73750)

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Simard: Mr. Chair, I'm going to rise on a point of order to help out my colleague.

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Simard has a point of order.

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Simard: Out of friendship for Mr. Patzer, I can rise on a point of order to help him.

In his comments, he speaks at length about the environmental impact bills. I'd simply like to point out to him that one of Quebec's major liquefied natural gas projects was turned down because of an environmental assessment carried out by Quebec. If we were to review every single environmental assessment, I don't think that that would necessarily lead to all kinds of agreements on gas and oil projects.

It's clear that Quebec doesn't want any liquefied natural gas projects. If Mr. Patzer's goal is to give the provinces more sovereignty over environmental assessments, then I fully agree with him. But I don't think that's his intent.

So I'd like some clarification from him on that matter.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Simard, for the point of order.

I would just remind colleagues to ensure the arguments being made and presented on the subamendment currently at hand are relevant, and to tie the subamendment back to the amendment and the main motion.

Just to remind everybody who's listening keenly at home across the country, Mr. Sorbara has introduced a motion. From that motion, we had an amendment. We are on the subamendment that was presented by Mr. Falk.

Mr. Patzer, with that, I will turn the floor back to you.

• (73755)

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you very much for that point of order, Mr. Simard.

I will be mindful of how I say this, because sovereignty can be used in a few different ways. I firmly believe the provinces should be allowed to develop their resources the way they see fit. Quebec has developed a lot of hydro power. They have an abundance of that power, which is fantastic. They've been able to utilize a resource they have because the province prioritized that. They've been successful as a province because of that, within Confederation. Manitoba is much the same with their hydro, and Ontario obviously has hydro. Ontario has been successful in developing nuclear power too.

The Impact Assessment Act, I suggest, should not be a barrier for a company in Quebec to develop LNG. As I understand it, Quebec has some of the largest reserves of natural gas in Canada. Heck, they could almost be part of the conversation around who the world leaders are in developing this valuable resource. I will concede that it's up to the provinces to decide whether they want to do that. As far as I know, I don't think Quebec at this point has an interest in doing that. That's their prerogative. In the interest of provincial autonomy, I disagree with their decision, but I support their right to make that decision. I think that's an important distinction to make. When provinces such as Alberta and Saskatchewan decide natural gas should be developed as a way to provide reliable, affordable and clean energy to their people, the federal government shouldn't be a barrier with its regulations to them being able to do that.

In particular, these mining projects in Timmins—James Bay are going to need a lot of power. Our grid needs to more than double in the next 10 years I think, or maybe by 2035. Our grid is going to have to more than double its capacity. To hamstring provinces with the Impact Assessment Act.... Who knows? Maybe Quebec will one day decide they're going to develop all that potential LNG in their province. If they do, it would be a shame if the federal government were the barrier that stood in their way. It stands to reason that, if Quebec wants to do that, they should be able to do that. I would support them wanting to do that. If they don't, they don't.

As I said, they have a lot of hydro power available to them, which is phenomenal. When you look at some of the potential for utilizing that hydro power for other means, boy, that's a good nation-building project in and of itself right there. I think there is some joint interest between Saskatchewan and Quebec and Alberta and Quebec to get some manufacturing. Raw goods and products that are harvested in the Prairies could be sent out east to Quebec or the Atlantic region, where there's existing infrastructure in place, to be refined or developed. That's a great idea.

• (73800)

One of the mines I was talking about in Timmins—James Bay is going to be developing 900 jobs during early operating years. Construction jobs last a certain period of time. Then they start the actual long-term jobs, the number of which is a bit lower. It looks as though we're levelling out at about 400 to 500 jobs down the line on that.

They applied, under the Impact Assessment Act, in March of this year. The timelines are going to be problematic for them. They're trying to figure this process out, and now all of a sudden the act that governs this is unconstitutional or largely unconstitutional. What does that do for their certainty when they've applied in March, and how is that going to work out for them? That means there are going to be more delays. That means more timelines aren't going to be favourable for the development of this project. The Canada Nickel Company has proposed the construction, operation, decommissioning and abandonment for this mine. It's an open-pit nickel-cobalt mine and on-site metal mill.

We're talking about the need for nickel-cobalt for electric vehicles. Electric vehicles are going to need a lot of these materials. It would be a shame if the Impact Assessment Act stood in the way of the expeditious development of this project. The Crawford nickel project would have a mine ore production capacity of 275,000 tonnes per day and a mill ore input capacity of 120,000 tonnes per day. This is a project that will operate for 43 years. That will be huge for the region, for jobs. That's how you keep communities, cities and towns viable. That is why the Impact Assessment Act is important.

We've heard from people, from a witness actually, that we would be lucky if that were to get from conception to operation—and I'm glad you're all sitting down—within 25 years. We have an EV mandate in this country. If it's going to take 25 years to get a project developed and producing to the point where things can be going, how are you going to hit that mandate? How are you going to hit that target? Where are you going to get the resources from?

That's the problem. Nobody is against EV vehicles. Give me a superior vehicle and I'll drive it. That's what I want. I just want a vehicle that will perform better. If my internal combustion engine vehicle is going to perform better, then I'm going to drive that. However, if a battery-powered vehicle performs better and it's more affordable without the government—the taxpayer—having to subsidize it to make it more affordable, I'm probably going to stick with what I have, to be honest.

We can see this project operating for 43 years. It's amazing how sometimes projects like this mine, which is in the heart of Timmins—James Bay, will go longer than what the prescribed timeline is. It says it would operate for about 43 years. There are mines in Flin Flon, for example, that were mining this resource and then all of a sudden it was discovered that they were right next to a deposit for something else. Once they exhausted the one resource, they switched to mining for other resources in the same shafts, or maybe they had to make a new shaft. They were doing that and were able to develop new resources. They discovered that throughout the process. All of a sudden, you now have mines that have long exceeded their expected end-of-life date.

● (73805)

These are jobs and certainties for people for decades and decades to come. This Crawford project is accessible from provincial Highway 655. A 13.2-kilometre section of the highway will need to be realigned, as it passes across the pit envelope. Phase one development will include a processing capacity of 42,500 tonnes per day, which will be increased to 85,000 tonnes per day in phase two.

I'm going to read those job numbers again. There will be 900 jobs during the early operating years, levelling out at 700 to 800, with 400 to 500 jobs created during the construction phase. That is a significant project for the area. An MOU has been signed as well, which is important for the other folks and first nations in the area. That's important too. This is about wanting to participate and wanting self-determination as well. That's important to note.

One thing these projects also do is support our community. We have the jobs part, but I hope one day to drive through the riding of Timmins—James Bay, through some of these communities, to see the names of these companies on the community rinks and as sponsors of kids clubs. There is an oil company in my riding that recently sponsored a kids curling club. I think it was Kindersley. The kids curling program is free for these kids because this company sponsored the entire program. That's what oil and gas companies are actively doing. I would suspect that these companies operating in Timmins—James Bay and throughout all the communities there.... I'd be willing to bet that the names of these companies are all over that town and all over the community organizations.

This Crawford nickel-cobalt mine is supported by the Taykwa Tagamou Nation. There are other first nations in the area that are part of it as well. It is of utmost importance for them that these projects have the certainty and clarity to be built and get done. That's why we have the subamendment for Timmins—James Bay.

I don't have the number of first nations in the Timmins—James Bay riding in front of me. Charlie has mentioned the number once or twice in the past. I will bet there are others that would like to be partners on future projects as well, or maybe they are in the process of setting up companies to do this. There are indigenous-led businesses and corporations all across the country that are in development or already in existence and are actively contributing to mining projects, among other types of projects around the country.

● (73810)

There's a good-news article from Timmins—James Bay in Northern Ontario Business. This is about the MOU. It says, "Agreement outlines exploration, development steps along with opportunities for Matachewan and Mattagami First Nations." The Canada Nickel Company and these first nations have signed the MOU "establishing a guideline for exploration and development operations at the company's Crawford nickel-cobalt sulphide project near Timmins."

The article goes on:

Announced on Dec. 14, [2020], the MOU signifies a commitment by the company to consult with the First Nations and establish a mutually beneficial relationship during all stages of project development.

The agreement also provides the communities with an opportunity to participate in the benefits of the Project through business opportunities, employment and training, financial compensation and consultation on environmental matters.

Mark Selby, Canada Nickel's chair and CEO, said the company is committed to "responsible development" of the project.

This is his quote, per the article:

"From the very beginning, our approach has been to work with First Nations and local stakeholders as partners in order to create shared value through economic opportunities, while also being respectful and responsible stewards of the natural environment," Selby said in the release.

"Canada Nickel acknowledges Matachewan and Mattagami First Nations in their commitment to protect and enhance the land and resource-based economy within their traditional territory.

"We welcome their constructive approach and their support of our efforts to move forward on the development, permitting and construction of the project."

The articles go on:

Located 40 kilometres north of Timmins, the Crawford Project is considered among the world's 10 biggest nickel deposits, and, according to Selby, has the potential to become world-class in scope.

In October, the company was reporting Crawford's total measured and indicated resources at 657 million tonnes, grading 0.26 per cent nickel, with inferred resources of 646 million tonnes, grading 0.24 per cent nickel.

Jason Batise, executive director of the Wabun Tribal Council, welcomed the opportunity to establish a "strong and mutually beneficial" relationship with the company.

In his role with the regional chiefs organization – which represents five First Nations, including Matachewan and Mattagami – Batise has been integral to the development of the Wabun Method.

This structured negotiating process between mining companies and member First Nations outlines how the First Nations will participate in resource activity within their traditional territory.

"Mark is genuinely committed to responsible and sustainable development, and our community appreciates being engaged in the early planning stages of the project," Mattagami First Nation Chief Chad Boissoneau said in the release.

Canada Nickel is expected to release a preliminary economic assessment of the Main Zone by year's end, followed by a more detailed feasibility study...[in] 2021.

That article is from 2020 or maybe early 2021. I think that really outlines what they're doing for first nations. When you look at the timelines of things, the fact that the regulatory process is about three years later means it's only just beginning, as we have a largely unconstitutional Impact Assessment Act in place with no indication from the federal government that it will be remedied anytime soon.

It would be in the best interests, you would think, of this government to make that priority number one, especially for a government that's been breathless in their support of reconciliation and in supporting not only the self-autonomy of first nations, self-determination and economic reconciliation but also the local knowledge they bring. I was grateful for the article and how it spoke about them being part of the consultation process, because you can't ever go wrong with local knowledge, especially from those good folks.

• (73815)

That's where the government has a responsibility, I think, to set the tone for how this will go. We're still waiting. That speaks to the tone being set, in and of itself. Will this project and others like it get the certainty they need?

Mr. Chair, do you hear a buzzing sound? I hear a high-pitched buzzing sound. Are the interpreters hearing that noise? They're not. Okay.

Mr. John Aldag: It probably blended into your voice.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Well, I gave you that one on a tee, didn't I? I have a lot of catching up to do with Mr. Lamoureux, speaking of extra emissions and hot air. He's not here, actually. That's not fair to him.

[*Translation*]

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

[*English*]

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

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: While it's all very well to hear from my colleague that he has not yet achieved Mr. Lamoureux's capacity for hot air, he should get back to the subject at issue, because things are getting a little bit out of hand. At least he was waxing lyrical in his latest comments. Before that, we had Mr. Dreeshen, telling us that he hoped Canada would export its oil everywhere for peace. Then there was Mr. Falk explaining that he liked big engines and plastic straws for his milkshakes. It's lyrical, interesting, and keeps us awake.

So I think my colleague should make a special effort, because reading us a newspaper story just doesn't cut it. If he hears a sound, it's probably the interpreters falling asleep. Please give them something to think about. If my colleague could put a little more emotion or passion into his parliamentary obstruction, I think everyone would be very grateful to him.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Simard, for your point of order.

Mr. Patzer, I would remind you and other colleagues to ensure there is relevance in your interventions that relates back to the sub-amendment presented by Mr. Falk and ties into the amendment and motion we have on the floor. I'm not sure if you've concluded your remarks, but I want to turn the floor back over to you so you can finish up if you're near the end. Then other members will get an opportunity to have an intervention today.

I'll turn it back over to you.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I am doing the best I can to try to be respectful to the interpreters, because I could bring a little more fire and brimstone, but I like to keep things on a bit more of a calm, even keel. That's more my demeanor. I'll leave it to my friend and colleague from Battle River—Crowfoot to bring the gusto. There are other colleagues who can do that. That's not me. This is more my pace. I'm more of a laid-back guy. I know that might make it hard to sit and listen for this long, but I have my points to make and I will continue to make them.

On the point of relevance, the news article was from Timmins, actually. As far as relevance goes, it was from the riding that the subamendment we are debating today is about. I think I've done a pretty good job of staying on point the entire time, although we went here and there a bit on a few things.

I'm not sure what that noise is, but that's okay.

There are lots of other good mining projects in the region that are still going through the assessment process. For this other project, the initial capital cost was \$972 million. They're putting a ton of money on the line for this project and they're looking for some certainty. They want certainty. They want to know that when they apply—actually, they did apply—the assessment is going to come to a rapid conclusion.

There's a time extension. There's been an extension to 2025 on the Springpole gold project. Something we've seen quite regularly from the government is extending deadlines on their end of things and taking as long as possible to complete the assessment. We have seen companies back out of projects. Teck famously did that after multiple delays. After they sank millions of dollars into the whole process, they just walked away from it. That doesn't send a very good signal to industry that this country is open for business. Unconstitutional acts don't send a signal to investors to come and invest in Timmins—James Bay. When we have an issue with an Impact Assessment Act that is unconstitutional, that's a problem.

• (73820)

There's another gold mine project in the region of Timmins—James Bay. We're talking of 400 to 600 operational jobs. If these projects can't get the certainty they need to proceed.... These are big projects that will be of the utmost importance to our country becoming the world leader it should be in the development of resources and the export of resources. We can and we should lead the world. We have that opportunity. We should take that advantage. We should use it to our advantage. We should take control of that.

The Chair: We have a point of order from Mr. Aldag.

Mr. Aldag, go ahead.

Mr. John Aldag: This is something that I perhaps should have done earlier in the day. If our colleague would like to conclude his comments, I would gladly move that we see the clock at 6:30. Then we could have a new speaker for the next meeting. I'm not sure if we can do that here, but it's a great way of moving along our speaking list and perhaps moving on.

I'm just throwing that out there.

The Chair: Thank you for the point of order, Mr. Aldag, and the encouragement and guidance you're providing to committee members.

I'll let the committee member think about what you've said.

Procedurally, I'll pass the floor back to Mr. Patzer.

• (73825)

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I mean, I'm still waiting—

Mr. John Aldag: He looks like he needs a milkshake.

Mr. Ted Falk: I think we all need a milkshake.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Yes, we do.

Mr. Ted Falk: It's hot in here.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Now, if you'd come bringing some AAA grade beef or something like that, some steaks, maybe we would have a conversation.

Mr. John Aldag: I got you. Red Angus only.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Absolutely. I've been asking the chair to bring Alberta beef, because he's from Calgary, Alberta. I think committee members would appreciate that.

Chair, just quickly, I think it would be beneficial to know, if you would indulge me, what the speaking list is.

The Chair: Currently, Mr. Patzer, you have the floor. After that we have Mrs. Stubbs.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Okay. Are we done at 6:30 p.m.?

The Chair: My intention is to go until 6:30 p.m., unless you cede the floor earlier. I don't want to give Mrs. Stubbs a moment or two to get started and then have to take a break before the next intervention. I'll leave it up to you how you'd like to proceed. We can proceed for another two and a half minutes to 6:30, because that's when we have resources until this evening.

You do have the floor. I'll let you decide if you want to provide a few more minutes of your important debate on Mr. Falk's subamendment.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: It's a great subamendment, because, again, the number of projects going on in the riding of Timmins—James Bay is quite remarkable.

We can look at the strategic advantage that we should have in this country. It's quite remarkable to think that the United States' military is investing in Canada for our resources, because we have the critical minerals the world wants and needs. When the U.S. military wants to invest in Canada, I'm sure a philosophical debate could be had by everybody on that. We'll maybe leave that one for another day, possibly another committee. Who knows?

It really shows what we have in this country. I think it would be extremely frustrating to them to know that it could take 25 years to get a project producing. Again, that leads to the question of where else they might go to invest. What other countries around the world are trying to produce lots of the same minerals, trying to mine the same minerals we are or that we possess in this country?

Certainly when you look at the human rights atrocities of some of these countries around the world and the lack of good working conditions, I can guarantee you there's no unionized labour in some of those countries with the way these folks are treated. That's not to mention that they do not have the environmental regulations and sustainability initiatives we have in Canada. They also don't have an unconstitutional Impact Assessment Act. They wouldn't have an Impact Assessment Act to begin with, but the point is that we have a former bill from this government, Bill C-69, that's now a law and it's largely unconstitutional. Of all the things in the way of getting projects built so that good, sustainable Canadian projects can supersede and replace—

• (73830)

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, I'm sorry to cut you off. We are at time, and I would ask you to hold that important thought for a future opportunity to finish up. Thank you.

Colleagues, we will suspend for this evening. Have a great evening.

[*The meeting was suspended at 6:30 p.m., Wednesday, November 29*]

[*The meeting resumed at 11:07 a.m., Monday, December 4*]

• (85105)

The Chair: Welcome back to meeting number 80 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Natural Resources.

Today we are meeting in public to discuss committee business.

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

When we suspended on Wednesday, November 29, we had resumed debate on the subamendment of Mr. Falk, and Mr. Patzer had the floor.

I will just remind everybody that Mr. Sorbara had moved a motion. We later had an amendment moved, and then we had the subamendment of Mr. Falk, and Mr. Patzer had the floor. Now, we will continue through with our speakers list after Mr. Patzer.

Ms. Dabrusin, I had you next on the list. Do you still want to speak to the subamendment?

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: No.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, you had raised that you wanted to speak. You now have the floor, sir.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you very much, Chair.

For a long time I have been seeking to have the floor here at the natural resources committee. Frankly we've seen an unprecedented situation that has limited my ability to have the floor. I had the floor, and it was taken away. We had instances of extended problems, confusion and a misstatement of the situation of interpreters by the chair. I have been in and out throughout that process.

I am grateful for the opportunity to finally be able to address the committee about an issue that is extremely important to my constituents. That is this government's anti-energy—

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'll ask you to pause for a minute. We have a point of order from Monsieur Simard.

Monsieur Simard, go ahead.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: I'd simply like some clarification.

My colleague just said that there had been a misstatement of the situation of interpreters by the chair. I'd like him to explain what he's referring to. What is he talking about?

If he is alluding to the fact that the uproar caused by a number of Conservative members made it impossible for me to hear the simul-

taneous interpretation, then in that instance, I wouldn't think you've interpreted this incorrectly, Mr. Chair. But I think that it's really bad behaviour on the part of my Conservative colleagues, who care very little about the welfare of the interpreters, and even less so, about francophone participation in the debate.

I'd like him to clarify what he meant.

• (85110)

[*English*]

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

I think this is also a good time to remind colleagues about the importance of interpretation, which has been raised. Only one member at a time speaks through the mic, so that interpreters can effectively do the great job of interpreting that they've been doing through all of the meetings here at our committee. It does become quite challenging for them if numerous speakers have their mics on and are speaking. It makes it difficult for interpreters to effectively interpret for the benefit of all committee members.

Thank you, Monsieur Simard, for that point of order.

Mr. Genuis, I'll come back to you.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'd like to respond to my colleague.

I have a great deal of respect for bilingualism and the French language. Your intervention clearly had nothing to do with the Standing Orders.

In fact, the chair lied to the committee. He said that when lots of people speak at the same time, it's a health issue. I would say that while it might make it difficult for the interpreters to do their work, it's not a health issue. We've already discussed this, but I'll take the opportunity to reiterate my position on this issue.

It's obviously not ideal when many people speak at the same time, but it doesn't have anything to do with the interpreters' health. That's obvious. We were therefore given inaccurate information.

[*English*]

Mr. Chair, we are now discussing committee business, but it is important to say in the context of that discussion of committee business that we now have a motion that was initially debated. It's begun debate in the House.

It would seek to impose an approach on the committee of considering this bill. This is motion number 31. It is an unprecedented, egregious and very draconian approach that the NDP-Liberal government is taking to impose a very specific timeline on this committee for Bill C-50. It's a timeline that is completely different from the approach that committees would normally take. This limits our ability to hear from any of the witnesses the motion we're currently debating would propose to enable us to hear.

The motion that is being debated before the House, which was put forward by the government—by all indications, with the support of its coalition partners in the NDP—says that in consideration of this bill, there will be, in effect, no witness testimony. Amendments would have to be submitted by four o'clock the day after the motion was adopted. It seems the government's intention is that the motion be voted on today, so amendments would have to be submitted by four o'clock tomorrow. The committee should meet “at 6:30 p.m. on the second sitting day following the adoption of the motion”—

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Chair, I have a point of order on relevance. We're not debating the motion that's in the House. We are in committee at this moment, and I believe what we have before us is the subamendment that was brought by Mr. Falk to call witnesses from Timmins.

Perhaps Mr. Genuis could get back to the subamendment.

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

• (85115)

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Dabrusin.

I will remind colleagues that we are on the subamendment introduced by Mr. Falk on the inclusion of witnesses from Timmins—James Bay.

I will ask the member, as you proceed in your debate on this important subamendment provided by Mr. Falk, to keep it relevant to the importance of enabling the stakeholders from Timmins—James Bay to participate in this.

Mr. Ted Falk: On a point of order, we have several new members—

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'll ask you to turn off your mic, if you don't mind, just until Mr. Falk is done.

Go ahead, Mr. Falk.

Mr. Ted Falk: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We have several members here today who aren't typically members of this committee. They're helping us debate this very important subamendment, but they don't all have copies of the subamendment. I am wondering whether the clerk could circulate it.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Falk, for your point of order. We will circulate the subamendment to all committee members.

I want to welcome the committee members who have joined us today for the first time.

Ms. Barron, welcome.

Mr. Brock, welcome.

Mr. Genuis, welcome, as well, joining us today in committee.

Ms. Lattanzio is online.

Mr. Genuis, we'll go back to you, so you can continue your debate on the subamendment.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I will remain relevant, as I always have.

Maybe to make it explicit for Ms. Dabrusin, who I'm sure is following intently every word that I am saying, the motion before this committee relates to the business of the committee, the study of bills, in particular, including Bill C-50. The amendment and the subamendment deal with which witnesses would be called during consideration of that bill.

Meanwhile, we have a motion before the House that, if passed, would make it impossible for this committee to hear from any witnesses. The government, with their coalition partners in the NDP, are moving in the House to impose a shutdown of debate here at the natural resources committee. Committees are supposed to be masters of their own domain, and we could be debating this subamendment based on the idea that we actually get to decide. It is the intention of the government to rob us of our historic and ancient rights and privileges as a committee, by imposing upon us this draconian situation where we would not be able to hear from any witnesses.

That is not merely tangentially relevant to the point; that is the point, because the subamendment is about which witnesses we would call.

This motion from the House, which I was discussing before being interrupted by Ms. Dabrusin's point of order, would make it impossible for the committee to hear from those witnesses.

Again, based on the government's scheduling and intentions, it appears to be their intention to impose the passage of this motion by the end of day today, December 4. This means that tomorrow would be the deadline for submitting amendments, and that the committee would meet “the second sitting day following” at 6:30 to begin clause-by-clause. I believe that means two days after, so that would be Wednesday. It would have two hours to do clause-by-clause; and if, by 8:30—

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'll ask you to pause for a second. We have a point of order from Ms. Dabrusin.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: I wanted to clarify for the member opposite, because he is relatively new to this committee today, that we are actually still on October 30 in this room—in that strange place where this filibustering from the Conservatives began. In fact, we are not on December 4; we are in a meeting of October 30. If we had in fact been able to proceed on October 30, we would have been hearing witnesses by this date.

I just wanted to clarify, because he may not realize what date we're actually on in this room.

• (85120)

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Dabrusin, for your point of order and your remarks for clarification.

Mr. Genuis, before you proceed we have a point of order by Mr. Falk.

Mr. Ted Falk: I would like to make it very clear that on Friday Ms. Dabrusin spoke in the House very passionately about Bill C-50 and about the work of this committee. She made a declaration in the House that day saying that she's looking forward to hearing witnesses here at committee. She knows full well that the motion that's presented by her party would prevent any witnesses from attending committee, so she's being very duplicitous in her comments between the House and our committee. I think she should maybe take an opportunity to clarify what she meant on Friday in the House by saying she was looking forward to hearing from witnesses she knew would never appear.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Falk, on the point of order.

We have a point of order from Mr. Sorbara.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: There are two things on my point of order, and whether it is or not, you'll be the judge of that, Chair.

The first thing is Mr. Falk is absolutely correct. My colleague, MP Dabrusin, has a real passion for Canada moving to a net-zero economy, because we know the economic opportunities for workers from coast to coast to coast are enormous. We'll continue demonstrating that passion, whether it's through policy or through debates.

MP Falk, you mentioned something about my colleague, MP Dabrusin, and you used a word I will not repeat. I think you should give it consideration and withdraw that comment about MP Dabrusin, please.

Mr. Ted Falk: “Duplicitous”?

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Yes.

Mr. Ted Falk: Well, if you're saying two different things, what is the second one?

The Chair: Colleagues, I would ask all members of the committee to use points of order for procedural concerns that we may have.

I would also ask all colleagues to make sure that we use parliamentary language in how we conduct ourselves at the committee today. It's always how we've conducted ourselves in the past, and today and into the future it's important that we conduct ourselves by using parliamentary language in the House of Commons but also here at the natural resources committee. Thank you.

We have a point of order by Mr. Brock.

Mr. Larry Brock (Brantford—Brant, CPC): Chair, I just want to clarify: Is it the ruling of the chair that the use of the term “duplicitous” by my colleague Mr. Falk, in pointing out two different versions from Ms. Dabrusin with respect to the state of the witnesses and the urgency by which he wants to hear these witnesses, is unparliamentary?

The Chair: I've asked colleagues to use parliamentary language. I'm not referring to any comment made by any member, but we should refrain from using unparliamentary language at committee. It's a reminder that I'm providing committee members at today's meeting.

