



House of Commons  
CANADA

# **Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development**

---

ENVI • NUMBER 022 • 1st SESSION • 39th PARLIAMENT

---

**EVIDENCE**

**Thursday, November 2, 2006**

**Chair**

**Mr. Bob Mills**

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address:

**<http://www.parl.gc.ca>**

# Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

Thursday, November 2, 2006

● (0900)

[English]

**The Chair (Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, CPC)):** I just mention a couple of things in getting started today. The first one is related to the timing of the meeting. We will go to the time posted in our agenda. For instance, today the meeting will end at eleven o'clock, except by unanimous consent that we carry on, or by a motion—that is, majority rule—that we in fact carry on beyond our posted time. Basically, that's how we'll operate from now on, so as not to have the confusion that we seem to have gotten into a couple of times.

**Hon. John Godfrey (Don Valley West, Lib.):** Look how well it worked out for us.

**The Chair:** Yes, but I think it's good to make it clear off the top that this is what we'll do.

Yes.

[Translation]

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez (Honoré-Mercier, Lib.):** I have no problem with the decision, Mr. Chair, but I would like to know if this is a ruling or if we are changing the rules?

[English]

I have no problem with the decision, Chair, but I am wondering if this is a ruling or if we're changing the rules with this. Are we voting on something?

**The Chair:** No, I don't believe it's any change of the rules. After having gone through all of the books and all of the records, I think it's an interpretation that this is the way we should operate. It is therefore my suggestion that it is how we will operate from now on. I think it's the chair's prerogative to make it so, just so it's clear for everyone. Obviously majority rules at that eleven o'clock hour, or whatever time it is, and we'll carry on from there.

Yes.

**Mr. Mark Warawa (Langley, CPC):** Just for clarification, Mr. Chair, you've mentioned two options. You said there could be unanimous consent.

**The Chair:** Yes, to carry on past the hour posted.

**Mr. Mark Warawa:** Yes, and I think that would be the norm in terms of changing the agenda. But then you went on to say that if—

**The Chair:** If there isn't unanimous consent, the only other way we could carry on beyond that would be through a majority vote. A motion moved—

**Mr. Mark Warawa:** So without unanimous consent, you would call for a vote?

**The Chair:** I'd call for a vote, yes.

Yes.

**Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, CPC):** Just as a comment, there was great confusion the other day. There is one example that I'll tell you about, and I assume we're getting some more from the clerk at some point. It occurred about three weeks ago in a different context, in a 140-year-old Parliament. As you caught on, Bob, I was very distressed by that.

Others have been around this place, and obviously it's the call of the chair if a meeting completes at a particular time. I've served at a more recent time in this committee and other committees, and if we had a posted time, that was what we went by unless we were into clause-by-clause and that type of thing. But the chair has always had the prerogative to state it was an open-ended meeting, meaning that it started at nine o'clock, with no closing date. There was an assumption that, yes, it was maybe unending, but when we had posted times in other committees....

This is wisdom from other committees, and the clerk may cross-reference as well. But we do have other plans around this place and our whole lives are not taken up by this committee. As important as this august body is, it is a little bit unsettling to have to cancel other crucial appointments because somebody has a different issue or agenda that day.

● (0905)

**The Chair:** Going back to my history of fourteen years in this place, when we have needed to finish an item, we've always simply finished the item. If it took an extra ten minutes to hear a witness or to ask questions, that's what we did.

We don't have to operate that way, and I'm suggesting that we don't operate that way as of today. I'm saying that the way we operate will be that, at the appointed time, the meeting ends unless there's consensus to carry on. If there is no consensus, somebody puts a motion. If a majority says we carry on, then we carry on. That seems to settle that issue, and we move on.

I don't think we need to discuss that much further, do we?

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** Last time, during the debate, I called for a vote on what we were discussing. You said you couldn't interrupt the debate, so we went on. They wanted to interrupt at eleven but they couldn't, so you said we'd have to go on. What's going to happen next time if it has to end at eleven and there's a motion calling for a vote? Do we take the vote at eleven when it finishes, or—

**The Chair:** We'll take the vote at eleven o'clock. If a majority says we carry on, we either stay in the room we're in or we find another room.

The clerk will provide documentation of some of this for Mr. Vellacott.

**Mr. Maurice Vellacott:** I don't think we should be in a rush in the last few minutes to get 100% consensus on this. Pablo has possibly more things, and maybe others would. I don't think this should be necessarily the end of it, but if you want to use that as guidance for the present....

I don't think, Mr. Chair, that to be pressured into conceding, in a few minutes, something for the future and eternity is fair to any of us. I feel a little forced to be pressured into making decisions on the fly like this.

**The Chair:** I'm trying to clarify things so that we don't get into that confusion at the appointed hour. To me that is a pretty good solution.

I really think you will understand the flow of the meeting. You'll know the witnesses if in fact you want to hear more. I think it's pretty unfortunate if we have to live by that rigid, eleven o'clock, no matter what...even if everybody agrees that we want to hear a witness. I'm more worried about the witnesses than I am about anything else.

**An hon. member:** I'm more worried about my privileges.

**Mr. Maurice Vellacott:** I concede that, Bob, on the fact that if we go a few minutes over.... That's been done at other committees, and I didn't want to mislead or give an impression otherwise, but the issue is if it's going an hour over, that's a little different from a witness being five minutes over.

**The Chair:** I agree.

**Mr. Mark Warawa:** I too don't want to spend a lot of time on this, but what you said as a guide, as a procedure that you're suggesting, is that if we've only got a minute or thirty seconds left at a meeting, you end everything and the meeting ends with a vote, which is what happened before—and a point of order was ignored.

So I think we need to discuss this a little bit more. Procedurally I think what is being suggested is not correct, and you do not have consensus to follow that procedure at this time.

**The Chair:** I'm just putting it forward as a suggestion.

**Mr. Mark Warawa:** If we could maybe discuss that a little further...but at this point, when we reach the time of eleven o'clock, if you want to have it continue that sounds reasonable, but to say that it will be a vote, and if we do not have a majority then you're going to force a vote, procedurally I don't believe that's correct.

**The Chair:** Can the clerk comment?

**The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Eugene Morawski):** You are correct. It takes a majority of the members to keep the committee

going, basically. It takes a majority of the members by a motion to keep going or to adjourn, and that would be non-debatable.

**Mr. Mark Warawa:** You can adjourn and continue the debate at the next meeting, if you wish, without having to force a vote.

**The Chair:** Is that what you're saying?

**The Clerk:** To adjourn you'd have to have a motion. If the committee is on, say, a point of order or debating and we get to eleven o'clock and the member wants to keep talking, we can't adjourn unless there's a motion—a motion to adjourn.

• (0910)

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** Can we call the vote on the subject we're talking about?

**The Chair:** No. Debate would carry on.

I'm just trying to suggest something so that we don't have confusion and that we settle it before we get into another situation like that.

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** I asked the same question and I got a different answer five minutes ago, so I just want to make sure.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Mills I think was trying to establish the procedure, not a ruling or anything. The procedure is basic. It takes a majority of the members to adjourn the meeting, as simple as that. So if you're still going, you're still going. That's the bottom line.

**Mr. Mark Warawa:** That's the only objection I had, that we won't force the vote if we're not ready for a vote.

**Mr. Maurice Vellacott:** [*Inaudible—Editor*]...the clerk was going to convey to us.

**The Clerk:** It's only in English, but we can get the French. It's from the Journals from 1971, a Speaker's ruling. It basically says the same thing, a majority of members—if you want to read it.

