



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

---

# Standing Committee on Natural Resources

EVIDENCE

**NUMBER 117**

**PUBLIC PART ONLY - PARTIE PUBLIQUE SEULEMENT**

Monday, December 2, 2024

---

Chair: Mr. George Chahal





## Standing Committee on Natural Resources

Monday, December 2, 2024

• (1110)

[English]

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

Welcome to meeting number 117 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Natural Resources. Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format.

I would like to remind participants of the following points: Please wait until I recognize you by name before speaking, and all comments should be addressed through the chair.

Members, please raise your hand if you wish to speak, whether participating in person or via Zoom. The clerk and I will manage the speaking order as best we can. For the folks who have raised their hand, I will look again at you to make sure I capture everybody and get you on the list.

I have a quick housekeeping item before we commence.

As previously mentioned, there was a request to meet with a delegation from Vietnam on Wednesday, December 4. It's an informal meeting from 4:30 to 5:30, during our usual meeting time.

If the committee wishes to proceed, can the clerk be given instructions to make the necessary arrangements for hospitality and defray the cost for that hospitality?

It's yes.

I'll go to Mr. Patzer and then to Mr. Angus after that.

Go ahead.

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC):** I was curious. It's great that there's a delegation coming from there, but which department is it, and what members? Do we know that information yet?

**The Chair:** Maybe Mr. Clerk can add more.

It's a parliamentary delegation from Vietnam that has a keen interest in natural resources-related work.

Mr. Clerk, is there any more information on that you'd like to add?

**The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Thomas Bigelow):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We emailed the committee late last week with information about names and some of their roles, but I can certainly pass the information along again by email.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Thank you, Mr. Patzer.

I'll go to you, Mr. Angus.

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

I think it's always good to meet with international delegations to see whether there are ways we can build trade and relations with Canada.

My only question is this: Is it going to interfere with our trying to finalize reports so that we actually get something done?

**The Chair:** Well, we're hoping that today's meeting, Mr. Angus, goes well. I booked in the second hour for a V2 of the report, and I'm hoping to continue, potentially, on Wednesday, if required, so we can continue to get on with the important work our committee has conducted over the last several months.

However, I'm also here at the will of the committee, because sometimes we have motions that arise that we have to work through as well. I'm hoping we have a successful meeting today, which will put us on a good path for the next meeting, moving forward.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** As a follow-up, Chair, to help with our international trade relations, can I ask for unanimous support to get my Asia pulp and paper study passed now, and Mr. Simard's motion? Then we could meet with the Vietnamese delegation and feel that we are helping international relations while being very judicious with our time.

**Mr. Ted Falk (Provencher, CPC):** That's a great idea.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I'll put that on the table.

**The Chair:** I'm glad you brought that forward.

Mr. Angus, you're on a point of order. I'm not sure if you were serious about unanimous consent, but you are on a—

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I'm always serious. You know me. I'm not—

**The Chair:** —point of clarification on the Vietnamese delegation.

I would say that when you get an opportunity later in the meeting, potentially—

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** That's fair play.

**The Chair:** —you can attempt that at an appropriate time. I'd appreciate it.

Colleagues, thank you for your support for having the Vietnamese delegation. The clerk will make the necessary arrangements for Wednesday.

When we adjourned the meeting last Monday, we were debating the motion by Mr. Simard and the amendment by Mr. Jowhari. Mrs. Stubbs was the next speaker on the list. Then I had Mr. Jowhari, so I will go now to Mr. Jowhari.

**Mr. Majid Jowhari (Richmond Hill, Lib.):** Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I'd like to welcome some of the colleagues across the aisle. It's good to see them in the natural resources committee. I had the pleasure of working with them on a couple of other committees, which was great.

Just as a reference, first of all, I'm going to be short. It's not going to be more than five minutes on the last two points I wanted to get through.

I'm clearly trying to state that this is not about what was perceived at the end of the last session to be a filibuster.

For the sake of some of the new members, there was a motion brought forward by Mr. Simard, and I made an amendment. It read as follows: "and have the Government of Canada provide a response to this report"—i.e., the Trans Mountain report—"pursuant to Standing Order 109", which basically, first of all, forces the government to respond, so the government has to respond within 120 days. Then we will be in a position to have all the facts in support of this motion when it comes to a motion for concurrence in the House.

I had also committed, when I got up and intervened on that, that I will be in a strong position to be able to have answers to lots of questions that seem to be very relevant. I was hoping to be able to get, as part of the government response, the number of changes that we had, the process, what the risks were, how the risks were mitigated and the mix on the financing model, etc.

That really dealt with the accountability. I hope I made my case that going into the House ahead of a report and only having a focus on a very small piece of testimony that was provided by the PBO will not put this and us in a position to have a very substantive conversation within the spectrum of accountability. That was it. I just wanted to reiterate that.

Then I asked about the timing. That's where I'll be spending probably the next three or four minutes, and then I'll conclude.

Why not complete the report, and why not wait 120 days? What is the sense of urgency?

Again, if we go back and look at the sense of urgency, is there any information that the government is planning to divest of this national investment in the near future? We really need to have this debate. If we have this debate as part of the concurrence, which is for three hours, how is it going to change anything? If the sense was that we need to have this debate because the pipeline is about to be sold, or that there was not enough participation by various groups, or that there were other points, rather than the PBO saying that given the scope of his study and these criteria and these assumptions, if the investment is done today, there is a possibility for the government not to recover the investment.... The PBO also clar-

ified that it's not that Canadians will lose money; Canadians are already making money.

