



House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

ENVI • NUMBER 062 • 1st SESSION • 39th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Thursday, May 31, 2007

—
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, May 31, 2007

•(1110)

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan (Halifax West, Lib.)): Colleagues, the meeting is called to order.

[Translation]

I'm sorry to be late. I had another meeting. It is Luc's fault as he slowed me down when I was on my way here.

[English]

No, he doesn't want to accept responsibility. We walked in here together, but we were both a minute late. So my apologies.

We have two orders of business today. The first relates to Bill C-377, an act to ensure Canada assumes its responsibilities in preventing dangerous climate change. The second is a notice of motion from Mr. McGuinty, which we'll get to a little later.

I understand from the clerk that the chair, Mr. Mills, has suggested that we first discuss how we want to deal with Bill C-377. We haven't had a discussion to determine our decision about what kind of work plan we would have in relation to this bill, so we should talk about how to organize the committee's work and perhaps about the number of meetings we think we need to have on this bill.

I haven't seen any hands yet, but I think Mr. Cullen would like to talk about a proposed work plan for this, so I'm going to invite him to do so. How does that sound?

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): It sounds great, Mr. Chair.

We've obviously been giving this some consideration. This is just in colloquial to remind committee members that this is Mr. Layton's private member's bill.

This bill was originally designed to take us from 2012 and beyond, because we knew that in play were the government's efforts around clean air and climate change, which became the Clean Air and Climate Change Act, and Mr. Rodriguez's bill. This piece was meant to follow. We've thrown over some ideas about who we think we need to hear from.

The timing of this is kind of fortunate because of the conversations going on in the global context right now. Some of us will be at the global forum leading to the G-8 plus 5.

Bali is the next round of the United Nations meetings that takes us beyond the Kyoto concept. For those of us who have been involved in some of the international negotiations, the main concern at the international community level is that there be no gap between the

commitments made in the Kyoto round and the next round, that the negotiations have a natural flow, and that countries recommit to new targets to take us beyond 2012.

Bill C-377 is meant to be that piece, so that Parliament wrestles with the idea of what comes next. We all know the context and the struggles with what happened around the first commitment period. There's an effort to get it right for the second one, because in a sense the second one is where Canada in particular is going to have the most bearing and weight on our domestic policies. I'm sure there are lots of comments on that.

What we're suggesting today is that we have not a brainstorm, Chair, but a throwing in of ideas, and that we then turn to the clerk, or Tim, or whoever may be advising us on a work plan.

Is Tim not with us any more? We're Tim-less. That's okay. Don't over-rely.

A voice: Do you want Timbits?

Mr. Nathan Cullen: If Timbits were made available, the NDP would have no objections, if they were transfat-free.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Nathan Cullen: The question is then to put forward a series of folks from whom we think we need to hear. We've looked over Bill C-288's and the Bill C-30's witnesses. We don't want repetition.

There will be some witnesses who we will suggest to hear from again, only because it's a different conversation. Everything we heard from on Bill C-30 and Bill C-288 was first round, first target-setting. This is all about much further into the future, into 2050, which has different industrial and economic implications.

Certainly we're going to suggest that we hear from the IPCC, in terms of some of their long range; from UN science representatives and their long-range predictions regarding impacts of certain degrees, temperature change, and those types of things; from the UNFCCC; and from some assortment of national domestic environment groups—and balance this with some of the industrial players who will have some comment.

We think there's some interest with Mr. Schwarzenegger's visit yesterday, in looking at what California's plans are. There seems to be some interest from the government side, and certainly from those of us in opposition, towards understanding. It seems that California is taking much of the lead in U.S. domestic policy and is likely to have some effect on Washington.

Maybe we could look at inviting some official American delegation from the federal level in Washington. The reason is that there's been much talk from both the previous government and this government not to be offside what the Americans are planning to do.

• (1115)

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): You're looking for an excuse to go to Anaheim for game seven.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: I'm not looking to go to Anaheim for game seven. I'm not sure we could pull it off in that time, and I think the Canadian taxpayers would probably have something to say about that.

The last two witnesses we would see as useful are department officials in terms of the government's long-range plans, and, as we've done on other private members' bills, Mr. Layton, the mover of the bill.

That's about it.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Just to clarify, when you spoke of the witnesses we had on previous bills on climate change, some of those witnesses would have spoken about the period up to 2012 and would have knowledge and so forth on the period after that. But you're saying you think that we would not call on most of them.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: There are two qualifications I would use, particularly on the environmentalist side of things. Some witnesses, I would suggest, are better informed. They specialize in the topic. The other qualification is that they've given serious consideration to what we're talking about here.

There has been a lot of interest and consideration of the first Kyoto period; there are fewer groups that actually work on thinking about the long-term implications. I would say that's also true on the industry side. Some are more short range, but some of the industry groups, the Alcan, in the Canadian context, have been more fixated on the long range.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): One of the reasons I asked is that the clerk has prepared a list of the witnesses who came for both Bill C-288 and Bill C-30. He has copies of that for the members who wish to have the list. Shall I ask him to distribute that list?

Mr. Nathan Cullen: I think that would be helpful. My suggestion for today is to put ideas on the table, hear from committee members as to who they definitely don't want or want, and then have the clerk present a work plan to take us through the bill.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): It seems to me that having the copy of that list would be useful—

Mr. Nathan Cullen: Sure. Absolutely.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): —as they think about who should come.

I'm going to ask you to pass that around, and then I'll turn to Mr. Warawa.

Mr. Mark Warawa (Langley, CPC): Thank you, Chair.

Mr. Cullen and I have talked before about the idea of steering committees. The last time we had the steering committee go over a list of witnesses it worked quite well. You can see how long it's

going to take for us to spend a lot of time this morning or in subsequent meetings trying to put together a witness list and a potential plan. I would suggest that we consider having a steering committee go over that. It worked well in the past, and I believe it would work well for this.