**The Chair:** I don't think we need to spend any more time on that.

The second item I wanted to bring up again was a tradition of this committee. When we put forward a list of witnesses, the normal way we've handled that in the past is that each party puts forward a list of members. I would like this committee to instruct the clerk and his associates that he make sure to have a rounded group for the panel, that in fact we don't have all from one group or all from the other group, that in fact we have members from both groups or as much as possible not just one group, and that we don't have repeat witnesses serving on four or five round tables. Any comments on that?

So I would like your direction—and this is all I'm asking, to get direction to the clerk so that he hears it from all of you that in fact he is instructed to take the lists and to get members from all of those lists as much as possible, so that we never end up with a group from just one list or the other, and that in fact we don't recall the same people over and over, committee after committee.

Mr. Warawa.

**Mr. Mark Warawa:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think your suggestion is good. I just want a clarification, though.

You're talking procedurally for all future meetings, whether it be for Bill C-288 or the CEPA review—

**The Chair:** No, I'm talking about Bill C-288, specifically, because we have lists now from everybody. I'm just saying that it would be good to clear the air now; that the clerk gets the instructions from this committee, that he does not have members from just one list at any given round table that we would have in the future.

**Mr. Mark Warawa:** I feel that's fair and I think it will work quite well, and it's a procedure that should be followed for all topics of discussion.

**The Chair:** As you know, with CEPA, those are the instructions we've been working under, and I think they have worked quite well.

I'm suggesting let's do that right now, because we're faced with long lists, and let's not have them all from.... The clerk and Tim and so on are faced with the difficult task of getting people here, but if we give them those instructions, then that's how it should work.

Are there any other comments on that or any problems with that? Is everybody in agreement?

Mr. Cullen.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP):** I'm looking at the two lists we have before us today and the balance between expediting this bill through and a thorough assessment of the implications of the bill. I'm still not convinced, looking at the number of meetings available, that the balance is there. I'm just not sure that in one, two, three, four meetings—

**The Chair:** Could we do that when we get into the work plan, Mr. Cullen? I think maybe that's where that could be dealt with.

I'm just suggesting a principle that we follow.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** I thought we were into the work plan. Sorry.

**The Chair:** Well, let's get there, but I want consensus so that we give clear direction to the staff about getting witnesses.

Are there any problems with that for anybody? Good.

Let's move on then to item one that we have here, Mr. Warawa's motion. I believe everybody has a copy of it.

Mr. Warawa.

**Mr. Mark Warawa:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This is an item left over from our last meeting, and I was actually quite pleased with the spirit of cooperation that we all saw at our last meeting.

I did, at our last meeting, express concern that CEPA appeared to be shelved for the time being, and as you all know, I think it's a high priority that we need to deal with. Again, in a spirit of compromise and the willingness to keep the momentum of the CEPA review ongoing and the list of witnesses we have, I've represented in this motion that I'd be willing to work within the committee an extra day a week so that we could keep the CEPA going.

What's being proposed in the work plan for Bill C-288 is that we meet Tuesdays and Thursdays at our normal hours. We could then continue on with the CEPA review in an additional meeting per week. This would show support for CEPA and the review, which is a legislative requirement. We have to finish. The plan was that we

were going to have a report tabled in December, and hopefully we can still strive to meet that goal.

So I hope for your support.

● (0915)

**The Chair:** Mr. Godfrey.

**Hon. John Godfrey (Don Valley West, Lib.):** Well, I understand and have some sympathy for that point of view. It seems to me, though, our world has changed since the motion was put forward. We now find ourselves moving forward on the clean air bill after first reading, and while it will be going to a special legislative committee, I suspect that many of the people around this table will be part of that special legislative committee. I would assume that many of us would want to be.

Ironically, of course, the bulk of the work around the clean air bill will be about CEPA. It is an amendment to CEPA. Mr. Warawa was not to know what the conclusion of those negotiations were when he put forward his motion, but I think realistically for those of us who.... We don't know for certain which of us will be there, but I suspect that we'll be doing double shift, as it is, with the environment committee on Bill C-288, and then some of us will be on the special committee, so that to add a third burden would be unreasonable, particularly since we will be discussing CEPA.

I think it would be very important, by the way, for as many of us as are around the table to be part of that special committee, because we've been prepped on CEPA. To go out and find other people who have not been studying it, as we have since May, would be very unproductive. It's rather ironic, actually.

I think in the context of the new responsibilities that many of us will have, I would have to vote against this, simply because—you weren't to know—I think we can't—

**The Chair:** Mr. Bigras.

[Translation]

**Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, BQ):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We should give this a little more thought and consider the consequences of passing this type of motion, since a special committee will be examining the Clean Air Act. Since the members of this committee will probably sit on the next one, this could make their work more cumbersome.

We could ensure that our committee and the one that we will strike will respect both the spirit of the resolution and the parliamentary secretary's motion.

It will not be easy to accommodate both committees, so we should tread carefully in considering adding another Standing Committee meeting.

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. Harvey.

[Translation]

**Mr. Luc Harvey (Louis-Hébert, CPC):** I was, for a while, on the committee that studied Bill C-2. We spent 20 hours a week on that bill. Currently, we are sitting 4 hours a week. In my opinion, adding an extra 2 hours should not be a problem, particularly since the new committee examining the Clean Air Act will not begin sitting for another two weeks.

So we could devote four to six hours to CEPA, which is important. We want to deal with it quickly, and I think that can be done within the next two weeks. The testimony that we hear may help us when we move on to air quality.

● (0920)

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. Watson

**Mr. Jeff Watson (Essex, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I don't want to suggest anything cynical, but let me just suggest a scenario. I would be interested to find out what the opposition think of something like this. In order to keep the CEPA review going, if we were to alternate days with Bill C-288, and push back the timeline, I submit there would probably be some howling from the other side.

Quite frankly, I think they're dressing up an argument on this one. I think we should go for an additional meeting. There is no guarantee that someone like me is going to end up on the Clean Air Act. I would like to keep going with the CEPA review, so we don't lose momentum and it doesn't get lost in the shuffle. I think it is a priority.

I think we've been accommodating with respect to the need to get on with Bill C-288 and some of those things. I suggest that it would be good faith from the opposition to accede to this additional requirement. Let's get on with the CEPA review.

**The Chair:** Mr. Cullen.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** It is a difficult one. I understand the intention of what Mr. Warawa is suggesting.

I do share some concerns with Mr. Godfrey in terms of basic participation. For many of us, this would be five committee meetings a week over the next little while, along with the other files we have to deal with.

It almost feels a bit out of order in a sense, because my interest in getting to the Bill C-288 action plan would determine what we're able to do. I made suggestions that there be some interspersing of CEPA within our work plan so as not to allow a loss of momentum with that study. There are a number of groups we deal with in business and environment who are worried.

The problem, though, as Mr. Godfrey pointed out...Bill C-50, in a sense, is almost entirely a CEPA review; it is a change to CEPA to allow certain outcomes. The CEPA review process feels almost academic compared to what the government has suggested in their Clean Air Act. That has concrete suggestions, producing concrete results, which can be debated, as opposed to just any general recommendations.

I also feel we are near the end of our CEPA review. I am not sure how much more we have and how much more we need. That will be something the clerk or the chair might be able to clarify.

**The Chair:** I am advised that there are seven topics left. That's seven meetings. That is just to get to the draft report. Then, of course, we'd have to have time on the draft report.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Just to clarify for the committee, as a minimum, we're talking about approximately ten meetings. The initial impetus was to try to get this done before Christmas. We don't have ten weeks, first of all, so this motion wouldn't necessarily allow us to get there.