I am also at a loss as to what the urgency is, and if the urgency is helping with the accountability, I would love to hear that. When I look at the runway that we have, had we dedicated the last session to getting the report drafted and then looking at it, we would be much more ahead.

I'll conclude by saying that on the accountability side, it would be strongly recommended that we adopt this motion, get the report done, get all the facts and get the response. Let's have that substantive conversation, because if you accept, we will have the concurrence no matter what, and hopefully it looks like the filibuster in the House would finish as well.

Then there's the other side of it. There's going to be an opposition day that we could look at.

On the timing I'm confused, and on the accountability I'm confused, but I yield the floor back to you, Mr. Chair.

• (1115)

Those are the points I wanted to make. Thank you for giving me the opportunity.

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

I had Mr. Dreeshen next on the speaking list. Since he is not here, I will go to Monsieur Simard. This is the speaking order I had in place from last day. I will go to Mr. Lake after Monsieur Simard.

Please go ahead.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Mario Simard (Jonquière, BQ):** I don't want to needlessly extend the debate, however, I'm going to repeat what I said last week: the reason I don't support my colleague's amendment is because that amendment would preclude a debate in the House of Commons.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer gave a presentation to us, here, that clearly shows that the pipeline purchase led to net losses that we'll never get back. However, the PBO was careful not to draw any political conclusions. I think that's really our job. That's why I want there to be a debate in the House, and I believe it's absolutely possible to hold that debate in the House and then continue the study.

There aren't many opportunities to discuss problems such as this, meaning a political project that's spiralled out of control and that involves a significant amount of public money. That's why I'd be prepared to vote on the amendment and the motion immediately. In any case, I think that, by trying to determine whether the House should debate the motion, the committee will have wasted the equivalent of three hours of debate in the House.

[*English*]

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

Mr. Lake, you have the floor.

**Hon. Mike Lake (Edmonton—Wetaskiwin, CPC):** I'm a guest at the committee, but of course this would be important in my constituency. I'm looking at the amendment, and I believe the effect would be to buy four months without debate in the House. I have listened to this carefully.

First of all, rarely do we see motions that bring members from all sides together, but hopefully all of us in the House agree that it's insane that the Government of Canada had to buy a pipeline, or got itself into a position where it had to buy a pipeline. I think we can all agree that what has happened since then has been a cascading series of debacles and disasters economically. I think it absolutely warrants a debate in the House sooner rather than later.

To my friend Majid's point, I've served on committee with Majid, and he would know, even with his short experience in the House, that the second this motion was moved on November 18, public servants were putting their papers together to prepare ministers and parliamentary secretaries and all Liberal members to have the opportunity to weigh in from a position of knowledge. I almost guarantee you that nothing will change between now and four months from now in terms of what is in the content of the choreographed series of speeches the Liberals will give in the House on this matter.

I am absolutely in opposition to this delaying amendment.

• (1120)

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

Mr. Patzer, you have the floor.

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

I too want to echo some of the thoughts of colleagues that I've heard around the table this morning and also in previous meetings. This absolutely deserves a debate in the House sooner rather than later instead of waiting for the report to come out and then whatever will come after that.

I think voting down this amendment and just passing the motion as it was originally written would make the most sense. It would show how seriously the House takes the issue of the government losing taxpayers' money. It would show the seriousness that the House should take on building resource projects and getting our resources to tidewater and the need for the private sector to be the one to do it, not the government.

I think there are so many different points that can and will be brought up in that debate. It feels like even three hours wouldn't be enough time, to be honest, but three hours is better than no hours. So is having it happen sooner rather than later instead of meeting four months down the road from now. A lot can happen between now and four months from now. I think it would be good to get this debate happening now.

I look forward to voting against this amendment and defeating it.

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

I'll now go to Ms. Dabrusin.

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin (Toronto—Danforth, Lib.):** I just wanted to add that I actually have said from the beginning that I don't have a problem with discussing this issue in the House. The question is whether we do it on the basis of just the PBO report or whether we

allow the full study that's been done in this place at this committee to go to the House. I think that the last two comments that have been made exemplify exactly why we need the full report from this committee with all of the evidence that we heard from different witnesses to go before the House for the debate, because none of what they were talking about was actually what the PBO report includes.

The PBO's report, the one that is being proposed to be sent to the House, is actually really quite narrow in its scope. The issues that were just raised by the last two speakers were the types of things that would be included in the full study with all the witnesses' evidence that we heard.

This isn't about whether we have a debate about TMX in the House of Commons; it's about whether we have a debate in the House of Commons based on one of our witnesses and one report that will be included in the full study, or do we go ahead with the full study and finish the report, put that to the House and then let people argue whatever they want—plus, for, pro, against, whatever. You would at least be arguing based on everything that we've heard, all of the witnesses who took their time to present to us and all of the testimony.

**Hon. Mike Lake:** I have a point of order, Chair.

**The Chair:** Ms. Dabrusin, I'll ask you to hold for a second. We have a point of order from Mr. Lake.

**Hon. Mike Lake:** I just want to make sure the rules haven't changed. All of that witness testimony is public, is it not, and anybody speaking in the House could refer to it regardless?

I ask that just in case anything's changed in the way that we do things around this place after my 19 years of being here.