Mr. Larry Brock: Well, if it's a ruling on the use of the word “duplicitous” in the point of order by Mr. Falk, I would be challenging your ruling on that, sir.

In my view, that is not unparliamentary. It is not derogatory. It's merely pointing out two versions of fact. All members of this committee have a right to know exactly where Ms. Dabrusin stands on that particular issue.

The Chair: Mr. Brock, you are challenging a ruling that I made. I will ask committee members if they would like to sustain the ruling of the chair, if you're challenging my ruling. Is that what you're doing, sir?

Mr. Larry Brock: I need you to clarify whether or not you as the chair have ruled the use of the word “duplicitous” to be unparliamentary, as opposed to your description of being mindful of unparliamentary language in this particular committee. I think everyone at this committee needs to know exactly where you stand, sir, on the word—

The Chair: Mr. Brock—

Mr. Larry Brock: Mr. Chair, I'm not done speaking yet.

I think everyone at the committee deserves to know if you feel that the word “duplicitous” in relation to the comment by Mr. Falk is ruled to be unparliamentary.

The Chair: Mr. Brock, I was referring to the use of parliamentary language here at the committee, not to any terms or words used by committee members. I just asked all committee members to ensure that as we conduct ourselves through the meeting—as we have in the past, as we have today and as we should in the future—we use parliamentary language. I did not refer to any specific word that any member has made.

I want to make sure that all committee members respect each other, have a workplace for everybody that has mutual respect, and consider using language as we move forward that is parliamentary and that does not veer off from that.

I hope that clarifies and answers your point of order, and—

• (85125)

Mr. Larry Brock: It does. I have another point of order.

The Chair: That being dealt with, Mr. Brock, I'll go to Mr. Dreeshen, who has a point of order. If you still have a point of order then, I'll come back to you.

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I believe you will find that the issue here has more to do with what Mr. Sorbara had mentioned as he attempted to present to the committee that there was an issue from us indicating that this particular word should not be mentioned. At that particular point, instead of indicating that, from everything you have ever heard, such a word would not have been considered unparliamentary....

Had you mentioned that to Mr. Sorbara, we would not be in this position at this point in time. The problem is that if we don't stop that the moment it is presented, then we can get into a situation where anybody can challenge a word. Unless they are challenged back by the chair to indicate that, sorry, that is not an unparliamentary phrase, then we will get into this situation constantly.

This is in order to help the committee. If you had addressed what Mr. Sorbara had said and indicated to him that nowhere in any precedent did the word "duplicitous" sound as though it would be unparliamentary, then I don't believe we would be in this position. I think the issue isn't so much related to the things Ms. Dabrusin said. It was because of the intervention from Mr. Sorbara. That is what we are dealing with.

The Chair: Thank you for that, Mr. Dreeshen.

As I've clearly said, based on the points of order that have been presented, number one, we should all conduct ourselves to make sure that we are using parliamentary language and not using anything that would not be parliamentary towards each other. Number two, we do not use our points of order to engage in debate. As I've said to a number of members, we focus on the procedural relevance of the point of order.

We will move forward to Mr. Brock.

Do you still have a point of order? I want to get back to Mr. Genuis, who has the floor.

Mr. Larry Brock: I do. You may rule it not to be a point of order, but since the word "duplicitous" has not been deemed by the chair to be unparliamentary, I would like a response, if possible, from Ms. Dabrusin to clarify the discrepancy.

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order, Mr. Brock.

If a member would like to provide that when they do have the floor and relate it back to the subamendment that's being debated, the member can do so, but I think we will move forward to where we were.

Mr. Falk, do you have a point of order?

Mr. Ted Falk: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

You know, Mr. Sorbara did make an accusation that there was a word that I'd used in my previous intervention that was unparliamentary, and I think you do need to make a ruling, sir, on whether it was unparliamentary language or whether it was a word that is very descriptive of the circumstance we found ourselves in.

I think, for Mr. Sorbara's better understanding and ability to make further interventions, he needs to know whether, in fact, he was making a valid point or not. That's a ruling, sir, that you should make.

The Chair: As I've stated numerous times, we should focus on ensuring at this committee we don't use language that is not parliamentary, and I'll stick with that. I am sure everybody can move forward in that manner so we have mutual respect working together on this committee.

Thank you for all your points of order, colleagues. I do want to get back to Mr. Genuis, who has the floor.

Mr. Genuis, we have no more points of order, so you have the floor, sir.

• (85130)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We're in unprecedented territory for this committee in that we've exhausted the available points of order and that I, having had the floor, have been allowed to continue to have the floor by you, the chair. These are some noteworthy developments, given the recent history of the natural resources committee.

I will respond to what obviously was not a point of order from my colleague opposite, Ms. Dabrusin, who objected to my use of the term "December 4" on the basis that it is, in her view, not December 4. I was referring to a motion before the House. In the House, as on the rest of the planet, it is undisputably December 4. At least it is in most. I think the time zones line up right about now, and it is, in fact, the case more or less everywhere.

She said it's October 30 in this room because we are continuing a previous meeting. Her point, I think, was to try to get out there the allegation that this is some lengthy filibuster process or something. I would just remind everyone of how we got here and where we're at. This has not been the sustained process of Conservatives making arguments about the motion before the committee. It's quite the contrary. Actually, what we've seen at this committee, over the last month or so, is consistent objections to the complete miscarriage of process because we had a situation in which one member had the floor and then was arbitrarily deprived of the floor. This was a matter that was discussed, extensively, over multiple sessions of this committee that went on for a number of weeks. It was not a matter of debating the motion in those exchanges, it was a matter of asserting the privileges of members of Parliament, the right of members to be able to speak and raise their concern before the committee.

I think anyone would find, if they reviewed the discussion that took place in those instances, that, in fact, the vast majority of the speaking being done was by the NDP-Liberal coalition. I think it is clear if you say, whose talking is taking the time, that, in fact, over the last month, most of it has been Ms. Dabrusin and Mr. Angus. I think that's fairly clear, although Conservatives were trying to get the floor to try to raise specific comments about this legislation, the important issues that it raises and the debates that need to take place around it. We were in a situation where it was Liberal and NDP members speaking, raising points of order, interrupting, not allowing members to have the floor, that was clearly the cause of this process having continued such that, formally speaking, we are in a committee meeting that began on October 30, although it's been suspended and scheduled under the circumstances, relatively sparsely by the chair.

All of these things are things that are beyond the control of Conservative members. We have sought to put some specific points of concern on the record and we have been snowed in by interruptions, points of order and flagrant violations of the rules. I think the worst was when, on multiple occasions, Mr. Angus used flagrantly unparliamentary language and was allowed to do so by the chair, even when points of order were raised at that time. This is what brings us to this point where Conservatives are looking for an opportunity to set the agenda of the committee in a responsible way and to speak to our concerns in the process about aspects of this government's agenda, an agenda that aims to shut down highly productive parts of our economy and force workers who are working in those highly productive parts of the economy to no longer be able to work in those sectors.

In terms of the doublespeak associated with the phrase, "just transition", I think, by now, it is extremely clear to workers and to everyone who follows these discussions that when the government says, "just transition," what they mean is to shut down critical industries in our economy.

• (85135)

The effect of this is likely to push those jobs overseas and to leave Canadian workers with very few options, but maybe under this rhetoric of just transition to offer them welfare payments.

The folks who are working hard in the energy sector, who are benefiting from energy-related extraction and manufacturing, are not looking to be transitioned to government benefits. They're looking to have the opportunity to continue to work in their field, which is a growth field globally. The Canadian energy sector is leading the world in terms of improvements in environmental performance, and this is why Conservatives strongly oppose the absurd doublespeak associated with the government's so-call "just transition" agenda.

It becomes so clear to workers that this rhetoric is aimed at shutting down jobs. In fact the labour minister admitted in the House that he no longer likes using the term "just transition", because workers don't like it. Quite strikingly, he admitted as much. Yes, they don't like the term, but they also don't like the substance of it. The government, in trying to change the verbiage they use to describe their agenda without changing the substance of the agenda, hasn't fooled anyone before, and it's not going to fool anyone now.

The fact is that the Liberal-NDP coalition has been consistent in not standing up for workers.

We want to hear from workers at this committee. This is what we have been saying from the beginning. We want to be able to have hearings in a—

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: I have a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I suspect it's not a point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'll just ask you to pause for a second. We have a point of order from Mr. Sorbara.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: I just have a question for you and the clerk.

I believe the motion that I submitted was done on October 30. Is that correct?

The Chair: Mr. Sorbara, the motion was moved on October 30 by you.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: How many meetings have we held on this motion, the subamendment, and so forth since October 30, when we could have studied...and invited witnesses to this meeting?

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

The Chair: Is this a point of order?

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: It sounds like I'm being interrupted on the other side, because they don't want to actually recognize the fact that we had—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You're being interrupted, because you don't know what a point of order is, Francesco. It's not a point of order.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: It's not for you to judge what I do or do not know, Garnett. Please go back there. Thank you very much.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Certainly you're speaking as if you don't know. Maybe you know, but you are speaking to the contrary.

The Chair: Colleagues, this may be a nice time for a reminder for everybody here. When we acknowledge a point of order, we have one mic on at a time and one person speaking into the mic at a time, because it is difficult for our interpreters to interpret multiple colleagues on committee speaking into the mic. I would ask colleagues, for the benefit of the interpreters to be able to interpret in both official languages, that I hear a point of order from one individual before proceeding to another.

Thank you, Mr. Sorbara, for your point of order.

Colleagues, I just want to remind everybody that we did have a motion moved on the floor on October 30 by Mr. Sorbara. We subsequently had an amendment moved and a subamendment moved, and another subamendment moved by Mr. Falk, which we are currently debating now. We have been debating this since October 30. Today, we're at December 4. I think that provides clarity on times and dates for everybody, and the number of meetings we can add up in between, and the hours that we've been working on this here at committee.

Now, hopefully that addresses any concerns that members had.

I will go back to Mr. Genuis, who has the floor.

Mr. Genuis, go ahead.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

I appreciate your generosity in restoring the floor to me, which of course is consistent with the rules.

Clearly, Mr. Sorbara's point was not a point of order. It was a point of debate, and I'll respond to the point of debate before continuing—

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: I have a point of order, Chair.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Oh, here we go again.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'll ask you to hold again.

Go ahead, Mr. Sorbara, on a point of order.

• (85140)

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: I'd like to raise a point of relevance, please, for Mr. Genuis.

The Chair: I would ask colleagues to—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I was responding to your point. Clearly, it's relevant, if yours was.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'll ask you to hold, please, until I acknowledge you.

On that point of order that's provided, Mr. Genuis, I'll just ask you to keep it relevant to the subamendment. Thank you.

Go ahead, Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you.

I think we may want to set a record for how long a person can speak before getting interrupted by another point of order.

Am I still good?

Chair, I'll say another sentence and see if Mr. Sorbara has any objections. He said it was a point of order—it was clearly not a point of order—when he intervened to claim that it was somehow a matter of order for him to...

The camera's pre-emptively gone to you.

Mr. Chair, Mr. Sorbara was saying that—

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

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Here we go. I knew it was coming.

The Chair: I have Mr. Sorbara on a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I didn't want to get too far into it.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: I'm very thrilled that Mr. Genuis is speaking about me, as the MP for the beautiful and wonderful riding of Vaughan—Woodbridge.

I would love for the committee to turn its attention to the millions of hard-working Canadian workers who would benefit—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: That's precisely what I was talking about before you interrupted.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: —from Bill C-50, get to voting on amendments or subamendments and so forth, and get the conversation on relevance.

This is not about me, Garnett. This is about Canadians, about labour and about working together with industry, and that is what Bill C-50 is.

It's not about Francesco, or about anybody in this room. It should be about them, so let's get back to relevance.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You interrupted when I was discussing precisely those matters.

Mr. Larry Brock: I have a point of order.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Sorbara, for your point of order.

I'd ask colleagues to not use points of order for debate. Also, to the individuals who have the floor, keep it relevant to the conversation at hand on the subamendment that's been provided by Mr. Falk.

I have Mr. Brock on the point of order. Go ahead.

Mr. Larry Brock: I'd like the chair to be aware that at least the last two—I've lost track, quite frankly—points of order by MP Sorbara were not points of order. They were debate. Quite frankly, if he wishes to engage in this type of intervention, which is clearly what it is...it's meant to stall the ability of my colleague Mr. Genuis to actually get to the point. He's raising issues of relevancy.

That's not a point of order, Chair, and you know it. As a suggestion to Mr. Sorbara, he should listen to the actual statements made by Mr. Genuis before he raises another point of order. With the last two, he was literally interrupted midstream before he actually got to his point.

I hear what he's saying. He wants to move this forward, but his own actions defy that logic.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Brock, for your point of order.

Mr. Brock, as you stated and have said in your own comments, we don't use points of order for debate. We have had a number of points of order over the last month and a half to two months that have been used in committee as opportunities to debate.

I would ask members to ensure that they use their points of order for procedural relevance. I would ask members who have the floor to ensure that their debate is relevant to the motion or the amendment. In this case, it's the subamendment that Mr. Falk has brought forward on this important topic.

Mr. Genuis, the floor is back to you on the subamendment. Go ahead.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you very much, Chair.

I wasn't sure how long that would go on for.

I will resume the points I was making previously with respect to the substance of this issue. I will say in passing that Mr. Sorbara raised three points of order in quick succession, first interrupting the points I was making about workers and then saying on the third point that we should get back to talking about workers.

I hope I don't cause a flurry of disorder by saying that this is the kind of duplicitousness we have come to expect from my colleagues opposite, who, in one instance in this committee, claimed that they want to hear from witnesses, but I expect that they are planning on supporting a motion in the House that would make it impossible for this committee to hear from witnesses.

This is what is happening. This is what people need to know. This is what is really an unprecedented attack on the ability of our democratic institutions to do their jobs.

The way the legislative process is supposed to work is that bills, when adopted at second reading, come to committee. They are considered in committee. In the process of consideration, there is a consensual process around hearing from a certain number of witnesses, and then ultimately the individual clauses and related amendments are put to a vote, and the committee is able to use its expertise on the issues at hand to study the bills and their effects.

Parliamentary committees are not supposed to be simply a rubber-stamp process. They are supposed to be a substantive investigation of critical issues by the members who are tasked with being on this committee and, therefore, becoming expert in the particular issues associated with it. That's why we have parliamentary committees. That's a critical reason that we have a legislative process in general.

Too often this government has treated Parliament as if it's some kind of a rubber-stamping sideshow. In particular, parliamentary committees are essential to the process of crafting good legislation.

We have been trying to establish a good process for working through this legislation. I think, if you look at the extended committee meeting that has been ongoing for the last month, you will see that the majority, if not the vast majority, of the talking has been done by members of the NDP and the Liberals. There have been constant interruptions and almost no opportunity for members of this committee to put thoughts on the record.

I had an experience early on when I was planning to speak to this issue, and I had the floor arbitrarily taken away from me by the chair, but we have had many instances throughout, as we have just seen across the way, when reasoned attempts to make arguments about the substantive issues associated with this legislation are being put forward, there are constant interruptions.

I think the claim by the government that this is some kind of sustained filling of the time by opposition members is just not consistent with the record. The record is very clear here in terms of what has been going on.

Nonetheless, we have, as I have been trying to identify for the last half hour in the midst of interruptions, motion number 31, which the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons has put forward that radically abridges the committee study process and effectively eliminates the committee study process on Bill C-50.

Once adopted, it would give members less than 24 hours to submit their amendments, which is extremely limiting, especially given the constraints around the legislative drafting team to do great work. Demanding a turnaround of a couple of hours if there are multiple complex amendments is obviously quite unreasonable. Even the ideas that we would want to hear, about what type of amendments would happen and the possible refinements of those amendments that should be coming, we will not be hearing from the witnesses, because witnesses will not be able to appear.

The motion created by the government involves no witnesses and no ministers even coming before committee to explain their posi-

tion around the bill. It envisions a process where, after a mere two hours of clause-by-clause consideration, the committee would be subject to a procedure whereby there would be no debate whatsoever on the clauses. This is in part 4 of the government motion that, after 8:30, all remaining—

• (85145)

Ms. Viviane Lapointe: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I will ask you to hold, please.

We have a point of order by Ms. Lapointe.

Ms. Viviane Lapointe: I'm just going to ask for relevance on the subamendment from Mr. Falk that this committee is currently dealing with.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On the point of order, Chair—

The Chair: I'll ask Mr. Genuis to just hold for a second.

Thank you for your point of order, Ms. Lapointe.

I would ask the member to keep it relevant to the subamendment that's been presented by our colleague, Mr. Falk.

Mr. Genuis, if you could keep it connected to that as you debate, go ahead.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, now that Ms. Lapointe has decided to intervene on this, I wanted to actually highlight the fact that a while back she had accused me of unparliamentary language. I had asked her to simply say what I had said that was allegedly unparliamentary. She didn't even respond at that time.

If Ms. Lapointe has comments—

• (85150)

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I will ask you, on that point—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I would welcome her to clarify her earlier accusation. She won't, of course, because she didn't then. She has nothing to stand on, but I would encourage her, when making accusations—

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I would ask you to hold, please.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —against other members to actually have in mind what she's accusing them of.

Ms. Yvonne Jones: I have a point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I will ask you to hold because there is a point of order by Ms. Jones.

Go ahead, Ms. Jones.

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

Mr. Genuis' comments have no relevance to the debate here today.

For a point of clarification, Mr. Chair, I'd like to say that we've had since the end of October to bring witnesses to this committee—

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

Are you allowing members to just make editorial comments and call them points of order?

Ms. Yvonne Jones: It's been the choice of the Conservatives to delay the proceedings, to filibuster the meetings and to discuss irrelevant information as part of this debate. That's the reason we have not been able to get to witnesses.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Jones, for your point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, are you enforcing order here?

The Chair: I will remind members—Mr. Genuis and others here—that when I turn on my mic, this red light comes on. That is an indication for all members to pause in their intervention, so we don't have multiple members speaking through the mic for our interpreters.

We all know the interpreters do a tremendous job of interpreting in both official languages. I want to make sure they can continue to do that, but when there are multiple individuals speaking into the mic and speaking over each other, it makes it difficult for the interpreters.

Now, thank you for the point of order. I would also remind all members around the table that we do not engage in lengthy debate as we use points of order. They're only for procedural use. I'm going to remind everybody of that.

Now I'm going to the next point of order.

Mr. Dreeshen.

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would hope that you would believe that I do not use points of order for anything other than points of order.

I would submit to you that once you recognize that it has gone into debate, from any member here, if you stop the comments at that particular point in time, we would not have to worry about the issues that you've had to address.

You have had experience here. You can recognize when it is debate. If you simply say that it is debate and shut the mics off at that point in time, then we won't have the issues that we seem to have at this point in time.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Dreeshen, for that reminder.

I will remind colleagues that I use a soft intervention of first turning on my mic to allow members to look towards me, see when my mic is on, and then pause. Then I ask members to pause in their thoughts, so I can intervene. I do respect the work of our interpreters and I want to make sure they can follow along and interpret.

That's the approach I've taken and will continue to take. I do not want to speak while others are speaking into the mics because it does make it challenging for interpreters.

I ask all colleagues, when you do make a point of order, make sure you're looking towards me. You can see whether my mic is on or off, so I do not have to interrupt you.

However, I do appreciate you making those remarks, Mr. Dreeshen. I will reflect on that as well.

We have another point of order from Ms. Jones.

Ms. Yvonne Jones: Thank you.

I just want to add to what Mr. Dreeshen is saying. I totally agree that any points of order should not be debated and should be relevant.

I also ask you, Chair, to give more guidance on the relevance of the content of the debate. Most of the interventions have been regarding relevance of the subject matter. If we could have more rulings on that, we could probably avoid some of the points of order.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Jones.

You are correct that we want to ensure that we focus on the subamendment we are on, which is Mr. Falk's subamendment, making sure stakeholders from Timmins—James Bay can participate in the work of our committee, and keep it relevant to that.

We've exhausted all the points of order, I think, now.

Mr. Larry Brock: I have a point of order.

The Chair: No, we have not. We have another point of order from Mr. Brock.

Mr. Larry Brock: Thank you, Chair.

This is meant to offer information only. There's been a lot of discussion regarding the issue of relevancy. In my former career, Mr. Chair, as a member of the legal system, the term “relevancy” has a subjective element to it. It's not objective. My experience, as limited as it is in this 44th Parliament—

● (85155)

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Is that a point of order?

Mr. Larry Brock: Yes, and I'd like to finish my thought before I get “point-of-ordered”, Mr. Chair.

In my experience on a number of committees, when the issue of relevancy comes up, I have seen chairs provide a certain degree of latitude for interventions by members. I have been to at least a half-dozen. I'm not suggesting you have to follow suit because you are the master of your own domain in terms of how you conduct yourself, sir, in this committee, but we are bound by rules at parliamentary committees. There is a degree of latitude that you can afford the member to eventually get around to the concept of relevancy.

Just because an opposition member feels that the issue of relevancy is not within the first, say, couple of sentences of the intervention by the member, is not to suggest that the entire intervention itself is devoid of relevancy. I simply ask—and this is for information only—that you provide a degree of flexibility to every member of this committee to get to the whole issue of relevancy, knowing full well that relevancy, in my view, is a subjective element.

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order, Mr. Brock.

I would just ask committee members to do what you've stated but that we do keep it relevant to the motion at hand, just to ensure that all committee members have the ability to participate in debate on this important subamendment. We also—as stated as well by you, sir—do not use points of order to debate extensively our thoughts on a point of order but get to the procedural aspects of the point of order.

Now that we've had that important conversation regarding those points of order, we will proceed. I see that Mr. Genuis is no longer here. We'll move to the next member we have on the list, who is Mr. Dreeshen, who now has the floor. Welcome, Mr. Redekopp, to the committee today as well. It's great to have you.

Mr. Dreeshen, the floor is yours.

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

A few days ago, I had a chance to speak to both you and the clerk, questioning whether the following statement would be a point of order, and you suggested that no, it's best for me to bring it up when I have the floor, so I have patiently waited for that.

In my last intervention I misspoke. I indicated that it was a company by the name of Hoverlink that had been required to go and get funds from the U.S., actually through the Canada pension plan, in order to fund....

I made a mistake. It was actually in testimony from Mr. Zsombor Burany, who had said that he had needed to get a \$250-million investment for his telecommunications company but that he was not able to get Canadian funds, so he had been required to go to the United States. It actually ended up being a U.S. company, but the irony, of course, was the fact that the funding for it came through the Canada pension plan.

I apologize for having made that mistake, but I did want to make sure that the record was corrected. That is the first thing I wanted to mention.

In my remarks, I went through a number of different issues. Again, one I had mentioned was the text of a book by the name of *Factfulness* by Hans Rosling. We, as politicians or business people, have certain ideas of what is happening in the world, based on our experiences and so on. It's not necessarily fact, and if you start to take a look at the way in which countries manage themselves, you'll see that things are a lot better off in the world than we perceive them to be.

One of the questions they posed—and this was posed to extremely intelligent people around the world—was about the average grade level of young men of 30 years old, who had 10 years of school. They then made the comparison and asked, “How many years of school do you think a young lady who is 30 years of age would have; nine years, six years or three years?” The vast majority of experts believed that it was three or six years. It's actually nine years, one year less than for a male equivalent, but that's not how we think. We have experts around the world saying that they are going to develop policies, make investments and so on, based on their perceived notion of how the world is.

When I read the book, I did the little quiz, and I realized that I am not much better at guessing than anybody else when it comes to

that because that's my perceived notion. These are the things that I've heard since I was young. I also reflected on the point—and, of course, this got a little bit of excitement from the minister—about the sorts of things that I've been subjected to as someone who was born in the 1950s and grew up in the 1960s and so on.

I remember when I was a kid. It was only eight years after the Second World War, and the Cuban missile crisis was one of the key issues. My dad was part of a civil defence where basically he was the guy who had to have the Geiger counter out there in case we had an atomic war. That was the sort of thing I was subjected to when I was seven or eight years old—the idea that what is going to get us next could be an atomic war.

Then I started to hear things—this was in the 1960s—that oil was going to be gone in 10 years. In the 1970s, I heard that another ice age was going to take place in 10 years.

This is what got people excited. I mentioned that acid rain was going to destroy all of our crops in 10 years. People got excited about that.

• (85200)

Perhaps I should have explained the significance of the work that had been done in order to mitigate those and to look at that, but I didn't. That caused a little excitement for the minister.

There were similar types of things when we were discussing ozone layers. Again, there have been efforts associated with this. There's a lot to it, so I didn't give the two-hour dissertation about the relationship that exists about that. Nevertheless this is what was presented to people. That was the point I was trying to make—every once in a while or about every 10 years, we are given the next thing to worry about. In 1997-98, of course, it was Y2K—look how the world is going to fall apart, because our computers can't figure out what day it is. That was the next thing we looked at. Of course, in 2000 we talked about when the next ice caps were going to be gone.

Here are the issues. We are constantly given a barrage of information that says we are doomed. Every time we deal with that “we are doomed” scenario, somebody is out there making money. I think that's a critical point.

Again, being old enough, I remember Greenpeace. I remember their reason for being. I remember Patrick Moore and the efforts that he has made. Now he is some sort of a pariah in the environmental community, because he says that the people who have taken over these ecology-focused groups are not there for the environment; they are there to make sure they can get money. He said, “I am firmly of the belief that the future will show that this whole hysteria over climate change [is] a complete fabrication.”

That all depends on where your definition is. I'm sure—as the last time the Minister of Environment took a run at me for stating some obvious facts, and the Minister of Natural Resources took a run at me for stating some obvious facts—that the climate does change. However, what we also have to recognize is that we need to use our strengths in order to make sure that we are helping humanity. Right now we have this thought, and we hear it constantly, that the earth is boiling, and all of these other kinds of things that are only meant to invoke fear in the populace.

You have others who sit back and say that it's not quite that bad, and maybe what we should be doing is using our wealth to come back to a spot where people are being looked after. That's not a bad idea. We have Dubai, where COP28 is taking place right now. The chair, basically, says that things aren't quite as bad as people think. Of course now you have the groups that ask why we decided to have a climate change meeting in some place where they actually produce oil. That's a dumb thing to have done. Well, no, maybe it's simply that they understand the realities of the world, and I think that's really a critical point.