Frankly, I think we're at a bit of a crossroads as to where our priorities lie.

**The Chair:** Mr. Warawa is next.

**Mr. Mark Warawa:** I will add a clarification to what Mr. Cullen has said. The motion says that we'd have one additional meeting per week until the Christmas break; at that point we will be done with Bill C-288, so we could then go back to the CEPA review at full speed. It keeps momentum. It keeps us updated on the issues.

There have been accusations that some do not support CEPA or even a CEPA review. I don't believe that. I believe there is a true desire to support CEPA. It's a good piece of legislation. What we've seen, basically, is Bill C-288 take over from CEPA. CEPA has been put aside. I want to give the committee an opportunity to show in good faith that it is still a priority; it is to us, and hopefully it is to everybody on this committee.

Yes, these are busy times. At the last Parliament I sat on three different committees. I sat on a Bill C-38 special legislative committee; we were meeting for many hours almost every day because it was a priority. Is CEPA a priority? Absolutely.

Basically we have an opportunity to show whether or not it is indeed a priority. I will be supporting this because it is a priority. I'm willing to work as hard and as long as necessary, and to go to as many meetings as necessary, to do the CEPA review.

I will respect the wishes of the majority to deal with Bill C-288, but, Mr. Chair, we have to continue on with the CEPA review. Morally, it's the right thing to do. Whatever is required, I'm willing to go to as many meetings as necessary for as long as necessary to do it. That's the spirit of this motion, and hopefully the majority of the committee members will agree that CEPA is indeed a priority to this committee.

● (0925)

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

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have a small point.

On Bill C-288, when is the legislative requirement for it to be back?

**The Chair:** It is February 20-something.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** That's important to keep in mind.

On Mr. Warawa's last point, in the government's Bill C-30, many fundamental changes are proposed to CEPA right in that bill. That is what many of us in this committee are going to be engaged in on this special legislative committee. It feels like a practical application of this almost academic review of CEPA.

The committee must keep in mind that the review we're doing of CEPA is only a set of recommendations to government; there's nothing mandatory about them. The government can completely ignore what we do with CEPA, whereas Bill C-30 is a proposed bill; it is a proposed piece of legislation to change CEPA. It seems to me that as a committee we haven't yet resolved the cross-purposes of all these different pieces of legislation and review in front of us right now that are affecting the same act. The one that seems to affect the act the most, and most directly, is Bill C-30.

**The Chair:** Mr. Harvey has suggested that we can't suppose what we're going to get and we can't suppose who's going to be on whatever. Mr. Harvey has suggested that we look at this motion in starting, and then when other things happen, we could re-evaluate.

I'm not sure, Mr. Warawa, whether that fits within your parameter of how you look at this situation.

Mr. Watson is next.

**Mr. Jeff Watson:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have a couple of things.

To your earlier point, the motion doesn't call for us to finish the review by Christmas; it's to continue the review with an additional meeting per week, so the review may actually take us beyond the Christmas timeline. What we're suggesting is that we continue with the review with an additional....

It's not only that. The experience of this committee in the last Parliament was that we were many, many weeks into a study of Kyoto and then the government dropped the plan in the middle of it. We continued on with our review of the Kyoto Protocol. We of course brought in aspects of what was happening with the government's climate change plan. That came in. It informed the work we did as a committee. We had no problem with doing that at the time, and we still produced a report—one that we're going to be bringing back, interestingly enough, in the discussion on Bill C-288—so I don't think that parties agreeing to put a special legislative committee to discuss the Clean Air Act can't somehow inform what we're doing.

It is a mandatory requirement that we do a review. Whether or not the result is binding on the government, it's mandatory that we actually do the review, so I think it's important that we continue.

**The Chair:** Mr. Harvey.

[Translation]

**Mr. Luc Harvey:** We should study Bill C-288, CEPA, and Bill C-30. Are there any issues that the committee should tackle in the short and medium term?

[English]

**The Chair:** A couple of private members' bills have now been referred to the committee, one of them unanimous last night, which means it probably wouldn't take a lot of time.

So those are there, and then of course there's the special committee, or however that's going to be arranged.

[Translation]

**Mr. Luc Harvey:** What is the deadline for C-288? When should it be sent back to the House?

[English]

**The Chair:** At the end of February.

[Translation]

**Mr. Luc Harvey:** February. Okay.

And CEPA?

[English]

**The Chair:** For CEPA it's May 10, I think.

[Translation]

**Mr. Luc Harvey:** And what about Bill C-30?

[English]

**The Chair:** We don't know. It hasn't been referred to committee. If it's a special committee, it may not come to us.

We don't know any of those answers yet.

[Translation]

**Mr. Luc Harvey:** How many times will we have to meet before we submit the CEPA report to the House?

● (0930)

[English]

**The Chair:** Approximately ten, probably, or seven, with witnesses, and then three more to finish the report.

I'm just guessing here.

[Translation]

**Mr. Luc Harvey:** And for Bill C-288?

[English]

**The Chair:** We're going to get to the work plan.

We have the minister as well, which would be one more meeting. On November 22, European parliamentarians are here.

Mr. Warawa.

**Mr. Mark Warawa:** Mr. Chair, what we're talking about in this motion is that for the next five weeks, starting next week, we already have the witnesses contacted. We can keep up that momentum, so it's not a lot of work.

We have been accused of maybe not working that hard. We do work hard.

I think it was somebody about the Liberals....

We can really earn our pay, Mr. Chair, and we can show as a committee that CEPA is important. We're only talking five weeks of working really hard. I'm willing to do it. As for the legislative committee dealing with Bill C-30, we don't know when that will start, but it may be starting after this.

So what we're talking about is an extra meeting per week, and we keep the CEPA review going. I think it's a priority. We need to do it. It's a legislative requirement, and it shows good faith.

Do we support dealing with toxic substances or not? I sure hope we do.

**The Chair:** Mr. Bigras.

[Translation]

**Mr. Bernard Bigras:** Mr. Chairman, Mr. Harvey's question was quite relevant; it helped us to better understand how much time is available for each one of these bills or acts.

We have until December 7 to deal with Bill C-288. You said that there are seven sitting days left for us to hear from the witnesses and two or three meetings to draft the report. We have until May.

Are you saying that we have until next May to study CEPA?

[English]

**The Chair:** Yes.

[Translation]

**Mr. Bernard Bigras:** I do not see why we need to add another sitting, at this time, since we have until May for CEPA, particularly since the government should be delighted that we will be dealing with the Clean Air Act and Bill C-30 as soon as a committee has been struck.

I think this fine balance will allow us to deal with Bill C-288 and respect our deadlines for the CEPA review, while allowing us to study Bill C-30, which is what the government would like us to do. To continue the discussion would be...

I do not know what the government is looking for, but it is clear that we have all of the time we need to do it and we can meet all of the regulatory deadlines.

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. Watson.

**Mr. Jeff Watson:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I think that scenario presumes on the future. I understand there is other private members' business that will have to be considered by this committee. There may be further government legislation that we don't know of yet that would have to come before this committee—any of a number of possibilities that could put off our timetable.

I always work under the understanding, why put off to tomorrow what can be done today? Presuming on the future I think is an irresponsible thing for this committee to do. There may be many things that come in February to the early spring that could push back the CEPA review even further, and suddenly what looks like we have a lot of time isn't a lot of time.

This is only one additional meeting for the next five weeks. It's not an awful lot of extra work to ask of the committee, and I think it's

better to get the job done now, break the back of this work, so that when we come back, we have only two more meetings for witnesses and then three meetings to write a report.