You're quite right that what we've discussed to this point has been up to 2012. We're looking to what's after 2012. The G-8 plus 5 climate change dialogue—and Mr. Cullen is going, as many of us on the committee are going, as there's representation from each party—may provide a helpful perspective to build that witness list. I'm willing to meet now, but I would suggest that we'll have a healthier perspective in planning for the future and building a realistic witness list after the G-8 plus 5. That's what I would suggest.

I'm hoping Bill C-377 will provide some good guidance. There are some problems with it, and hopefully we'll find some middle ground. There was some comment in the report from the Library of Parliament that an amendment was suggested for Bill C-288 because of some concerns.

Another witness we need to have would be the environment commissioner. I think that would be helpful. There are some expectations of the commissioner.

I would suggest that we have the witness list built at the steering committee.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Mr. Cullen, you have....

• (1120)

Mr. Nathan Cullen: That suggestion sounds fine to me. I think it's the best way to work things out quickly. I think we did the Bill C-30 witnesses that way. Everyone presented their options, we vetted them, and then we presented them back to committee.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Monsieur Bigras.

[*Translation*]

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

I am more or less in agreement with what the government is proposing. On the substance of it, I want to remind you that my party supports the principle of Bill C-377, even though we consider that it has major flaws. One would be that the first greenhouse gas reduction period, for 2008 to 2012, does not appear in clause 5 of the bill.

Given that we managed, in committee, to amend Bill C-30 and to pass Bill C-288 which has a 6% greenhouse gas reduction goal for the initial period, I feel that this bill deserves study and major amendments, particularly as far as clause 5 is concerned, so that we could incorporate the 6% greenhouse gas reduction goal, which is not part of Bill C-377.

As far as the approach is concerned, I agree entirely with Mr. Warawa. I think that we must wait for the G8 meeting in June, which will probably give us more information. We also have to wait to see what the Senate will say and what will happen to Bill C-288. If it were to come into effect, that would perhaps change the aspects we would want to work on in Bill C-377.

I am suggesting more or less the same thing as Mr. Warawa. When we look at our agenda, we can see that we have little time left. We know that several committee members will not be here on June 5th, because they will be in Germany. In the full knowledge that there will probably be a proposal that we'll have to vote on in a few minutes, I think that we will, indeed, have to draw up a witness list and prepare a schedule to study Bill C-377 at the steering committee, as Mr. Warawa has moved. I believe we will be in a position, when we return in September, to study the bill with a witness list and a well-structured agenda.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Thank you, Monsieur Bigras.

[Translation]

The clerk has suggested, and I think this is in line with what my colleagues have suggested, that we take a week or two so that committee members can send the clerk their suggested witnesses. Those names will be studied either by the committee or by the steering committee. We will have to choose today.

[English]

Are there other speakers?

Mr. McGuinty.

Mr. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.): Thanks, Mr. Chair. I'd like to support the comments made by Mr. Cullen and Mr. Bigras.

I think this is an important bill to examine closely, because we're in a period of great uncertainty.

We asked the minister on Tuesday of this week whether we're going to see Bill C-30 arrive on the floor of the House of Commons, as it should, and the answer was no.

We asked the minister if he was prepared to work with us on examining whether Bill C-30 could be even further improved. The answer was no.

For meaningful debate, as Monsieur Bigras said just moments ago, there is the question of Bill C-288: where is Bill C-288 going, and how does the government intend to treat Bill C-288? Also, what are the government's constitutional responsibilities? What is it intending to do with a bill that may or may not receive royal assent? The government has been silent so far.

There is great confusion around the potential use of CDM under the Kyoto Protocol. As the minister let us know on Tuesday, he's not clear about how we will or will not participate in CDM.

There is huge uncertainty in the financial markets. I was speaking this week to—

• (1125)

Mr. Mark Warawa: On a point of order, I don't mean to interrupt, but the discussion right now is Bill C-377, and how we are going to plan Bill C-377. So I would encourage Mr. McGuinty to stay on topic.

Thank you.

Mr. David McGuinty: I'm right on topic, Mr. Warawa. Thank you very much for reminding me.

There's huge uncertainty, and this speaks directly to this bill. We cannot examine Bill C-377 in isolation. You cannot. We must examine this bill in the context of Bill C-30, in the context of Bill C-288, in the context of CDM, and in the context of what's happening this weekend in Germany. We have to. We have to examine this in a more fulsome context, a larger context. I'm strongly supportive of examining this bill precisely because of the uncertainty created by the government's plan. There is uncertainty internationally, uncertainty in the provinces, uncertainty in the financial markets, uncertainty with industrial players. There's great uncertainty in Canada now. This is where we've arrived.

I think Bill C-377 is going to take us more time rather than less time. I support Mr. Cullen's idea, for example, to bring the IPCC forward to give us some clarity on two-degree, three-degree, five-degree changes going forward. I support the idea of examining the California plan. We heard yesterday that the California plan is to a certain extent aligned with Bill C-377. It's clearly not aligned with where we're going as a country, but it's aligned with Bill C-377, and it's certainly more aligned with Bill C-30.

There's also uncertainty in the European Union. The French president is now saying they're taking the notion of trade sanctions to the European Union to react to countries like Canada, who unilaterally change the terms and conditions of the treaty they've signed. There's uncertainty.

I think this is something we have to examine in some detail. I don't know whether we're going to get to it, Mr. Chair, and get to all these witnesses before the government decides to have the House rise. There's even uncertainty as to when the House is rising.

We're now in a situation where if we can roll out a plan that makes sense, I want to table it.

I think it's important for all of us to keep in mind that we cannot examine Bill C-377 in isolation. It does speak to a larger question, and once again the greater uncertainty created domestically and internationally by the government's plan.

Thank you very much.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Thank you, Mr. McGuinty.

First of all, we don't have a steering committee at the moment, right?

A voice: There is a steering committee.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Oh, we did create one. Pardon me.

I haven't heard opposition to the idea of referring this to the steering committee, and I haven't heard opposition to the idea of giving a week or two for members to submit suggestions to the clerk. I'd like to get clarification in terms of what period of time you want to give for members to get their suggestions to the clerk.