Then we get back to Timmins—James Bay, and every other riding that we have. This is what I had mentioned last day, and I think it's critical. We have made decisions that say Canada, somehow, is going to be the leader in battery production, electric-vehicle production and mining. Sadly, we say that we will do that at the same time as we are going to minimize the oil and gas industry here in North America—so, our part of it. There are lots of contrary aspects and different things associated with it, but quite frankly, we know what is taking place in the rest of the world.

• (85205)

We know that China has a grasp on all of the supply chain as far as electric motors and battery parts are concerned.

These are the reasons we see companies backing off from their pledges of having this many electric vehicles by 2030.

We see that happening constantly, but here we sit down and say, “Not here in Canada”. We will keep going like a moose on a trail. Nothing that matters is going to change. We're going to stay on that trail.

That's where we have to be thinking. That's where when I go back to this Hans Rosling book. We have this concept that if this is what we have started on, nobody can tell us that anything else is relevant and, therefore, we are going to continue to push this.

We talk about Bill C-50, the just transition and so on. If you do a little bit of research on where that came from, it is a UN discussion. That UN discussion basically started off with a lady named Sharan Burrow who had written a commentary about how shared prosperity provides hope and security. It's basically giving everybody the thought that things are just going to be great.

Who is she? She heads the International Trade Union Confederation.

Basically she is saying that if we can convince everybody that they could change their job, but the only way that they're being saved is because we have trade unions that are going to be part of it and they will stand up for people.... That's not exactly how the

world works, especially if you're looking at small business. The fact is that the majority of anything happening in this country right now is small and medium-sized businesses. They're not associated with trade unions. There are parts...but that isn't the reality, yet here is this UN Declaration that indicates that the world should be going through this just transition. That's the sort of thing we're dealing with.

When the UN presents this as one of their goals, they say all the right things. They say all the things that I hear our government talking about when it goes to international fora, about how this just transition is going to work out so well for us.

The reality is that's not the way the rest of the world is. Sadly, right now when we talk about what is happening in Europe.... As I mentioned, I've been part of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe. We talk about food security, we talk about energy security, and of course we talk about what is happening in Ukraine. Those are the three main issues we have. A year ago, I was talking to these people and people from Ukraine, asking how we can help. How can we be part of this? Things have kind of fallen apart even worse now than they were a year ago.

I've been on the environment committee and the natural resources committee. I listened to my friends from the NDP and from the Bloc. They are adamant that there should be no nuclear energy development because of their concerns about something that I was concerned about back in the sixties because of nuclear war. We kind of realized that wasn't the reality of it, but they can still go back to that rhetoric that says that something terrible is going to happen.

They have no idea what it's like. They have no idea about the safety associated with it. They have no idea that the reason it is so expensive to produce is because we have all of these naysayers sitting on the sidelines saying that we have to make sure we do this. They say, “Fine, we will do it; we will prove it”. Once it's proven the first time though, you'd think maybe we could get to the stage where things could proceed a little faster.

Actually, they are proceeding faster now. If you look at what is happening in Europe, you see them expanding the number of nuclear projects they have to generate electricity, so much so that the next issue is how they transmit that. How do they get that energy to where they need to have it if they're going to concentrate on heat pumps, EVs and that sort of thing? They don't have a grid that can deal with that.

• (85210)

There are billions and billions of dollars that are associated with that part.

That's the reality we have, so those of us in our 338 communities start to look at the opportunities for us to be part of this new transition into electric vehicles. We have to be smart about it, and sadly, I don't believe that is the case.

As I've said on so many occasions, if you're not going to measure the environmental impact from the first shovel you use to dig something up until you're finished with it and have to shove it back in again and throw dirt on it, at the end—whether that be nuclear, hydroelectric, oil and gas, windmills or solar—if you're not going to measure it, then how can you say that you are actually doing anything for the environment?

However, we still do. We say, yes, but somebody told us this, or, we believe this is the case. Even though we might be completely wrong we believe it and therefore that is the path we are going to follow.

If we follow things that are wrong and we spend billions or trillions of dollars globally on these issues, what other things could we have solved in the meantime? I was on the health committee for quite some time. If we could spend our money looking at ways of helping with those things, whether it be cancer or other types of things that affect each and every one of us, if we were able to take the wealth we have and say, let's concentrate on that, instead of saying, the U.S. has the Inflation Reduction Act, so we've got to spend money or else we're going to be left on the wayside here....

It's not going to work for them either in the situations where they're doing it. It's not working from the perspective that they still have electric vehicle plants. They have all of these types of things. They have their own companies that are saying they can't keep up. This 2030 thing or 2035, there is no way that is possible. We are backing away from it.

They might have great ideas, but think, what was the last great idea that happened when this government was elected? The first thing that happened was that the president decided to shut down Keystone XL, and the little bit of push-back that the Canadian government gave, based on that, was very minimal. All that did was prevent our being able to take our rich natural resources that are produced in the most environmentally friendly way in the world from heading into the U.S. market because they didn't want it to move into the world market.

People have to understand the science associated with hydrocarbons. When you bring them in, depending upon how they come in, that's where you get the different types of products that can be used. They need them, so now let's start talking about Venezuela. How can we bring Venezuelan heavy oil in here so that the refineries we have on the gulf coast can actually do the things they need so that these products can be presented around the world?

When you have a neighbour who thinks that way about your energy resources, when you have a neighbour who says, you know what, now we are actually producing more oil and gas to send around the world than anybody else, how much do you really think they are going to be working with us as far as partners are concerned?

The president can simply say, we sure want to be engaged with some of your mining projects so that we can have the rare earth minerals that are required, whether it be for batteries or whether it be for engines and all those sorts of things, and we can look at that and we'd be happy to make you our partners. We have been partners before where we take what we have, dig it up and send it

someplace else. Yes, there are lots of people who make money and we chip away at our wealth, give it to somebody else and we go from there.

● (85215)

That's not what the government is saying. The government is saying, "Yes, but we're not going to allow that. We are going to be the ones going in. We will make sure that, whether it's in Timmins—James Bay or Red Deer—Mountain View, we're going to get to these products that we have. We will try to find the supply chain to get them to markets, and everything's going to be great." That's until, of course, you talk to the community and ask them what their thoughts are about different types of production in their communities.

I remember people being so upset that there were simply going to be transmission powerlines going through their part of the community. These weren't because of some windmills or anything else. It was just that somebody decided they wanted to change the line and then there was a lot of discussion based on that. That's the reality that each and every one of us is going to have to deal with when it comes to looking at what the future is going to be.

Now I know we have amazing wealth and amazing intellect as a country. We should not be stopping any options, but it does not mean we should be shutting down one part of our economy because of an ideological bent, which not just this government but other governments around the world believe is significant. I worry about that. The other governments still have their signatures on the bottom of these agreements, so they're not jumping up and down and saying what they're doing, but the reality is that within their borders they are changing things. I think that becomes a critical aspect of it.

We have had people here slamming the Alberta government because they chose.... As a matter of fact, I can't remember which minister it was as there's a sort of tag team on this. They slammed Alberta because of the moratorium on renewables, whoever it was—I think it was a minister. Nevertheless, what people don't recognize is that Alberta has a massive number of renewables, many more than other places, when you talk about what has been developed over the last number of years—

● (85220)

The Chair: We have a point of order from Ms. Dabrusin.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: It has been fascinating to hear all about Venezuela and Alberta: We're travelling a lot these days. I would like to know, given that the subamendment is about witnesses in Timmins—James Bay, how the policies being brought by the Province of Alberta, in putting a moratorium on renewable energies, are relevant.

The Chair: Thank you for the point of order, Ms. Dabrusin.

I'd ask you, Mr. Dreeshen, to keep it relevant. I think you were getting there, to the relevancy to Timmins—James Bay. I just want to make sure that colleagues ensure that our debate is relevant to the subamendment brought forward by Mr. Falk.

Mr. Dreeshen, it's back to you.

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: I suppose I should start on the point of order.

I think that my discussion has constantly been on.... I've worked it around and talked about how we as individual MPs have to look at what is happening in our surroundings. I believe that was the point I was making.

I will attempt to keep to relevance. However, on my statement about the moratorium on renewables the comment back to me was, I believe, a point of debate. Once it went to that level when the suggestion was, "Oh, but what is this item?", as far as relevance is concerned I believe that is when we moved to debate. As I mentioned earlier, I believe that is when there should be a case of shutting down that discussion because now it has brought back in this next level of debate, to which I had no intention of going, but it does bring that into the discussion.

That is the end of my point of order.

The Chair: Thank you.

I'll remind you, Mr. Dreeshen, as you're reminding myself and others, that all colleagues should refrain from using debate in their points of order and keep to the procedural relevancy. I would ask you to make sure that you proceed to your comments now and not debate during your point of order as well.

Mr. Falk, you have a point of order.

Mr. Ted Falk: I think Mr. Dreeshen was doing a very good job of building a case. You know, I'm not unfamiliar with the construction industry, Mr. Chair, and just using a house as an example, it's nice to be able to have the house, but before you have the house, you have to do some excavation. You have to lay a foundation, and you have to build on that foundation before you end up getting to the house. When there are these points of order based on relevance that are brought up, I don't think they're compensating enough and showing enough latitude to an individual who's building the foundation for the case he's presenting. I think that's a very important part of debate here.

The Liberals like to call out members of the Conservative Party on relevance, but it is absolutely relevant that you build a strong foundation before you start to construct a structure on top of that, and I think that's what Mr. Dreeshen was doing. He's building the foundation to make his point.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Falk, for your point of order and for providing some additional context around the debate that Mr. Dreeshen was providing through your own debate.

I think this is a time, colleagues, for me to reflect on the *House of Commons Procedure and Practice* book. I have, on a few occasions over the last few months as we've had this debate, been reading some important passages.

• (85225)

I think this is important because a lot of today's conversation has been on relevance, so on relevance, I want to read this passage on the top of page 629:

In doing so, Speakers tend to be mindful of the need for some leniency. At times they have allowed references to other matters in debate if they were made in passing and were not the principal theme of the speech.

I think that provides some additional context to committee members on the importance of relevancy. If you would like to read on your own the passage prior and the passage after this, I would ask committee members to do so to get further understanding of the importance of the rule of relevance.

Thank you, colleagues.

Mr. Dreeshen, I'm going to turn the floor back to you.

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I was just hoping that you would have a chance to see things through the eyes of the Conservatives there for a moment.

Nevertheless, the point I was making was that sometimes governments have to pause and look at the realities of the things that are taking place. It doesn't matter if it's in my province of Alberta, in Quebec, in the Maritimes, in Ontario, or in the territories.... I won't name all the provinces, but that's my point.

If you don't have a government that sits back...or you have people who say that they found out we've got some issues here, so we'd better back off. It's the same sort of thing that's going to happen if there is a mining project set up for my riding, Mr. Falk's riding, Ms. Lapointe's riding or Ms. Jones' riding. You have to deal with not only the community, but the province or territory has to deal with not only the community, but the company and the federal government.

When I talk about what has happened in Alberta, a massive amount of renewable resource development is taking place. Then of course, we got somebody who had the support 170,000 union workers say that this is terrible. They said it was going to take \$33 billion out. I think the minister—I can't remember whether it was the natural resources minister or the environment minister; they're interchangeable—said the same thing. It's nonsense, but nevertheless it's the same thing. You have to worry.

The reality is, in my community, as in any other people's communities, when you have groups saying they would like to take 11 quarters of good farmland out of production and put in solar panels, if that doesn't mean you should sit back and take a look at it, I don't know what does.

I know the farmers' advocate from Alberta told these people that they'd better really make sure they know what's taking place. At this point in time, it's the Wild West when it comes to these groups.

It's not like oil and gas, where there's somebody there to say this is how this has to be dealt with once it's gone. This isn't the way it is. The same sort of thing happens whether it be windmill projects and so on. They are only designed for 20 to 30 years. As I've mentioned, I have one where it's been about 15 years since it started. It takes a lot more of the environment to deal with putting them up, getting to them, the roads associated with them, the hydrocarbons that are needed to build them in first place and the hydrocarbons that are needed to keep them running in the second place.

A government basically said that they'd better have a plan for this. Therefore, they are going to have a moratorium on other projects. These things are still on the books. There's never a problem. Although we were told that's going to stop everything, that's not true.

That's what happened there. It should be happening around the whole country.

People should be asking whether this is really the right thing.

When you start digging a pit mine some place, it's not going to be like Fort McMurray. They're not going to turn it back into a forest when they're done. It's going to be a hole in the ground. Those are the things that people have to be aware of. I question whether we are aware, when we follow this ideological bent.

Coming back to what I had mentioned before, we do not have the right information in front of us. We believe certain groups that come at us with passion and commitment to their cause. We never take the time to figure out how that affects us as Canadians.

How does that affect our communities?

● (85230)

That, to me, is where I think we need this sober second thought.

Now, on the just transition part, again, this is going to affect people all over, not just in Alberta. It's going to affect people in the entirety of Canada.

When we take a look at what is taking place there, the union leadership is saying, "Oh, that's great. Here's another chance for us to look at the new jobs that are there. We get a chance to be part of that expansion. We'll be able to have more members," trying to make people think that most people in this country are unionized. That's not necessarily the case.

The other part is that they're basically saying that the investments that have been made in hydrocarbons were a mistake; therefore, we go back. I was for years on the aboriginal affairs and northern development committee, as it was called back in those days. We are now stranding billions of dollars of indigenous investment with the policies of this government.

I have said it before, and I see other people using the term now. We are eco-colonialists. We believe that this is best for the indigenous people of this country. They would love to have jobs working on windmills, solar panels or other types of things, but we should not be encouraging them to continue to invest in or continue to work in the hydrocarbons in which they have spent decades perfecting their skills. If we continue to do that.... We are so naive.

There's always going to be some group that will say, "Oh yes, I'm...." It's whatever the government says. There's a box to check. There's going to be this happen if we do that, and it will make our lives easier if we've checked off any box that the government has. It doesn't matter what government. If this is their plan, then the best thing to do is find somebody who really knows how to write a proposal, send it to the bureaucrats, and then go from there.

[*Translation*]

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

[*English*]

The Chair: Monsieur Simard, go ahead on your point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: Just out of curiosity, I'd like to raise the following point. I recall Mr. Dreeshen telling us last week about the possibility of pacifying the planet through oil. It was very interesting. Now we're talking about "eco-colonialism". That's something new. I didn't know Mr. Dreeshen was a left-winger who wanted to combat colonialism.

My question is a very simple one. How is that related to the sub-amendment on inviting people from the riding of Timmins—James Bay to testify?

I don't know whether people in the riding of Timmins—James Bay are particularly keen on eco-colonialism, but I don't see the link. Perhaps my colleague could inform me about it and explain the link with eco-colonialism and bringing in people from the riding of Timmins—James Bay to testify.

I'm curious. I'm keen to hear about it.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you, Monsieur Simard, for your point of order at a very crucial moment to make sure that the comments being presented to debate are relevant to the folks, the stakeholders and the individuals who all come from Timmins—James Bay, and the importance of it.

I would ask you, Mr. Dreeshen, to make sure that you get to tying it into the importance of that in making your argument.

Before I proceed back to you, Mr. Dreeshen, I have Ms. Lattanzio patiently with her hand up online.

I apologize, Ms. Lattanzio, that I did not see you earlier.

I do see your hand up, so I want to acknowledge you now on a point of order.

● (85235)

Ms. Patricia Lattanzio (Saint-Léonard—Saint-Michel, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm listening very attentively here this morning, and I thank all members for their interventions.

I would like to get clarification from Mr. Dreeshen in terms of how he defines this new term that I've heard this morning, eco-colonialism or eco-colonialists. I'd like him to provide me more details with regard to this term.

I agree with my colleague in terms of wondering how this new term is relevant to the sub-amendment.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Lattanzio, for your point of order, and Mr. Simard as well.

We are not debating eco-colonialism here at committee today, as we may want to do so moving forward through a study, so I would ask my colleague if it does tie in to the relevance of Timmins—James Bay and the inclusion of those stakeholders. Mr. Dreeshen, please indicate how, so these committee members can also think about the importance of that connection of eco-colonialism to the subamendment introduced by Mr. Falk.

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: Thank you very much.

I noticed that everybody wanted to get into the debate on eco-colonialism. First of all, it's a term that, when I was at environment committee, people from first nations used. Although people might believe that I'm attempting to claim it, it is not mine.

That is what has been said. I see this melding between my time in environment and my time here at natural resources. I tried to look at the mandate letters; I couldn't see any difference between the two.

We have a Minister of Natural Resources who still thinks he's the Minister of Environment, so I can't remember which one...whether it was discussions here or discussions there. I didn't coin it.

It's somewhat ironic that when Charlie is here and we talk about his community, I would think that is where you would find a lot of first nations people who want to be engaged in whatever type of development is going to take place, whether it's building a road to get there, getting the power coming from there. I've had lots of discussions with first nations leadership from Ontario, talking about this exact commentary. Yes, they know that if they have to follow the government's mantra there are certain boxes they have to check off, but they also know that in terms of those things that are important to their community, if you have a higher power that believes that it and it alone dictates how things are going to be done, that is exactly the colonialism that has been part of the discussion for over a hundred years.

I welcome the comment on it, but again, there are a lot of first nations people who believe that they should be the ones who have the right to make decisions in their lands. It's not me who presented that, even though I would be happy to take claim for it because, quite frankly, that is exactly what is happening when we talk about investments that people have.

Yes, it ties in to the fact that there are a lot more people being affected by that mindset than just native communities. Perhaps that's where the confusion is, but they believe that these things require us to work together.

You take Chief Helin—I'm grasping for his first name now—from British Columbia. One of the books he wrote was *Dances with Dependency*, which I would suggest people read, talking about what it's like being a leader in indigenous communities and the types of things that have prevented them from being able to do the things that are important for their community.

If we get to that stage, and their community has invested in oil and gas and mining and fishing and forestry, there are a lot of different things that communities in B.C. have been involved with, I think they would agree that there is a mindset here that says Ottawa knows best. As a matter of fact, Ottawa seemed to know best when

they chose to take Bill C-50 out of our hands. The whole reason for that is the Supreme Court of Canada's decision that said parts of Bill C-69 were unconstitutional.

• (85240)

Therefore, the development of a bill that speaks to the workings in communities of a philosophy that says that we will do as much as we can to stop oil and gas development, or any type of development, and forget what the Supreme Court says.... When that affects that bill, it then takes us to the next part, which is to talk about Bill C-49. Whereas there are 33 references to the egregious parts of Bill C-69 within that bill, we get nothing from the government to say, "You know what? Maybe we should wait a bit. Maybe we should get some reference points." All we get from the government and from the minister is, "Well, we don't believe that. That's just their opinion."

Yes, it's their opinion; therefore, you should do something about it. Otherwise, you throw legislation to us, to each and every one of us sitting here, that says, "You have to rubber-stamp something that you know the Supreme Court has said is unconstitutional." How then are we supposed to proceed?

We've waited for a discussion of Bill C-69 and these egregious points from the Supreme Court ruling. We've waited for some discussion on that. People talk about how long October was. Well, we're still waiting. We're waiting for the Supreme Court decision to be addressed by this government, rather than, "Oh, it doesn't matter."

Those are the issues we have, which is why we come back to say that, well, if people don't agree with this—

The Chair: Mr. Dreeshen, I'll just ask you to pause for a moment.

We have a point of order by Ms. Lapointe.

Ms. Viviane Lapointe: I just want to again ask my colleague for relevance. We're not here debating Bill C-69. We're actually here debating a motion and a subamendment to a motion that deals with Bill C-49 and Bill C-50.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Lapointe, for your point of order.

Mr. Dreeshen, I would just ask you to keep it relevant to the motion at hand, which was presented by Mr. Sorbara, and the subamendment on the inclusion of Timmins—James Bay stakeholders and community, as presented by Mr. Falk.

Please state the relevancy to the subamendment and how it connects.

Thank you.

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Usually how this goes is it takes another five minutes to go back and state the same types of things to prove the relevancy that was associated with it. If we don't deal with Bill C-69, if we can't therefore properly dispose of the discussions associated with Bill C-50, and if we then can't properly look at and be prepared to look at decisions with regard to Bill C-49, then anything we talk about within our own communities is held up by this blockage of legislation.

Of course, the things that happen in Timmins—James Bay are relevant to the discussion taking place here. You have people—the indigenous community—come, and you ask whether the government is overstepping its reach or whether they feel that they are back in a colonial era. That was the last topic we were talking about. Those are community people, specifically to Timmins—James Bay. We could go to that.

We look at the egregious parts of the Supreme Court ruling, which will affect Timmins—James Bay people. If we have something else that we put into legislation and then merrily go along our way, saying that the government said this is true.... Well, guess what? The Supreme Court doesn't like that one either. Why did the Government of Ontario, or why did this group, or why is it....?

I'm trying to remember. I think the first nations have taken the government to court too. I think this has happened on our carbon tax, but that's a different story. I would agree that that is perhaps outside this.

However, I really think it's relevant. How can you not say that the Supreme Court is making decisions, and they affect everybody's riding? They do. I believe that is certainly significant.

I fly over that part of our country twice a week. Unless it's at night, I take a look down there, and I see this amazing country we have. I know we have six time zones from one side to the other. I know there are only three provincial capitals that are north of the 49th parallel. I know that a massive amount of our population is within 50 miles, or 80 kilometres.... This is just to prove that I'm bilingual in math. That's where our population is; and those decisions, then, are made for the breadth of this nation and for communities, and they don't see what this country is like.

Yes, it concerns me, therefore, when someone says, “Yes, but Alberta, you want this,” or, “B.C., you want this,” or, “Saskatchewan is not being reasonable.” It's coming from a government that doesn't care, because its decisions are made for what it believes...for those who are hugging the U.S. border. Therefore, the Inflation Reduction Act and all of these kinds of things are significant, because where do you think all that action is going to come from? Where are all these billions of dollars going to be spent? They're going to be spent right next door. That's what we're going to see.

Quite frankly, no one has challenged them and asked if that's the right thing to be doing. When they say they're going to put billions of dollars into this project or that project, well, here's how they're doing it. They are basically saying to the States and the municipalities, “It's not going to cost you a dime. We're going to develop all of this, and we'll find out some way to get this back from the proponents later on. It's not going to cost you a dime.”

• (85245)

How sustainable is that, first of all? It's a lot more sustainable if you're the U.S. than it is here, because we look at the way our economy is tanking compared to the U.S., and so they have this flexibility. It's still wrong, but they do have this flexibility to continue in a wrong way for a lot longer than we do.

It's going to take a lot of nerve to say, “Here's where our strengths are.” We know that Canada can produce natural gas. We know that the world needs natural gas. We know that different parts of our nation have different strengths and different ways of creating energy. The worst part, though, is when one part of the country says, “We don't like yours, so shut it down and we'll do all we can. We will partner with like-minded individuals who really don't believe that your type of energy is the kind of energy that Canada should have.” Again, they don't make it too far off the 49th parallel when they come up with decisions like that, so I guess that's where we find this disconnect that we have as a nation.

Take a look at all of the potential natural gas we could have in Quebec. Go get it. We could use it, but that would take the narrative away from how we want to use all of our energy, we want to use.... We already have this area flooded, so now we have this green energy coming out of hydroelectric power. As long as nobody goes back and thinks about what it was like prior to that, and as long as we ignore the displacement of animals and humans, and so on, to get to that stage, then it's great. Everyone should be happy.

I remember as a kid—I guess I wasn't a kid at that time—when the Red Deer River was dammed. There are friends of mine who lost land. It had to be sold so that they could dam up the river. For years after, people loved it. It looked good, because you could put a sailboat on it and everything looked fantastic, and that must be environmental—until you saw these trees popping out. They pop up once the lake-bed has deteriorated. We know the methane that comes out of those. We know that any of the minerals and the toxic minerals that are associated with it will then get dissolved. We know all of those sorts of things, but it looks good. I congratulate the people in the community who take this facility and use it in a positive way. I don't go back and complain about it.

I'm not complaining about what the people in Quebec do. As a matter of fact, even if I were an eco-environmentalist, I wouldn't go to Quebec—if they were getting ready to go and flood the whole place to get their hydroelectric power—and tell them they couldn't. I'd say, “It's up to you. You make that decision,” but don't come back to me and say, “Hey, Alberta, we don't like your oil and gas, and we're going to stand up here and we're going to make sure you don't get to do that.” I see. Is that the duplicitous...? I'm not sure whether that's true—it may be two ways of looking at things, but—

• (85250)

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: That's not actually what the word means.

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: I had no idea what the word was when you said it in the first place, but anyway, that's okay.

The Chair: We have a point of order by Ms. Dabrusin.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Quite truthfully, look it up in the dictionary: “Duplicitous” has a very specific meaning. If he doesn't know what it means, then he shouldn't be using it in this place, and certainly not to other members of this committee. Learn what the word means before you start saying it to people.

The Chair: Ms. Dabrusin, thank you for your point of order.

Mr. Dreeshen, I'm going to come back to you.

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: I stand corrected. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I know that you ruled on the word before. Perhaps at the time we should have had a dictionary, so that all of us could have been informed of the seriousness of that particular term.

That's the thing about points of order—you have to go back a ways to figure out just where you were in your thoughts, but I'll try not to go over many points.

I was talking about how you can respect other Canadians and why that is important. I mentioned having gone to Central America on parliamentary business and having the Bloc there, as well as the Liberals and the NDP. Of course, we were in government at that time, and the Bloc basically said, “We love Canada and we love Quebec—two great countries.” That part I... Anyway, but they still said that, so it was the case that they knew that if we have a strong Canada, it strengthens them. They're a part of it, and they can move forward.

Now, in the last eight years, they see one group being pitted against the other. This group doesn't work. Everyone hates each other, and they sit back and say, “Ah, we can't be part of this group. Look at how dysfunctional this country is.” Well, it took only eight years to use a different mindset, in their case, to make their own point, but it's the reality.

We see that happening. I really think it's something that we should recognize, because I remember when we had this major issue with aluminum coming in from China, and basically all they had to do.... It came in, actually, through Mexico, but it would go into China, and they would do some little thing to hook it up and say, “Okay, now it's a product of Mexico, and then we can bring it into the U.S., and we can bring it into Canada,” and that was going exactly against the aluminum industry in Quebec. We stood up for Quebec's aluminum industry, because what was taking place was wrong.