I would rather worry about five days' worth of meetings in the new year than several more than that, because there may be more business coming that the opposition may not be aware of. So I think it's time to get this thing done.

**The Chair:** Mr. Cullen, and then Mr. Harvey.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** There are two things. One is the concern I have with some of the things Mr. Bigras has said. Focusing on May as a deadline, the one element in there—and many of us consider this—is that the potential election around the budget means we would lose the CEPA review. To assume that we're going to get to May...I haven't heard a lot of pundits or party leaders talk about all the work we're going to do together in May, because there seems to be at least the probability of an election call.

The only question I have, because you've mentioned a couple of other things on our calendar, is that there are many competing interests on this committee's time, and I'm not sure I know all the pieces you've talked about having. You've mentioned certain European parliamentarians, the two private members' bills that both passed through with near unanimous—

● (0935)

**The Chair:** I think, Mr. Cullen, just to clear that up, we could ask the clerk and Tim to put together a list for us of all the things they're aware of.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** It's difficult to make a decision on this, to be frank, when I hear another couple of things and another couple of things.

**The Chair:** I just don't think we should get into the hypothetical, what might happen and what might not happen. Let's try to deal with what is and what we know and move from that basis.

I think Mr. Harvey is next.

[Translation]

**Mr. Luc Harvey:** Mr. Cullen said from now to May, but anything can happen.

**Mr. Bernard Bigras:** So we will not be dealing with C-30?

**Mr. Luc Harvey:** We should at least submit the CEPA report; that was one of our objectives. That is what I meant to say when I spoke earlier.

Whatever we do, we have to decide if we will be adding one extra meeting per week. Since we have no other obligations for the time being, we can easily add one more sitting. We all agree on the importance of the environment. If you talk to talk, then you have to walk the walk. We are ready to move things along. We are the ones putting the brakes on this. We would like to sit more often, and we want to do more work.

What is happening then? You are the ones asking us. We want to work harder, and we are told to wait two weeks. We could get a lot done this week and the next. That is the objective.

Do you agree?



[English]

**The Chair:** If I might just suggest, I think we've heard pretty much all the arguments.

We have two more people on the speaking list, Mr. Bigras and Mr. Rodriguez. Can we go to the vote at that point?

Okay. Mr. Bigras.

[Translation]

**Mr. Bernard Bigras:** Mr. Chairman, Mr. Watson's arguments make no sense. He says that there is no guarantee that the government will not introduce new environmental legislation.

I do not want to make this political, but according to the Conservative Party's election platform, the only commitment that they made was to introduce a bill on air quality, which is Bill C-30.

In view of what Mr. Watson has just said, I have every intention of checking with my House leader to enquire about the government's agenda. I will ask my House leader if the government House leader has any other bills related to the environment.

If we follow that reasoning, then we should not even study Bill C-30 in committee, since there might be an election in May. So there would be very little time to move Bill C-30 along to report stage.

That makes no sense, Mr. Chairman. We have deadlines to meet, and the number of meetings that we have planned will allow us to deal with Bill C-288, amendments to the Canadian Environmental Protection Act and — I hope, for the government's sake — Bill C-30 as well.

With things as they now stand, we will not need to add any extra sittings.

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. Rodriguez.

[Translation]

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** I am in full agreement with Mr. Bigras.

I only have one thing to add. I would like to remind our government friends that since we set a date for Bill C-288, which should return to the House before December 7, we are wasting time quite uselessly here today.

Since you feel that Bill C-288 warrants our attention, I would encourage members to begin discussing the list of witnesses so that we may, as they have suggested, spend as much time as possible on Bill C-288.

● (0940)

[English]

**The Chair:** So, Mr. Warawa, it's your motion. Do you want to finish debate?

**Mr. Mark Warawa:** Thank you.

Mr. Cullen made a suggestion that he was hoping the clerk would provide a schedule or a listing of upcoming business to make our responsibilities a little clearer. If he's suggesting that we defer, that

would be an option we could consider and then deal with this at a future meeting.

But my first choice is that we make a decision today. I think based on priority, is a CEPA review important? It is to the government.

We've heard from the Bloc and the Liberals that Bill C-288 appears to be more important than CEPA. Mr. Chairman, I'm concerned that Bill C-288 is taking a priority. As has been pointed out, we have until the end of February to deal with Bill C-288. So at the last meeting we suggested that we do Bill C-288 on a Tuesday and then on a Thursday do CEPA review, so we could be doing both in parallel. Mr. Chair, that was not supported. So what we are willing to do, if the Liberals and the Bloc want to push through Bill C-288, then—

**The Chair:** Mr. Warawa, if I might interrupt, we do have a motion, which was passed, that we have to report back about Bill C-288 by December 7.

**Mr. Mark Warawa:** But the point was made by Mr. Harvey that we have until the end of February. It was the decision of the committee—and I respect that, which was the point I was bringing out—that they are going to do it within that timeframe.

Originally the proposal from the Liberals was that we do it I think the following week, but at the suggestion of Mr. Bigras, we sped it up another week. So in the spirit of cooperation, we agreed.

My motion then addresses, is CEPA still a priority? Absolutely it is to the government. Is it a priority to the members across? I hope so. What Mr. Harvey said is that we are willing to work harder. We are willing to work as hard as necessary to keep the CEPA review going, and that's the motion before us. Do the other members support having the CEPA review continue on? And it's basically black and white. We do, and we hope CEPA is a priority. Now I'll be disappointed if they show by not supporting this that CEPA is not important.

But, Mr. Chair, it is a legislative requirement. It deals with toxins and the health of Canadians, and for them to be turning their back against the pollution.... Canadians are dying prematurely because of illnesses due to toxic substances in our environment. We need to deal with it; it's a priority.

We heard from the David Suzuki Foundation. They wrote a paper saying it's one of the biggest crises facing Canada right now—greenhouse gas emissions and pollution, and basically we're at a crossroads. We were told by the commissioner that we're at a crossroads. Is CEPA...are toxic substances in our environment important? Right now we're at a crossroads, and this motion says you support dealing with the issue. Do you support dealing with the crisis or not? This side does, and we will work as hard as necessary to deal with that issue.

**The Chair:** Okay. I think we have all had our opportunity to comment on this.

[Translation]

**Mr. Luc Harvey:** We do not want to delay Bill C-288. What we are doing is deciding whether or not we want to add one sitting in order to continue the work on CEPA which we began in April. If we want to do a good job, then we must not lose our momentum or any of the information that we have already collected.

[English]

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

Let's go to the vote. We've been asked for a recorded vote.

**The Clerk:** It's tied, so it's in your hands.

**The Chair:** Thanks guys. Thanks a lot. I really enjoyed today.

I will vote in favour.

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

**The Chair:** We can now move on to the work plan. I believe everyone has two proposals. Having looked at them, there are similarities, so I would like comments on them.

Obviously, we now have a clear direction to our clerk and researchers to go out and give a balanced panel once we decide on what the exact topic should be.

So could we address the work plan issue? Who wants to start?

Mr. Godfrey.

● (0945)

**Hon. John Godfrey:** Mr. Chair, it seems to me the way to proceed is to see what our possibilities are and where there is common ground, get that out of the way, and then zero in on the differences.

The last work plan we submitted anticipated that there would be four sessions, and then we decided to open it up. Did you make it that we have actually six sessions for witnesses before we have to do clause-by-clause on the 5th? I think it's the 6th.

Okay. So the good news is that we actually have a couple of extra sessions beyond what we worked on.