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

I'm not sure if it's a point of order from a procedural perspective, but I will answer your point of clarification. As you're new to the committee as well, welcome.

I believe that testimony was public, folks, but I don't believe that members of the public would have access to the physical, approved report of the committee.

• (1125)

**Hon. Mike Lake:** They would have access to the testimony, right? They would have access to the testimony, everything the witnesses said and everything, as Julie said, we heard as a committee.

**The Chair:** Thank you for that point of clarification.

Ms. Dabrusin, we go back to you.

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** All I was saying—and I have said this since the very beginning—is that I've never before seen us decide to send one witness piece, one report piece that's been submitted as evidence to this committee in a larger study, to the House of Commons without completing the full study. I still think that there's merit to it, and I just was pointing out that I think that the arguments that were just made by the two speakers before me exemplify that there's an interest in actually digging deeper into the larger issues.

With that, I'm happy to go to a vote on Mr. Jowhari's amendment, but I just wanted to make sure that my position was known.

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

We will get to a vote at some point, but we still have a few more speakers

Mr. Falk, you're up next. Go ahead, Mr. Falk.

**Mr. Ted Falk:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you for this time to speak to this amendment.

It's clear, and I think Canadians can see that what's going on here is that the Liberal government is faced with an issue that the Parliamentary Budget Officer says is going to become quite uncomfortable for them. This is because, for years, they've told Canadians that this pipeline is going to be a good thing and is not going to cost them anything and everybody will be made whole. We know from the Parliamentary Budget Officer's report, which he brought here, that this is not the case. Canadians are on the hook for an awful lot of money, and the likelihood of recovering the full cost of the TMX project is very small.

It would be unwise to delay a debate in the House of Commons for another four months. The sooner the House can debate the issue and dig a little deeper into the facts, as my colleague Mr. Lake pointed out.... This has been a public study. There's no new information in the report that Canadians haven't been able to acquire through following the study. The sooner the House can debate this issue fully and completely, the sooner we can bring some kind of conclusion to this whole thing.

In reference to the study that this committee has done, I don't think it's been quite as thorough a study as the Liberals would like to portray it. There are other voices that need to be heard. There's more information out there.

We still haven't really got to the root of exactly why all of these cost overruns occurred on the pipeline. What should have initially been a \$9.7-billion expansion project turned into an over \$34-billion project. It's wild that you can go so far up on a project that it's seven times more expensive than it was budgeted to be.

There has obviously been some mishandling of the construction by this Liberal government. I think Canadians will be very curious to follow the debate in the House of Commons, where I'm sure there will be new information that comes forward. Canadians are going to be in a better position to make an informed decision as to whether or not this government should have bought a pipeline and should have attempted to construct this pipeline in the manner it did.

Once we have that debate in the House.... I agree with Mr. Patzer. I don't think three hours is going to be enough time, even in the House, for this debate to adequately happen.

I think we need to defeat this amendment. The motion my colleague Mario from the Bloc has brought forward is a great motion. The sooner the House debates this issue, the better for Canadians.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

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

I'm just taking one last glance at the screen for all those online.

At this point, we don't have any other speakers. We will proceed to a vote.

Mr. Clerk, could you call the roll?

**Mr. Ziad Aboultaif (Edmonton Manning, CPC):** Is the vote on the amendment?

**The Chair:** Yes.

Do colleagues need clarification on the amendment, or are we pretty clear on what the amendment is?

**Mr. Ziad Aboultaif:** No, I just wanted to clarify that.

**The Chair:** Yes. Thank you for that, Mr. Aboultaif.

(Amendment negatived: nays 6; yeas 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** Now we will proceed to the main motion that was previously amended.

I will look to colleagues who want to speak to the main motion.

• (1130)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Mario Simard:** I'm prepared to vote, Chair.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** You're ready to vote. Okay. I like your enthusiasm and your being prepared, Monsieur Simard.

I just want to give colleagues an opportunity before we proceed to a vote. Is there anybody online who wants to speak to this?

No.

Go ahead, Mr. Clerk.

Wait; we have a hand.

Go ahead, Ms. Lapointe. You have your hand up. Would you like to speak to the main motion?

**Ms. Viviane Lapointe (Sudbury, Lib.):** I would like to present an amendment to the main motion.

**The Chair:** Well, you have the floor. Go ahead.

**Ms. Viviane Lapointe:** The amendment that I'd like to propose involves changing the four last words of the motion.

[Translation]

At the end of the French version, the motion states that the committee “asks the Chair to report to the House as soon as possible.” I propose replacing that with the following: “asks the Chair to report to the House following the conclusion of the Committee's report on the Trans Mountain pipeline.”

[English]

The reason I'm moving this motion has been stated before. For me, there are two main reasons. One is a matter of process—

[Translation]

**Mr. Mario Simard:** Point of order, Chair.

[English]

**The Chair:** Ms. Lapointe, hold on for a second.

We have a point of order from Monsieur Simard.

[Translation]

**Mr. Mario Simard:** I simply want to ask the clerk whether Ms. Lapointe's amendment is in order.

To my understanding, the amendment proposed by my colleague would have the same effect as Mr. Jowhari's amendment, which we already negated. I imagine that, even if we debate it all over again, we'll reach the same conclusions. All the members said that there must be a debate in the House as soon as possible. To some extent, Ms. Lapointe is trying to reword Mr. Jowhari's amendment, and I don't think that there's any point in debating the issue yet again.