Some days it would be nice to know that people thought about the rest of the country in the same manner, and so, Mr. Chair, I believe that.... I can see that you are looking at the clock. I thank you for the time.

● (85255)

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

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: I'd like to clarify something for my colleague Mr. Dreeshen in connection with what he just said.

The amendment concerning aluminum in the free trade agreement was made because some members of the Bloc Québécois had organized a protest in the region, where most of the aluminum comes from. Unfortunately, the Conservative MP from Chicoutimi—Le Fjord did not join in, leading to criticism from various sides.

My colleague said that everyone got together to support the aluminum sector. But one key person was missing, his colleague from Chicoutimi—Le Fjord. At the time, it may well have been preferable for me to do business with Mr. Dreeshen than the member for Chicoutimi—Le Fjord in order to support the aluminum sector.

I just wanted to point that out amicably to my friend Mr. Dreeshen.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you, Monsieur Simard, for providing that intervention on a point of order and for context to that.

That was a great job by the interpreters for making sure that was clear all the way through. Thank you.

Colleagues, at the end of that point of order, I know Mr. Dreeshen was wrapping up [*Inaudible—Editor*] finish. Just before we do maybe finish the meeting today, because we are at time, we have a small item that I wanted to ask colleagues about for just a moment, with your indulgence, to deal with an administrative matter.

The clerk circulated a budget a while ago related to a meeting we had on October 16 with Suncor CEO Rich Kruger. This is the first time we've had a chance to discuss this since that meeting took place. I want to get your approval for the budget. Is there agreement by members to adopt the budget in the amount of \$4,500 by unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Thank you, colleagues.

● (85300)

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: On a point of order, Chair, I had more to say. I'm not sure I believe that you more or less said I was finished, but I see the clock.

The Chair: Mr. Dreeshen, you were not finished in your debate and you still have the floor. We will end there today.

The meeting is suspended. Thank you.

[*The meeting was suspended at 1:01 p.m., Monday, December 4*]

[*The meeting resumed at 6:36 p.m., Wednesday, December 6*]

● (90635)

The Chair: I call this meeting to order.

Welcome back to meeting number 80 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Natural Resources.

Since it's now 6:30 p.m., I need to interrupt the current proceedings before the committee. Pursuant to the order made by the House on Monday, December 4, 2023, the committee is meeting at this hour to consider Bill C-50 at clause-by-clause. Because of this interruption, the debate on Mr. Falk's subamendment stands adjourned.

I would like to provide members of the committee with a few comments on how the committee will proceed with clause-by-clause. As the name indicates, this is an examination of all the clauses in the order in which they appear in the bill. I will call each clause successively, and each clause is subject to debate and a vote. If there are amendments to the clause in question, I will recognize the member proposing it, who may explain it.

I would like to remind committee members that, pursuant to the order adopted by the House on Monday, all amendments had to be submitted to the clerk of the committee by 4 p.m. yesterday. As a result, the chair will only allow amendments submitted before that deadline to be moved and debated. In other words, only amendments contained in the distributed package of amendments will be considered. When no further members wish to intervene, the amendment will be voted on. Amendments will be considered in the order in which they appear in the package each member received from the clerk.

In addition to having to be properly drafted in a legal sense, amendments must also be procedurally admissible. The chair may be called upon to rule amendments inadmissible if they go against the principle of the bill or beyond the scope of the bill—both of which were adopted by the House when it agreed to the bill at second reading—or if they offend the financial prerogative of the Crown.

Amendments have been given a number—it's in the top right-hand corner—to indicate which party submitted them. There is no need for a seconder to move an amendment. Once moved, you'll need unanimous consent to withdraw it.

During debate on an amendment, members are permitted to move subamendments. Subamendments must be provided in writing. These subamendments do not require the approval of the mover of the amendment. Only one subamendment may be considered at a time, and that subamendment cannot be amended. When a subamendment is moved to an amendment, it is voted on first. Then another subamendment may be moved or the committee may consider the main amendment and vote on it.

Finally, pursuant to the order adopted by the House, if the committee has not completed the clause-by-clause consideration of the bill by 8:30 p.m., all remaining amendments submitted to the committee shall be deemed moved; the chair shall put the question, forthwith and successively without further debate, on all remaining clauses and amendments submitted to the committee, as well as each and every question necessary to dispose of the clause-by-clause consideration of the bill; and the committee shall not adjourn the meeting until it has disposed of the bill.

I would like to welcome our two witnesses, who will assist us in our debate tonight. From the Department of Justice, we have Barbara Winters, legal counsel—

• (90640)

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

The Chair: —and from the Department of Natural Resources we have Cori Anderson, director, sustainable jobs.

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

The Chair: I thank the members for their attention and wish everyone a productive clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-50.

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

The Chair: Yes. Now on a point of order, I recognize Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I note that the order adopted by the House.... You read the section about what would happen at 8:30, which in my view is quite draconian, but in any event, it was adopted by the House.

The House order also says that the committee shall meet at 6:30 p.m. You, of course, started this meeting substantially after 6:30 p.m., which is a violation of the House order, as I think you'll have to acknowledge. Is it your intention to allow the full two hours envisioned by the House, or do you intend to interrupt proceedings at 8:30, which would limit the clause-by-clause debate further than what was the intention of House?

Again, you were supposed to start this meeting at 6:30. You did not start it at 6:30. Will you interrupt the meeting at 8:30, limiting the time for debate, or will you allow the full two hours, as envisioned by the House, for debate on clause-by-clause?

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

The Chair: Mr. Angus, is it on this point of order?

Mr. Charlie Angus: It's on Mr. Genuis's point of order, and I'm very glad he raised it.

I did notice that the time has started, and I think it's really important that it's on the record. However, we do have many people here, many more than is normal. I know it takes a lot to set it all up. However, I would raise the question on whether we are limiting reflection on the amendment, because at 8:30 we can continue. I think that 8:30 was the time we agreed on in order to follow the House order. That's our understanding. We understood in the past that sometimes things start later because there are so many....

Look at how many people are around the table. Look at how many people are here tonight. They all wanted to make sure it was all done properly, but at 8:30 the House told us we start, so we're certainly ready to switch over.

I'm hoping we'll have it all done by 8:30, on goodwill, so 8:30 may not be necessary, but that all depends on what people do. I'm more than willing to start moving into the second phase, because I think Canadians expect us to get something done.

I appreciate your ruling, Chair.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On the same point of order, Chair—

The Chair: There's a point of order, and a point of order to the point of order, so I'm just going to deal with the first point of order.

Due to some technical challenges, we did start a few minutes after 6:30, but the House order is very clear that at 8:30 we will be moving forward.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It was also clear about 6:30.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Genuis, for your point of order. That is the ruling of the chair.

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

[*Technical difficulty—Editor*] next.

The Chair: That ruling's been made. Do you have a point of order on something else, Mr. Patzer?

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Yes, but it's on that point of order, though, Chair. There are precedents from many other committees that when the committee starts late due to technical difficulties, as you allege, the committee is extended. I'm generally curious to know whether you'll afford that same luxury here. As Mr. Genuis clearly stated, the order from the House to start at 6:30 doesn't say, "try to start at 6:30". It says, "start at 6:30".

Because of technical difficulties, we started later. It gives us two hours, so will you give us the full two hours, or will you not give us the full two hours?

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, thank you for the point of order. I'll let other colleagues also know, as I've stated previously, the chair's ruling. It is that at 8:30 we will proceed with the House order. That's the ruling.

If there's a challenge to the chair on that ruling...

We have a point of order from Ms. Dabrusin.

Mr. Brock, I can only manage...

Ms. Dabrusin, I'll go to your point of order.

Mr. Brock, if you have a point of order as well—

• (90645)

Mr. Larry Brock: I had a point of order at the same time.

The Chair: Ms. Dabrusin, go ahead on the point of order.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Mr. Chair, if the Conservatives—

Mr. Larry Brock: I have a point of order, Chair.

The Chair: Mr. Brock, I'll ask you to turn off your mic until you are recognized.

I think I'm going to take a moment here to remind all colleagues that, when we have multiple points of order, you will be recognized. When multiple members turn on their mics and intervene, it is very difficult for our interpreters to provide interpretation. We've stated this, meeting after meeting, for the last two months.

I would ask all members to show respect and give every member an opportunity to participate. I will scan the room and acknowledge points of order as they come. I just want to make sure all members know that members speak one at a time so that the interpreters can do the tremendous job that they've been doing.

Mr. Brock, I will recognize you after I recognize Ms. Dabrusin.

Ms. Dabrusin, you have the floor.

Mr. Ted Falk: I have a point of order.

The Chair: Ms. Dabrusin has not spoken, Mr. Falk. We'll deal with the point of order by Ms. Dabrusin—

Mr. Ted Falk: Mr. Brock hasn't spoken, and he was prior to—

The Chair: Mr. Falk, I'll ask you to turn off your mic, and I'll recognize your point of order once Ms. Dabrusin starts. I would ask that you do not interrupt Ms. Dabrusin until she has the opportunity to make her point of order. Then I will recognize you, sir.

Thank you.

Ms. Dabrusin, go ahead on a point of order.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: On a point of order—

Mr. Ted Falk: Point of order, point of order... You said that once she talked you would recognize me, so I have a point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Falk, I going to ask you—

Mr. Ted Falk: Here's the deal, Mr. Chair—

The Chair: No, I'm going to ask you to turn off your mic, Mr. Falk.

Mr. Ted Falk: No, no.

The Chair: I'm going to ask you to turn off your mic. You were not recognized.

Ms. Dabrusin will have an opportunity to present her point of order—

Mr. Ted Falk: Well, Mr. Brock was prior to—

The Chair: —and then—

Mr. Ted Falk: Mr. Clerk...

Let's ask the clerk.

The Chair: I will ask you to turn off your mic.

Mr. Ted Falk: Let's ask the clerk.

The Chair: Mr. Falk, I'll ask you to turn off your mic, please, and allow Ms. Dabrusin to present her point of order.

An hon. member: I hope we'll be afforded the same luxury.

The Chair: Ms. Dabrusin, go ahead on a point of order.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Mr. Chair, I believe you have made a ruling. Are they challenging the chair? If yes, let's put it to a vote.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Dabrusin.

Colleagues, if you are challenging the chair, please express that. If you're not, let's move forward on the previous decision that has been made.

Now I will go to Mr. Brock on the point of order.

Mr. Larry Brock: Thank you.

For the record, my colleague Mr. Falk was absolutely correct. Both the chair and the clerk looked at me at the same time that Mr. Patzer raised a point of order. From that, I inferred that I would be recognized immediately after Mr. Patzer, but I wasn't. The chair prioritized a member of the Liberal Party. That's one observation I wish to make.

The second observation, based on the point of order from Mr. Genuis, is that this particular order says, "shall start at 6:30". It doesn't say "may." "Shall" is not discretionary. My original point of order was to ask the chair to explain why there was an approximate 10-minute delay, notwithstanding all committee members were clearly seated in their seats, ready to get the meeting started.

I looked over at the chair. The chair was not engaged in any discussion with any technical officials or the clerk. The chair has indicated on the record that there were technical difficulties. I would like an explanation, on the record, as to what those technical difficulties were, because clearly no one is on Zoom right now.

Perhaps the chair can provide a little more clarity, on the record, as to what technical difficulties prevented him from complying with this particular order that we should commence—or "shall" commence—at 6:30.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Brock, for your point of order. A ruling has been made on that, and we will proceed.

I have provided clearly to committee members what the delay was and on the technical....

Mr. Larry Brock: I have a point of order, Chair.

The Chair: If you would like to challenge the ruling of the chair, I ask you to do so.

Mr. Brock.

• (90650)

Mr. Larry Brock: I am asking for a clarification, sir, which I'm entitled to do. You have not provided a clarification. If the chair refuses to provide a clarification, I will challenge your order.

The Chair: You have the ability, Mr. Brock, to challenge the ruling that has been made.

I'm going to go to the next point of order by Mr. Angus.

Mr. Angus, go ahead, on a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you.

I want to totally support Mr. Brock. Mr. Brock says that, if he doesn't get an explanation, he's going to challenge the chair. I totally support him.

Chair, I think you made a ruling. If you do not give a technical explanation, then Mr. Brock is going to challenge the chair.

I'm more than willing to have Mr. Brock challenge the chair. He said it, and if he doesn't want to follow through, then what he's do-

ing, Mr. Chair—and I don't want to waste anyone's time; this is important legislation—is just using his spot to try to upend our work.

If he's going to challenge the chair, I support him—challenge the chair. If he's not, then he should participate as a respected member of Parliament and follow through.

Chair, I think you have made a ruling. Let them challenge you.

The Chair: Colleagues, before I go to the next point of order, I am going to remind members as well of what I have done in previous meetings.

I will endeavour to ask you to pause, and I will turn on my mic to ensure that our interpreters can hear one committee member at a time, so that we do not have multiple committee members speaking into the mic at the same time and so that our interpreters can interpret.

I would ask committee members, when you have a point of order, to look at me. I will try my best to make sure I give everybody an opportunity to participate. You can raise your hand. You can acknowledge me, but if I do turn on my mic and I ask you to pause, I would ask all committee members to pause at that point. Thank you.

We have a point of order from Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Genuis, go ahead on the point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

When Mr. Angus was speaking, I thought it would be important to clarify the rules around the participation of members. I know that in the House yesterday Mr. Angus was not able to speak because he explicitly defied the Speaker. I wonder if he is permitted to speak in committee or if the rules still apply.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, thank you for your intervention. That was not a point of order. You have been engaging in debate. I will ask you turn off your mic.

I will go to Ms. McPherson on a point of order.

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): I am just reiterating that it was difficult to understand the member because his mouth was full. If he could please finish what he's eating before addressing the committee, that would be appreciated.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. McPherson, for your point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On the same point of order, I'm happy to repeat the point if it was unclear.

The Chair: I'm going to go to Ms. Gladu, who has been waiting very patiently.

Thank you, Ms. Gladu, for waiting patiently. You're now recognized on a point of order.

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

Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Thank you, Chair.

In the hopes of moving things along, I think the intent of the order from the House was to have two full hours of discussion. It looks like things may become a little fractious, and perhaps it would be good to have the clerk keep a list of who has wanted to speak, in order, so that we don't fight about that. Then that will move things along nicely.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Gladu.

I have Mr. Patzer on a point of order and then Mr. Simard on a point of order.

Mr. Patzer, go ahead on your point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

At the start of the meeting you were already giving us a little bit of grief, supposedly, about not interrupting other members when they're speaking, yet when the bonus NDP member over there jumped in right away, there was no chiding of sorts from the chair as to that. I'm just wondering if you're going to apply the rules equally or how this is going to work.

Mr. John Aldag: I have a point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Aldag, do you have a point of order on the point of order?

Mr. John Aldag: Yes.

The Chair: Go ahead on the point of order.

Mr. John Aldag: I just ask that we be respectful and not use language that's clearly meant to cause further debate. The Conservatives have more than four members. You're allowed to be here. The NDP are allowed to have extras here. I welcome Ms. McPherson—

Ms. Heather McPherson: Why, thank you.

Mr. John Aldag: —and I don't think we should be calling her out for being at the table and speaking, as the Conservative members are doing. I just ask that, as we get into the evening, we have a good, respectful discussion, as you have asked us many times to do.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On that point of order, Chair—

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Aldag.

All members are welcome to be here and participate.

Thank you, Mr. Simard, for waiting patiently.

We do have a point of order on Mr. Aldag's point of order, and I'm going to come to you, Mr. Genuis, on your point of order. Then I'm going to Mr. Simard.

• (90655)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Just to Mr. Aldag's point, I think some members are quite liberal about accusing people of unparliamentary language. My colleague described someone as a “bonus” member. I don't think “bonus” is a derogatory term. It's simply a description of the normal numbers and having additional numbers. I'd like you to maybe clarify if you view “bonus” as—

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, thank you for your point of order, but you're getting into debate.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No, it's a question of the rules. Do you view “bonus” as parliamentary or unparliamentary language? I

would like to know because I was actually planning on using the word “bonus” in a few points later in my remarks—

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Genuis, for your point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —so I want to make sure I moderate myself accordingly.

The Chair: Colleagues, once again I'm going to ask everybody to pause and reflect for a moment on the work we are instructed to do here. We've seen, over the last several months, interventions that our committee is not allowed to move forward. We do have important work to do. I would ask all members to give another member an opportunity to participate and speak, and that we avoid using unparliamentary or inflammatory language. I think that goes for everybody. We take that seriously. We make sure we consider what we say before we say it, because our words do have impacts on others.

On that note, I am going to go to Monsieur Simard. He has been waiting very patiently on that point of order.

Mr. Larry Brock: I have a point of order, Chair.

The Chair: Monsieur Simard has been waiting and I've acknowledged his hand a number of times. I'm going to go to Mr. Simard on the point of order.

Mr. Simard, on the point of order, please go ahead.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I would ask all my colleagues to take a deep breath and focus on the work ahead of us this evening.

My Conservative colleagues seem to be saying that they would like specific rules. I congratulate them for doing so. They want to know whether there are going to be two hours allocated to the study of this bill. I would like to know that too. However, to keep things rolling along for the committee, are we going to agree for more speakers than usual from each party? The Conservative Party has four voting members. Does that mean that all the Conservatives can speak this evening? Does it mean that there might be two NDP members? On the one hand, I'd like clarification on this.

On the other hand, there are things in the bill that we have to discuss. For example, there's the matter of the labour agreements between Canada and Quebec. Unfortunately, that won't be possible, because if we have two hours and everyone keeps rising on trivial points of order, I don't think we'll be able to look in depth at everyone's amendments, or to study the bill.

If people keep rising on a point of order, it means they're not very interested in studying the bill and attempting instead to bring the committee's work to a standstill.

There are two options. Either we move on quickly with our study of the bill and put our amendments forward, or waste our time with trifling matters and procedures that don't amount to anything.

So I'm asking everyone to take a deep breath. We need to be legislators—it's what we do best—and stop behaving like idiots, which is what I've been seeing for a while.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you. I'm just going to ask everybody to pause for a moment. I was waiting for interpretation, and I just want to get clarification from the clerk as well.

Now we have Mr. Brock on a point of order, and we have Mr. Angus.

Mr. Brock, go ahead on the point of order, and then I'm going to go to Mr. Angus.

Mr. Larry Brock: Thank you, Chair. I listened very carefully to my colleague Monsieur Simard, particularly the latter part of his point of order in terms of taking a deep breath.

I've taken a deep breath to gather my thoughts for this second point of order, just like I took a deep breath for my first point of order. I don't rush into points of order, Chair, so I'll take his words at face value.

I think it's important that I raise this issue, because this is an issue that was brought up initially at our meeting earlier this week. There was a term used by my colleague Mr. Falk in reference to Ms. Dabrusin, which she took offence at. I'm not going to mention the word again. Other members of the Liberal bench took offence too. You thought about that particular word, and you cautioned all of us, if you recall, Mr. Chair, at the committee about the use of derogatory and non-parliamentary language.

I didn't challenge that particular order because it wasn't an order per se—it was a suggestion by the chair—but I asked for clarification. I asked on more than one occasion for clarification as to whether or not the chair was going to make a ruling with respect to the use of that particular word. I asked it on more than one occasion. The chair dodged the specifics in terms of opining on whether or not that word itself was derogatory or unparliamentary. I raise that in the context of what has just happened tonight, where one of my colleagues used the reference to a “bonus NDP member”, to which MP Aldag took great offence and raised a point of order, viewing that as unparliamentary. Again, the chair, using the very same language that the chair used two days ago, cautioned committee about the use of derogatory terms and non-parliamentary terms.

Again, I need clarification, Chair, and I think it would benefit every particular member at this committee, as to what the chair deems to be derogatory and/or unparliamentary. I'm of the same view as my colleague Mr. Patzer, that the word “bonus” could actually be flattering as opposed to derogatory. If the chair still feels that it's a derogatory derivation or some knock on Ms. McPherson's abilities....

I have great respect for Ms. McPherson. I haven't had any personal conversations with her, but I always admire her interventions in the House. I would certainly not use any derogatory terms for Ms. McPherson. In my understanding, sir, the use of “bonus”.... It is a bonus actually to this committee to have Ms. McPherson's presence at this committee.

Again, I am asking the chair to provide clarity because, quite frankly, as this meeting progresses and as future meetings progress.... I hope that the Conservative team invites me for future resource meetings because I quite enjoy the content in these meetings. To enable me to perform at my best, Mr. Chair, I need to hear, from the chair's perspective, what is deemed to be derogatory and a ruling as to what is deemed to be derogatory or non-parliamentary. Thank you.

• (90700)

The Chair: Thank you.

I would also remind members not to use a point of order for extensive debate on issues that have been ruled upon or previously ruled upon.

Mr. Larry Brock: I have a point of order, Chair.

The Chair: Mr. Brock, I will finish, and this is for everybody. It's not to one member directly, but as per our previous meeting or today, I just want to make sure that we all respect each other and use language that is respectful and use a tone that is respectful for all members. I think we can do that, as we did at the last meeting as well. We did get into working with each other quite well to finish off that meeting.

I did not make a ruling at a previous meeting that the specific word used was unparliamentary, as I would need a dictionary to determine every word in the context it's used. I don't believe that I have the ability, in all cases, to provide that, but I do have the ability to make sure that we all have a respectful workplace for everybody around the table, that we attempt to respect each other as colleagues around the table and use parliamentary language and that we continue in that fashion. I'm asking you to do that again today.

Thank you.

Mr. Angus, you have the floor on the point of order that you had.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you, Chair.

I'm hoping that I can try to find some consensus here. Mr. Aldag did take offence at referring to my colleague from Edmonton as a “bonus NDP”.

Mr. Brock, I think, quite rightly points out that “bonus” could be positive. I think it's very positive that we have a member from Alberta who actually believes in climate science. That's a bonus for us. I think it's a bonus—

Mr. Ted Falk: That's debate, Chair.

Mr. Charlie Angus: —that we have a member who met with the carpenters union in Edmonton, which actually wanted to talk to us about this legislation. That's a bonus.

The Chair: Mr. Angus—

• (90705)

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

Mr. Charlie Angus: Now they're trying to.... See, they're attacking me and trying to shut me down. I'm trying to support them.

Mr. Charlie Angus:

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: The chair's light is on.

Mr. Charlie Angus: The bonus is having a member from Alberta who actually cares about workers, who doesn't use delay tactics—

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

Mr. Charlie Angus: —and also doesn't speak with crackers in her mouth.

I would advise that she's a real bonus to our committee tonight.

Thank you, Chair.

The Chair: Mr. Angus, thank you for your point of order.

As I just reminded all colleagues, let's not use our points of order for debate. I really don't want to have to cut you off.

I want to make sure that our interpreters can interpret. When I ask you to pause or hold, or I turn on my mic.... Please try to address your point of order while looking towards me so you can see whether my mic is on.

I do want to welcome Ms. McPherson and Mr. Morrice, who was here a moment ago, to our committee, and Ms. Gladu as well as others who have joined us today.

Mr. Genuis and Mr. Fonseca, thank you for joining us this evening.

Now we will proceed on.....

Do you have a point of order, Mr. Genuis?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I had a point of order.

You didn't rule on my question regarding—maybe it wasn't audible—whether Mr. Angus is allowed to speak or whether the Speaker's ruling in the House applies to committees as well.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, thank you for your point of order. Members who are participating here today in committee are allowed to participate.

Now I just want to, colleagues, as we've gone through and we've reset where we're at—

[*Translation*]

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

[*English*]

The Chair: Monsieur Simard, go ahead.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: I hope we can make a start after that.

I'd like clarification, because you haven't answered my question.

Which members can speak this evening? Will it be only the voting members of the committee? Can any member of a party speak this evening? I haven't heard an answer to that question. If there are

two members of the Bloc Québécois, will both be able to speak this evening?

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you, Monsieur Simard, for your point of order. All members can participate unless there's a vote. Only voting members who have been recognized and registered with the clerk can participate in a vote. Thank you for asking for that clarity, Monsieur Simard.

Colleagues, there is a change to make in the package of amendments. I want to start off at this point by allowing committee members to know about the change. PV-1 on page 25 of the package should be moved to after LIB-3 on page 27. Once again, just for all members, PV-1 on page 25 of the package should be moved to after LIB-3 on page 27.

Mr. Larry Brock: I have a point of order, Chair.

The Chair: I just want to make sure everybody caught that. If there are any concerns, let me know.

Mr. Brock, you have a point of order.

Mr. Larry Brock: With respect to that last statement by the chair, can you provide some context as to why that move is being made?

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Brock.

That's the order that it appears in the bill. As folks were putting together all of these packages for committee members, they wanted to make sure that, to the best of their ability, they could provide it in that order. That was the information provided to me, and I wanted to bring that forward to committee members.

We'll go to Mr. Aldag and then to Ms. Gladu.

Mr. Aldag, go ahead.

Mr. John Aldag: I'm trying to understand it.

Could you give it to us again? I didn't follow where I'm supposed to be, so I just need to note it down.

The Chair: Before I proceed, I will provide it once again, and that might address your points of order.

There is a change to make in the package of amendments.

PV-1 on page 25 of the package should be moved to after LIB-3 on page 27. I'll do it once again, just to make sure: PV-1 on page 25 of the package should be moved after LIB-3 on page 27.

Next is Ms. Gladu on the point of order, and then we'll go to Mr. Morrice.

Go ahead.

• (90710)

Ms. Marilyn Gladu: With respect to moving PV-1 after LIB-3, that would imply that it was in clause 7, but the text of PV-1 says "in clause 6". Does that mean that the amendment has to be amended in order for it to be compliant?

Thank you.

The Chair: Ms. Gladu, there was a drafting error with legal.... It has now been rectified and put in the right place according to the bill. Thank you for your catch.

Mr. Morrice, you had a point of order.

Mr. Mike Morrice (Kitchener Centre, GP): On the same point, I'm just looking to understand better.

If PV-1, which I'm here hopefully to speak to with respect to a just transition for coal power workers being included as part of this bill, is in clause 6. LIB-3 is clause 7. Why is it that PV-1 would follow if it is in an earlier clause?

The Chair: I'll ask you to confer with the clerk.