I think the second piece of good news is that if I were to look for commonality, there is I think one session that deals with accountability issues. That is covered in our work plan as meeting number four, and in the Conservative work plan, although these meetings are not numbered, it's section 10 issues, where we have issues about the Auditor General's office, and the witnesses seem to be more or less the same. So it seems to me that if we take that off the table as being agreed upon—that is to say, it will be the last session of witnesses—I think there's enough commonality there.

What we then come down to is that we have five sessions into which we must find a space or a reorganization for three sessions from the opposition list and five sessions from the Conservative list. So now the challenge comes down to finding the place where we can again tighten up the list, perhaps, and find any more common ground.

One of the questions that obviously stands out, where there's a real difference of opinion—at least, on the two proposed lists—is that on the list of opposition witnesses we have two sessions that deal with an update on impacts. In other words, it's all about urgency. I cannot find a similar section in the Conservative plan, so that's a clear difference. On this side, given how this file is evolving and just to remind ourselves of why we're doing this, what it's about—climate change, global warming—I think we as a group would very much insist that we have a session on impacts. Once we get beyond that, the only other question is whether in fact on the impact side it may be possible to take some of the....

Well, I guess there are two kinds of impacts. There are the impacts of global warming itself and there are the impacts of attempting to do something about it. So there are two kinds of impacts: what is the cost of inaction, as Nicholas Stern would say, and what is the cost of action? Maybe that's one way we can pull out some of these witnesses.

Maybe that's really what we're talking about, and maybe we need another session, and you see, I think if I look at the Conservative list, the whole concept of target setting, action to date, and previous plans seems to me to be very much a similar kind of exercise. It's the history of what we've tried to do and what we're trying to learn from that, and how that would be reflected in what we're trying to do in this legislation.

● (0950)

That's something we would all want to be part of, so that's a third session, and then maybe a session on mechanisms. In other words, we would clearly want to know the plans and we will have a chance to do so, because, fortuitously, the Nairobi meeting will update us.

As I remember from Montreal, part of the issue is what we do after 2012. Once we have that information, we should somehow incorporate that understanding of international mechanisms and what penalties would look like and what new targets would look like, with regard to how that would affect the proposed bill.

I see four topics where we can rejig these things and get a balanced witness list. That leaves us a fifth. The fifth session would be a reminder; it was on our list as meeting number three, which is a reminder of how other countries are doing, because this is very much part of the debate. We've had a lot of discussion about other countries not meeting their targets. What are they doing about it? We could benefit from an update about all that, and then we go to the accountability issues and a sixth session with the Auditor General. Then we go to clause-by-clause.

Does that help a bit?

**The Chair:** What would be very helpful, too, for both of these lists, is to prioritize them. That would help our staff a lot. If we had the most important witnesses as a priority, then our clerk and researchers will try to achieve that, as we decide these topics.

Mr. Warawa, do you want to respond to Mr. Godfrey's proposal? You have a plan on the table as well, and then we'll go to Mr. Bigras and then Mr. Cullen.

**Mr. Mark Warawa:** Mr. Godfrey introduced his plan a week ago. We've submitted a plan, and there are some overlaps.

I had a little difficulty following some of his suggestions, but if we were to start with what he is proposing for meetings for next week, the 7th and the 9th, is he wanting to stay with the theme of urgency and have the first meeting on impacts of climate change: scientific, social, economic? Is that what he's proposing?

**Hon. John Godfrey:** Yes, although I'm open to discussion. What I'm really trying to do is find a way of bringing these things together, finding some common ground, so my first thought was whether this is the right sequence. I'm still not sure.

The first order of business would be an update on the urgency of the matter, the kind of thing that Nicholas Stern was talking about, where we have a confluence of scientific and economic information, the cost of business as usual, if we do nothing.

The next one would be the potential costs of doing something. What are the risks of taking more aggressive action? Nicholas Stern puts it at 1% of GDP. We have lots of witnesses, who can be condensed a bit—lots of folks from industry associations, particularly the oil and gas sector, who are going to give us short-term costs. We don't need them all, but we can get a fairly good—so a kind of economic cost of action, according to some. And we'll have a balanced list there.

That was sessions one and two, if we can pull this off.

• (0955)

**Mr. Mark Warawa:** Excuse me, could I interrupt for a quick question? I'm not sure who it was, but somebody mentioned David Suzuki. You had him on your work plan of November 2, which is today. Is he not going to be available any other day?

**Hon. John Godfrey:** I think that's the situation as far as I know it, but we just had to let that go.

**Mr. Mark Warawa:** That's unfortunate.

**The Chair:** Again, if we have a priority list, then the clerk will do his very best to get those priorities to fit in. Of course, obviously Tuesday and Thursday of next week become the big challenges for them.

**Mr. Mark Warawa:** We may then want to provide plans for our meetings of next week and then be a little flexible, depending on when witnesses are available for the other topics. If we could agree on the focus of the six meetings, we could give the clerk some flexibility to find out when we can best use or have access to the different witnesses. Are you okay with that?

**Hon. John Godfrey:** I think it will work. There's an advantage in what you're proposing. What I'm now seeing is next week being as I've described, the first meeting on Tuesday being on both the scientific and economic impacts of climate change if we don't do anything. The impacts of action will potentially come on Thursday, and we have lots of people who will talk about that.

We then have a week-long break, at which point I think it would be most timely—and maybe we can even get the minister in for this

—for the first session after we return to be an update on the Kyoto process, because it will be concluded at that point. It would be on what's happened. It's a complicated business, and I think we would want to spend serious time on that.

The fourth session, on the Thursday of the week after we get back, would be on mechanisms of various sorts: the ways in which we might be able to get to targets now that we know how the Kyoto process is evolving, target setting, and all those kinds of things.

The fifth session would then be the international session on how other countries are dealing with this and what we can learn from them.

The sixth session would be on accountability, which is when we'll bring in the Auditor General.

If people accept that as an outline, we then have to put on our thinking caps as to how we can take people out of one list and put them on to another. I'm making this up as I go along, but I don't know if that's helpful.

**The Chair:** We do have to trust our researcher and clerk to plug these people on this priority list in where they fit best, as they can get hold of them.

**Hon. John Godfrey:** Let me actually ask Tim, although I realize he's reacting to stuff that's just happening here.

Does this have a kind of logic to it, or are we missing something here in terms of doability, and also in terms—

**The Chair:** Obviously, we're going to Mr. Bigras, Mr. Cullen, Mr. Watson, and then Mr. Harvey.

[Translation]

**Mr. Bernard Bigras:** Mr. Chairman, I think we are straying off topic. I read the list of topics. We must not forget that there will be six sittings, which is a limited number. If you look at the government's proposals, you will see that the first one is target setting and reducing greenhouse gas emissions by 6 per cent. I hope we will not spend an entire meeting discussing how the 6 per cent target was set. We could easily devote 10 sittings to that issue alone.

Then we have the following topics: actions to date and previous plans. In my opinion, we should first be dealing with the content of the bill itself. For example, is it feasible to require annual plans relating to the targets? Can we do this?

Moreover, the environment commissioner could tell us if this bill is a step in the right direction and if it can indeed be done. We could discuss how the 6 per cent target was set, we can even revisit previous plans, but what is most important is the full consideration of Bill C-288.

Can we submit plans to the House of Commons? What type of plan does Mr. Rodriguez's bill provide for? I think these are the basic elements that we should be tackling before we discuss what will happen in Nairobi and what will come after that.