I have Mr. Cullen and then Mr. Vellacott.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: I don't think two weeks to have people think through the list is necessary.

I would caution committee members to not base their suggestions just on this list. Committee members will remember that there were some witnesses that we, as a committee, agreed to, but who couldn't make it. There were other committee choices that for whatever reasons didn't get put on. There are some broader lists to consider, but this is a great start.

In talking to my staff, we're talking about the end of this week to submit things to the clerk, so that when we come back we can hit the ground running. I don't think there's any need to have long consideration over possible witnesses. We've heard a lot around this topic. We should probably know where we want to go.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): You're saying you're prepared to have it in by the end of this week; you're not saying you would limit it to tomorrow, obviously. I think you're saying a week. Is that your point of view?

Mr. Nathan Cullen: I'm looking at when the committee comes back. We're doing some estimates. The subcommittee can get together next Wednesday or something.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): So your suggestion is Wednesday morning? I just want to know—

Mr. Nathan Cullen: I'm thinking if everyone has everything in by Tuesday then Wednesday the subcommittee can meet and look over a draft.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Your view is Tuesday.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: Yes, sorry. Just to finish, Chair, the draft would be presented to the committee by Thursday and the committee can decide yea or nay as to that plan of action. We'll need to start calling people.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Thank you.

Mr. Vellacott.

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, CPC): I have only one caution in respect to the steering committee. I'm not radically opposed to it. The issue is that if it ends up being the very same ground covered in our full committee then I question the wisdom of people's use of time. I'm not on that steering committee, but I don't want to see other people's time abused, where we go through a wrangle and replay at the full committee level. I'm just throwing some caution out on that. You're all well aware, and I don't really need to belabour that. But I question the merits of the committee, at least in terms of the operation from the past year.

• (1130)

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Thank you very much.

That has been the concern in the past, but we're in the hands of the committee today. So far the preponderance of reviews would seem to be—although there hasn't been a motion or a vote—toward having the steering committee doing this in the hopes that it could resolve this in an amicable manner.

Mr. McGuinty.

Mr. David McGuinty: Through you, Mr. Chair, I would like to ask Mr. Cullen a question. With respect to the motion, at some point in the past—I think in committee—he said he was anxious or interested in examining the extent to which this bill might be amended and whether there was any possibility of migrating parts of,

for example, Bill C-30—the now suppressed Bill C-30—into this private member's bill. I'm not sure if he's given that any more thought, or if he can help us understand this, or whether, through you, Mr. Chair, he's spoken to the legislative counsel or clerk to get a sense of the kind of amendable approach he wants to bring to this. Secondly, how amendable is this bill?

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): I have Mr. Warawa next, and if Mr. Cullen indicates he wishes to speak, I'll obviously put him on the list.

Is that a yes, that you wish to speak?

Mr. Nathan Cullen: I'll speak.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Okay.

Mr. Warawa.

Mr. Mark Warawa: I'm fine with speaking afterwards.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Great.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: You heard me make the suggestion to the minister when he was in front of the committee discussing what parts of Bill C-30 he liked and what parts he didn't, and those sorts of things. So we're obviously open to the concept. There are certain rules under which we all operate in private members' bills, because there are certain things you can't bring into a bill, and certain things you can; we operate under those rules.

The idea of this is to begin the next conversation in this country, which is at least a decade delayed, I would suggest. When we go to GLOBE we will see that other countries have had this long-range and medium-range conversation about targets at least five years ago, and most of our European partners have.

So of course we're always open to amendments.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Thank you, Mr. Cullen.

Mr. Warawa.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Thank you, Chair.

At this point we don't have a motion on the floor, do we?

I think there is a desire, a consensus, to have this referred to a steering committee. Mr. Bigras had suggested starting in September. I think that's practical, in the sense that we're scheduled to be here until the 22nd, so we have another three weeks, approximately.

Tomorrow, many of us are going to Berlin to the G-8 plus 5.

Mr. Cullen suggested that we meet Wednesday of next week. We will arrive back on Tuesday, so we'll be a little jet-lagged, but I think having a first meeting of the steering committee would be fine on Wednesday of next week.

During this next week we can provide the clerk with some names, but it wouldn't be a restrictive list of names; that list can evolve. We can start in September with a reconvening of the steering committee, maybe a day before we have the committee meeting. So we can start in September with Bill C-377, with the recommendations of a witness list, and a plan.

If that's okay, I'd like to move a motion that the witness list and the planning be referred to a steering committee, and that the first meeting be Wednesday of next week.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Would you like to add to that motion a few words on the time in which members are asked to submit suggestions of witnesses to the clerk, so that you can have a list to consider?

Mr. Mark Warawa: I think the agreement was by next week. It would not be a restrictive list.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): What I have in mind is whether you want to say 5 p.m. Tuesday, for example.

Mr. Mark Warawa: That would be fine.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Before we go further, I'm going to make sure the clerk has the motion. I'm going to ask him to read it back as best he can.

Mr. Mark Warawa: It's not a restrictive list.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): No, the list is to make suggestions to the steering committee. And the steering committee can obviously propose who it wants to the full committee. And hopefully we won't have another debate here about that, but we'll have to wait and see how that goes.

The steering committee is made up of the chair, Mr. Warawa, Mr. McGuinty, Mr. Bigras, and Mr. Cullen.

I'm going to ask the clerk to read the motion.

Mr. Warawa, I want to make sure you hear this, so you can check to see whether this is the right wording.

• (1135)

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Justin Vaive): The motion of Mr. Warawa is that by 5 p.m. on Tuesday, June 5, suggestions for witnesses on Bill C-377 be provided to the clerk in advance of the steering committee meeting on Wednesday, June 6.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): That's reasonable; it sounds fine.

(Motion agreed to)

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Is there anything else? Is there any further business to discuss in relation to the study of Bill C-377? I don't think so.

We can go on to the next item, which is the notice of motion from Mr. McGuinty, to which I'm guessing he may wish to speak, but I'm only guessing.