Colleagues, pursuant to Standing Order 75(1), consideration of clause 1 and of the preamble are postponed.

Since there are a few amendments to clause 2, the interpretation clause, I suggest that we postpone the study of clause 2 until the end. This will allow us to first consider and make a decision on amendments that could have an impact on the definitions.

As a reminder, *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, states on page 773 that:

The interpretation clause of a bill is not the place to propose a substantive amendment to a bill unless other amendments have been adopted that would warrant amendments to the interpretation clause.

Therefore, clause 2 will be considered after clause 21.

(On clause 3)

The Chair: We are on CPC-4 on page 11 of the package.

Do we have a mover for that?

Mr. Patzer.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you.

It is that Bill C-50, in clause 3, be amended by replacing lines 3 and 4 on page 5 with the following:

3 The purpose of this Act is to improve affordability and to facilitate and promote economic growth, private sector investment, the creation of sustainable jobs and

● (90715)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Patzer.

I just want to let colleagues know that if CPC-4 is adopted, BQ-4 cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I believe I still have the floor.

The Chair: I'm sorry. I thought you were done, Mr. Patzer.

I'll ask other colleagues to hold.

Mr. Patzer, go ahead and finish, and then we'll proceed.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I think it probably goes without saying, but just in case it doesn't I thought it would be good to just make the point. The reason I want to see the improvement of affordability is that we've definitely seen, after eight years, that affordability has become an issue for the overwhelming majority of Canadians.

Certainly, economic growth and private sector investment is of utmost importance to natural resource development in this country.

We've seen a fleeing of private sector investment from this country over the last eight years, so I just think it's important that we make sure there's language in this bill that would be supportive of affordability and of facilitating and promoting economic growth.

Certainly in my region.... I'm sure many members around the table here would be willing to support this amendment, because they also have natural resource development happening in their riding.

You know, it's interesting. We had a subamendment previously, as you'll recall, about the need to have people come from Timmins—James Bay to speak at committee. Unfortunately, the member from Timmins—James Bay was missing for three meetings and wasn't able to speak to it. When he did—actually, at the meeting prior to his being subbed out of the committee—he didn't even spend time to talk about projects in Timmins—James Bay, but—

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

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: —we spoke at length, as Conservatives, about what's happening in Timmins—James Bay.

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, I ask you to pause for a second. We do have a point of order.

Mr. Angus, you have a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I really like my friend Mr. Patzer, but he has a really bad memory. I do believe I spoke extensively on the issue.

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

Mr. Charlie Angus: I don't know if that has anything to do with this, but he can carry on as long as he wants because he has another hour and 11 minutes. He can talk about Timmins a lot if he wants.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus, for the point of order.

Colleagues, I would just ask you to keep points of order to procedural issues and to not engage in debate through points of order. Thank you.

Mr. Patzer, I ask you to conclude so we can move to the next speakers.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: For sure. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Actually, I spoke for two hours straight about the great projects and the great work that is going on in Timmins—James Bay.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Did I miss that?

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Actually, yes, you did, for some reason. I wasn't sure why you missed the last three meetings. Maybe it had to do with the fact that the last week was a week to acknowledge survivors of domestic abuse. Given what had happened in committee prior to your being subbed out, I think that had something to do with your being removed from the committee. Anyway, I digress.

I think it's important, though, that we talk about affordability, Mr. Chair—

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

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, I'll ask you to pause on affordability.

Go ahead, Mr. Angus, on a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I don't know why Mr. Patzer is talking about victims of domestic abuse. If he's going to make stuff up, I think he could be clear, but not during this time. We're actually talking about Bill C-50. If he wants to make allegations against me, he can do that anywhere he wants, but we're dealing with Bill C-50.

Could you, Chair, keep him focused? I'm worried about my friend here. He gets so angry, he just goes off track. Either they're serious about this or not.

• (90720)

The Chair: Mr. Angus—

Mr. Larry Brock: I have a point of order, Chair.

The Chair: I'll address that, and then I'll go to your point of order, Mr. Brock.

Colleagues, as we've mentioned previously, let's focus on using points of order for procedural issues that are relevant to procedure, not for debate.

I would also ask committee members, through their debate, to focus on the motion that's been moved and how it relates to the work we're doing on Bill C-50 here today. Thank you.

Mr. Brock, are you on a point of order regarding Mr. Patzer or Mr. Angus?

Mr. Larry Brock: I'm on a point of order based on the comments of Mr. Angus.

You heard Mr. Angus's commentary with respect to Mr. Patzer, which I find to be not only offensive but unparliamentary, claiming he was not proposing a relevant amendment on the floor to improve this bill but rather making a personal angry attack against Mr. Angus himself.

Again, I'm not asking for a ruling—

Mr. Charlie Angus: [*Inaudible—Editor*]

Mr. Larry Brock: Mr. Angus, I have the floor. You do not. Thank you.

I'm asking that the chair not make a particular ruling per se, but rather that it be another cautionary tale to all committee members that we need to be respectful. We're all elected officials. We are all honourable members of Parliament. We should conduct ourselves accordingly and show respect.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Brock.

I think you've clearly stated in your point of order what the expectations for everybody on the committee should be and that we focus on the bill and the clauses at hand.

Ms. Gladu, you have a point of order. Go ahead.

Ms. Marilyn Gladu: No, I don't have a point of order. I want to be on the speaking list after Mr. Patzer finishes. Thanks.

The Chair: Yes, we have a number of people on the speaking order, Ms. Gladu. We'll put you down. Thank you.

Mr. Patzer, you were at “affordability”, I believe, in the moving of your amendment. Go ahead.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you.

I was talking about affordability, economic growth and private sector investment, which we know are going to be of utmost importance to the people of Timmins—James Bay.

I think they would definitely be concerned about the fact that their member missed my two-hour intervention previously, as there are many great points and projects that we spoke about. We spoke at length about what's going on in natural resource development up in Timmins—James Bay.

It was unfortunate that Mr. Angus wasn't there. I trust that he will go back to read through all of the fantastic things that are happening in his riding, so he can refresh his own memory for when he goes back there, maybe over the Christmas break.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Could you repeat those great things in my riding? I love what's going on in my riding.

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

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Genuis, on a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

I think it's clear why the Speaker stopped Mr. Angus from speaking in the House, given his constant interruptions and contribution to disorder today.

I hope that you, as chair, can encourage Mr. Angus to not be shouting at my colleague while he's intervening. I recall some of the things that Mr. Angus used to say if someone so much as whispered or sneezed when he was speaking, so I hope you will preserve some pretense of fairness and allow my colleague to speak uninterrupted.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Genuis, for your point of order.

Mr. Angus, go ahead on a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I was certainly interested in hearing what my colleague knew at all about Timmins—James Bay.

I would like to apologize in advance to any European soccer player I might offend by asking my colleagues to stop rolling around on the pitch and demanding a red card. Just stick to the amendment at hand.

We have work to get done. We're going to be here all night. I'd like to know if they're going to move this amendment or they're going to talk about it.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus.

Colleagues, I'll ask us to get back to where we were. We have a number of people on the speaking order, so please allow a member to finish and move their motion.

Mr. Patzer has a point of order on Mr. Angus, who had point-of-ordered him.

Go ahead.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: It's on his point of order, as I was saying.

For him to come in here and to allege that Conservatives are a bunch of European soccer players.... In the context of what he is actually saying, he's alleging that we're all a bunch of flopping, whining and crying...like, "Oh, Mr. Chair, oh, oh."

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

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: That's not what's going on, but that's what he's alleging.

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

On the point of order, I didn't hear that. Could he repeat that about what Conservatives are like? It didn't come through properly on my translation.

• (90725)

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: This is not a point of order. That is a point of debate. It's a point of debate.

The Chair: Colleagues, let's focus on the work at hand today.

If somebody said I was like Messi, the great soccer player, I would take that as a compliment personally.

I would like everyone to focus on not getting off the track of the work that needs to be done here today, the cause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-50.

I ask all colleagues to maybe, as Mr. Simard said very eloquently earlier, take a deep breath and reflect, so that we can move forward on the work at hand that we've been asked to do.

On that, I'm going back to you, Mr. Patzer, so that you can continue on. If there's a procedural issue, please identify it so that we can deal with the procedural issue. If not, let's not engage in lengthy debate. Let's get back to where we were, because you have the floor, sir, to speak to the amendment you're bringing forward.

Go ahead.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: The procedural question I was getting to in my point of order, Mr. Chair, was about deliberately inflammatory language by members of this committee. Mr. Angus has egregiously breached that numerous times in the past. I would expect, Mr. Chair, that you would be judicious in the way that you handle the conduct and behaviour of members of this committee and that the rules would apply fairly and equally to all parties.

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order.

I'm going now to—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I didn't say I was on a point of order.

The Chair: Back to you. You have the floor.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Yes. I was making sure that I finished that thought for everybody here, especially for you, Mr. Chair, because I do think it would be helpful.

I was getting to the point of the private sector investment in the many great projects that are happening in Timmins—James Bay. As I was saying, it was a shame that he wasn't here to hear my intervention and the interventions of many of my colleagues, as he missed three meetings.

When he did speak, you know.... We have the transcripts available. We can actually see what he was talking about, and there was very little that actually was directly related to the subamendment. He was talking about all kinds of things all across the country, but on the—

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, I'll ask you to hold. We have a point of order from Ms. Dabrusin.

Go ahead, Ms. Dabrusin on a point of order.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: It's relevance. We're looking at CPC-4. I believe he has moved it. Can we talk about the amendment, please, and a little less about other members on this committee?

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order, Ms. Dabrusin.

I'll ask my colleague to focus on the amendment at hand, on CPC-4, and to make sure the remarks he is making are relevant to clause-by-clause and the amendment he's moving. Thank you.

Go ahead, Mr. Patzer.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: As I was saying before I was interrupted again, it was about the private sector investment in Timmins-James Bay. We would hope you would see that anyway, but, you know, after eight years of this government, we have seen a lot of that flee the country, for sure.

I think making sure that at the very least there's language that will provide some certainty around whether or not the government's actually serious about promoting economic growth, or private sector investment, would definitely be good to see. But we all know that the way this bill will go, it will crush any opportunity for the type of economic growth that the current natural resource industries provide; the private sector investment that at one point it did, prior to this government's getting into power eight years ago and the chaos that, along with the NDP, it has invoked upon the provinces and on the sector at large.

I do think this is a good amendment for us to be able to start this debate off on. As I say, it's to improve affordability. That's what this gets to at its very heart and core. We know that affordability in our small towns and communities like Coronach and Rockglen and Willow Bunch will suffer when this bill gets rammed through, much like it did in the town of Hanna, Alberta. That's why we're making sure that we have some language like this. We want to make sure the government is actually accountable for what it is going to be trying to do for our communities.

Now, in terms of the creation of sustainable jobs, I'm of the opinion that the jobs people currently have are quite sustainable and in fact should be prioritized and not just thrown by the wayside. We know that these current jobs lead to the revenue that these companies make, which allows them to make the private sector investment that we were talking about earlier, which leads to economic growth. Sustainable jobs already exist. There might be some ideologically driven folks around the table who think otherwise, but we know that sustainable jobs do exist. There are private sector investments from these companies. They are the ones who are largely investing in, say, wind power or solar. They want to be investing in some of the other emerging things that have come and will be available.

For example, in my neck of the woods—Mr. Aldag has family in that neck of the woods, which I've talked about before—is the SunBridge wind farm. Suncor invested in wind, one of the very first companies in Saskatchewan, and I would suggest probably in other provinces as well, to do so. They were one of the early investors in wind. Enbridge partnered with them to be able to build that wind farm to provide power for the power utility in Saskatchewan, which is SaskPower. That's why it's called the “SunBridge” wind farm, because it was Suncor and Enbridge. They are oil and gas companies. Over 20 years ago they made the decision that they were going to become energy companies, because they saw that there was the opportunity for expanded economic growth and the opportunity to grow the types of services or I guess the type of power and type of energy they were going to provide to people. They wanted to make sure they were involved in that. It created jobs. It created wealth for communities. It expanded the tax bases of some communities in the area.

Unfortunately, what's happening now, because of what's going on with this government, is that the wind farm is being decommissioned. It's not going to be replaced because of the lack of certainty that comes from this government. Bill C-50 will only create further issues for the types of companies that want to invest in energy production in this country.

• (90730)

I think it's important to acknowledge what the private sector can do, the role they actually have to play in energy production across the country and what that means for sustainable jobs. Those are jobs that actually already exist. It's not some new concept that this government is going to pretend to invent and take credit for. These sustainable jobs already exist. They do exist in the oil and gas industry. They do exist in all parts of the economy and in all sectors.

To make sure that we prioritize will mean an effort to see more affordability for Canadians, because Canada's strategic advantage

for years and years and years has been affordable, reliable energy. That's in large part due to our oil and gas companies, which have provided reliable, affordable, environmentally sustainable sources as well. That's not to mention the indigenous partnerships that have come from these resource companies and the fact that they are continuing to work toward economic participation and self-determination for first nations.

As such, there are companies like Natural Law Energy. This government has actually denied this company the ability to participate in the economy, by getting rid of things like Keystone XL, not bothering to put any effort into having any advocacy on that to make sure that those projects, which were good for Canada and good for our energy security and our future going forward.... There were good opportunities there that were lost. This type of bill will make absolutely sure that those folks don't have that opportunity.

At the very least, we could put in some friendly language around affordability and prioritizing economic growth, private sector investment and the creation of...well, sustainable jobs, because a “just transition” bill is what this is. We could say that this bill is not going to do anything about sustainable jobs, but we're still going to put the reference in there, because we think those jobs already exist and that the government should prioritize those jobs.

I hope colleagues all around this table will be voting for this amendment. I know I'm excited for it. I'm looking forward to seeing what other people think.

• (90735)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Patzer.

We'll now go to Genuis. After Mr. Genuis, a number of speakers want to intervene on this amendment.

Go ahead, Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

This is my first chance to speak in the context of this bill. I'm grateful for that opportunity, and I will be speaking, of course, to the amendment. However, I do also want to move a subamendment that I believe the clerk has. I submitted it in writing, so I'll go ahead and state that subamendment. The requirements have been met. I gather that it will be distributed when it's translated.

The amendment is to add, after the words “sustainable jobs”, “that provide powerful paycheques to Canadian workers”. I think this is an important addition to the excellent amendment from my colleague Mr. Patzer. It really underlines what the bill should be about. We are in the purpose section of the bill. We're describing what should be the purpose of the bill.

Sadly, I don't think it is the purpose of the bill as written. That is, I don't think it is the purpose that the minister had in mind when proposing this bill. I don't think it's the purpose that the government had in their thinking when they put this bill forward. The government's approach to our economy is, sadly, not about creating more private sector investment or creating sustainable jobs that provide powerful paycheques to Canadian workers. That is not the approach of this government, but it should be.

We are in the process of looking at amendments for this bill and putting forward this amendment to the purpose. Of course, we will have other subsequent amendments that give greater voice and life to that amendment and that will shift the purpose of this legislation to where we should be. In my remarks on this amendment, I want to talk about where we are right now with this government and with the current purpose of the bill, and then I want to talk about where we should be.

Here is where we are. We have a piece of legislation that this government is increasingly embarrassed about. We know they're embarrassed about it, because they have put forward an unprecedented, draconian programming motion in the House that does not even allow this committee to hear from any witnesses. No workers, no companies, no affected families, no first nations—nobody—will be able to address the committee on this bill because of a motion adopted in the House that narrowly prescribes.... That includes no ministers, by the way. We won't hear from ministers. We have a draconian—

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'll ask you to pause for a second. Hold that thought.

Go ahead, Mr. Angus, on a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I love listening to Mr. Genuis. Once he gets wind in his sails, he goes straight for the rocks. We're talking about a subamendment, and what he's talking about has nothing to do with the subamendment. Can we keep focused on the issue?

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus.

I would ask my colleague Mr. Genuis, as you continue, to stay relevant to the subamendment that you proposed to the amendment.

We have another point of order.

Mr. Brock.

Mr. Larry Brock: It feels like almost a *deja vu* moment, because I recall having this point of order two days ago on the issue of relevancy. My Liberal colleagues were continuously interrupting members on the Conservatives side during their interventions, because they deemed the content not to be relevant.

I ultimately raised the point of order and brought to the attention of the chair and every member of this committee that in a legal context—and I view committees to be quasi-judicial in their formats—the word “relevancy” is subjective. It's not objective. What is relevant in the eyes of Ms. Dabrusin or Mr. Sorbara, Ms. Lapointe, Mr. Aldag or Mr. Fonseca ultimately is up to the member who is speaking. In this case it is my colleague Mr. Genuis, who is getting to the point.

The fact that he's not getting to the point as expeditiously as Liberal members would like is not the point. The point of the matter is that his content is very relevant to the overall bill itself and that he be afforded, and most chairs do this, a very wide ambit and a wide latitude to intervene—in this particular case, on a subamendment—to get to the relevancy aspect.

I'm asking the chair to not rule without allowing Mr. Genuis to fully flesh out and articulate his points in relation to the subamendment. I've always believed Mr. Genuis to have relevant points, and he may not describe the relevancy initially, in the first couple of

minutes, but eventually he gets around to it. Therefore, I'm asking the chair to provide that latitude to all members of this committee, and in particular to my colleague Mr. Genuis.

Thank you.

● (90740)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Brock, for your point of order and for providing that additional context. We've had a number of relevancy questions over the last two months as we've been debating this.

I do provide members the latitude to be able to express themselves as they move an amendment or a subamendment, but I would remind members that they do have the right, across the floor and around the table, to make a point of order if they believe there's something potentially that's not relevant and that we need to focus on the relevancy of the motion at hand. As well, thank you for providing your point of order and your insights on that.

I'm going to turn back to Mr. Genuis to allow him to continue on with his intervention. The only thing I would ask of you, Mr. Genuis, is to keep it relevant to what you're providing.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you very much, Chair. Mr. Angus made some comments about my remarks, relating them to having wind in one's sails. I would only say that it shows he knows as much about sailing as he does about the interests of energy workers.

The central issue in this subamendment....

Mr. Angus says he's never sailed. I'm sure he'll have lots of time for that after the next election, and I do wish him well.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'll ask you to pause.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Chair: Order, members.

Mr. Genuis.

I see Mr. Angus on a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I really think we're going to be here a long time. I'm going to try to pull back so that we don't see this kind of toxic behaviour from the Conservative. I made a comment earlier that I'd like to apologize for. I compared them to European soccer players, and then Mr. Patzer made a “wah-wah” sound, which I didn't quite understand.

I'd like to apologize, because certainly there are European soccer players, like Beckham, De Bruyne, Mbappé and Vinicius, who get the ball in the net. Regarding my comparison to European soccer players and the behaviour of the Conservatives, as we come down to about 37 minutes left while they talk the clock out, I would like to withdraw that in a way of showing goodwill towards my colleagues.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus, for retracting your remarks from earlier.

I don't want anybody to be offended by any remarks regarding soccer or anything else. I know that Mr. Fonseca is Portuguese, and Cristiano Ronaldo might be a fan of his—and others as well.

We all have opinions, but let's focus on the work we're doing here at committee on Bill C-50, on the clause-by-clause and the subamendment we're on now.

Thank you, Mr. Angus, for your point of order and for retracting your remarks from earlier.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you, Chair, for allowing me to do that. I feel better.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I will ask you to proceed and maybe conclude if you're on the subamendment, so other members can also proceed.

Go ahead.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you very much, Chair.

I think Mr. Angus should consider letters to various European ambassadors to apologize for the gross generalizations he's made about people from a particular continent and culture.

• (90745)

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'm going to ask you to hold.

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

I'm trying to work here with my colleague. I would like to work with Mr. Genuis, because I probably do need to apologize to European ambassadors for comparing them to some of my Conservative colleague's tactics.

If he has ambassadors who can work with me—because I haven't done a lot of international work and I know he has—I would be more than willing to work with his office. I would send those apologies—nice, personal, signed letters.

If he wants to work with me on that, I'd take that as a sign that we can get through this tonight.

Voices: [*Inaudible—Editor*]

The Chair: Colleagues, rather than getting into a back-and-forth, I will ask members once again to focus on the work at hand. There's been a retraction made, so let's refrain from further engaging on conversations that maybe aren't involved with the work we're doing here on committee today on Bill C-50 and the amendment, and now the subamendment that's been proposed.

Voices: [*Inaudible—Editor*]

Mr. Genuis, if you would focus on the work and the important subamendment that you brought forward and—

Mr. Larry Brock: On a point of order, Chair, I can't hear myself think. There is so much chatter going on outside of these desks that it's making it very difficult to understand the interventions of my colleagues.

Can the chair caution those individuals who are not committee members to keep it down, please, or to take their conversations outside?

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Brock, for the important reminder for everyone.

I will ask everyone in the room today to keep the tone down so members of committee can do the important work we're doing here

on the clause-by-clause, and that members speak only if they're recognized around the table. The clerk and I will make sure that everybody gets a chance to participate who wants to participate.

If you want to have a conversation that's a little more animated or loud, please take it outside. There are opportunities to have those conversations elsewhere.

Thank you for providing that intervention and that important reminder.

We have a lot of quiet in the room, Mr. Genuis. That's a good opportunity for you to continue.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

Just to briefly respond to Mr. Angus, I might suggest that even after the next election, when he has an abundance of time, he could do that apology tour in person and visit various European capitals. I'm sure the newly elected Conservative MP for Timmins—James Bay at that time will be happy to provide any form of assistance, letters of introduction, etc.

I am happy to return now to discussion of the subamendment that is before the committee. I'll remind members that after the words “sustainable jobs” in the amendment, it adds the words “that provide powerful paycheques to Canadian workers”. Before I was interrupted by a string of quirky amendments from my New Democratic friends, I was just wanting to frame the argument for the subamendment in terms of where we are and where we should be. This is sort of the core framing section of Bill C-50. It is the section that deals with the purpose of the bill and what the bill intends to achieve.

Of course, Conservatives do not agree with the government's plans in this regard, so we are proposing constructive amendments to redirect the purpose of the bill. The government's plans, sadly, do not include delivering powerful paycheques to Canadian workers. The government's plans are focused on piling taxes on Canadian workers. Our focus is on powerful paycheques for Canadian workers, and we would like to see that be the purpose of the bill, instead of what is actually the purpose of the bill, which relates to their so-called “just transition” agenda.

I could tell you that when I speak to workers, what they are looking for is not a just transition; they're looking for a Justin transition. That is, they want a new Prime Minister who will actually have their backs and will deliver powerful paycheques for workers.

Mr. Chair, the context though for where we are is that we have this piece of legislation with the purpose, as it's currently defined, of pushing this radical just transition agenda. We have Bill C-50, which the government is clearly embarrassed about. How do we know they are embarrassed about it? They don't want it debated. They have put forward this intensely draconian motion in the House that imposes very limited opportunities for any discussion of the bill here at this committee.

• (90750)

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'll ask you to pause.

Ms. Dabrusin, go ahead on a point of order.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Mr. Chair, the record is quite clear on the basis for the programming motion that we have, that, in fact, it was the Conservatives who blocked us from being able to have a scheduling motion to hear from any witnesses. Therefore, this is where we are. It's unfortunate that they forced our hands to be here, but it was more than 25 hours that we spent, and we were unable to get 10 witnesses.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Dabrusin.

Mr. Genuis, we will go back to you. Go ahead.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair. It's not a point of order, although I'm happy to respond to it.

In terms of why we're here, Ms. Dabrusin is completely wrong about the context of what happened at the committee, and people can look at the record. We had an extended meeting in which Conservatives were trying to put certain arguments on the table with respect to scheduling and were constantly interrupted. In fact, if you look at who was speaking during that time, you'll see that most of the talking was done by Mr. Angus and Ms. Dabrusin, with some contribution from various other Liberal members. Conservatives were trying to speak. We were trying to put some points on the record, and as you are about to see, we were constantly interrupted by spurious points of order from Mr. Angus, exhibit A.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'll ask you to pause.

Mr. Angus, go ahead on a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Just for people watching who have actually followed this, they're going to be wondering if Mr. Genuis is—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: This is not a point of order, Chair.

Mr. Charlie Angus: They're trying to shut me down again.

The Chair: Hold on for a second, please.

Colleagues, I'm not sure what Mr. Angus is about to say on his point of order, because I can't hear when other members are speaking toward me. When you are recognized, please turn on your mic and speak. If you're not recognized, I don't need folks telling me what is or what is not a point of order. I do want to hear the member and give him an opportunity, procedurally, to let us know on the point of order.

Mr. Angus, I'll ask you—

Mr. Charlie Angus: Very quickly, Chair, I would just like to ask you, during all those meetings in which the Conservatives interrupted continually, did I not have the floor, and was I not allowed to speak? I remember you kept saying at the beginning of each meeting that I had the floor, but then I was not allowed to speak. Therefore, for the historic record, you were there, Chair. I was trying to speak. I wasn't allowed, but we're down now to less than about 37 minutes, and Mr. Genuis is still—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, could I have the floor back? I'd like to actually speak to the subamendment.

Mr. Charlie Angus: —not getting to the point.

We can do this till 8:30 p.m. I think it's fair to recognize—

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

Mr. Charlie Angus: Chair, I'm asking you to clarify who had the forum at that time.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: This is obviously not a point of order.

The Chair: Colleagues, we've had extensive debate over the last several months, with members trying to participate who had the floor and the chair's ruling on who did have the floor.

Mr. Angus, you were an individual who did have the floor. Eventually, you were able to provide your important remarks.

I will ask members today to allow other members to participate in these important clause-by-clause proceedings on Bill C-50. As members want to be able to participate, I'll ask all members to allow their colleagues to participate.

Mr. Genuis, you have the opportunity to participate and maybe conclude your comments.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

You know, this whole situation is quite shocking. Unlike some people around this table, I come from a riding where energy workers live. I actually represent energy workers in this House. I am constantly interrupted and shut down on spurious points of order. The chair refuses to enforce the rules.

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: I have a point of order.

Ms. Heather McPherson: I have a point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, we have—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I am not being allowed to speak at this committee on behalf of the hard-working people in my riding.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'll ask you to pause.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, I am trying to get these important points on the record. You are not allowing members—especially Conservative members, especially members who represent energy workers—to speak, and it's unacceptable.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I will ask you to pause.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'd like to be able to speak on behalf of my constituents.