No doubt, my colleague is aware that her amendment has a similar objective to that of Mr. Jowhari's amendment. I don't know then whether her amendment is in order.

[English]

**The Chair:** As you asked a very specific question, Monsieur Simard, on your point of order, I'll let the clerk weigh in, as it was directed to the clerk.

Go ahead, Mr. Clerk.

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

[Translation]

The first time around, the government was being asked to provide a response pursuant to Standing Order 109. That section sets out the number of days within which the government must respond and allows a debate to be held in the House. However, even if Mr. Jowhari's amendment had carried, the committee could have tabled its report immediately. In my opinion, Ms. Lapointe is proposing we wait and table the report once we've concluded our consideration of the Trans Mountain project and finalized our report.

In my opinion, these are two separate motions. Mr. Jowhari's amendment sought to table the report immediately but then wait for the government's response. Ms. Lapointe's amendment seeks to wait until both the study and the report are completed before tabling the report. In my opinion, those are two different motions and I would say that the motion is in order.

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Monsieur Simard, I hope that clarifies the motion and the admissibility of it for colleagues around the table here.

Ms. Lapointe, you were in mid-sentence, so I go back to you.

• (1135)

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

[Translation]

I thank my colleague Mr. Simard for his comments. That said, I think it's important to discuss the points raised this morning by my Conservative colleagues.

[English]

They made statements that these are delaying tactics and that we're avoiding having this come before the House. I would suggest that just the opposite is the case. This is about ensuring that we have a thorough debate in the House. Really, a thorough debate can only happen if we include all of the testimony that we heard rather than just testimony from one specific witness.

The purpose of the TMX study—which we've been working on since September—is to hear from the experts and to make recommendations to the government. We heard from witnesses, and it's important that we not be seen, as a committee, as disregarding their very important and valuable testimony.

They provided expertise on a number of fronts. We heard from witnesses who talked to us about—

**The Chair:** Ms. Lapointe, I have another point of order from Mr. Lake.

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

**Hon. Mike Lake:** Again, just to be clear, the witnesses have been heard from. That testimony is all public, and this is clearly a delay tactic on behalf of the government.

We're in a public meeting right now. Anybody watching this meeting—and I'm sure we will make sure that more people see it—will see that there is a public discussion wherein the Liberal members are very clearly and repeatedly trying to delay a debate about this important issue in the House of Commons.

**The Chair:** Mr. Lake, with regard to your point of order, this was addressed earlier, and you are now engaging in debate.

I do actually have you on the list after Ms. Lapointe, so you can make the same points that you're making on this point of order when you have the opportunity to debate.

I would like to let you know that, yes, this was a public meeting. This information has been provided to, or is accessible by, the members of the public, but the final report and recommendations have not been approved by this committee at this point. We have not gone through that process. Just from a procedural understanding of where we are, that's where we're at.

Thank you for your point of clarification, I will say, and I look forward to your debate when you're up next.

**Hon. Mike Lake:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Ms. Lapointe, I'm going to go back to you. Go ahead.

**Ms. Viviane Lapointe:** Thank you for providing that clarification, Mr. Chair.

Again, I'm going to repeat that this is about ensuring that the witnesses we brought forward who had expertise on a number of fronts be included and that the report be before us when we go to the House.

Some of the witnesses spoke to us about the economic, safety and indigenous community impacts as well. I would suggest that when we, as a committee, all agreed to take on this study, what we wanted was to hold the government to account. The report will provide that more complete and thorough review with all of the witnesses' testimony, as well as the recommendations that may ensue from that report.

The final point that I will make—and I know that my colleague MP Dabrusin made it, but I think it's important because I did start by saying that process is important—is that every report this committee has made since the beginning of this session required the Government of Canada to table the reports. It is the accepted process that has been adopted by this committee and other committees. The reports that we've seen where this occurred include the report on the climate crisis in Canada's energy sector. There are a number of reports that we know of, such as the report on the fair and equitable energy transformation, and there are many others.

I would conclude by saying that in terms of process, I think it is important that we follow that due process. In terms of accountability and in terms of ensuring a good and complete debate, I think it is important that we do that with the full range of witnesses and testimony that we heard.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

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

I am going to go to the next speaker on our list, and that is Monsieur Simard on the amendment.

• (1140)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Mario Simard:** I'll be frank: I'm prepared to vote immediately, since Ms. Lapointe's arguments were already raised during the debate on Mr. Jowhari's amendment. I think that all of my colleagues were quite clear in that regard. We voted.

I understand that my Liberal colleagues are using the excuse that they'd like to have the full study before there's a debate in the House. However everyone here heard what the witnesses had to say. If we're doing our jobs properly, we know the facts and the ins and outs of pipeline purchase.

I think, then, that we can easily hold the debate in the House. I'm going to repeat myself yet again: in my opinion, the amendment is repetitive. We can chew gum and walk at the same time. We can hold a debate in the House and wait until later to finalize the com-

mittee's report, and we'll be no worse off. In my opinion, we can do both, and I invite my Liberal colleagues to, perhaps, have a little more courage and to face up to this issue, which would rebound in the House.

I'm ready to proceed immediately with the vote on my colleague's amendment.

[*English*]

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

We do have another speaker on the list. Then we'll try to get to a vote.

Go ahead, Mr. Angus.

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

I am very concerned by what I think is a clear pattern from my Liberal colleagues to filibuster this motion and keep us from presenting to Parliament the findings of the Parliamentary Budget Officer.