Mr. David McGuinty: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I will be mercifully brief.

This motion flows from the meeting of Tuesday of this week, Mr. Chair and colleagues, where we had an opportunity to ask the minister about estimates. Upon reviewing the minister's testimony, I'd just like to review for committee colleagues what we heard, for example, with respect to spending in 2007-08.

This is what the testimony indicated, from the minister's mouth: \$88 million through clean energy; a clean regulatory agenda on which we're spending \$68 million; ecoENERGY measures in support of the clean air agenda on which we're spending, apparently, \$145 million; clean transportation, the transit pass tax credit, upon which we're spending \$220 million—I don't know how it's possible, for example, Mr. Chair, to know what the transit pass tax credit is

actually going to cost us; ecoTransportation measures in support of a clean air agenda from prior to the budget 2007, on which we're spending \$20 million.

That comes to a total of \$541 million, according to my numbers. Yet the number we were given in total sum was I think also in testimony, something around \$844 million, \$845 million. To my calculations, that's at least a \$300 million discrepancy.

With respect to last year's spending, in the minister's words, for 2006-07, the total was \$3.336 billion, including ecoTrust, \$1.519 billion paid out on the last day of March. But all the provinces have stated, in their own budgets, that they haven't received a penny of ecoTrust money in our early research that is contingent on the 2007-08 budget passing.

Having looked at the numbers and the sums, I just couldn't understand where the money was at. I thought it would be helpful for us to bring back to the committee, as soon as practicable, as soon as convenient, the senior officials to examine, again, in more detail the climate change spending for 2006-07 and the anticipated spending for 2007-08.

I'm also disappointed because I e-mailed our chair two days ago, hours after the testimony, reminding the chair, and I copied the clerk, that the minister assured us he would get to us by Thursday of this week, today, a detailed breakdown of the spending in 2006-07 and the anticipated spending for 2007-08. I would assume that this information is available at the push of a computer keyboard button, that this information is calculated, defensible, the sums have been added up, the estimates are correct, and that a key breakdown of what's actually been spent and being anticipated in spending surely is available at the push of a button on the minister's desk. Surely the government, the parliamentary secretary, must have access to those numbers.

So because no material has arrived, as well as the fact that we asked the minister to provide for us by today a copy of the interesting deck that was put up for public and photo opportunity consumption.... That deck has not materialized in both official languages. There are staff here from offices who I think might have been working the computers and might be able to table that deck today, in both official languages. That has mysteriously not appeared today, after it was asked for and we were assured we would get it.

I thought, well, we need to hear more. We just need to hear more. As parliamentarians, our first responsibility is the estimates process. It's about transparency. It's about accountability.

• (1140)

Mr. Brian Jean (Fort McMurray—Athabasca, CPC): I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): On a point of order, Mr. Jean.

Mr. Brian Jean: I want to advise the committee that different committees are waiting for material to be translated. That may be part of Mr. McGuinty's problem with the issue at hand. Certainly I don't think he should blame translation for any backlog in the work.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Mr. McGuinty.

Mr. David McGuinty: If I might respond to that point of order—it's an important one—if the parliamentary secretary is telling me the estimates that are available to the minister and his staff are not in both official languages immediately, I have a hard time believing that. The estimates are always produced in both official languages. In fact, so is all the accounting.

The point is that it would be helpful for us to hear from senior officials again before the House rises, which is why I put a tentative date of June 5 in the notice of motion. I open it, Mr. Chair, for discussion.

I do formally move this motion. I don't think I used those words at the beginning of my remarks.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Is it your intention, because it's not clear from the motion, that this would be a further part of the study of the main estimates, or a self-initiated study? It doesn't specify that in the motion.

Mr. David McGuinty: I would expect this to be part of the main estimates process.

I need some clarification as to the nature of your question, Mr. Chair.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): The question was whether this study, which you ask the department officials to come for, would be part of the study of the main estimates or it would be a new, self-initiated study.

Mr. David McGuinty: It's part of the continuum. I don't think we got the the clarity we would expect to get in the ministerial presentation of last Tuesday.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): The clerk has indicated that could be acceptable as part of the motion. That's part of the motion you're moving it, I take it.

Mr. David McGuinty: It is.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): All right. That's the information I have from the clerk.

For your information, before we continue with the discussion, it's worthwhile to understand what we're debating. It is a notice of motion, and the motion would say that as part of the main estimates, the committee invite department officials from Environment Canada and Treasury Board, etc.

On a point of order, Mr. Godfrey.

Hon. John Godfrey (Don Valley West, Lib.): If one were to add a phrase, “in accordance with the right of the official opposition to designate one department for delay of estimates”, does it add clarity? That is what we're doing: it's an official request at the level of the opposition to designate one department for delayed consideration. Whether that actually helps or not, I don't know.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): From that clause that has been added to the motion I've read, I think it is clear. I think members are cognizant that what you've just referred to as a point of order has occurred.

We have a list: Mr. Cullen, Mr. Harvey, Mr. Lussier, and Mr. Warawa.

Mr. Cullen.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: I'm reminded of some advice that Mr. Mills gave the committee at one point in terms of how parliamentary committees have not traditionally done a good job at getting answers out of the main estimates process. There has been more of a skimming approach. As we do this we should seek to be a bit more surgical about what we're trying to understand and then dive a little more into one or two or three aspects.

I don't know if it was something off the top of Mr. McGuinty's head or something prepared—it doesn't matter—, but he made a list of things that he wants to know about: some of the energy components in particular. I think that's more productive. Maybe we could seek some assistance from the clerk or the Library in terms of preparing some analysis. Frankly, the whole main estimates is a large budgetary item. Oftentimes questions become more vague than specific. If there is something particular we want to know, that is the focus we'll be bringing.

I put that into the mix. As opposed to having a general view of what the department is doing or not doing, let's dive into something in particular. I took that advice from Mr. Mills to be able to actually bring something back to Parliament or the Canadian people and say this is the area of concern or this has to have more done to it.