The Chair: I'll ask you to pause. We have a point of order. When I ask you to pause—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: [*Inaudible—Editor*]

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, this is not a debate.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: The NDP don't want to let Conservatives speak.

The Chair: I'll ask you to turn off your mic.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Will I be able to speak, Chair, without interruption?

The Chair: We have a point of order. This committee has process and procedures—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You never enforce or follow them.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I will ask you to turn off your mic, respect committee members at this committee meeting and allow me to allow members to participate.

We have two points of order. I will go to Mr. Sorbara for the first point of order and Ms. McPherson for the second point of order.

Go ahead, Mr. Sorbara.

● (90755)

Mr. Francesco Sorbara: Chair, I'm always interested in listening intently to all the members when they speak and raise their points of order or points of debate. I would only ask that, out of respect for the interpreters, when we do speak, we don't scream into the mics.

Mr. Genuis, I hear your passion about the constituents you represent, but out of respect for the interpreters, I think we could speak in a more mild manner and in a lower tone, so that we're not screaming into our mics. You're quite, quite loud and quite passionate, and I get it, but I think out of respect for the interpreters and what they do for us and the job they perform, we could be a little more "subdued", if I can use that term.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Sorbara, for that reminder.

Colleagues, it is important that we refrain from having multiple individuals speaking into the mics at the same time. It makes it extremely difficult for our interpreters to do the great job they're doing on interpreting.

Also, when we are loud or when we end up—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: May I speak, Chair?

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I have the floor. I will recognize you—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have the floor.

The Chair: You will be recognized after we deal with this point of order. I'll ask you not to turn on your mic unless you're recognized. I'll ask you to turn off your mic until you're recognized.

Thank you.

Ms. McPherson, you have a point of order.

Ms. Heather McPherson: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to reiterate what my colleague Mr. Sorbara said. We have to be very cautious and careful on behalf of our translators. They do such incredible work for us.

The point of order I want to raise is that Mr. Genuis implied by his comments that he was the only Albertan in this room.

Mr. Chair, I know that you're an Albertan. Certainly I'm an Albertan. I represent the oil workers in my province as well. In fact, my husband works at Enbridge. He's part of the energy industry, as

are in fact many members of my family. My father was a truck driver for a long time—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, this is not a point of order.

Ms. Heather McPherson: —and has been in the oil industry. My brother works in the oil industry.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, if this member wants to speak, she can add herself to the list.

Ms. Heather McPherson: I do want to make sure it's on the record that there are many Albertans represented in this room.

An hon. member: [*Inaudible—Editor*]

The Chair: Order!

An hon. member: If you're going to allow that, then we are going to do the same thing, Chair, and this is going to turn into bedlam. Rules have to be enforced.

The Chair: Order!

We'll have one member speaking at a time.

Some hon. members: [*Inaudible—Editor*]

The Chair: Order!

Mr. Larry Brock: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: You'll be recognized, Mr. Brock. I'll ask you to turn off your mic until you're recognized.

Ms. Gladu, on a point of order.

Ms. Marilyn Gladu: Yes, Chair.

On the same point of order that Ms. McPherson was speaking to, I want to point out that, as the member for Sarnia—Lambton, 30% of the energy workers in the country—28,000 workers—are in my riding. I certainly represent them, and I'm extremely concerned about the legislation.

I just wanted to make that clear to anyone who would wonder how many energy workers might be represented here around the table.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Gladu.

Colleagues, we have many members here—I would say all of the members—who have energy workers who work tirelessly every single day.

Mr. Desjarlais is here, another fellow Albertan. He has some...and many others. Mr. Blaikie has workers.

Colleagues, Bill C-50, which we're working on, is important legislation on sustainable jobs. We're in clause-by-clause. As a reminder, we're on a subamendment to an amendment, and we need to get back to where we were so we can get to the subamendment.

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

The Chair: I want to go to Mr. Brock on a point of order before I proceed to any other points of order.

Mr. Larry Brock: Thank you, Chair.

I'm asking the chair to enforce rules of decorum. During that latest exchange, I had to hear Mr. Angus shout out and refer to me as nothing more than a visitor. I am a duly elected honourable member of Parliament. I'm asking for an apology, and I'm asking for a retraction, Chair.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP): [*Inaudible—Editor*]

Mr. Larry Brock: I don't need any more commentary from you, Mr. Blaikie.

The Chair: Colleagues—

● (90800)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, may I continue with my remarks?

The Chair: No.

Mr. Genuis, I'll ask you to turn off your mic until you're recognized.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I was recognized. I have the floor.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'll ask you to wait until you're recognized. We have points of order. You know very well the use of a point of order, so I'll ask you to wait until others have their opportunity to provide their point of order.

Mr. Angus, on a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Yes, Chair.

I think if people back home are watching, they're going to obviously think this is disgraceful.

I don't think that Mr. Blaikie makes peanut comments. Maybe he does; I'm not sure. I've never heard a peanut comment.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: This is not a point of order, Chair. This is editorializing. It's a matter of debate.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I would like to ask a question, Chair.

It's almost one minute past eight, so could you clarify the rules—?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You can't have a point of order just to editorialize.

The Chair: Order.

Colleagues, I cannot hear what Mr. Angus is saying from here, because we have multiple individuals speaking. I'll ask you to let him finish. If his point of order is not a point of order, he will be told. He knows that a point of order is a procedural issue. He can provide his procedural issue that he has a point of order on.

Mr. Angus, I'll ask you to conclude your point of order, and then we'll resume our important work.

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

I just want to clarify.... We're now at one minute after eight, going on to two minutes after eight. At 8:30, if I heard you correctly, we then move to vote clause by clause. We don't have to have these constant interruptions and constant points of order.

Is that how the process works? At 8:30, if the Conservatives choose not to bring their amendment before 8:30, will it then be deemed adopted and we vote?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: How could we? You're constantly interrupting.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Is that the process? At 8:30, I certainly don't want to have any chaos happening. I think we would then sit down to business.

I'm asking you to clarify this, Chair.

If now we have 28 minutes left—27 and 30 seconds, say—will we be ready to get down to business? Could you clarify where we'll be at that point?

The Chair: Yes, Mr. Angus.

As I provided for committee members at the opening of today's meeting, pursuant to the order adopted by the House, if the committee has not completed the clause-by-clause consideration of the bill by 8:30, we will proceed at that time to begin going through each clause. As per the House order, 8:30 is the time that we will proceed with that.

I hope that provides clarity to all committee members.

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

The Chair: I want to go to Ms. Barron on a point of order.

Go ahead, Ms. Barron.

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron (Nanaimo—Ladysmith, NDP): Thank you very much, Chair.

I want to bring to your attention that my colleague Mr. Genuis continues to turn on his microphone while others are speaking.

This is happening repeatedly. I am very concerned about the well-being of the translators, who are doing their very best to navigate this very challenging meeting.

I'd please ask, through the chair, if we can ensure that my colleagues are not turning on their microphones before they have been acknowledged by the chair.

The Chair: Before I move to the next point of order, I will just remind colleagues, please do not turn on your mic until you are recognized. When I turn on my mic, this red light comes on. That means I would like to speak. I've asked members to pause or hold their thought so that I can acknowledge another member, so that they can have the opportunity to provide their point of order and engage.

We do not need multiple mics on at the same time because, for interpreters, it is extremely difficult to translate when multiple mics are on and when we have multiple individuals speaking into the mics.

Thank you, Ms. Barron, for that reminder. I hope everybody can follow those simple rules, and we can proceed accordingly.

Mr. Falk, go ahead on a point of order.

Mr. Ted Falk: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Earlier in the meeting, you indicated that we needed to be careful about our language, about the use of unparliamentary language. Just a few moments ago, Mr. Angus used unparliamentary language when he referred to Mr. Brock as “a visitor”. Mr. Brock has asked for an apology and for Mr. Angus to withdraw his statement.

I think Mr. Angus knows the drill very well from his experience yesterday in the House, when the Speaker asked him to withdraw his comments and he chose not to withdraw them. Then the Speaker asked him to remove himself from the House, and he would not be heard.

Mr. Chair, I would expect you to maintain that same decorum here.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Falk, for your point of order.

Colleagues, I'll just ask that everybody focus on the study at hand and the clause-by-clause work we're doing on Bill C-50, that we not engage in unparliamentary language towards one another, that we ensure we have a respectful workplace for everyone and that everybody gets an opportunity here to participate. I hope we can do that as we move forward. Thank you for your patience.

Thank you, Mr. Falk.

Mr. Blaikie, go ahead on a point of order.

● (90805)

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

On the same point of order, in fact, I'm very happy as a visitor to this committee to have the opportunity to speak at this table and to say that I don't find anything objectionable about the language of “visitor”. We know that there are some MPs who are regular standing members of standing committees, and then there are other MPs who come from time to time. Sometimes it's subs, and sometimes it's something else.

I wonder, Mr. Chair, if Mr. Brock would like to give us some guidance on the word he would prefer that we use for MPs who are not regular committee members, but are nevertheless appearing at committee.

I'm satisfied to use the word “visitor”. I don't think there's anything unparliamentary about that. I would say that when I made a little comment, and just the first comment of the evening, in fact, Mr. Brock said he didn't need to hear any more comments from me. Well, in fact, I hadn't made a single comment, which leads me to believe that he thinks I should be making no comments. I often hear Conservatives get quite righteous around tables like these about who to silence.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Can I speak, Chair? I have the floor.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: For me to make my first comment of the evening and to be told by Mr. Brock that I should shut up because he doesn't want to hear any more from me—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: I'm paraphrasing. Pardon me if my paraphrasing is a little more aggressive—

The Chair: Mr. Blaikie, I'll ask you to conclude your point of order.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Could we hear from Mr. Brock on what language he would like to use to describe what I, at one time, until very recently, would have called a “visitor” to committee, so that we can designate non-permanent members at committees in the appropriate fashion? There are clearly a lot of them here tonight. I think the concept is going to come up again. Therefore, why don't we have an agreement on what term properly denotes the concept?

The Chair: Colleagues, earlier in the meeting, I did have a conversation with the committee on who's able to participate. Members here are allowed to participate. Whether we have some voting members or we have some members who have come to participate, everybody's welcome here. We want to give all members, whether you're a long-time committee member or whether you're just coming here for the first time today, the ability to participate in this important discussion we're having on Canada's sustainable jobs act, Bill C-50, and the clause-by-clause work that we're doing today.

I would encourage members at this time also not to.... Once again, I'm trying to do the best I can, but when multiple committee members are telling me who said what and what was said, I can't make much of what's being said. I'll ask all committee members, once again, as a reminder, that we speak one at a time, that we speak when we're recognized by the chair and that we not turn on multiple mics at the same time, because it is very difficult for our interpreters.

Thank you, Mr. Blaikie.

I'm going to go to Mr. Perkins on a point of order.

Mr. Rick Perkins: It's on the same point of order.

Just to clarify, it's not my first time at this committee. I'm an associate member of this committee, as are all the Conservative members. We're registered as associate members, in addition to being legitimate ones.

In answer to Mr. Blaikie's question, the full-time permanent members, or whatever you want to call them.... We are associate members and are invited, as you said, Mr. Chair, to participate in any.... The associate members are defined in the big green book. You can look it up.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, may I continue?

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I've asked you several times to wait until you're acknowledged. We do have another point of order by another member.

Monsieur Simard, thank you for your patience, sir. Go ahead on the point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

In the House of Commons, I've often heard people say that they were a part of team Canada. It would be rather odd for a sovereigntist to say that, but when Conservative, Liberal and NDP members say it, I believe they are expressing a sense of belonging to the Canadian state.

Feeling a sense of belonging to the Canadian state means, it would seem to me, respect for its institutions. What I've seen this evening is anything but respect for institutions.

What I'm seeing is members playing around and noisily trying to determine whose turn it is to speak, and which members in attendance at this meeting of the committee ought not to be here.

The purpose of this meeting is to discuss Bill C-50. We have barely 20 minutes left and we've only spoken about the bill for about five minutes. We've got bogged down in points of order.

I'm well aware of the fact that people can have different points of view and different policy positions, but I find it highly ironic that a sovereigntist MP should happen to be showing the most respect for Canadian institutions.

There are people out there listening to us. I would ask my friends in the Conservative Party and the NDP to tone things down and show a degree of decorum.

As for me, I want to no part of it. People listening at home must think that taxpayers are paying us to behave like idiots. I want nothing to do with this nonsense.

If we could move on to a discussion of the amendments, a real discussion about Bill C-50, I believe everyone would be more than happy.

● (90810)

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you, Monsieur Simard, for that important point of order. It's a reminder of why we're here today and of the important work we're here to do, which is the clause-by-clause work the House has ordered us to focus on and do.

As a reminder, if anybody has missed where we are, we're on CPC-4, which was moved by Mr. Patzer. Mr. Genuis has moved a subamendment.

Mr. Genuis, now I will recognize you to continue with your subamendment. I'd ask you to keep it relevant to the subamendment. Could you be succinct so that other members can also participate on your subamendment?

Go ahead.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

It is extremely frustrating to have the constant interruptions from the NDP. They are trying to prevent—

The Chair: I'll ask Mr. Genuis to hold.

We have a point of order from Mr. Blaikie.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: I'll just wait for it to quiet down, Mr. Chair.

I understand that there are thousands of amendments being considered by the committee tonight. Apparently, they may have been created with generative AI. I appreciate that the Conservatives have to get intelligence wherever they can find it. I'm wondering if there are any resources for the committee to be able to use AI to do analysis of these amendments or if we're stuck with analogue analysis for digitally created trouble.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: May I actually speak, Chair, since I have the floor?

I'm very frustrated with these constant NDP interruptions.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'll ask you to hold.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have the floor.

The Chair: We have a point of order.

Mr. Blaikie, you are correct. We do have a large number of amendments, potentially over 19,600. We have a tremendous amount of work to do this evening. I'm hoping we can get to that work.

I think as parliamentarians, we are all well equipped and sent here by our constituents to do this work. They've elected everybody around this table. They have confidence in all members here to be able to work through these important amendments.

I'll ask us to refocus and make sure that we get there.

Now, before I go back to you, we have another point of order.

Mr. Angus, we have a point of order from you. Go ahead.

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

I want to do this with the best goodwill possible.

We have gone for six weeks where the Conservatives did everything to stop witnesses, but now we're getting down to this. We only have 15 minutes and 31 seconds left before we switch into the new time. I don't know if the Conservatives are going to use Chatbox to replace them once they get tired, with 20,000 amendments.

I am more than willing to see if Mr. Genuis is ready to bring his subamendment to a vote so that we can actually show goodwill. I believe—and correct me if I'm wrong—that, now that we're 15 minutes and 10 seconds away from the clock changing, at this point we just vote on it anyway.

My colleague, Mr. Genuis, now has 15 minutes and 3 seconds to show some goodwill and leadership and say that he's ready to vote on the subamendment. We could vote on the subamendment and move on, and I think it would show some goodwill. I don't know if they're getting their punch lines from Chatbox, but they're not that funny. We have 14 minutes and 41 seconds left now. I'd like to know if Mr. Genuis is ready—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I'll continue speaking now.

Mr. Charlie Angus: —to speak to his amendment because now we're coming down to—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Are you going to enforce the rules here?

Mr. Charlie Angus: —14 minutes and 20 seconds.

• (90815)

The Chair: Mr. Angus, thank you.

Colleagues, at 8:30 we will be moving forward, so we have roughly 14 minutes before that comes. If anybody is watching at home, that's where we're at, and then we will be moving to getting into the next stage at 8:30, as ordered by the House.

Mr. Genuis, you have the floor.

Go ahead, please.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Here's what's happening.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: I have a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm trying to speak in defence of workers in my riding—

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'm going to ask you to pause again.

Go ahead, Mr. Blaikie, on your point of order.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I know that, from time to time, members will take exception to something that's in a subamendment and then may like to move an amendment to the subamendment in order to try to find more conciliatory language that more people around the table can agree to.

I wonder if you might be able to take a moment for this. In some cases, you can amend the subamendment, and in other cases you can't. I'm not exactly sure of the context we're working in, because I'm a visitor. Scratch that; I'm an associate member. I don't want to upset anyone in the peanut gallery.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: This is not a point of order, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: I wonder if we could take a moment and advise the committee if amending this subamendment is possible, in which case we may wish to undertake such a thing. Of course, if it's

not possible, then we would not want to do that, Mr. Chair, and waste any more of the committee's time.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Blaikie.

If you give me a moment, I can provide some further commentary on that.

I'll ask all members to hold for a moment.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, he can't move a further amendment while I have the floor anyway. Why don't you allow me to speak while you consult on that?

Mr. Chair, maybe I'll just continue.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'll ask you to hold until you're recognized.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: But I have the floor, do I not?

The Chair: When you're recognized, you will have the floor.

Mr. Blaikie, there has been an amendment brought forward by Mr. Patzer, and there is a further subamendment brought forward by Mr. Genuis. We cannot move another subamendment to the subamendment. I think that provides the clarification that you were looking for on your point of order.

Thank you for that, Mr. Blaikie.

Mr. Genuis, go ahead.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to briefly thank the officials who are here, by the way.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: I do actually have a point of order.

I think it would be unfair to let him get far into his comments and then—

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Genuis, I will ask you—

An hon. member: It's disgusting.

An hon. member: Just ignore it.

The Chair: Colleagues, please.

Go ahead, Mr. Blaikie, on your point of order.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Well, I've noticed—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I have a point of order.

An hon. member: This is an abuse of process.

The Chair: Colleagues, order.

Are we done, folks? Do we want to have some more—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'll continue.

The Chair: When you're recognized, you'll be given the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Blaikie, go ahead on your point of order.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: I don't know what members are talking about when they say there's an abuse of process. I don't know exactly what they're indicating. However, I wish that they would hear me out, and then they would know if I'm asking legitimate questions or not.

Again, the temptation is to use the word "visitor" because I thought of myself as a visiting committee member when I came in. However, I know that's upsetting to some Conservatives who have thin skin.

I notice that there are a lot of associate members around the table tonight. I know that, from time to time, papers aren't filed the way they ought to be, and that can create problems later. Can you consult with officials at the table to check and make sure that all of the paperwork has been appropriately filed for people who may be substituting? Others, of course, are here as visitors or associate members, so it's not as big a deal. However, for some who may be substituting.... I wonder if we could know who is a substitute, who is an associate member, and whether all the paperwork is in good order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, may I continue?

This member could have gone up and—

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Blaikie.

You're asking, I believe, who the voting members are on the committee before we proceed to any votes and who the other participating members are. If you give me a moment, I'll get clarification on that.

• (90820)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: In the meantime, Chair, since I have the floor, may I speak? I have been speaking—

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I have not recognized you again. I am dealing with the point of order raised by Mr. Blaikie, which I think is an important point of order so members know. The member has asked who the voting members are. The clerk will—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, just on that, I would like, on a point of order—

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I will ask you to turn off your mic and not keep turning it on until you are recognized.

I'll ask the clerk who the voting members are before we proceed to any votes.

Go ahead, Mr. Clerk.

The Clerk: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I have Mr. Aldag, Ms. Dabrusin, Ms. Jones, Madame Lapointe, Mr. Sorbara, Mr. Brock, Mr. Falk, Mr. Patzer, Mr. Genuis, Monsieur Simard and, finally, Mr. Angus.

Thank you.

The Chair: I hope, Mr. Blaikie, that provides clarity on the point of order.

Now, we have another point of order by Mr. Angus.

Mr. Angus, go ahead on a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you.

Since I'm technically the only New Democrat vote here, if I have to step out or, say, if my mom calls to tell me she's sick, and I have to deal with that, we do have a process that I can transfer the voting chair that belongs to Mr. Angus—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: That is not a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm just asking for clarification because we're dealing with really important legislation, Mr. Chair. We've had six weeks of gong show stuff where we couldn't get to the legislation, so tonight, I just want to make sure I don't undermine the role of the New Democrats by having to, say, go talk to my 84-year-old mother, whose birthday was yesterday, by the way.

An hon. member: Oh, happy birthday.

Mr. Charlie Angus: So, if Mom calls me and I step out, do I have to tell the clerk?

The Chair: Colleagues, that is an important point of order to get clarification from Mr. Blaikie's point of order. We do have voting members. If a voting member is leaving, your whip needs to advise our clerk on who the voting member is and who that voting member is substituting for. I think that's quite clear. I think that's been standard among committees here for many years.

If you do need to step out, Mr. Angus, your whip needs to let the clerk know who is replacing you as the voting member.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Okay, just to that point, then, it's not me who steps up and says, "I'm leaving. I'm going to have Daniel or Ms. McPherson substitute." I have to go to the whip, and then the whip goes to the clerk, and then the clerk will let you know. I just want to make sure, because it's been a while—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: This is a farce.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I just want to make sure that I.... I'm sorry. I can't hear. Chair, I'll turn off my mic. I can't hear because they keep talking.

Thank you.

The Chair: Colleagues, what I'd ask is that, prior to stepping out, you ask your whip to send an email to the clerk, to the committee inbox, and to identify who the committee member is and who the voting committee member is going to be replaced by, before you leave, so it's very clear to the clerk that a voting member has been substituted by another member.

All right. I think that provides clarity on that procedural issue.

Now, I'm going to proceed to a reminder as to where we were. We were on amendment CPC-4, which was moved by Mr. Patzer. Now we're on a subamendment by Mr. Genuis, who has the floor.

Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

I have been trying to speak on my subamendment for about half an hour—

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: I have a quick point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —and I'm constantly getting interrupted by New Democrats who are committed to preventing me from speaking because they don't want my—

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'm going to ask you to pause.

We have a point of order by Mr. Blaikie.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: This is disgusting, Chair. Bring these members to order, and let me speak, because I have the floor.

The Chair: Mr. Blaikie, go ahead on a point of order.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I have to say that prior to coming here this evening, I thought I knew something about parliamentary procedure. What I thought I knew was that the chair determined who had the floor. Only when the chair told a member that they had the floor could the member then speak. Only then could their microphone come on.

Now, sometimes members have the floor and something arises in the course of the remarks, and a point of order or a point of privilege has to be raised. It was my understanding that the chair at that point has the authority to tell the member who has the floor to wait while he gives the floor to someone else in order to make that procedural point. When that's resolved, the floor is then returned to the person who was speaking before.

But in observing Mr. Genuis's behaviour tonight, it seems to me that, on some committees, members decide for themselves when they have the floor. They turn on their own microphone. They just declare by fiat that they have the floor. They talk over others.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Let me speak, Chair.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: They damage the hearing of the interpreters.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: This is not a point of order.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: Case in point, Mr. Genuis. I have the floor.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have the floor. Let me speak.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: This has given rise to some important confusion, so I wonder if you could explain it to members, Mr. Chair. Maybe I'm the person who doesn't understand how it works, but if I do understand how it works, then a lot of others around this table apparently don't.

Could you take this opportunity to please explain to all members of the committee, associate and otherwise—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: This is not a point of order, Chair.

Mr. Daniel Blaikie: —how it's determined who has the floor, when that changes and who's in charge?

• (90825)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Blaikie, for your point of order.

Colleagues, as I have indicated previously, Mr. Patzer moved an amendment. Then Mr. Genuis moved a subamendment.

You've asked me, Mr. Blaikie, how I determine who has the floor and who has the right to speak. Mr. Genuis has the floor, because he's moved a subamendment.

As the chair, I recognize members if they have a point of order while another member is debating their subamendment. Members throughout this meeting have had a number of points of order with a number of different speakers. To the best of my ability, I've recognized every member by creating a speaking list and a speaking order.

What I hope to do, and I hope colleagues here will follow this, is to have you not turn on your mics unless you are recognized.

I have also indicated to members—actually for the last several months in the proceedings on this important bill—that when I turn on my mic, this nice red light comes on. This indicates that I would like to intervene and that I would like a member to pause in their intervention. That way I don't have to cut them off. More importantly, the interpreters have the ability to interpret what's being said into the mic when there aren't a number of mics turned on at the same time.

Mr. Rick Perkins: I have a point of order.

The Chair: It provides a tremendous challenge for them—

Mr. Rick Perkins: You're filibustering. You repeated this five minutes ago.

The Chair: Mr. Perkins, I did not recognize you, sir. If you have a point of order, once I conclude—

Mr. Rick Perkins: You said all this five minutes ago.

The Chair: Once again, I will recognize you. Everybody will have an opportunity to participate. Right now we have a speaking order. I know that Ms. Gladu and others are waiting to participate.

I hope that provides some context on process and procedure and how this committee has been working over the last few months. I've tried to ensure that everybody can participate while respecting and thanking the interpreters for the great work they have done.

I will now go to you, Mr. Perkins, on your point of order. Do you have a point of order on Mr. Genuis?

Mr. Rick Perkins: I will just point out that you're filibustering.

The Chair: That's not a point of order. I'm providing a ruling on a point of order from a member, Mr. Perkins, but thank you.

Mr. Genuis, now you do have the floor. I will give the floor to you so that you can continue.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

Chair, I think members see what's happening.

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron: I have a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: The NDP are doing everything they can to deprive Conservatives of the right to freedom of speech. We were supposed to have two hours for discussion of this. We are being constantly interrupted by absolutely ridiculous points of order—

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'm going to ask you to pause.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —and you, Mr. Chair, are playing their game.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Conservatives should be allowed to speak. These are absurd points of order that have nothing to do with the matter at hand. You're constantly preventing—

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, you are—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —Conservatives from speaking. Conservatives have a right to speak on behalf of their constituents. You need to enforce the rules.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have the floor. We need to stop with these absurd, baseless points of order from the New Democrats. The New Democrats are trying to shut down our discussion. We have a right to represent our constituents.

The Chair: Order. Mr. Genuis, I'm asking you to pause and allow a member to proceed with their point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's been 40 minutes that I've been trying to speak and I've had the floor.

The Chair: You will get your opportunity, Mr. Genuis, once we've finished all the points of order.

I've asked the member to pause and the member has turned on his mic. I'm asking that when my mic light is on, a member pauses so that I can allow the other members to participate.

Ms. Barron, I would like you to participate. I will give you the floor on your point of order.

Please go ahead.

Ms. Lisa Marie Barron: Thank you so much, Chair, for allowing me to participate.