Let's deal with the basics and the content. I am sure that the government has its own questions and is wondering if this bill can really fly. The government has every right to ask that question. Can annual plans be submitted? Some will say that they cannot, and the question is a perfectly legitimate one.

That is why the bill is before us today. Personally, I think it is possible and it can be done, but the government seems to think otherwise. As far as I am concerned, that is what we should be discussing, rather than spend the next six meetings wondering how the 6 per cent target was set. Because in the end, as they say, it is all academic.

Let's look at the content of the bill, which, to my mind, is much more constructive and is what we should really be doing.

• (1000)

[English]

**The Chair:** Let's get input from everyone. Then we'll get back to the actual plan.

Mr. Cullen.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Thank you, Chair.

I'm in agreement with Mr. Godfrey's comment on the post-Nairobi.... I would only suggest that it seems to take a little dust-settling after these types of meetings for the officials to know what the results actually were from Nairobi.

I am concerned about our putting officials or even the minister in front of us two days after returning from Nairobi. It usually doesn't happen this way in international agreements, that we know what the actual moving forward plan is, for either our government or international governments. So a meeting or two later for that....

The other concern I have in looking over these lists is that there are references in the bill to the provinces and the implementation and equivalency, yet we don't have any witnesses from the provinces, or any representation.

Following Mr. Bigras' point about the attainability of doing this over the next six years, it seems to me that at a minimum the provinces are going to be playing an absolutely massive role in it. I just don't see it as possible that the federal government, with the tools it has available, is going to be able to achieve the reductions of 30% or more.

The second point is that if provinces.... I met with the FCM, and I'm sure others have recently. The cities are often talked about as the vehicle for a lot of this to actually take place. There are places where the federal government works, but there are many places where it doesn't.

My last comment is that we have not spoken of or resolved this "past politicians" or "current politicians" list that the government has provided. That seems to be a point of contention.

As a very last comment, I wouldn't mind seeing some modelling, either from the government or a third-party validator or an ENGO or another country—from somebody—as to what the implications are of using a bill like this to achieve 6% below 1990 by 2012.

I understand there are pieces in this bill that talk about spending and pieces in the bill that talk about the Auditor General. There are pieces in this bill that can't happen, that you simply can't do in this bill.

I understand it was drafted with help, but that raises cause for concern, when you have a comment in the bill asking for the Auditor General to provide comment on policy.

**The Chair:** Certainly it's the committee's role to do that, and the Auditor General has met with me and I think with some of you to tell you about the difficulties she sees in this bill in terms of the role foreseen for her to play that she can't play.

It's the committee, though, that will be addressing those sorts of things.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** I don't want to lose that point about the modelling. It is important for us to have somebody—and I don't even suggest it be someone who comes from government—who understands what types of tools would be needed for enforcement, so that the committee has good bearings for its final vote on this bill, on the question, if setting the 2012 target at 6% below 1990 is the objective set out, of what that means.

As to the provinces, I just do not understand how we can get through this without that component being heard from.

• (1005)

**The Chair:** I went to New York and looked at some of the modelling that is done by the UN. They had 40 models when I was there. I don't know what the number is now. What you get out depends on what you put in, in terms of the actual model of climate change. It is a very complex subject.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Let me clarify. I don't mean climate change models; I mean more of a business case model. Where would the components likely come from? What would the implications be? The committee hasn't really looked at that yet.

We understand and we're supportive of the 2012 targets. My party has set out a plan, but we spent months on it. We brought economists and all kinds of people in. We didn't spend five meetings on it.

This is serious stuff, if you're asking the government to meet this by 2012. I am not suggesting climate change modelling at all. That is not a path for us. I mean, where would you get the reductions from and how would you achieve them? What amount of emissions buying would you need to do in order to achieve the targets?

**An hon. member:** It's up to them to decide.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** But I think it is worthwhile for the committee to hear what the considerations would be.

**The Chair:** Do you have an idea for a witness who could cover that sort of...?

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** It is a challenge, but let me consider it.

**The Chair:** Sure.

Mr. Watson.

**Mr. Jeff Watson:** I have just a simple request, Mr. Chair. I think we have had some discussion on six potential topics and meetings here. We have a fairly good idea of where this may be going. But once we leave the meeting, it's going to be up to the rest.

To make sure, could we have Tim read back the six potential meeting topics, so that we know he has the same understanding we probably have around the table? Is that all right?

**The Chair:** We can ask him to do that.

**Mr. Tim Williams (Committee Researcher):** Sure, I wouldn't mind having some clarification that I've got it right as well.

**Mr. Jeff Watson:** That's what I want to make sure of, because if we're going to come to some agreement over these six topics, I want to make sure that if he leaves here he's going to have the same understanding we had around the table of what's being discussed here.

**The Chair:** We'll ask him to go through those, and of course, Mr. Godfrey, if you could pay particular attention.... There have been suggestions that, of course, Nairobi will be rearranged, but let's just look at the six topics, the general areas.

**Mr. Tim Williams:** As I understand it, we have the first meeting on the urgency of the situation—why this bill has been tabled in the first place. The second meeting is on the impacts of doing something and the impacts of not doing anything. Those are the two extremes, I guess.

**The Chair:** You're talking economic, I believe, largely.

**Mr. Tim Williams:** Economic and social impacts.

**Mr. Jeff Watson:** Would that also include the cost of non-compliance with Kyoto?

**Mr. Tim Williams:** I would imagine so, yes.

The third meeting and I think the next two meetings—those first two meetings seem to be—

**Mr. Jeff Watson:** Just to clarify, when I say the cost of non-compliance, I mean specifically with the terms of Kyoto, what Kyoto itself as a mechanism imposes as the cost of non-compliance. I just want that clarified.

**The Chair:** Just repeat, Mr. Watson.

**Mr. Jeff Watson:** I don't just mean what the environmental costs of not complying are if we don't do this. I mean specifically what the costs are. If we don't meet the target and the timeline, what will the costs then be for non-compliance of Kyoto and its mechanisms? What additional costs will have to be incurred for missing the target and timeline?

**Hon. John Godfrey:** There's one distinction, which is that there are economic costs in the sense of putting aside the Kyoto process, the cost of doing something versus the cost of not doing something. Then there are the penalty costs that are associated with Kyoto, which is what you're talking about.

**Mr. Jeff Watson:** That's a third cost, if you will.

**Hon. John Godfrey:** Yes. What I would suggest is that we put that in under what I've called an update on the Kyoto process. It needn't be the third session, but that would give us the latest on penalty costs, if you like, the Kyoto costs, as opposed to just general economic costs one way or the other.

Does that help?

**The Chair:** One of the problems with that, of course, is that is under discussion for the after 2012 discussion. While Kyoto said one thing, most of the countries involved at the COP meetings are saying, we're all going to have a problem; that's going to be part of the 2012 plus discussion. So that may be clarified as a result of Nairobi.

• (1010)

**Hon. John Godfrey:** Right. So that's why I'm saying to put that discussion off until you come to Kyoto.

**Mr. Jeff Watson:** I just wanted to make sure that was part of the discussion.

**Mr. Tim Williams:** So as far as I understand, the order of the last four meetings is based on who can show up, the availability of witnesses, but I have an update on the Kyoto process, mechanisms, and target setting, which would bring in the modelling, I think, that Mr. Cullen.... The modelling will come into mechanisms. It will also come into economic costs and impacts. There will be some crossover, as there always is, in the subject matter.

Number five is international, basically looking at how other Kyoto countries with targets are doing and how they're approaching their targets, and six is accountability, basically the commissioner.