I'll leave it at that.

• (1145)

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Thank you, Mr. Cullen.

Perhaps that's an invitation of sorts to the analysts and researchers to look at these questions in advance of that meeting. Members might want to give suggestions in terms of key areas they would looking for the researchers to consider. That's up to members, and I would encourage them to do so. Next Tuesday isn't necessarily the deadline for that, because we're a ways off from having those meetings.

We'll go on to Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Luc Harvey (Louis-Hébert, CPC): It's okay. I got my answer. I will give my place to Mark.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Well, Mr. Bigras is next, and then Mr. Warawa and Mr. Godfrey.

Monsieur Bigras.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Bigras: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I support the principle of the motion. I do not believe that the last committee meeting allowed us to fully study the issue of government expenses concerning climate change. That was perhaps because there were two items on the agenda: the plan to fight against climate change and expenditures. We obviously did not get to the bottom of things as far as expenditures are concerned at the last meeting. I'm not criticizing the minister, because the questions posed by Mr. McGuinty were very detailed and no doubt the senior officials will have to testify in order to allow us to study the issue of climate change-related expenditures more closely.

I support the principle of the motion, but the date of June 5 poses a problem for me. I know that Mr. Warawa, Mr. Cullen and Mr. Godfrey will be in Germany. As for myself, I will not be here for personal and professional reasons. I would move an amendment to the motion which would aim at these witnesses appearing on Thursday June 7, 2007 instead. In any case, we may only have one more committee meeting; we will see what happens. I think we need to get to the bottom of things and hear from the senior officials in order to get some clarification. The Bloc will support the motion if our amendment is accepted by Mr. McGuinty.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Thank you very much, Mr. Bigras.

I see that you moved a motion to amend. We will now debate the amendment.

Mr. Warawa.

[English]

Mr. Mark Warawa: I have a clarification, Chair, before I speak to the amendment. Was it a friendly amendment that was accepted, or is it an amendment I'll be speaking to?

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): What we're debating is whether we go from the 5th to the 7th, and I guess Mr. Warawa was asking whether that was acceptable to Mr. McGuinty.

Mr. David McGuinty: Yes, I'm very supportive of the notion, as a friendly amendment, to move it to either the next day, the 6th, or it could be the 7th, but it certainly can't be any later than the 7th.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Technically, we have to deal with the amendment either way. The motion to amend is to go to the 7th, and what you're saying is that you're open to that or something else. That's what you're saying. We have to vote on the motion in any case, but we have a list—

• (1150)

Hon. John Godfrey: I have a point of order.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Yes, Mr. Godfrey.

Hon. John Godfrey: Just to make sure, and I hope the clerk knows the answer to this, since we're going to be voting on the entire estimates package at 10 o'clock on the 7th, as I understand it, is there any technical reason that running it up so close to the deadline with these estimates puts us in any problematic area? I would assume that if we made no changes—and the only kind of changes we could make would be to reduce—and if it just went through as is, that wouldn't be a problem. But to your knowledge, is there any potential difficulty with taking it as late as the 7th, given the fact we're going to vote on the whole thing on the evening of the 7th?

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): I'm going to ask the clerk to explain his answer to this question.

The Clerk: There is an issue. What you're referring to, I think, Mr. Godfrey, is Standing Order 81.4, paragraphs (b) and (c).

Hon. John Godfrey: Precisely, but I didn't want to clutter up the conversation with all those numbers.

The Clerk: The leader of the opposition has requested, and from my understanding it was adopted yesterday in the House, that consideration of the main estimates for the environment committee be extended beyond May 31, at which point they otherwise would

have been deemed reported back. The new deadline can be viewed, I guess, as to some extent still up in the air, because the committee on the extension would have up to ten extra sitting days to consider the main estimates. However depending when the last allotted day is, which is basically the last opposition day of the current supply period, this committee would have the opportunity to report the main estimates back up until the day immediately preceding the last allotted day.

I myself don't have confirmation when that last allotted day is; I'm not sure whether the government has set it officially yet. But for example, if it were to be on Thursday the 7th, the main estimates would be deemed reported back automatically to the House. So the last opportunity the committee would have, if in fact the last allotted day is on the 7th, would be to consider the main estimates no later than the day immediately preceding that, which would be the 6th of June.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): What you're saying is that if, for example, hypothetically we all were pretty confident that it were going to be next Thursday, our last opportunity to do it would be next Wednesday.

Mr. Godfrey, you're on a point of order?

Hon. John Godfrey: Absolutely.

My understanding is that the government has indicated that the last opposition day that comes to us, which is what we're talking about, will be on Thursday the 7th. That's exactly the point I was trying to get at.

For technical reasons, we should then perhaps change the amendment to make it the afternoon of the 6th, which is not a time we normally meet, but it allows us to fulfil what you suggest. Otherwise, we don't have any authority on the 7th.

[Translation]

I will ask Mr. Bigras.

[English]

Technically, we can either—

[Translation]

Mr. Bigras, I don't know if you want to change the date, since—

Mr. Bernard Bigras: Are you referring June 6? It would not be possible on June 7 because that is an opposition day.

[English]

Hon. John Godfrey: Okay.

[Translation]

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Mr. Godfrey, we also have to consider the fact that we already agreed that the steering committee will sit on June 6.

Excuse me. Mr. Godfrey?

[English]

Hon. John Godfrey: I'm sorry, we're just sorting out a little detail here.

Does it really matter, then, whether we do it on the 6th or the 7th?

We should go with the 6th? Okay.

[Translation]

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): As I said, we already decided that the steering committee would sit on Wednesday at 3:30 p.m. We should continue this discussion, and we can obviously change the day the steering committee meets, but we do have to keep that fact in mind.

Mr. Bigras.