I have a number of concerns. It was one of the reasons I pushed for a study of TMX. I think it speaks to the underlying falsehood of the Prime Minister's promise to Canadians and the Prime Minister's promise to the world.

We remember the Prime Minister at COP26 saying that Canada was back and that we were going to be an environmental leader. He had no intention—ever—of following through on that. We had the environment commissioner, Mr. DeMarco, come before our committee and say that Canada has missed every single target it has established under this Prime Minister. We are now the outlier of the G7. Canada is leading the world in increased oil production while they tell us that they are going to address increasing emissions.

Mr. Guilbeault regularly makes repeated falsehoods that we are bending the curve on emissions. Well, we are somewhat bending a very tiny bit of a curve, except when it comes to the oil sector, and this is where the government has decided to invest their money. It's been two years since they promised action on the clean energy file. Through that time, for Cenovus and Imperial, for anything they needed in terms of money for the bogus carbon capture schemes, government was there. The \$34-billion TMX pipeline, which had no financial case, they were there for. Under this Prime Minister, we have seen oil production increase 41% over what happened under Stephen Harper.



Why does that matter? It matters because what we know from the IPCC is that every increase in carbon at this point is putting us closer and closer to a dangerous red line from which we don't return. I've found in this Parliament that climate denialism is deeply embedded. It's certainly deeply embedded in my colleagues in the Conservative Party, but it's much more concerning to have nice climate denialism—the climate denialism of the Liberals, who tell us, yes, we can massively increase unrefined bitumen exports around the world, but we won't count it as part of our inventory. It's as though somehow the world won't notice the increase, with Cenovus going from 800,000 to 950,000 barrels of unrefined bitumen a day, if they burn that in the United States or Malaysia or China. It won't affect the atmosphere that Imperial Oil production levels had a 3% increase just this past February. They are now at the highest production levels ever.

The Prime Minister went to COP. He made promises. He made promises of an emissions cap. It's a ridiculous suggestion, if you're going to massively increase production, to then say you're going to put an emissions cap in place. It's part of what the Liberal government says: "Don't worry. Trust us. We're going to get behind the wheel and drive and drink our way to sobriety. You can trust that we'll be safe on the highway." This is not environmental stewardship.

I have a number of concerns about the PBO report. I think it was overly optimistic. I think he ignored a number of key factors, such as changing the net present value to present value, which basically wiped out the massive debt. Canadians want to know who's going to pay to get us whole again after the \$34 billion.

We had the Deputy Prime Minister come and tell our committee that, yes, all that \$34 billion would be paid back, and more. She was going to make money off it. That was either an open falsehood or she hadn't looked at the numbers. The Parliamentary Budget Officer, even though I believe he has overly optimistic scenarios, says that's impossible and that we are going to lose money.

The issue before us is that Mr. Simard has moved a motion that we should present the PBO's report to Parliament. That's reasonable. Normally, I would suggest that it's reasonable to do it within a larger study, and I get that, but the TMX is not a normal study. The TMX was not a normal investment. The TMX investment was this Prime Minister going all in on betting on oil infrastructure when the International Energy Agency was saying not to do this and when the IPCC was saying not to invest in this kind of infrastructure.

● (1145)

This is the Prime Minister's legacy project, a legacy that will impact Canadians for generations to come, so it deserves to be brought to Parliament as well as undergo a full study with all the witnesses. They don't preclude one another and they don't erase one another, but what is being erased here is our ability to get our reports done because the Liberals are filibustering. They're filibustering because they don't want the issue of TMX to be brought to the House.

I reject this attempt to continue to obstruct this effort on our committee's part to bring the PBO report to Parliament so that parliamentarians can discuss it. I reject the filibustering and I reject the falsehoods of a Prime Minister who promised to be an environmen-

tal leader while Canada is now the laggard of the G7 and our planet burns.

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

I'm going to go to Ms. Dabrusin.

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** Actually, I was originally just going to let it go to a vote, but I feel like there are a few things I have to respond to in that one.

Do you know what? It might be really hard to see from the inside of a Maserati as we drive down that highway, but things are changing in Canada. In fact...

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:** I see what you did there. That was good.

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** I appreciate that.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** Hold my drink.

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** We are actually seeing our emissions going down as a country. The most recent report from the Canadian Climate Institute supports that, but our own inventory report to the IPCC said the same thing.

Under the previous Conservative government, our emissions were going up. There was no tracking down. Now they are bending down, and we are continuing to do the heavy lifting to make that happen. Our emissions are actually lower than they have been in 25 years, and that's a huge move forward.

I could respond to a whole bunch of things that the member opposite, Mr. Angus, just said, but I don't want us to take too much more time before we get to this vote, except just to say that he was incorrect about the emissions—they are going down—and to say that there is, in fact, a lot of work that's happening, including the cap on emissions from oil and gas and including the work that we've done with carbon pricing, which his leader has chosen to step away from. That was an interesting choice, but again, maybe it's because it has become expensive for him with his choice of vehicle.

On that point, I say let's go to a vote.

**The Chair:** We will go to a vote soon, but we have three more speakers. I'm going to go to Mr. Simard, Mrs. Gray and Mr. Patzer.

Mr. Simard, you have the floor.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Mario Simard:** I just want to come back to what my colleague Mr. Angus said earlier. Because I don't drive a Maserati but rather a Hyundai, which isn't quite as sexy, I clearly understand and share Mr. Angus's analysis.