As someone who doesn't normally sit on this committee, I know there are processes and procedures around what an appropriate point of order is and isn't. I notice that my colleague continues to interrupt my colleague Mr. Blaikie as he has a very clear point of order about process and procedure on this committee—

● (90830)

The Chair: Ms. Barron, I have to interrupt.

Pursuant to the order adopted by the House, if the committee has not completed the clause-by-clause consideration of the bill by 8:30 p.m., all remaining amendments submitted to the committee shall be deemed moved and the chair shall put the question—

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

The Chair: —forthwith and successively without further debate on all remaining clauses and amendments submitted to the committee—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Point of order, Chair.

The Chair: —as well as each and every question necessary to dispose of the clause-by-clause consideration of the bill, and the committee shall not adjourn the meeting until it has disposed of the bill.

I want to take this moment to thank our witnesses, Cori Anderson and Barbara Winters, for joining us this evening.

Thank you. Enjoy your evening.

We will move to the clause-by-clause now.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, I have an issue to raise.

The Chair: Colleagues, we are on the subamendment to CPC-4. I'm going to ask the committee to pause for a moment to get clarity.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, I have an issue to raise.

The Chair: We are going to the subamendment to CPC-4, and we'll go to the vote.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, I have a point of order to raise. There's nothing in the House order that prevents me from doing that. There is nothing in the House order that prevents it.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, it cannot be used as debate if it's a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: That's correct.

The Chair: Specifically on the point of order, go ahead.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

I believe this committee should have gone to the full two hours.

I would move that the committee report to the House that the privileges of all members of the committee were violated when the chair limited debate on clause-by-clause of Bill C-50 to less than two hours, in violation of the House order adopted on Monday, September 24, 2023.

Mr. Charlie Angus: He needs to read the motion, Chair.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: This is a question of privilege, and clearly the House order does not preclude members raising questions of order or privilege.

Here is the issue. The House prescribed, I think, a very narrow and draconian but nonetheless specific framework within which the natural resources committee would consider the issues before it, namely Bill C-50. That motion prescribed within it that the committee would begin at 6:30 and would be able to meet for two hours, and then at 8:30 the successive voting would be taken up on clause-by-clause.

I think there's an argument that there are privilege issues raised even by that issue. Nonetheless, it was an order adopted by the House. When the House adopted that order, it was very specific about what time the committee had to start. It said "the committee shall meet at 6:30." The chair provided an explanation for the committee not beginning at 6:30 saying there were technical impediments. Regardless of whether there were technical impediments, whether it was through mal-intent or simply by accident, the fact is that the House order was not followed. The House order required the committee to meet at 6:30. That did not occur, which was a violation of the directive of the House.

Normally speaking, the privileges of members, which include the right to speak, are protected. They are sacrosanct. The rights of members are prescribed in the Standing Orders, and it is only when the House adopts a special order that those can be abridged. Obviously, we are operating under a special order, but any further abridgement of the rights and privileges of members that goes beyond the special order is a violation of their privileges.

Standing Order 116 specifies the following:

In a standing, special or legislative committee, the Standing Orders shall apply so far as may be applicable, except the standing orders as to the election of a Speaker, seconding of motions, limiting the number of times of speaking and the length of speeches.

Standing Order 116(2)(b) provides that if the chair, in violation of part one of the standing order, violates the privileges of members—

• (90835)

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'm going to have to pause there.

You're getting into debate. This is not a question of privilege. That is my ruling.

We will proceed. That is the ruling of the chair.

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

Mr. Larry Brock: Point of order, Chair.

The Chair: We do not debate a ruling.

If a member wants to challenge the chair, I would ask the member to challenge the chair.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, I have a right to make arguments about privilege.

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, the ruling has been made.

If a member—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, you didn't listen to the argument.

The Chair: —would like to challenge the chair, please go ahead and challenge the chair.

A ruling has been made.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On a point of order, Chair, members have a right to make arguments about the matter of privilege. You presumed to make a ruling about whether or not it was a matter of privilege before I had come anywhere near the making of arguments—

The Chair: Mr. Genuis, I'll ask you to turn off your mic.

The chair has made a ruling. The ruling is not debatable. A ruling has been made.

Mr. Larry Brock: I have a point of order, Chair.

The Chair: Mr. Brock, go ahead.

You cannot debate the ruling that's been made. If you want to challenge the chair on the ruling that's been made, you can do so.

Mr. Larry Brock: I have a point of order.

House of Commons Procedure and Practice, chapter 20, page 1060, says:

The Chair of a committee does not have the power to rule on questions of privilege; only the Speaker has that power. If a Member wishes to raise a question of privilege during a committee meeting or an incident arises in connection with the committee's proceedings that may constitute a breach of privilege, the committee Chair allows the Member to explain the situation.

You have denied the privilege of Mr. Genuis in doing so by interrupting him.

The Chair then determines whether the question raised in fact relates to parliamentary privilege. If the Chair determines that the question does relate to parliamentary privilege, the committee may then consider presenting a report on the question to the House. The report should:

clearly describe the situation;

summarize the facts;

provide the names of the people involved, if applicable;

state that there may be a breach of privilege; and

ask the House to take such measures as it deems appropriate.

Ordinarily, presentation of a report to the House is a prerequisite for any question of privilege arising from the proceedings of a committee.

Chair, you did not allow the member to fully explain the privilege.

The Chair: Mr. Brock, thank you.

I made a ruling. We'll not engage in further debate on that.

Ms. Gladu, go ahead on a point of order.

Ms. Marilyn Gladu: Yes, Chair.

First of all, let me say that I've never seen anything like this. I chaired a committee for years on the status of women. This is unbelievable.

On the specific point, I witnessed Mr. Genuis being prevented from speaking by numerous interruptions. He was making a motion about a point of privilege when you cut him off.

The Chair: Ms. Gladu, we're getting into debate.

A ruling has been made. If there is a challenge to the chair, please challenge the chair. Otherwise, we will be proceeding—

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

• (90850)

The Chair: We will proceed to the vote on the subamendment to CPC-4.

Some hon. members: Point of order...I have a point of order.

• (90855)

An hon. member: Don't call the vote. There are points of order, Mr. Chair.

• (90900)

Mr. Damien Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): The chair is disregarding the practices and procedures of this place in order to pursue an agenda that violates the privileges of duly appointed—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

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

The Chair: Shall CPC-4 carry?

Some hon. members: I have a point of order.

An hon. member: Mr. Chair, there are points of order on the floor.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

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

The Chair: Shall BQ-4 carry?

Some hon. members: There are points of order.

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge the chair.

Mr. Damien Kurek: There's a challenge to the chair. It's a dilatory motion.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

An hon. member: According to the order that came from the House, all members of Parliament can move points of order. It's right there. Come on.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair. I don't actually know what we're voting on. I don't know what you're even trying to call the vote on. We're trying to raise points of order, and I don't even know what the vote is on.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

An hon. member: Hey, shut up.

An hon. member: I will not shut up.

An hon. member: No one tells me to shut up.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

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

The Chair: We will now move to CPC-5.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: I'd like a recorded division.

Some hon. members: I have a point of order.

The Chair: Shall CPC-5 carry?

Some hon. members: There are points of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order. I don't know what we're voting on. It wasn't even read. I'm raising points of order, and I'm not allowed to speak.

Some hon. members: There are points of order.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

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

The Chair: Shall BQ-5 carry?

Mr. Damien Kurek: There is a point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Wow. This is unreal.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I don't know what we're voting on, and I have a point of order.

Mr. Larry Brock: Follow the rules, Chair. There are points of order, Chair.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: We can't vote when we don't know what we're voting on. We have points of order, and we can't hear.

Mr. Corey Tochor (Saskatoon—University, CPC): There's no translation.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Damien Kurek: I have a point of order. There was clearly a point of order on the floor prior to the call of a vote. The rules and procedures of this place should not be trumped by partisanship.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

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

The Chair: We will suspend.

• (2103)

(Pause)

• (2115)

• (90915)

The Chair: We're back.

Shall CPC-6 carry?

An hon. member: I'd like a recorded vote.

The Chair: We'll do a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment negated: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

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

The Chair: Shall clause 3 carry?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm sorry, Chair. Do you not hear that I have a point of order to raise?

Mr. Charlie Angus: The vote has been called.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, there's a point of order on the floor.

Mr. Charlie Angus: The vote has been called.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: There's a point of order on the floor. It was raised before you called the vote.

The Chair: We will do a recorded vote.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

• (90920)

The Chair: During the vote, Ms. Jones voted nay. Do we have unanimous consent for Ms. Jones to vote yea?

Some hon. members: No.

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

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Chair, it's impossible to hear where we're at. Are we on clause 3? If so, I voted yes.

I can't hear because of the Conservatives' interrupting.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: He's saying it's a tie. It's not a tie. There were seven nays.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: It's not a tie. We can all add, and it happened in public.

Mr. Larry Brock: Mr. Clerk, how many nay votes are there? The chair won't answer.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Can you please summarize the votes? It all just happened in public, which we were all present for. We can also all add.

How easy would it have been for you guys to collaborate on the schedule that we proposed on October 30?

(Clause 3 negated: nays 6; yeas 4)

The Chair: We're on new clause 3.1. It's BQ-6.

Shall BQ-6 carry?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'd like to raise a point of order, Mr. Chair.

Members are able to raise points of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Was the vote called, Mr. Chair?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I'd like to raise a point of order. I've been trying to since prior to the vote being called.

Can you hear me?

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Mr. Chair, you can't ignore duly elected members of Parliament at this committee.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm trying to raise a point of order, Mr. Chair.

An hon. member: What are we on? You didn't even say what we're on.

The Chair: For clarification, we're in the middle of a vote. It's on new clause 3.1.

Shall BQ-6 carry?

(Amendment negated: nays 6; yeas 1 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

• (90925)

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, you have a point of order on a subamendment.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Yes, I do, actually.

Is this BQ-6 or BQ-4?

The Chair: It's BQ-6.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: We had sent a subamendment, because we are allowed to do that. The subamendment I sent to the clerk said that BQ-6 should be subamended by deleting the word "legislative".

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

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: It's important that we acknowledge that there have been subamendments submitted to the clerk. The problem is that, even when it's quiet in here, we still can't hear what we're voting on, because you haven't made it abundantly clear to the committee which ones we're voting on here. We didn't even know what we were on. Therefore, there is no queue to try to get your attention to make doubly sure you received the subamendments we submitted.

I read through the motion order as provided by the House of Commons. It does not say anything about subamendments, which would therefore imply that we have the full right and ability to move them.

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, thank you for your point of order.

Subamendments are not admissible after 8:30.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: It doesn't say that. Where does it say that?

The Chair: Subamendments are not admissible—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Where does it say that?

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

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, we have to be on the clause to move a subamendment.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Yes, I know—

The Chair: We have to be on the clause of the amendment to move a subamendment. Your amendments were provided in advance, but we were not on the clause where you could propose a subamendment.

We are now in—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I proposed the subamendment. I just did.

The Chair: After 8:30—

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: No. Tell me where it—

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, your subamendment is not admissible.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Would you let the clerks advise us on the rules, since you don't know them?

The Chair: Colleagues, I'm going to once again ask members not to turn on their mics.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I challenge the chair.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order. I don't even know what the chair's ruling is.

The Chair: Colleagues, it's very clear.

To Mr. Patzer's point of order, it says, "and if the committee has not completed the clause-by-clause consideration of the bill by 8:30 p.m., all remaining amendments submitted to the committee shall be deemed moved".

Now that they have been moved and we are in a vote, we are voting on each one without further debate.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: It's not debate. It's a subamendment. The House order says nothing about moving subamendments. Please point to the spot in here where it says we cannot move a subamendment.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Are we on clause 4 now?

The Chair: Mr. Patzer has challenged the chair, and there is a vote on the floor.

Shall the chair's ruling be sustained?

• (90930)

Mr. Larry Brock: You haven't told us the ruling, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: The ruling is this: You cannot move subamendments at this point. I made a ruling, and the vote is because Mr. Patzer challenged the chair.

Shall the chair's ruling be sustained?

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order. You've entertained points of order from other members.

The Chair: Shall clause 4 carry?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, I had a point of order before the vote.

You are selectively recognizing some members and not others on points of order, Chair. At least be consistent in your application of the prohibition, or not, of points of order.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

(Clause 4 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

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

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

Mr. Larry Brock: Why are you ignoring Conservatives' points of order?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You can't entertain some points of order and—

• (90945)

The Chair: We are on CPC-7. If CPC-7 is adopted, CPC-8 cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

We'll have a recorded vote.

(Amendment negated: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall CPC-8 carry?

We'll have a recorded vote.

(Amendment negated: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clause 5 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

(On clause 6)

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: There is a subamendment for the next one. It was submitted.

The Chair: On clause 6, we have LIB-2. If LIB-2 is adopted, CPC-9, BQ-7 and CPC-12 cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

Shall LIB-2 carry?

We'll have a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall CPC-10 carry?

We'll have a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment negated: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall CPC-11 carry?

We'll have a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment negated: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall clause 6 as amended carry?

An hon. member: What about CPC-12?

Colleagues, CPC-12 had a line conflict from an earlier vote on LIB-2.

We'll have a recorded vote.

(Clause 6 as amended agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

(On clause 7)

• (90950)

The Chair: On clause 7, we have amendment CPC-13.

We'll have a recorded vote.

(Amendment negated: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: If amendment LIB-3 is adopted, amendment CPC-17 cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

Shall amendment LIB-3 carry?

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall amendment PV-1 carry?

We'll have a recorded vote.

(Amendment negated: nays 10; yeas 1 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

• (90955)

The Chair: Colleagues, if CPC-14 is adopted, CPC-15 becomes moot and cannot be moved and voted on.

Shall CPC-14 carry?

An hon. member: Can we have a recorded vote?

(Amendment negatived: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall CPC-15 carry?

We'll have a recorded vote.

(Amendment negatived: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

• (91000)

The Chair: If CPC-16 is adopted, BQ-8 cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

Shall CPC-16 carry?

We'll have a recorded vote.

(Amendment negatived: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: We are on BQ-8.

Shall BQ-8 carry?

An hon. member: Can we have a recorded vote?

(Amendment negatived: nays 6; yeas 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall BQ-9 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment negatived: nays 10; yeas 1 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

• (91005)

The Chair: Shall BQ-10 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please

(Amendment negatived: nays 8; yeas 3 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall CPC-18 carry?

An hon. member: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment negatived: nays 6; yeas 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall BQ-11 carry?

An hon. member: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment negatived: nays 10; yeas 1 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clause 7 as amended agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

(On clause 8)

The Chair: We are on CPC-19.

The amendment seeks to increase the number of members of the council from 15 to 20, which would create additional spending. As *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, states on page 772, "Since an amendment may not infringe upon the financial initiative of the Crown, it is inadmissible if it imposes a charge on the public treasury, or if it extends the objects or purposes or relaxes the conditions and qualifications specified in the royal recommendation."

In the opinion of the chair, the amendment proposes new spending, which would require a royal recommendation. Therefore, I rule the amendment inadmissible.

Go ahead, Mrs. Stubbs, on a point of order.

• (91010)

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Can you give the rationale for that, since, of course, one of the main problems with Bill C-50 is that there are no costs outlined for any of what these things will be.

How can there suddenly be a rationale and declaration from you that this amendment won't work? You're asserting that it's going to add costs, but there are no costs outlined in the bill in the first place. This is a key problem with it, which we could have discussed if you guys had allowed this to go through the normal process.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Is that a challenge to the chair?

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Madam Dabrusin, you'll know when I'm challenging the chair, because I'll say so. It was a point of clarification, exactly as I said.

The Chair: In the opinion of the chair, the amendment proposes new spending, which would require a royal recommendation. Therefore, I rule the amendment inadmissible.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Chair, there is no new spending in the amendment.

The Chair: There is no debate. We will proceed to amendment NDP-3.

Mr. Larry Brock: I'm challenging your ruling, Chair.

The Chair: Okay, we have a challenge of the chair.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: There's no spending outlined in the bill at all, so how can you assert there's any addition?

The Chair: We'll have a recorded vote.

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

• (91015)

The Chair: We're on NDP-3.

If NDP-3 is adopted, then CPC-20—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Chair, on a point of order, we'd like to know who the voting members are right now.

The Chair: —and CPC-27 cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

Also, if NDP-3 is adopted, then CPC-20, BQ-12, CPC-24, CPC-25 and CPC-26 become moot since the committee would already have made a decision on the composition of the members of the council.

Shall NDP-3 carry?

An hon. member: I'd like a recorded vote.

Mr. Larry Brock: On a point of order, before I enter my vote, I need to know what the line conflict is. I want an informed vote.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I'm sorry, Chair and Clerk, but have we suddenly disappeared into the ether or has everyone lost their hearing? Can someone acknowledge us? We do represent millions of Canadians.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: On a point of order, tell us who the voting members are—right now.

Mr. Ted Falk: Do it before you call the vote.

● (91020)

The Chair: Colleagues, I'm just going to give everybody a reminder. In the middle of votes, there is no debate and no conversation.

The member has asked, on a point of order, who the voting members are, just for clarification. Is that correct?

Some hon. members: Yes.

The Chair: Okay. Now is the appropriate time to do so.

Go ahead, Mr. Clerk.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Thank you, Your Majesty.

[*Translation*]

The Clerk: The members around the table who are currently eligible to vote are Mr. Aldag, Ms. Dabrusin, Mr. Badawey, Ms. Lapointe, Mr. Sorbara, Mr. Brock, Mr. Falk, Mr. Patzer, Ms. Stubbs, Mr. Simard and Ms. Barron.

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall CPC-21 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment negated: nays 6; yeas 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall CPC-22 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment negated: nays 6; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall BQ-13 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote.

(Amendment negated: nays 10; yeas 1 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall CPC-23 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment negated: nays 6; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

● (91025)

The Chair: Shall BQ-14 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair; I was reading the wrong page. I'd like to change my vote to a yeas.

[*English*]

The Chair: To confirm, do we have unanimous consent from Mr. Simard to change his vote to yes?

Some hon. members: Yes.

(Amendment negated: nays 10; yeas 1 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clause 8 as amended agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

(Clause 9 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

(Clause 10 agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

(On clause 11)

● (91030)

The Chair: Shall CPC-28 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment negated: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall CPC-29 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment negated: nays 6; yeas 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: If CPC-30 is adopted, CPC-31 and package A cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

Shall CPC-30 carry?

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 8; nays 3 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

● (91035)

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

The Chair: Shall clause 11 carry as amended?

(Clause 11 as amended agreed to: yeas 6; nays 1)

(On clause 12)

● (91040)

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Before the next vote, I have a point of order, Mr. Chair. You said you would acknowledge points of order between votes.

The Chair: Mrs. Stubbs, go ahead on the point of order.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Mr. Chair, you have to get back to Garnett's point of order between the last votes.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, first of all, I want to clarify your ruling that, with the adoption of CPC-30, the first amendment in CPC package A could not be moved. Is that correct?

The Chair: Thank you for your point of order. I will clarify this.

Page 769 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, says, "Amendments must be proposed following the order of the text to be amended. Once a line of a clause has been amended by the committee, it cannot be further amended by a subsequent amendment as a given line may be amended only once."

Now we will—

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

The Chair: —proceed to CPC-32. If CPC-32 is adopted, package B cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

Shall CPC-32 carry?

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

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I have a point of order.

The Chair: Shall clause 12 carry as amended?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Clause 12 as amended agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

(On clause 13)

• (91045)

The Chair: We are on CPC-33.

Mr. Patzer has a point of order.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: You ruled that a bunch of our amendments were out of order, so I challenge your ruling.

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, this is not a ruling. It is a line conflict that was explained quite clearly.

We've just had a vote and we are proceeding to CPC-33. If CPC-33 is adopted, CPC-34 cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

Shall CPC-33 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote.

(Amendment negatived: nays 11; yeas 0 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall CPC-34 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I have a point of order, Chair.

Can you not hear us?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, this is a flagrant violation of my privilege.

The Chair: Call the vote.

(Amendment negatived: nays 8; yeas 0 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

• (91050)

The Chair: Shall LIB-4 carry?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, we're in between votes and I have a point of order.

The Chair: We'll have a recorded vote.

(Amendment negatived: nays 6; yeas 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: We're on CPC-35. If CPC-35 is adopted, package C cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I have a point of order, Chair. We're in between votes.

The Chair: Shall CPC-35 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall clause 13 carry as amended?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Clause 13 as amended agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

(On clause 14)

The Chair: We will suspend.

• (2255)

(Pause)

• (2303)

• (91100)

The Chair: Welcome back.

We're on LIB-15. If LIB-5 is adopted, BQ-15 cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

Shall LIB-5 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clause 14 as amended agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

(On clause 15)

The Chair: Shall LIB-6 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

• (91105)

The Chair: We are now on CPC-36.

If CPC-36 is adopted, package D cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Mr. Chair, I challenge your ruling.

Shall CPC-36 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: We now have CPC-37. If CPC-37 is adopted, CPC-38 becomes moot and cannot be voted on.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I have already challenge you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Shall CPC-37 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote.

(Amendment negatived: nays 8; yeas 2 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall CPC-38 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment negatived: nays 6; yeas 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall clause 15 carry as amended?

(Clause 15 as amended agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

(On clause 16)

• (91110)

The Chair: We are on clause 16, package E.

All amendments in this package have a line conflict. As soon as one amendment is adopted, no other amendment can be voted on. Also, if one of the amendments in package E is adopted, PV-2 cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

• (91115)

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Chair, I have a point of order to raise.

The Chair: Shall CPC-AC-166-1 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: We are on package F. All amendments in this package have a line conflict. As soon as one amendment is adopted, no other amendments can be voted on.

Shall CPC-AC-167-1 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall BQ-16 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment negatived: nays 8; yeas 3 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall CPC-39 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment negatived: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall CPC-40 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment negatived: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

• (91120)

The Chair: Shall BQ-17 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment negatived: nays 10; yeas 1 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall NDP-4 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall CPC-41 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment negatived: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall CPC-42 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment negatived: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall LIB-7 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall PV-3 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment negatived: nays 10; yeas 1 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

• (91125)

The Chair: Shall CPC-43 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment negatived: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall NDP-5 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.
(Amendment agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall NDP-6 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.
(Amendment agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

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

The Chair: Shall NDP-7 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.
(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall NDP-8 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.
(Amendment agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall NDP-9 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.
(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

- (91130)

The Chair: Shall LIB-8 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.
(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

- (91135)

The Chair: Shall LIB-9 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.
(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall BQ-18 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.
(Amendment negated: nays 10; yeas 1 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

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

The Chair: Shall BQ-19 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.
(Amendment negated: nays 10; yeas 1 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clause 16 as amended agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

(On clause 17)

The Chair: We have CPC-44. If CPC-44 is adopted, amendments in package G cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Chair, could you outline the amendments that would be impacted?

The Chair: Shall CPC-44 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.
(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clause 17 as amended agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

(On clause 18)

- (91140)

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order. Can you not hear us?

The Chair: We're on NDP-10. If NDP-10 is adopted, then CPC-48 cannot be moved due to a line conflict.
Shall NDP-10 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.
(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: We're on CPC-45. If CPC-45 is adopted, CPC-46, CPC-47 and CPC-48 cannot be moved due to a line conflict.
Shall CPC-45 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.
(Amendment negated: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

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

The Chair: We're on CPC-46. If CPC-46 is adopted, CPC-47 and CPC-48 cannot be moved due to a line conflict.
Shall CPC-46 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.
(Amendment negated: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: We're on CPC-47. If CPC-47 is adopted, CPC-48 cannot be moved due to a line conflict.
Shall CPC-47 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.
(Amendment negated: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

- (91145)

The Chair: Shall CPC-49 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment negatived: nays 6; yeas 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall BQ-20 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment negatived: nays 10; yeas 1 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall BQ-21 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment negatived: nays 10; yeas 1 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clause 18 as amended agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

(On clause 19)

The Chair: Now we're on clause 19. All amendments in package H have a line conflict. As soon as one amendment is adopted, no other amendment can be voted on.

Shall CPC-AC-1913-1 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

● (91150)

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall CPC-50 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment negatived: nays 6; yeas 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Now we have package I. All amendments in package I have a line conflict. As soon as one amendment is adopted, no other amendment can be voted on.

Mrs. Shelby Kramp-Neuman (Hastings—Lennox and Addington, CPC): Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

The Chair: Shall CPC-AC-1916-1 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: We're on LIB-10. If LIB-10 is adopted, BQ-22 cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

Shall LIB-10 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

● (91155)

The Chair: We're on CPC-51. If CPC-51 is adopted, CPC-52 and CPC-53 cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

Shall CPC-51 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Chair, can you just clarify the line conflict for members?

(Amendment negatived: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: We're on CPC-52. If CPC-52 is adopted, CPC-53 cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

Shall CPC-52 carry?

Mr. John Aldag: I'd like a recorded vote, please

(Amendment negatived: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

● (91200)

The Chair: Shall CPC-53 carry?

An hon. member: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment negatived: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

Shall CPC-54 carry?

An hon. member: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

● (91205)

(Amendment negatived: nays 6; yeas 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clause 19 as amended agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I have a point of order.

The Chair: Next is new clause 19.1 and BQ-23. There has been a request for a recorded vote.

Mrs. Shelby Kramp-Neuman: I'd like a full stop here. I'm sorry. I recognize that the chair has the use of his discretion. We're not being repetitive, because the chair does not even know what our point of order is. It's incumbent on the chair to at least acknowledge a point of order.

The Chair: Shall BQ-23 carry?

(Amendment negatived: nays 10; yeas 1 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: We will suspend for a few moments.

● (0007)

(Pause)

● (0024)

● (91220)

The Chair: We are back.

(On clause 20)

The Chair: Shall amendment LIB-11 carry?

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall amendment BQ-24 carry?

(Amendment negated: nays 10; yeas 1 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall amendment CPC-55 carry?

(Amendment negated: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall amendment CPC-56 carry?

(Amendment negated: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall clause 20 as amended carry?