Mr. Bernard Bigras: I will read exactly what you have just said. We have just said that a meeting of the steering committee has been scheduled. I think June 6 is a bit early, unless the Liberals announce today that the opposition day will be on the environment. I don't know why having the meeting on this issue on June 7 is a problem even if there is an opposition day in the House of Commons that Thursday. Of course, if the opposition day was on the environment, I admit that could cause certain problems. However, we don't know what the subject of the opposition day will be; it could be a subject which a committee member may be called upon to speak to in the House in his or her capacity as critic, or in any other capacity. I think the meeting should be held on June 7. We will only support the motion on that condition. We could make sure that all committee members are present to fully review the issue, as per McGuinty's wish, and we would accommodate everyone's schedules. I did not say so earlier, but this is a friendly amendment to Mr. McGuinty's motion.

• (1155)

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Thank you, Mr. Bigras.

The clerk has just told me that the main estimates will not be studied by the committee next Thursday if that day is designated as an opposition day. If that turns out to be the case, and we arrive here on Thursday, but the main estimates are not available to us, it will be for that reason.

Mr. Bernard Bigras: I don't see any conflict, unless I'm told that people would like to... What I take from the Liberal motion is that they simply want more details about government expenses for 2006-07. If they want more information and if that information is already public, I don't see how that could affect the work of our committee. The Liberals simply want more details. I don't see how that is contradictory.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): I'm going to go back to Mr. Godfrey just for a quick explanation and then I'm going to Mr. Warawa.

Hon. John Godfrey: Just to make it clear, one of the potential opposition day motions... We know first of all that next Thursday will be an opposition day. The house leaders have agreed to that being a Liberal opposition day. Secondly, one of the motions on the order paper has to do with climate change and the G-8 meeting. I'm not saying, because it's not up to me, that this will be the motion we will put forward for opposition day.

[Translation]

Nevertheless, the opposition day may be on the G8 meeting and climate change. Indeed, the timing is right. It's not up to me to speak to the issue, but the fact remains that Mr. Bigras has concerns. I

cannot guarantee that it will not be on the order paper for the opposition day.

Mr. Bernard Bigras: Ad hoc.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Mr. Warawa.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Just for clarification before I speak again, we are speaking to the amendment—is that correct?

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Yes.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Which is that we meet on June 7—

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): As opposed to the 6th.

Mr. Mark Warawa: My first question to you, Chair, is whether or not the original motion is in order. Without an original motion, you're not going to have an amendment.

I received during yesterday, and even late last night, an agenda that did not include this motion from Mr. McGuinty calling for another meeting on the main estimates.

When did the clerk receive this motion from Mr. McGuinty?

• (1200)

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Mr. Warawa, the clerk informs me that he received the notice of motion at ten minutes to five yesterday and sent it out about ten minutes to six. Members had until six o'clock yesterday to get this to the clerk, as I understand it; therefore the motion would be in order.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Thank you. I just wanted clarification of that.

I also want to begin my comments in addressing a question from Mr. McGuinty. He asked, when we had the minister here:

Can you provide for the committee, say by Thursday of this week, a detailed written breakdown of this so-called new environmental spending?

He asked for it to be received on Thursday of this week, which is today, and it will be received today by the clerk.

Hopefully that answers the question, Mr. McGuinty; it definitely will be received today.

Chair, we've had numerous meetings already on the estimates. We met on March 22, May 16, again on May 17, and again on May 29. We've already had numerous meetings on this. I'm not quite sure Mr. McGuinty said he had... I think he said he was confused.

So we've had numerous meetings; the minister and the department have been here; we've already discussed this subject. If the committee wants to have further meetings on it, I question the rationale, the why. I don't have a problem. If they want to have more information, fine; we can meet on June 7. But I question why.

We've built a schedule of meetings. One of the agreements was that we were going to have—

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Mr. Warawa, I'm sorry for interrupting, but can I ask you to hold the broader question of whether to have these meetings at all until after we've settled this amendment? Do you mind?

The question really is, if we do hold them, do we do it on Tuesday or Thursday? The motion is to do it Thursday; and Wednesday hasn't been moved.

Mr. Mark Warawa: If we want to call the question on that, then we'll see what happens. Otherwise, if we're going back to the general day of the 5th, then I will have more comments.

So we'll call the question on June 7.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): In terms of calling the question, you're asking if it's the will of the committee to go to the question. If there are no further speakers on this, then we'll go to the question.

Apparently Mr. McGuinty wishes to speak.

Mr. David McGuinty: It's a point of order that goes back to what Mr. Godfrey brought up a moment ago. And this question, Chair, is through you to the clerk.

Is it possible, technically, to hold such a meeting on the 7th, when the government has instructed the official opposition that it has allotted the final opposition day on Thursday of next week. Is it then, in fact, too late to hold this meeting on Thursday the 7th, and are we obligated to hold it on the 6th instead?

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): I'm going to ask the clerk to respond.

The Clerk: If in fact the last allotted day is June 7, then the main estimates on June 7 at that point will no longer be before this committee; they will have been deemed reported back on that day. Therefore, the last day this committee can take up the main estimates —

Hon. John Godfrey: Even with the extension?

The Clerk: Even with the extension.

The last day the committee can take up the main estimates is the day immediately preceding the allotted day, which in this case would be on June 6. But I haven't heard officially that June 7 is the last allotted day.

• (1205)

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Okay.

Does that mean the motion is still in order, because you're saying you don't know whether or not June 7 is the allotted day?

Mr. Bigras.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Bigras: The question is simple. Does the fact that the June 7 opposition day prevent us from going ahead with the study as presented? If it does not, we can study the estimates, and the committee can get more information. Nothing prevents us from doing that.

However, if there is a vote, I admit I have a problem with that. Decisions will probably have been made with regard to the budget. In that case, can the committee proceed with the study as proposed for June 7?

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): I think this takes us back—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Bigras: Is that in order? My question is straightforward.

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Thank you.

Just before I answer that, I think this takes us back to the first question I posed when we started this subject, which was whether or not this was to be part of the study of the main estimates or whether it was to be a self-initiated study, because what the clerk has indicated is that it could not be part of the study of the main estimates, if next Thursday is, as we know, the last allotted day. Therefore, it could not be part of the main estimates.