The PBO came to tell us not only that a significant amount of money will never be recovered and that market conditions will make any attempt by the government to recover a portion of its investment extremely difficult, but also that as a consequence, we'll be beholden to oil and gas for 40 years.

I'd also like to quickly and simply remind you of the figures provided by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change or IPCC. They told us that, if we want to keep the rise in average temperature to 1.5 degrees Celsius, we need to reduce our oil consumption by 62%, depending on new technologies such as carbon capture and sequestration. Otherwise, the IPCC says that we need to reduce our oil consumption by 70%, which I don't think is consistent with the use of a pipeline over a 40-year period.

For all those reasons, I believe we must hold that debate in the House.

• (1150)

[English]

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

I will now go to Mrs. Gray.

Mrs. Gray, you have the floor.

**Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

With respect to the original motion, this is an important motion, and it's good that this is brought forward. The statements from the Parliamentary Budget Officer were very revealing and really need to be discussed in the House. The amendments that have been brought forth by the Liberals are part of a continual trend of not wanting to address the serious issues and to push things under the rug. They're filibustering rather than voting for a good motion that we should be able to move forward with very quickly. Bringing forth these ongoing amendments without just looking at the original motion....

One thing with the original motion that is solid is that it's right to the point and is something that all parties will be able to speak to carefully and address. It's unfortunate that the Liberals keep bringing forth these amendments in order to shut down the opportunity to move forward with this good motion.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mrs. Gray.

I'll now go to Mr. Patzer.

Mr. Patzer, you have the floor.

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

I want to add a few thoughts to this as well.

I think it's quite clear, and I think Charlie was correct, that the government is clearly trying to filibuster. They don't want to have their failure on the Trans Mountain pipeline brought up in the House of Commons. That's why they're trying to kick this down the road as far as they possibly can and just hope that maybe if something happens—I don't know; maybe an election—it would prevent it from happening, or maybe they want to prorogue Parliament. Maybe that would be something that would happen as well. Who knows?

We know that their clearly stated objective is to delay this motion as long as they possibly can. My hope is that we can get to the point

of passing the original motion, as it was written, or as we have it before us, without any further amendment.

When you look at the cost that's tied on to this, \$34 billion, the PBO was pretty clear.... It's not the first time that a committee has requested a Parliamentary Budget Officer's report to be concurred in prior to a committee study being finished. We see this every now and then from different committees.

This report is a pretty substantive report. Any time you're talking about \$34 billion, that's enough of a report in and of itself. If the Parliamentary Budget Officer has made the case that the government stands to take a loss, that should be a five-alarm fire for everybody, regardless of their feelings.

I absolutely think that we should be having a debate as soon as we can get one on the government's handling of the pipeline and the finances of it, as per the PBO report, and I'd like to see that happen tomorrow if we could. I know that's not going to happen, but that's the kind of urgency that we should see with this issue.

I would think the government would want to get up and speak to it as well, as soon as possible, and not want to wait 120 days. I think for them it would be urgent to try to build confidence with Canadians. I think the fact that they want to kick it down the road shows just how scared they are to have that debate. They know that they can't defend their record on it because they know that it's been an absolute failure, even just on the financial side, let alone other issues here.

I'm ready to vote and I hope we can pass the original motion.

• (1155)

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

Mr. Patzer, if you're ready, I think colleagues on committee might be ready as well.

I'm looking for any last hands and taking one last glance around the horseshoe here and online.

There's nothing. Okay, let's vote, Mr. Clerk.

Please start the roll call.

**Mr. Ziad Aboultaif:** It's on the amendment.

**The Chair:** Yes, it's on the amendment of Ms. Lapointe. Thank you for that, Mr. Aboultaif.

The vote is on the amendment that Miss Lapointe brought forward.

Are we all clear on what we're voting on? Okay.

(Motion negated: nays 6; yeas 5 [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** We are now back on the main motion that was previously amended.

I don't have anybody on the speaking order at this point, but I'm going to take a glance across the room. Once I look across the room, I will eventually look online.

Ms. Dabrusin, I'll recognize you. I'm looking at folks online as well.

Go ahead, Ms. Dabrusin.

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** I'll be really quick.

I just want clarify that I think I've been clear in every intervention that I've had that I have no problem with debating our record on this in the House of Commons. My issue has been with the process and not with having the study go forward. At no time has it been to not actually have the issue at large discussed. I still don't like the way this is going forward. I do still think that we should have the complete study with our recommendations rather than just the PBO report, which is just one piece of evidence that came to us.

On that, I'm happy to go to a vote.

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

Before we get to a vote, we have some additional speakers.

Go ahead, Mr. Angus.

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

I think it is really important for the record to point out that one does not preclude the other, because the Parliamentary Budget Officer is not just a witness. I would think it would be very uncommon or questionable if we said that we liked one witness and wanted their testimony brought to the House of Commons.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer reports to Parliament; that's his job. This is a different factor in comparison to a professor or somebody from a company or an NGO with regard to whom we would try to extract testimony for the study. It's a simple thing to ask Parliament to reflect on the report of the Parliamentary Budget Officer. Then there will be the full report with all the witness testimony. That's really important, I think, for the public to know.

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

Do you have your hand up, Mr. Simard? No, okay. You were just raising your hand in joy and excitement.

All right, colleagues, I'll give one last glance, a very quick glance....