**The Chair:** Mr. Bigras.

[Translation]

**Mr. Bernard Bigras:** That is fine with me. We can discuss the broad outline of the Kyoto Protocol, the cost, the mechanisms, but I am intent on doing one thing, and that is examining Bill C-288. I feel that it is important. Our mandate here is not Kyoto, we should try to see if we can amend this bill to make it acceptable to everyone. For example, clause 6 gives the provinces a certain amount of flexibility. That is something that concerns me greatly, and I would like to tighten up the definition and see how the provinces could implement the objectives that are set out in the bill's preamble.

We should devote some time to discussing how the provinces will implement this bill and how much flexibility they will be given. I do not know if one meeting will be enough, but this is something that we must certainly do. Personally, I do not think we will need more than one sitting out of six to discuss how these mechanisms to provide flexibility to the provinces would work. I think it is an interesting suggestion. And one meeting out of six is not too much to ask.

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. Cullen.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Thanks for that, Tim. We always give you the best challenges.

I still haven't heard any committee members talk about this wrath of politicians that has been suggested by the government.

The other component was in terms of the provinces and their ability to meet these targets or be the partners, or what role they're likely to play in that brief, unless I missed it in your synopsis, Tim.

This goes back to the calendar, which I know the clerk and Tim will advise us on. I'm still not sure of other components that we're meant to be dealing with in the next number of weeks, these other visits and the other private members' bills. Are we just assuming that none of them are—

**The Chair:** I agree with you on the cities and certainly the provinces. I just don't know how we would pull that off in a meeting in terms of involving all of the different provinces. Getting the provinces and other levels of government involved in this becomes a huge challenge.

Mr. Bigras, you've addressed it as well. Do you have an idea?

[Translation]

**Mr. Bernard Bigras:** You misunderstood what I said. I want to investigate the scope of this bill and how the provinces would implement it. For example, clause 6 states that the Governor in Council may make regulations limiting the amount of greenhouse gases that may be released into the environment, within a specific time frame, within a province or territory, something to which the government agrees under the provisions of this regulation.

We could call as witnesses lawyers specializing in environmental law who would explain the scope of this bill. I am not asking for the provinces to appear. I want to know how this bill will affect the provinces. Maybe it should be amended. Maybe we should leave it alone. There is an important provision in this bill that allows provinces to set a target. We have to see how that would work.

This is important. If the bill passes, then provinces would be able to use this clause to operate within their own jurisdiction. That is not inconsequential. We have to be aware of the scope of this important provision of the bill.

• (1015)

[English]

**The Chair:** I think I understand now. Obviously the department would be the ones who could help us out there. Maybe we could even involve Justice's recommendations on interpreting the bill. I think that's what you're saying, and that would get us there.

[Translation]

**Mr. Bernard Bigras:** I want to be clear; I am not only interested in how the Justice Department interprets the bill. I would also like to hear from some independent experts. I think they will be more objective.

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. Warawa.

**Mr. Mark Warawa:** Mr. Chair, Tim has shared a list: urgency, impact, update on Kyoto, mechanisms and modelling, international, and then accountability, in that order, with some flexibility for the last four. We're in favour of that.

There are two topics, and I just want to clear up a comment from Mr. Bigras. The topics were not a work plan in that order. They were topics. If we can, I think we should incorporate these topics—which

I think are important—into Mr. Godfrey's proposed work plan or the plan that Tim just shared with us.

The only two topics that I want to make sure are incorporated into that are the second and the third, which are action to date and previous plans. The other topics are being addressed with Mr. Godfrey's plan. The second and third could be incorporated into the update on Kyoto or into the urgency, which would be the first or third meeting. Either way, I think it's important that we learn from the past. We don't want to repeat mistakes.

That's my suggestion.

**The Chair:** Mr. Rodriguez.

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** Personally, I have no problem with incorporating those two items, actions to date and previous plans, because we have to learn from the past if we're going to improve in the future.

On the auditor, I don't think you need two hours. I personally discussed this with her, and you did too. A lot of people discussed this with her. By a simple amendment, it's very simple to make it acceptable for her and her team. If we're going to spend two hours and then change a sentence in two seconds for that, we will have wasted a whole session.

**The Chair:** Mr. Harvey.

[Translation]

**Mr. Luc Harvey:** I would like to raise something that has not yet been discussed, namely, the solutions. Our aim is to cut CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. That is all very well, but I would like to know what is being put forward, what solutions have been suggested.

In my riding, there is a company called CO<sub>2</sub> Solution. It takes CO<sub>2</sub> and changes it into HCO<sub>3</sub>. Is there anything similar elsewhere? It is all very well to say that we want to reduce emissions and set certain limits, but we must also determine what that represents in dollars and cents and if it is doable.

I would like us to discuss solutions. We say that the situation warrants immediate attention, and that there are consequences relating to acting or not acting. I do not think that buying a carbon credit from Cameroon will solve the problem here at home. There are also objectives, costs, international issues and accounting. Motherhood and apple pie are one thing, but we have to be realistic.

Two weeks ago, my cousin died of cancer. The doctors did everything they could to save him, but he died because technology is not yet advanced enough. There may be progress in five or 10 years, but it will be too late for him, because he is dead.

I would like to know what is happening in this area. Is it doable? Ms. Gélinas said that out of the 300 million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> that must be eliminated, only 100 tonnes can be accounted for here in Canada. The rest will have to be acquired elsewhere. That is her opinion. I would like to know if we are capable of reducing CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 300 million tonnes here in Canada, with the help of some facilities or some researchers. Thanks to its scientific research chairs program, Canada funds almost 70 chairs that are researching climate change.

Have there been any results achieved from all of the money we are investing? Is anything on the way?

● (1020)

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. Harvey, for your information, the G-8 plus five dialogue group is of course dealing with solutions, and their report is due in June 2008.

Just in the paper on the weekend, in an article on the carbon dioxide solution in Saskatchewan, entitled "Saskatchewan leads in CO<sub>2</sub> recovery", their company, EnCana, is capturing carbon dioxide and sequestering it very successfully, and now that's being broad-based in Saskatchewan, which will be a huge difference.

Obviously now you're getting into the whole area again that personally I find most interesting. Here are the technological solutions to the real big problem, not only in Canada but globally. But now you're broadening the base again to include a lot of information.

I believe Mr. Cullen is next.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, for pointing out the work of another good NDP government out there in Saskatchewan.

The question I have, and a lot of the large final emitters have posed this, and the previous government never answered the question, is one of any credit for early action. A number of companies have come forward and said, "We have done these things in some belief that Canada was going to actually be achieving targets." Is there a percentage fix, or are companies just left to be with what they're left to be? And does this bill make any consideration for that? It's actually pretty critical for some of the companies we've talked to.

The other question, and I know it's in some of the plans, but not the one described by Tim, concerns the readiness of the market. I'm imagining under Mr. Rodriguez' bill that one of the key mechanisms will be the ability to trade emissions within the country or between companies or provinces. I'm not sure we've ever had testimony from the markets or the trading commodities in this country right now. I have no idea where they're at. Are they ready, or is Montreal ready to go? If that's going to be a key mechanism and they're five years from readiness, or they're ready to go tomorrow, I think that's worthwhile testimony.

**The Chair:** I do remind everyone again to please read this. This was the six-month report of this committee, and we again addressed things such as sequestering of carbon dioxide. Many of these issues have already been dealt with, so rather than reinvent the wheel and invite the same witnesses, to hear the same testimony that we already have in writing...I just urge every member to read this. This is not all that old. This is from last year.

Many of the witnesses, of course, we're having back, so I just urge everyone to read that.