Now, that begs the question of whether or not the mover of the motion wants to make an amendment to withdraw the part about the main estimates. But if you want to have it under the main estimates—in effect, the estimates at all—it would have to be by the 6th.

So your question is whether the motion you made is receivable, in view of the fact that the last allotted day is next Thursday, as we all recognize.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Bigras: The motion contains no reference to the main estimates.

Was there an amendment?

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): When a motion is made, the mover can change the wording as he moves it. That's happened.

[*Translation*]

When Mr. McGuinty moved the motion, he indicated that it was for the main estimates. They are included in the motion for now. But that can be amended, or not.

Mr. Cullen is up next.

[*English*]

Mr. Nathan Cullen: Right.

We'll do the main estimates on the 6th. However expeditiously we can get ourselves there, let's do them. I find this conversation is running in circles.

If the intention is to look at the main estimates and the day we can do that is the 6th, then let's vote on a motion to do that.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): I think what you're telling us is that you would oppose this motion and that you might bring forward another one to say the 6th, in your view?

Mr. Nathan Cullen: Correct, if that's the proper process. Defeat this—

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): We first have to deal with this motion, but I can't bring it forward unless no one else wants to speak.

So, are there any other speakers on Mr. Bigras' motion, which you've indicated...

Is it receivable?

[Translation]

Mr. Bigras, since the government has not told the House that next Thursday would be an opposition day, which is the last opposition day of the session, your motion is in order. We all know what the situation is, but nothing has been formally announced in the House.

Does anyone else want to speak to this issue?

Mr. Godfrey.

Hon. John Godfrey: Mr. Bigras, should we take a moment to think this over?

Mr. Bernard Bigras: Sure, we could take a five-minute break.

•(1210)

[English]

Hon. John Godfrey: I would suggest we have a five-minute break, Chair, because I know that some people have to check back to make sure everybody's happy with what's being proposed here. So could we have a five-minute break?

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Is that a motion?

Hon. John Godfrey: It's a motion, or whatever. A suggestion.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Is it agreed that we adjourn for five minutes?

An hon. member: Well, no, I think we have a motion on the floor.

Hon. John Godfrey: Or we can talk. We can go either way. We can talk for five minutes and it will be riveting.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Call the question on the amendment, and if it doesn't pass, as Mr. Cullen said, then there can be an additional motion.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): If Mr. Godfrey is moving a motion to suspend, that takes precedence over the motion. It's in order and it takes precedence, so that motion would have to be voted on first.

Are you moving a motion that we suspend for five minutes?

Hon. John Godfrey: I'm moving a motion that we suspend for five minutes.

(Motion agreed to)

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): There will be a five-minute suspension.

• _____ (Pause) _____

•

•(1215)

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): The committee will come to order.

Are there further comments on the motion of Mr. Bigras? Is there further debate, colleagues, on the motion of Mr. Bigras?

Monsieur Bigras.

•(1220)

[Translation]

Mr. Bernard Bigras: Could you please repeat the motion we will vote on?

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Yes, we will vote on your motion calling for us to sit on June 7.

Mr. Bernard Bigras: Could you repeat the motion as amended? Would you like me to read it to you?

That the Committee invite department officials from Environment Canada and Treasury Board Secretariat to appear at Committee on Thursday, June 7, 2007 to discuss the government's climate change spending for 2006-07 and anticipated spending for 2007-08.

Shall we vote on this motion?

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): No, because no one said that the motion you are amending also includes the main estimates.

Mr. Bernard Bigras: Mr. Chairman, that's why I asked you to clarify the motion. Perhaps Mr. McGuinty should clarify the motion he originally presented.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Monsieur Rodriguez.

[Translation]

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez (Honoré-Mercier, Lib.): We can make an amendment to remove the connection with the main estimates.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): I suggest we vote on the subamendment, and then on the main amendment. Mr. McGuinty, or someone else, could then move the amendment on the main motion. However, if we want to avoid doing all that, the committee can unanimously agree to withdraw the part dealing the main estimates.

[English]

In other words, all that we'll have to go through otherwise.

First of all, there's no consent in any event, and the view of the clerk is that we should proceed first with the vote and then go back to the....

Monsieur Bigras.

[Translation]

Mr. Bernard Bigras: I want to be clear. I can ask for unanimous consent to adopt an amendment to change the date from June 5, 2007 to June 7, 2007. I therefore am asking for unanimous consent to amend the original motion so it reads June 7, 2007 instead of June 5, 2007.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): The problem is that the motion before, as moved by Mr. McGuinty today, was not amended in accordance with the standing orders. When Mr. McGuinty moved the motion, he indicated that it was part of the main estimates. So the motion before us also involves the main estimates. The fact that the motion was sent to the clerk yesterday is not relevant right now. Understood?

[English]

So if we deal with this, there's nothing to prevent us from coming back and dealing with the other issue right after that.

Mr. Warawa.

•(1225)

Mr. Mark Warawa: My first question, Chair, was whether this motion was in order. I was told by the clerk that it is.

With respect to Mr. Bigras, I misunderstood what the intent was. My understanding is that he only wants to change the date from June 5 to June 7. I would provide unanimous consent for that.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Actually, there's a problem with that. The problem, Mr. Warawa, is that he's saying he wants to amend the motion as written in the notice of today's meeting.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Right.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): But that isn't the motion before the committee. When a member comes to the committee and actually proposes the motion, he or she can word it as they wish. In this case Mr. McGuinty has worded it differently from the notice. That's still in order. He worded it to include the fact that it's part of the study of the main estimates.

Mr. Bigras is saying he would agree to changing it to the 7th, provided this element was excluded. That's not possible without the unanimous consent of the committee.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Harvey: I have a point of order. Could Bernard withdraw his motion, followed by Mr. McGuinty withdrawing his as well? We could then start again with the original motion, and Bernard could change the date from June 5 to June 7. Let's stop explaining where we're at. We understand that it's all mixed up.