Mr. Aboultaif, if you're going to ask me, the answer is that we're voting on the main motion that was previously amended.

I think everybody's clear, and if you're not, we can read it into the record once. However, if you are clear, we will proceed to a vote.

(Motion as amended agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** I have Mr. Aboultaif. Then I'm going to go to you, Mr. Angus.

Go ahead, Mr. Aboultaif.

• (1200)

**Mr. Ziad Aboultaif:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I just want to move a motion on behalf of my colleague, Mrs. Stubbs.

The motion is as follows:

Given the government's draft regulations for an emissions cap on the oil and gas sector, the committee conduct a study and the following witnesses be invited to appear, separately, for at least an hour each:

The Minister of Energy and Natural Resources,

The Minister of Environment and Climate Change,

The Minister of Labour and Seniors,

and that other witnesses be invited to appear as submitted by members of the committee.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Aboultaif, for moving a motion.

I'm going to get hands up here.

I'll go to Ms. Dabrusin and then I'll go to Mr. Angus.

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** I support this motion, but I would propose an amendment to remove "The Minister of Labour and Seniors" from the study list. I'm not really sure how he frames into this conversation.

**Mr. Ted Falk:** All those workers.... Don't you care about the workers?

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** I would say that I would support this study, but....

**An hon. member:** But not Randy.

**An hon. member:** Oh, oh! Randy, yes.

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** — I don't know if you need specific wording for the amendment I moved.

**An hon. member:** [*Inaudible—Editor*] the other Randy.

**The Chair:** I'm sorry, Ms. Dabrusin. Can you just clarify what you were just saying? There was a lot of chatter, and I just want to make sure that it's clear.

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** I just want it to be clear.

My amendment that I'm proposing is to remove "The Minister of Labour and Seniors" from the witness list.

**Mr. Ted Falk:** You mean the other Randy.

**The Chair:** We have an amendment by Ms. Dabrusin, a deletion.

I'm going to go to Mr. Angus.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I agree with my colleague.

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

I see some heads nodding in agreement.

Mr. Patzer, go ahead.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** But I would prefer Randy.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:** I quickly want to say that the reason the labour minister would be of utmost importance is that we have seen various groups come out and talk about reports that have been done. There's the Business Council. There was Deloitte. Another one or two have done it. They've talked about the potential for tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of jobs lost because of an emissions cap, which would be ultimately a production cap.

To get the labour minister, whenever there is one appointed, here to talk about it, assuming that Randy is no longer....

Has there been one appointed?

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** Do you mean for Minister of Labour?

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:** Sorry, have I got the wrong.... ? Oh, he was workforce development. That was my mistake. I thought Randy was the.... It's my mistake.

**Mr. Ted Falk:** It's the other Randy.

**Mr. Jeremy Patzer:** There we go.

My point is that having the labour minister come and talk about the impact on jobs that the emissions cap would have.... There are multiple reports out there talking about how devastating it will be to employment in the country, which shows that it would be absolutely important to have the labour minister come and talk about it.

**The Chair:** We have Ms. Dabrusin's amendment on the deletion. I don't see any other speakers looking to speak, so we will proceed to a vote.

Is it clear for everyone what we're voting on? It's deleting the line, "The Minister of Labour and Seniors".

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Motion as amended agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** That carries unanimously.

I will go to you, Mr. Angus.

• (1205)

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

I want to bring up the committee business that has been an open file and unfinished business.

We remember that we had asked Mr. Jackson Wijaya to come and testify about his takeover of multiple Canadian mills, and he refused to testify, which I find very concerning.

Just this past month we learned, through the European anti-monopoly regulators, that Mr. Wijaya's group, Paper Excellence, admitted that they are the Asia Pulp & Paper company. They admitted that to European regulators, but they told the Canadian government that there was absolutely no connection whatsoever between this new entity that they created, Paper Excellence—which took control of Domtar, Northern Pulp, Resolute and other mills—and Asia Pulp & Paper, and we now know that was false. I think it's incumbent upon our committee to send another invitation for Mr. Wijaya to come and testify—including a subpoena if necessary—and that we bring forward officials who had investigated and assured us about Asia Pulp & Paper not being connected with Paper Excellence.

Why is this important? Well, Asia Pulp & Paper has a notorious environmental track record. I don't think anyone would have opened the door to Asia Pulp & Paper or the Wijaya family coming in to take over Canadian forestry operations if it were known that they are Asia Pulp & Paper—hence the creation of Paper Excel-

lence as the Trojan Horse to get into Canada. What's concerning is that the track record and the paper trail of the connection of Asia Pulp & Paper to the Wijayas was so clear from the beginning. We need to know how they were able to hoodwink Canadian officials and get control of our mills.

I'm not going to go into this for too long.

What do we know? At the height of it is a group called Sinar Mas, which is controlled entirely by the Wijaya family. Asia Pulp & Paper was founded by Eka Wijaya, under Sinar Mas. This Asia Pulp & Paper China company is situated in the White Magnolia Plaza in Shanghai, in a building known as the Sinar Mas plaza. We know that Jackson Wijaya, one of the key members of the Wijaya clan, established their Canadian presence through Paper Excellence, and that when they were being set up, they received a bank loan at an extremely low rate of 0.1% from a Chinese bank controlled by the Wijaya family. From the beginning, this should have set off alarm bells about financing from Chinese authorities for Canadian natural resources, but there are many other serious concerns being raised.