(Clause 20 as amended agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

(On clause 21)

• (91225)

The Chair: If CPC-57 is adopted, CPC-58, CPC-59, CPC-60, CPC-61, CPC-62, CPC-63, CPC-64 and amendments in packages J and K cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

• (91230)

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I challenge your ruling—

The Chair: Shall CPC-57 carry?

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I challenge you. I challenge your ruling. It's pretty straightforward. It's a dilatory motion, which means there's no debate and you immediately have to proceed to a vote, because it's a dilatory motion.

It was in between the vote calls, so you can't say that a vote was going on.

It's a dilatory motion. You have to recognize it—

The Chair: I'll say it again. Shall CPC-57 carry?

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I've challenged you. You cannot proceed when there's a dilatory motion on the floor.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: You can't break the rules, Chair. You're supposed to—

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I challenge the chair. It's a dilatory motion.

Chair, you have to acknowledge that there is a dilatory motion on the floor.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Since the chair's ignoring us, could one of the clerks answer what should happen now with the challenge to the chair?

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Because there's a dilatory motion, all things have to stop and you proceed with the dilatory motion until it's done. We're between votes, so you can't just ignore me, Mr. Chair. This is the time that I was instructed by you earlier this evening to raise points of order. This is supposed to be the time for me to challenge the chair.

Earlier today in this meeting, you actually instructed us to challenge you, and I am doing so. If you want to be consistent with your words and your rulings, Mr. Chair, you should accept this

challenge—this dilatory motion—and we should proceed with the challenge to the chair over the ruling you made with regard to the CPC amendments.

Mrs. Shelby Kramp-Neuman: We recognize that you have discretion, Mr. Chair, but you also have rules to follow.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: I'd simply like to say to my interpreter friends that it's very late. I understand that, and if they want to stop interpreting the nonsense from my Conservative colleagues, it wouldn't bother me at all. So there.

[*English*]

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: There's a dilatory motion, Mr. Chair.

Since there seems to be a pause, I think we should proceed with the vote on the challenge to the chair, because it's—

• (91235)

The Chair: We are on CPC-65.

If CPC-65 is adopted, CPC-66, CPC-67, CPC-68, CPC-69, CPC-70, CPC-71, CPC-72 and CPC-73 and amendments in package L cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

Shall CPC-65 carry?

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clause 21 as amended agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

(On clause 2)

The Chair: Since clause 2 was postponed, the committee will now vote on clause 2 and its proposed amendments.

On clause 2, we have amendment BQ-1.

• (91240)

Shall BQ-1 carry?

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: We gave notice of a subamendment for this one, to strike “obligations and” from paragraph (a).

Assuming that we are voting for that, because that was what the subamendment to this one was, I would have voted in favour of it. Since I don't know what's happening, I'm going to say....

Mr. Vance Badawey (Niagara Centre, Lib.): You're voting for it.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Are we going to do a subamendment? Is that—

The Chair: Mr. Patzer, we're on BQ-1, amending clause 2.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: We have a question, though. Can someone answer our question?

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: This is on the subamendment that was submitted. The directive from the House does not actually exclude subamendments, so—

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: The rules are not being followed. The chair is absolutely making things up as he goes along and is backed up by the NDP and Liberals. I just want to get.... It's the middle of the night in Ottawa, and this whole thing has been pushed through behind closed doors, which is exactly what this bill will be.

I just want to give verbal notice that the committee has lost confidence in the member for Calgary Skyview as the chair of the Standing Committee on Natural Resources and instructs the clerk to organize an election of a new chair.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: I think that there's someone who is speaking over the vote. I can't hear it.

(Amendment negated: nays 6; yeas 1 [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: That is defeated.

CPC-1 is inadmissible, as the interpretation clause of a bill is not the place to propose a substantive amendment to a bill unless other amendments have been adopted. In that case, amendments to the interpretation clause would be warranted.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I challenge your ruling, Chair.

The Chair: Mr. Patzer has challenged the ruling of the chair.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: Thank you, Chair.

Obviously, we disagree that this is a substantive amendment. I mean, this is definitely—

The Chair: We will go to a challenge of the chair's ruling.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall amendment NDP-1 carry?

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall amendment BQ-2 carry?

(Amendment negated: nays 10; yeas 1 [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall amendment LIB-1 carry?

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: If CPC-2 is adopted, CPC-3 cannot be moved or voted on because of a line conflict.

Shall amendment CPC-2 carry?

(Amendment negated: nays 7; yeas 4 [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall amendment CPC-3 carry?

(Amendment negated: nays 7; yeas 4 [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

• (91245)

The Chair: Now we'll go to NDP-2. If NDP-2 is adopted, BQ-3 becomes moot and cannot be moved or voted on.

Shall NDP-2 carry?

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clause 2 as amended agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We are now at the preamble.

If LIB-12 is adopted, CPC-74 cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

Shall amendment LIB-12 carry?

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5 [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: We are now at CPC-75, which is inadmissible. The amendment seeks to make a substantive modification by adding new elements to the preamble. Since no amendment has been adopted to warrant the addition of these new elements, I declare the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I challenge your declaration, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: We have a challenge of the chair.

We will now proceed to a vote to sustain the chair's ruling.

• (91250)

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: CPC-76 is also inadmissible. The amendment seeks to make a substantive modification by adding new elements to the preamble. Since no amendment has been adopted to warrant the addition of these new elements, I declare the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I challenge your declaration.

The Chair: We have a challenge of the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: CPC-77 is inadmissible. The amendment seeks to make a substantive modification by adding new elements to the preamble. Since no amendment has been adopted to warrant the addition of these new elements, I declare the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I challenge your declaration.

The Chair: We have a challenge of the chair's ruling. We will proceed to a vote.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: CPC-78 is also inadmissible for the same reasons provided previously.

• (91255)

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I challenge those rulings again, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: We have a challenge to the chair. We will proceed to a vote.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: CPC-79 is also inadmissible, for the same rationale provided earlier.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I also challenge that ruling.

The Chair: We have a challenge to the chair. We will go to a vote to sustain the chair's ruling.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: CPC-80 is also inadmissible.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I challenge the chair.

The Chair: We have a challenge to the chair, so we'll go to a vote to sustain the chair's ruling.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall CPC-81 carry?

(Amendment negated: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

• (91300)

The Chair: We are on amendment CPC-82, which is inadmissible.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I challenge your ruling, Chair.

The Chair: There is a challenge to the chair's ruling. To sustain the chair's ruling, we will go to a vote.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall amendment NDP-11 carry?

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Colleagues, amendments BQ-25, CPC-83, CPC-84, BQ-26, BQ-27, CPC-85, CPC-86 and CPC-87 are inadmissible. Do we have unanimous consent to group them together?

Mr. Larry Brock: Absolutely not. There is no consent.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Larry Brock: We want to treat them individually, and we challenge your ruling.

The Chair: We will start with amendment BQ-25, which is inadmissible.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: Mr. Chair, I'd be willing to combine all the Bloc Québécois amendments for a single vote.

[*English*]

The Chair: On BQ-25, BQ-26 and BQ-27, do we have unanimous consent to group them together?

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: No.

The Chair: It's a no. Okay. We will start with the first one.

BQ-25 is inadmissible.

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge your ruling.

The Chair: We have a challenge of the chair. We will go to a vote to sustain the chair's ruling.

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

The Chair: Amendment CPC-83 is inadmissible.

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge.

The Chair: We have a challenge of the chair. We will proceed to a vote to challenge the chair's ruling.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We will go to amendment CPC-84. It is also inadmissible.

• (91305)

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I challenge the chair.

Hon. Mike Lake (Edmonton—Wetaskiwin, CPC): Mr. Chair, can we have a reason for why it's inadmissible? It's unusual for the chair to not give a reason.

The Chair: The reason is the same as provided earlier on with all the amendments. CPC-84 is inadmissible because the amendment seeks to make a substantive modification by adding new elements to the preamble. Since no amendment has been adopted to warrant the addition of these new elements, I declare the amendment inadmissible.

Hon. Mike Lake: Can you explain that a little bit more? I don't understand the ruling.

The Chair: We're in a vote, and the chair has been challenged.

An hon. member: I've been here for 18 years. This is a very unusual process.

The Chair: It's not debatable. The chair has been challenged.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Now we have BQ-26. It could only be moved if BQ-16 were adopted. That did not happen, so I declare the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: BQ-27 is inadmissible.

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: CPC-85 is inadmissible.

• (91310)

Hon. Mike Lake: I have a point of order.

I would suggest, when you're ruling things inadmissible, that each time you give the reason you're ruling it inadmissible. It's not good enough to just say that it's inadmissible.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Lake.

CPC-85 seeks to make a substantive modification by adding new elements to the preamble. Since no amendment has been adopted to warrant the addition of these new elements, I declare the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair. That addresses his...

I go back to the situation where NDP-11 was—

The Chair: No. Mr. Dreeshen, that is debate. It's not a point of order.

I provided a ruling. We can go to a challenge of the chair.

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: I challenge your ruling.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: CPC-86 seeks to make a substantive modification by adding new elements to the preamble. Since no amendment has been adopted to warrant the addition of these new elements, I declare the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: CPC-87 is inadmissible for the same reason as before, but I will read it out for colleagues. The amendment seeks to make a substantive modification by adding new elements to the preamble. Since no amendment has been adopted to warrant the addition of these new elements, I declare the amendment inadmissible.

• (91315)

Hon. Mike Lake: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

How is that inadmissible? How is that irrelevant to the bill? The amendment simply adds the words “support the creation of meaningful work”.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Lake.

We need to adopt an amendment for this to be able to stand, so it is inadmissible. There's no amendment that's been brought forward that would allow this motion to stand. That's why I stated the amendment seeks to make a substantive modification by adding new elements to the preamble. Since no amendment has been adopted to warrant the addition of these new elements, I declare the amendment inadmissible.

I will proceed to the next item.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: This is an amendment added there. It's just inadmissible, because you're declaring it so.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: We challenge the ruling.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall NDP-12 carry?

An hon. member: I'd like a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: BQ-28 is inadmissible.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: On a point of order, can you explain why?

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: On behalf of Monsieur Simard, we would like to know why.

The Chair: The amendment seeks to make a substantive modification by adding new elements to the preamble. Since no amendment has been adopted to warrant the addition of these new elements, I declare the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I'm offended on his behalf, so I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: As CPC-88 seeks to make a substantive modification by adding new elements to the preamble, and since no amendment has been adopted to warrant the addition of these new elements, I declare the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (91320)

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: On a point of order, can you clarify who the voting member for the NDP is?

The Chair: The chair's ruling has been sustained.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: On a point of order, I think we have a problem with the voting issue.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: On a point of order, Chair, we just want to know who the voting members of the committee are at this moment, please.

Thank you.

Mr. Thomas Bigelow (Committee Clerk): Currently I have at the table sitting down Mr. Aldag, Ms. Dabrusin, Mr. Badawey, Madam Lapointe, Mr. Sorbara, Mr. Dreeshen, Mr. Lake, Mr. Patzer, Ms. Stubbs, Mr. Simard and now Mr. Angus.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: If the official member of the committee is in the room, that's the person who gets the vote, not the substitute. That last vote was a void vote.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I vote yes, then.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Again with the whole rules thing, I'm sure the chair will figure it out. He's asking for the rules.

The Chair: The colleague was at the table when the vote was started and was eligible to vote.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: It's in the room. The rule says in the room, not at the table.

The Chair: We will now proceed to CPC-89.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I challenge that ruling, Chair. It's inadmissible.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: You can't just make stuff up. It's all on camera.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I challenge this ruling as well.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: What is happening?

The Chair: We are proceeding to CPC-89.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: On a point of order, Mr. Chair, I challenge your ruling on the eligible member from the NDP.

The Chair: There are new elements to the preamble. We have a challenge to CPC-89 that is inadmissible. To sustain the chair's ruling, there's a challenge.

Mr. Patzer challenged. Please proceed with the vote to sustain the chair's ruling on CPC-89.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: This was the challenge, Mr. Chair, on the ruling of whether or not the member from Timmins—James Bay was around the table or in the room. That's what the challenge was. It's pretty obvious.

Mr. Thomas Bigelow: The question is on the chair's ruling of CPC-89, sir.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We will go to NDP-13.

Shall NDP-13 carry?

An hon. member: I request a recorded vote.

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

● (91325)

The Chair: We're on CPC-90, which is inadmissible.

An hon. member: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

Hon. Mike Lake: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Lake.

Hon. Mike Lake: I want to get clarity around the rules of this particular committee, who the voting member is for the NDP and what the rule is around who the voting member is.

Is it when someone is in the room and a regular member of the committee that they're automatically the voting member?

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm the voting member down here.

Hon. Mike Lake: There's video of the entire room, and we can see on the video who's in the room or not.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm right here.

I'll be on the video. I'm the voting member.

Hon. Mike Lake: I would make the argument that on—

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm the voting member.

An hon. member: You don't have the floor. Turn off your mic.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Can we get to the vote?

Hon. Mike Lake: —multiple votes, Mr. Angus was in the room while Ms. Kwan was voting. I just want clarity on what the rules are for who the voting member of the NDP is when both members are in the room.

The Chair: Mr. Lake, thank you for your point of order. The clerk has previously provided that information to committee members.

We'll now move to BQ-29.

Hon. Mike Lake: Excuse me. I'm asking a question.

The Chair: This is not for debate.

We'll move to BQ-29.

The amendment seeks to make a substantive modification by adding new elements to the preamble, and no amendment has been adopted to warrant the addition of these new elements. I declare the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I challenge you.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We'll now move to BQ-30. I declare the amendment inadmissible for the same reasons provided previously.

● (91330)

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I have a point of order. It's for what? I'm sorry.

The Chair: The amendment seeks to make a substantive modification by adding new elements to the preamble. Since no amendment has been adopted to warrant the addition of the new elements, I declare the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: We challenge the chair.

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

Hon. Mike Lake: On a point of order, Mr. Chair, I would suggest that any vote cast by Ms. Kwan while Mr. Angus was in the room should not be counted.

I would say that if the NDP is insistent on co-operating with you, as the chair, and the Liberals to ram this legislation through, they should at least follow the rules that the committee has passed and agreed to abide by.

The Chair: Shall CPC-91 carry?

An hon. member: I request a recorded vote.

(Amendment negated: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: We move to CPC-92.

CPC-92 is inadmissible as the amendment seeks to make a substantial modification by adding new elements to the preamble. Since no amendment has been adopted to warrant the addition of these new elements, I declare the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We are on CPC-93, which is inadmissible.

We will move to LIB-13.

If LIB-13 is adopted, BQ-31 cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

An hon. member: I request a recorded vote.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: We will go to BQ-31, which has been declared inadmissible.

• (91335)

Mr. Larry Brock: I have a point of order, Chair.

The Chair: Are you challenging the chair on the inadmissibility?

Mr. Larry Brock: No, it's a point of order, Chair.

Can you clarify why it was ruled inadmissible?

The Chair: Actually, there is no ruling on this one because LIB-13 was adopted. This is inadmissible because of a line conflict.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I challenge your ruling, Chair.

The Chair: There is no challenge to the ruling because it's a line conflict. There's no ruling; it's a fact. There's no challenge.

We're on LIB-14.

An hon. member: I request a recorded vote.

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

The Chair: We will now go to CPC-94, which is inadmissible.

The amendment seeks to make a substantive modification by adding new elements to the preamble. Since no amendment has been adopted to warrant the addition of these elements, I declare the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We're on amendment BQ-32. The amendment seeks to make a substantive modification by adding new elements to the preamble. Since no amendment has been adopted to warrant the addition of these elements, I declare the amendment inadmissible.

An hon. member: I challenge the chair.

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

The Chair: We will go to amendment CPC-95.

Shall CPC-95 carry?

An hon. member: I request a recorded vote.

(Amendment negatived: nays 7; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: We will now go to amendment LIB-15.

Shall LIB-15 carry?

An hon. member: I request a recorded vote.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: We'll go to NDP-14.

Shall NDP-14 carry?

An hon. member: I request a recorded vote.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: We are on amendment CPC-96, which is inadmissible.

• (91340)

The amendment seeks to make a substantive modification by adding new elements to the preamble. Since no amendment has been adopted to warrant the addition of these new elements, I declare the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I have a point of order.

I'm just curious as to why the previous preamble wasn't ruled inadmissible because it didn't have another amendment needed to make the amendment admissible, but yet every other one that has "CPC" in front of it seems to be inadmissible. Why is that?

The Chair: Are you challenging the chair?

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: It depends on how you answer the question.

The Chair: There's no debate. The ruling has been made. If you're challenging the chair on CPC-96, please proceed.

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We'll move to CPC-97, which is inadmissible. The amendment seeks to make a substantive modification by adding new elements to the preamble. Since no amendment has been adopted to warrant the addition of these new elements, I declare the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We will now go to CPC-98, which is inadmissible. The amendment seeks to make a substantive modification by adding new elements to the preamble. Since no amendment has been adopted to warrant addition of these new elements, I declare the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We will go to CPC-99. The amendment seeks to make a substantive modification by adding new elements to the preamble. Since no amendment has been adopted to warrant the addition of these new elements, I declare the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge the chair.

• (91345)

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We are now going to CPC-100.

I declare the amendment inadmissible.

• (91350)

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 3)

The Chair: CPC-101 is inadmissible.

The amendment seeks to make a substantive modification by adding new elements to the preamble. Since no amendment has been adopted to warrant the addition of these new elements, I declare the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained [See Minutes of Proceedings])

Hon. Mike Lake: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

I want to clarify that I don't know what the circumstances are, or what the rules are. I'm not sure whether Charlie Angus actually apologized in the House.

I'm wondering whether he is allowed to be part of the committee if he hasn't apologized in the House.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Lake, for your point of order.

All members here are members in good standing on this committee.

We will move to CPC-102.

CPC-102 is inadmissible.

Mr. Larry Brock: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Are you challenging the chair?

Mr. Larry Brock: No, it's a point of order because you did not explain why it's inadmissible.

The Chair: The amendment seeks to make a substantive modification by adding new elements to the preamble. Since no amendment has been adopted to warrant the addition of these new elements, I declare the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Larry Brock: Now I challenge you.

(Ruling of the chair sustained [See Minutes of Proceedings])

The Chair: Colleagues, I will ask only one member to have their mic on and to not speak over others, because it is difficult for the interpreters to interpret.

CPC-103 is inadmissible.

The amendment seeks to make a substantive modification by adding new elements to the preamble. Since no amendment has been adopted to warrant the addition of these new elements, I declare the amendment inadmissible.

• (91355)

Mr. Jeremy Patzer: I have a point of order first.

An hon. member: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We will now go to CPC-104.

The amendment seeks to make a substantive modification by adding new elements to the preamble. Since no amendment has

been adopted to warrant the addition of these new elements, I declare the amendment inadmissible.

An hon. member: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We are on LIB-16.

Shall LIB-16 carry?

An hon. member: I request a recorded vote.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5 [See Minutes of Proceedings])

The Chair: Shall the preamble carry as amended?

An hon. member: I request a recorded vote.

(Preamble as amended agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5 [See Minutes of Proceedings])

The Chair: We will move now to the short title.

CPC-105 is inadmissible.

The amendment seeks to make an amendment to the short title. The *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, states on page 775:

Titles, whether it be the long, short or alternative title, may be amended only if the bill has been so altered as to necessitate such an amendment.

• (91400)

No amendment has been made to the bill that would necessitate a change to the short title. Therefore, I rule the amendment inadmissible.

Hon. Mike Lake: I have a point of order. I would like clarification on that. I don't understand how you can make a judgment. That seems pretty subjective.

The Chair: Mr. Lake, I will ask you to challenge the chair.

Hon. Mike Lake: I definitely challenge the chair.

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

The Chair: We will move on to CPC-106.

This is inadmissible. No amendment has been made to the bill that would necessitate a change to the short title. Therefore, I rule the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We will now go to CPC-107.

It's inadmissible. No amendment has been made to the bill that would necessitate a change to the short title. Therefore, I rule the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We will go to CPC-108.

This is inadmissible. No amendment has been made to the bill that would necessitate a change to the short title. Therefore, I rule the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We will go to CPC-109.

No amendment has been made to the bill that would necessitate a change to the short title. Therefore, I rule the amendment inadmissible.

An hon. member: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We will go to CPC-110.

This is inadmissible as no amendment has been made to the bill that would necessitate a change to the short title. Therefore, I rule the amendment inadmissible.

● (91405)

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge the ruling.

The Chair: We have a challenge to the ruling.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We'll go to CPC-111, which is inadmissible. No amendment has been made to the bill that would necessitate a change to the short title.

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge the ruling.

The Chair: We have a challenge to the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We'll go to CPC-112, which is inadmissible. No amendment has been made to the bill that would necessitate a change to the short title.

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge the ruling.

The Chair: We have a challenge to the chair.

Is there a problem with the translation?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Simard: The interpretation into French is working very well.

[*English*]

The Clerk: I have no flags from the interpreters.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We'll go to CPC-113, which is inadmissible. No amendment has been made to the bill that would necessitate a change to the short title.

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We'll now go to CPC-114, which is inadmissible. No amendment has been made to the bill that would necessitate a change to the short title.

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We'll now go to CPC-115, which is inadmissible as no amendment has been made to the bill that would necessitate a change to the short title.

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We'll go to CPC-116, which is inadmissible as no amendment has been made to the bill that would necessitate a change to the short title.

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

● (91410)

The Chair: We'll go to CPC-117, which is inadmissible. No amendment has been made to the bill that would necessitate a change to the short title.

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: CPC-118 is inadmissible. No amendment has been made to the bill that would necessitate a change to the short title.

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: CPC-119 is inadmissible. No amendment has been made to the bill that would necessitate a change to the short title.

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: CPC-120 is inadmissible. CPC-121 is inadmissible.

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge the chair.

Mr. Mike Lake: I challenge the chair's ruling.

The Chair: We have a challenge to the chair's ruling on CPC-121.

Mr. Larry Brock: The challenge is on CPC-120, Mr. Chair. You can't ram it right through like that.

Mr. Mike Lake: Mr. Chair, we agreed that you were going to give reasons each time.

● (91415)

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge the chair's ruling on CPC-120.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We'll go to CPC-122, which is inadmissible. No amendment has been made to the bill that would necessitate a change to the short title.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Slow down, please, Mr. Chair. That's enough. Slow down so that we can hear you.

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: CPC-123 is inadmissible because no amendment has been made to the bill that would necessitate a change to the short title.

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: CPC-124 is inadmissible because no amendment has been made to the bill that would necessitate a change to the short title.

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: CPC-125 is inadmissible because no amendment has been made to the bill that would necessitate a change to the short title.

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: CPC-126 is inadmissible because no amendment has been made to the bill that would necessitate a change to the short title.

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: CPC-127 is inadmissible because no amendment has been made to the bill that would necessitate a change to the short title.

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

• (91420)

The Chair: We'll go to CPC-128, which is inadmissible as no amendment has been made to the bill that would necessitate a change to the short title.

Mr. Earl Dreeshen: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We'll go to CPC-129, which is inadmissible as no amendment has been made to the bill that would necessitate a change to the short title.

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We'll go to CPC-130, which is inadmissible. No amendment has been made to the bill that would necessitate a change to the short title.

• (91425)

Mr. Larry Brock: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall the short title carry?

(Clause 1 agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We will now proceed to the title.

CPC-131 is inadmissible as no amendment has been made to the bill that would necessitate a change.

An hon. member: I challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall the title carry?

(Title agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall the bill as amended carry?

(Bill C-50 as amended agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

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

(Reporting of bill to the House agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall the committee order a reprint of the bill as amended for the use of the House at report stage?

(Reprint of the bill agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Colleagues, thank you so much for your hard work and dedication.

• (91430)

Thank you to all of the staff, the clerks, the interpreters and everybody involved for your tremendous job over the last several months.

We are suspended.

[*The meeting was suspended at 2:34 a.m., Thursday, December 7*]

[*The meeting resumed at 11:04 a.m., Monday, December 11*]

The Chair: I call this meeting to order.

Welcome back to meeting number 80 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Natural Resources.

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

Ms. Dabrusin, I will now move to you.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Mr. Chair, I move:

That given 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, has been referred to committee, the committee initiate its consideration of Bill C-49 with the following schedule:

- a) That the minister and officials be invited to appear before the committee on Bill C-49 on a date to be determined by the chair;
- b) That members submit their lists of suggested witnesses concerning Bill C-49 by 12:00 p.m. on a date to be determined by the chair and that the chair, clerk and analysts create witness panels which reflect the representation of the parties on the committee, and, once complete, that the chair begin scheduling those meetings;
- c) That the chair seek additional meeting times and that meetings be scheduled, if resources are available, for up to three hours each;
- d) That the chair issue a press release for Bill C-49, inviting written submissions from the public and establishing a deadline for those submissions;
- e) That the committee hold four meetings with witnesses on Bill C-49 before clause-by-clause consideration for Bill C-49 is scheduled and that the chair seek to hold one of those meetings in Halifax, Nova Scotia and one of those meetings in St. John's, Newfoundland and Labrador;
- f) That the chair set deadlines for the submission of proposed amendments for Bill C-49 in advance of the beginning of clause-by-clause consideration but no sooner than after the completion of the respective witness meetings, and that the members of the committee, as well as Members who are not part of a caucus represented on the committee, submit to the clerk all of their proposed amendments to Bill C-49 no later than 4:00 p.m. on a date established by the chair, in both official languages, and that these be distributed to members;

g) That up to four meetings be scheduled for clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-49 and should the committee not complete its clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-49 by the end of scheduled clause-by-clause considerations, at the next available meeting all remaining amendments submitted to the committee shall be deemed moved; the chair shall put the question, forthwith and successively, without further debate, on all remaining clauses and proposed amendments, as well as each and every question necessary to dispose of clause-by-clause consideration of the bill, as well as all questions necessary to report the bill to the House; order that it be reprinted; and order the chair to report the bill to the House as soon as possible.

Thank you, Chair. Now that I've moved the motion, I move that the committee move in camera.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: I have a point of order.

The Chair: We have to go to a vote, because she moved it.

Mrs. Shannon Stubbs: Chair, I had already asked to speak, and you acknowledged me.

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

The Chair: Call the roll.

(Motion agreed to: yeas 7; nays 1)

The Chair: We'll now go 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>