A voice: And Mr. McGuinty could present a new motion.

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): I think if there is unanimous consent for Mr. Bigras to propose a motion that would simply say the wording that's here on the paper—change it to the 7th—with unanimous consent he can do that. If that's the will of the committee, then we can do it.

Is it the will of the committee to accept that?

Some hon. members: Yes.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Just bear with me.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): You have a moment, Mr. Warawa. I thought you were opposed to pauses.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Things change.

Mr. Chair, a moment ago I said we would provide unanimous consent to change the date in the motion before us from the 5th to the 7th. We oppose the 5th. I don't want to go into a number of reasons, but I could if we have to.

The chair responded that we couldn't, and then a moment ago I understood that you said we could. We do provide unanimous consent for that.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Forgive me; I was mistaken. Imagine that.

I gather we have unanimous consent to the motion as proposed by Mr. Bigras. Therefore, the motion says:

That the Committee invite departmental officials from Environment Canada and Treasury Board Secretariat to appear at committee on Thursday, June 7, 2007 to discuss the government's climate change spending for 2006-2007 and anticipated spending for 2007-2008.

That is the motion that has been proposed, and I believe it has unanimous consent.

(Motion agreed to)

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): How about that? It took a while, but there we are.

For the edification of the committee, the study next Thursday will be pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), which is what allows us to do a self-initiated study. Because it will not be part of the main estimates, we will not be able to take up the individual votes. I don't think that's any kind of impediment that we have to be concerned about. This is just FYI. The clerk has asked me to pass that information along to you.

Is there any further business?

Mr. Godfrey.

• (1230)

Hon. John Godfrey: I guess it's deemed voted, because it was unanimous, right?

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): It was unanimous, and therefore it's been carried.

Hon. John Godfrey: All right.

So I guess the question is if the clerk could perhaps just give us a reminder about the other items on the agenda so far, for the balance of our time here, if he could perhaps just remind us what we're up to.

The Clerk: For the balance of this meeting, or for the balance of...?

Hon. John Godfrey: No, for the balance of the rest of our lives—but June will do.

The Clerk: As of right now, the only additional piece of business the main committee has given itself is Mr. McGuinty's motion next Thursday, June 7. There will also be, as you decided, a steering committee meeting that the chair will need to call for next Wednesday to discuss Bill C-377.

The committee hasn't actually set a new date for a meeting on Mr. Warawa's issue of gasification, because our initial schedule in May was changed and the steering committee has adopted something else.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Could I suggest, then, that it be held the following week? If Tuesday's meeting is cancelled next week—because many of us will be gone—then Thursday that week could be the meeting you just referred to. Thus, in the following week, the last week before the summer recess, we could have a meeting on gasification, either on that Tuesday or Thursday.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Mr. Bigras, and then Mr. Cullen, in that order, please.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Bigras: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Godfrey's question is very relevant because we don't know when the House will rise. I think we need to discuss this next Wednesday at the Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure. So in addition to evaluating the conditions relating to Bill C-377, we should also think of what we want to do in case we sit until June 22.

I therefore recommend that the committee mandate the Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure to look at what we can do until the end of the session, in addition to Bill C-377.

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Is that acceptable?

Mr. Godfrey, do you wish to speak, still?

Hon. John Godfrey: So that means there wouldn't be a meeting of the committee on Tuesday? Is that correct? It's cancelled?

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): That's correct. There would not be a meeting on Tuesday.

Hon. John Godfrey: Okay.

So I'll guess we'll leave to the steering committee any other possible ideas we may have from now until June 22. I think that's perhaps the best way to proceed.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Fine.

Mr. Cullen.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: That was going to be my suggestion, that if committee members have some floating topics they wish to consider, they come together on the Wednesday and cobble them together and have a quick run through those—not an extensive part of our meeting—to give some advice to the clerk to plan the rest.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): For the benefit of the committee—and Mr. McGuinty should hear this—the research analyst has asked for a little more clarity and specification in terms of what exactly members would like her to do in preparation. What topics would you like her to look at in preparation for next week's study? Now, I indicated earlier that you should get those thoughts to her quickly—but that was about the other issue we dealt with first, Bill C-377, wasn't it?

Would members like to indicate right now any particular topics you'd like the researcher to look at? Otherwise, I'd ask you to get those topics to her by.... I'd ask members, if you have any suggestions now, let's hear them. If not, I'm going to ask you to get them to the clerk by five o'clock tomorrow, who can then pass them on to the research analyst.

I think I have Mr. Bigras, and then Mr. Godfrey.

•(1235)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Bigras: I don't want to dwell on this, but I think Mr. Mills' people should talk with our analyst, because Mr. Mills is very interested in this subject. It might be a good idea for the analyst to contact Mr. Mills' office to see what issues he would like to see included in this study. I think that's the first thing we should do and, of course, if committee members would like to add other things, the analyst could look at those as well.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Thank you, Mr. Bigras.

Mr. Godfrey.

[*English*]

Hon. John Godfrey: I would just like to know from the parliamentary secretary—and maybe he's told us this already—his best guess as to when the two sets of things we asked for on Tuesday from the minister's office will be delivered. That is to say, when will we have the deck—full of its charming references to me, and other things, which I'm personally looking forward to very much—and perhaps more pertinently, the information on climate issues we asked for with regard to our study a week today? I'm just wondering about those, because there was some talk of having them by today. It will clearly help us talk to the researcher, when we have a sense of what we've got in front of us—which is beyond what we had. I'm just wondering when we're going to be getting that information.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Mr. Warawa, do you wish to respond?

Mr. Mark Warawa: Yes, thank you, Chair.

I just wanted to make sure we're talking about the same thing. Was that the deck where you were supporting intensity targets?

Hon. John Godfrey: That would be the deck from Liberal members—

Mr. Mark Warawa: Okay, thank you.

As I said earlier, the information that's been requested will be provided today.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. Geoff Regan): Thank you, colleagues.

I don't see any more hands raised.

The meeting is 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.