Mac Anderson from MacKenzie Fibre testified to a B.C. legislative committee that "Paper Excellence is owned by a company called Sinar Mas." He then said further that "Guys at Shanghai were reviewing what I was doing." How is it possible that Paper Excellence—now they're calling themselves Domtar again—can claim to be a Canadian company if we have employees who said that they were being directed by Shanghai operations over Canadian pulp and paper operations?

According to media reports, there was a former manager at the APP Shanghai office who described the expansion into Canada as a "fibre grab". He said, "They want to keep the perception that Paper Excellence is an asset for Canada of Canada for Canada and by Canada, but in reality, it's a feeder for the Chinese machine." We need to know whether our mills, some of which have been shut down, and some of which have faced environmental penalties since they were taken over by Paper Excellence, are being managed for the good and the interests of Canadian operations or as feeders for the Chinese machine?

The Halifax Examiner also raised serious questions that decisions were not being made at the Paper Excellence headquarters in Richmond, British Columbia, but at the APP offices in Shanghai. At that point there was a direct link that APP was controlling our mills, yet we had Minister Champagne and his staff tell us that they couldn't find any connection whatsoever. This is either the ultimate example of Canadian officials being hoodwinked or not wanting to know the connection, but we need to know that connection because Sinar Mas and Asia Pulp & Paper have a long list of allegations of environment damage.

• (1210)

There have been massive international campaigns against APP because of the massive burnings in Indonesia and destruction of their peat ecosystems and the loss of their FSC forestry certification licences under APP.

We don't need that kind of negative corporate track record when it comes to Canada's mills. We want to have the highest standards and we want to know that the people who are running our mills are willing to maintain that highest standard.

I have brought forward a motion that I'd like to read into the record:

That, in light of recent reports that Jackson Wijaya and Paper Excellence are about to take control of Asia Pulp and Paper (APP), and given that Paper Excellence and the Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry assured this committee there is no connection between Paper Excellence and Asia Pulp & Paper; at the discretion of the chair, and within 10 days of the passage of this motion, the committee call Jackson Wijaya; the Minister of Innovation, Science and Industry; and representatives from the International Forest Stewardship Council to testify in regard to the impact of such a takeover and whether the control of 22 million hectares of Canadian forests and multiple dependent mill towns by Asia Pulp and Paper represents a "net benefit" to Canada.

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

I'll now go to Ms. Dabrusin.

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

I actually think it's a good idea to have Mr. Wijaya come to speak, so I am happy to do that. However, I was going to propose an amendment to replace "within 10 days of the passage of this motion" with "as soon as possible".

The only reason I am suggesting that is that I wouldn't want Mr. Wijaya to be able to say, "Oh, I wasn't able to come within 10 days" and then have the wiggle room not to appear. "Within 10 days of the passage of this motion" would be great, but I think that it would be better if we leave it to "as soon as possible" so that we don't give that kind of wiggle room.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Mr. Angus, go ahead.

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** I appreciate that, and I'm certainly open to that discussion.

However, I'm wondering if the interpretation could be that within 10 days we're asking you, Chair, to issue this call to him. We're not expecting that he's going to show up here by December 22 but that you will initiate this process immediately to start calling him. You would then come back and tell us when he is available.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Go ahead, Ms. Dabrusin.

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** Do we need to change anything in the wording of the motion? I agree with what Mr. Angus has just proposed. Does something need to be changed to the wording in terms of my amendment?

**Mr. Charlie Angus:** That's how we interpreted it, so I would turn it over to the clerk to see if the way we wrote it wasn't clear enough.

**The Chair:** We'll just take a moment for the clerk to review. I'll actually just suspend for a moment.

• (1215) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (1215)

**The Chair:** We do have a motion on the floor with an amendment.

I'm going to go back to you, Ms. Dabrusin, on the amendment.

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** I think I have had the clarification that I need, and hearing the way Mr. Angus described it, I am happy to withdraw my amendment.

**The Chair:** Very good.

Colleagues, we have a motion on the floor brought forward by Mr. Angus.

I'm going to look across the room. I don't see any further hands up, which means that we will proceed—

Go ahead, Mr. Falk.

**Mr. Ted Falk:** I won't take a lot of your time, but in reading the motion, I don't see a date that's been specified as to when we would like to see these representatives.

Is that intentional, Charlie, or did you have something in mind—through you, Chair?

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

I will go to Mr. Angus.

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

What was intentional was that the chair will reach out to Mr. Wijaya.

We have gone through this before. The process is that you ask them politely. Mr. Wijaya said that he was too busy to talk to Canadian parliamentarians about his Canadian operations. We were going to follow up with a summons, but then we got caught up with other business.

I think the chair and the clerk should come back to us and say whether they are willing to meet and how soon they can meet. If we then have questions about them delaying that, there are further steps we can take, but the first step is for the chair to reach out.

Of course, I invite Mr. Champagne any day of the week. I'd like to see him here, but I trust the chair on that.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Let's proceed to a vote.

(Motion agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0)

**The Chair:** I will now go to Ms. Dabrusin.

• (1220)

**Ms. Julie Dabrusin:** I believe that we saved the time for the second half of this meeting to do some report studying, so I move to another order of business so that we may move in camera.

**The Chair:** I don't see any objections to that, so we have consent to do so.

We will now move into camera, and we will suspend for the transition. It may take about 10 minutes.

We're suspended.

*[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>