I believe Mr. Godfrey is next.

**Hon. John Godfrey:** Just in the spirit of hope.

**The Chair:** Okay. Mr. Watson, a comment on—

**Mr. Jeff Watson:** I just have a comment on the report, Mr. Chair.

I will point out for the benefit of committee members who weren't here last time that major swaths of witness testimony were cut out of that report too. So there are some things that still need to be heard by this committee.

**The Chair:** Okay. Mr. Godfrey.

**Hon. John Godfrey:** I'm trying to incorporate this into the work we're doing. It seems to me that the place to deal with actions taken, previous plans and all that, is both under an update to the Kyoto process and on the mechanisms discussion, because it will remind us of mechanisms that have been tried and maybe worked or not worked and what we think about those.

So there are two places for that in our work plan.

That would also get to where Mr. Cullen was talking, because in the bill itself, under 5(1), there is a description of the various mechanisms that might be deployed by government that we would want to measure. So that is a place again for a discussion of mechanisms, and trading, and all the sort of things that Mr. Cullen raised.

Understanding Mr. Rodriguez' point that it is probably, on our sixth session, unnecessary to devote the whole two hours to sorting out a problem that seems to have been pre-sorted, that might be a good place to bring in the provinces, because that will mean we're not crowding one of the other sessions.

So I'm just trying to keep incorporating these ideas into the plan in a way that doesn't.... I don't know if that works for you—

**The Chair:** I think Mr. Bigras, though, had agreed that it wasn't so much the provinces, it was more the implications for the provinces, which again would be dependent—

● (1025)

**Hon. John Godfrey:** But I think we could do it in that session, is all I'm saying.

**The Chair:** Yes, we could.

**Hon. John Godfrey:** I don't want us to lose sight of the point that maybe some of the provinces could divvy up the last session on accountability. Since we don't need the whole two hours for the Auditor General, we could think of doing the provinces or a consideration of Mr. Bigras' point. That's all.

**The Chair:** Mr. Rodriguez.

[Translation]

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to clarify something that Mr. Harvey said. I think Mr. Cullen also referred to it.

The aim of the bill is to make the Kyoto objectives compulsory, and there are a number of ways to do it. However, we have to draw the line. If the bill passes and the government is compelled to respect the Kyoto targets, then it will be up to the government to decide how to proceed.

The government cannot ask us how much it will cost or what is to be done. Would it be 20 per cent of domestic market trades and 30 per cent foreign credits?

The bill is not intended to replace the government. Its intention is to ensure that Canada will not go against international law and will respect its Kyoto Protocol obligations.

**Hon. John Godfrey:** ... wherever possible.

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** Of course. And it is up to them to work out the details. Why ask me how much it will cost? They will have to decide if they want to opt for 50 per cent or 20 per cent of the domestic market. The choice is theirs.

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. Bigras.

[Translation]

**Mr. Bernard Bigras:** In my opinion, there is another aspect that we should examine during the course of the six sittings, namely, the assumption that we find in the bill, and I quote: "[...] market-based mechanisms such as emissions trading or offsets [...]"

That is not incidental, Mr. Chairman. We cannot study this bill without considering the possibility that, if it is passed, we could have a market-based CO2 emissions trading mechanism here in Canada. I know that the government is not keen on domestic emissions trading. I cannot help but wonder why. The government believes in a market-based system, but when comes the time to apply it to the environment, it no longer thinks that it is a good idea. This is something that warrants a full debate, and I have no intention of going into it today.

We think that Canada should have a market-based mechanism for CO2. The government does not think so. Why not discuss the implementation of this type of market in Canada? Some will say that it has worked quite well in Europe. I know that the government does not share that opinion. A parliamentary committee should discuss the content and the essential aspects of these issues.

I am not saying that we should devote an entire meeting to this subject, but as far as I am concerned, the market-based mechanism and its implications are far too important for us to ignore.

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. Cullen.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Just to follow up on Mr. Rodriguez' point, there's no suggestion in my comments to say that we need witnesses to tell us how it's going to happen, the outside commentary that I think is required in this.

To simply say it's the government's responsibility and the committee bears no responsibility for its calling upon government is irresponsible. It reminds me a lot of the complaints made over the 13 years after we signed Kyoto, for the years after Kyoto, that a number was picked. There was no plan in place. Where did we end up?

To simply suggest, though, that this is the number it's going to be and we're not going to listen to, from experts, what the likely or possible makeup of achieving those targets might look like...I don't understand why that would be a wrong-headed conversation for this bill.

So while I understand—

**The Chair:** Do you want to clarify that for Mr. Cullen?

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** Of course, I want to clarify that. I want to hear from those experts how much this could cost. The only thing I'm saying is that they decide what they do with it. If we're going to discuss how much it could cost, that's fine; I agree with it. But it's not me with a private bill who is going to draft all the government legislation. No way. I just want to make sure that we agree on that.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** It was never the suggestion to do so. That would take how many meetings? It would take dozens and dozens of meetings. If we're in agreement on the need to understand some of the implications of what we're asking for and the likely solutions, in a sense it would help force the hand of the government to achieve this bill, by using the mechanisms that are appropriate. This goes back to Mr. Bigras' point and mine regarding the marketplace.

In talking to Tim briefly and looking through our report, there are some comments on the market. But honestly, I don't think committee members are at all aware of the readiness of Montreal and how effective Montreal is right now for companies or the government to engage.

As Mr. Bigras said, there are some fundamental differences of opinion over the use of the market as a mechanism for achieving reductions. Without the marketplace, the implications are otherwise. I can't even imagine what this would actually require the government to do, if they're unwilling to use that tool, so that tool has to be presented.

• (1030)

**The Chair:** Mr. Warawa.

**Mr. Mark Warawa:** Mr. Chair, I think we've reached consensus on a plan.

Is there any objection with the plan that's been laid out, which Tim has made very clear, in the spirit that the witnesses for the next two meetings...?

**The Chair:** I think we've pretty much.... The next two meetings are kind of agreed to, and obviously we can be somewhat flexible regarding the availability of witnesses in terms of the last four meetings.

**Mr. Mark Warawa:** Yes, and some of the discussion taking place now will be taking place over the coming weeks.

**The Chair:** Sure, and again, Mr. Cullen, you're going to look at that one issue.

Mr. Bigras, if you have people you think should be part of this, now that we sort of have the outline, please submit those names to the clerk.

Could the opposition please prioritize that list to help out, so we know who the clerk should try to get here on Tuesday and Thursday of next week? I believe the government has already prioritized, or is in the process of doing so, and can provide that to the clerk. It would help to know the main people we'd like to get here first.

Are there any other comments?

**Hon. John Godfrey:** My comment is that this process has worked reasonably well.

**The Chair:** Great. Any others?

Yes, Mr. Cullen.



**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Lastly, I know Tim's under pressure for this, but could we please have some sort of calendar of events by Tuesday?

It's hard to just agree to what we have today, without—

**The Chair:** And of course we will have a CEPA meeting as well in there—

**A voice:** On Monday.

**The Chair:** So we'll work on that right away.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Luc Harvey:** When will the next CEPA meeting be held?

[*English*]

**The Chair:** We'll have to wait on the clerk to see about witnesses—certainly next Tuesday, and maybe on Monday.

Are there any other questions?

Thank you. We're adjourned.

---





**Published under the authority of the Speaker of the House of Commons**

**Publié en conformité de l'autorité du Président de la Chambre des communes**

**Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address:  
Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à l'adresse suivante :  
<http://www.parl.gc.ca>**

---

**The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.**

**Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.**