



House of Commons  
CANADA

## **Standing Committee on Natural Resources**

---

RNNR • NUMBER 001 • 2nd SESSION • 39th PARLIAMENT

---

**EVIDENCE**

**Thursday, November 15, 2007**

—  
**Chair**

**Mr. Leon Benoit**

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

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

## Standing Committee on Natural Resources

Thursday, November 15, 2007

•(0905)

[*Translation*]

**The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Chad Mariage):** Honorable members, I see a quorum.

[*English*]

Before we begin, I'd like to introduce myself, for those who don't know me. My name is Chad Mariage, and I'm the clerk of the committee.

With me is Maxime Ricard, a new clerk. He'll be shadowing me and the work of the committee. At the back of the room are the two committee assistants, Isabelle Héroux and Sophie Dalpé, who will be assisting me in the communications with the committee throughout the session.

Pursuant to Standing Order 106(2), I'm now ready to proceed to the election of the position of chair. I should note that as clerk I'll be presiding over the election of both the chair and the vice-chairs, should the committee wish to proceed. I won't be able to receive motions, other than for the election of chair, entertain points of order, or participate in debate.

I'm now ready to receive motions for the position of chair.

Mr. Tonks.

**Mr. Alan Tonks (York South—Weston, Lib.):** I move that Mr. Benoit be chair.

**The Clerk:** Are there any other motions?

**Hon. Navdeep Bains (Mississauga—Brampton South, Lib.):** He was the chair of international trade. I can vouch for that.

**The Clerk:** Are there any other motions?

Seeing none, is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Clerk:** I declare Mr. Benoit the duly elected chair of the committee.

Before inviting Mr. Benoit to take the chair, if the committee so chooses, I'll proceed to the election of the vice-chairs.

Pursuant to Standing Order 106(2), the first vice-chair must be a member of the official opposition.

Mr. Tonks.

**Mr. Alan Tonks:** I move that Mr. St. Amand be vice-chair.

**The Clerk:** Are there any other motions?

Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Clerk:** I declare Monsieur St. Amand the duly elected first vice-chair of the committee.

[*Translation*]

Pursuant to Standing Orders 106(2), the second vice-chair must be a member of an opposition party other than the official opposition.

Are there any motions?

Ms. DeBellefeuille.

**Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry, BQ):** I would like to nominate Ms. Catherine Bell.

**The Clerk:** Ms. DeBellefeuille moves that Ms. Bell be elected second vice-chair.

Are there any other motions?

Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

(Motion agreed to)

**The Clerk:** I now invite Mr. Benoit to take the chair as Chairman.

[*English*]

**The Chair (Mr. Leon Benoit (Vegreville—Wainwright, CPC)):** Thank you very much for electing me as chair. Congratulations to the first and second vice-chairs.

I've heard good things about this committee, in terms of it being a committee that deals with business and not as many of the partisan kinds of things you can have from time to time at committee. I'm happy to hear that. I'm very much looking forward to this committee.

Now I'm looking for the will of the committee. Should we proceed with the routine motions for establishing the committee?

Madame DeBellefeuille.

•(0910)

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille:** First of all, Mr. Chairman, I congratulate you on your appointment.

Does the document we received from the Clerk contain the same routine motions that we had during the last session? Has anything changed?

[English]

**The Chair:** They are the same as from the last session. They're a starting point. It's up to the committee to determine fully what rules will govern this committee.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille:** I agree with the routine motions that we adopted during the last session. They worked very well. However, it seems to me—the Clerk may correct me—that the first round of questioning was seven minutes, unless that was a liberty which the previous Chair took. Nevertheless, that is what I had understood.

Could you clarify the matter?

[English]

**The Chair:** Yes. Could we deal with these in the order that they are on paper? Some of them, I'm sure, will go through quite quickly, and some will take more discussion.

Is it agreed that we go through the order? Anyone who wants to add routine motions, of course, is welcome to do that. We will discuss and debate those.

Who wants to start off with the services of an analyst? Should we just start there? Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** Okay. Would someone like to move it?

**Mr. Ken Boshcoff (Thunder Bay—Rainy River, Lib.):** I'll so move, yes.

**The Chair:** Okay, it's "That...the services of...analysts from the Library of Parliament..." You see the motion in front of you.

Is it agreed?

(Motion agreed to [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** We now have the analyst; Jean-Luc Bourdages, I think, is the pronunciation.

Welcome to our committee. You're officially part of the committee now, part of the team.

Will anyone speak on reduced quorum?

Mr. Trost.

**Mr. Bradley Trost (Saskatoon—Humboldt, CPC):** By and large, this worked pretty well here last time. The only one thing is that I think it's implied that there be a member of the government for a quorum. If we could at least have, for the sake of clarity, "including two members of the opposition and one member of the government", that would be the only small, little difference.

We never were in a situation last time in which there wasn't a member of the government, but I think it would make certain people feel more comfortable if that were in there.

**The Chair:** Ms. Bell.

**Ms. Catherine Bell (Vancouver Island North, NDP):** Thank you. And congratulations, Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

**Ms. Catherine Bell:** I'm curious. Doesn't saying "including two members of the opposition" automatically mean that the other two members would be the government?

**The Chair:** Not necessarily. The way I, at least, would interpret that—not for the chair, though—would be that at least two members, but all three members, could be from the opposition.

Now, you can't start a committee meeting without a chair, and the chair in this case is a government member.

**Ms. Catherine Bell:** Yes, but it doesn't say "at least two members", it says, "including two members of the opposition".

**The Chair:** Yes.

Mr. Boshcoff.

**Mr. Ken Boshcoff:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I believe the wording we have agreed to is clear and I would not want to change it at this time.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Okay, we have a motion....

Mr. Anderson.

• (0915)

**Mr. David Anderson (Cypress Hills—Grasslands, CPC):** I would just make the point that we had a committee yesterday that approved the change to include one member of the government. I don't think it's implicit in this, so I think it would be good if we did it. But it will be the will of the committee, I guess.

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

**Mr. Ken Boshcoff:** Mr. Chair, can I ask what committee did that?

**The Chair:** Mr. Anderson.

**Mr. David Anderson:** We did it in the agriculture committee. Pat Martin suggested it, and it was passed at the committee.

Do you remember that he made the amendment, Ken?

**The Chair:** Ms. DeBellefeuille.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I support Mr. Boshcoff's motion. The wording of the motion on reduced quorum, that four members of the committee including two members of the opposition be present is fair and correct. I think that the rule should remain the same and that is the responsibility of each of the committee's members to be present at the time determined for meetings, both members of the opposition as well as those of the government. This wording poses no problem for me. During the last session, we never had any difficulty and I do not see how the clarification suggested by Mr. Trost would be of assistance.

[English]

**The Chair:** Okay, we have an amendment proposed by Mr. Trost, which adds to the motion from the last committee, "and one member of the government".

We've had some discussion. Is there any further discussion on that motion?

(Amendment negated)

**The Chair:** Shall we now go with the original motion? Is it agreed?

(Motion agreed to [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** On distribution of documents, does anyone want to move a motion?

Yes, Mr. Boshcoff.

**Mr. Ken Boshcoff:** I move that this motion be approved.

**The Chair:** The motion for distribution of documents?

**Mr. Ken Boshcoff:** Check.

**The Chair:** Is there any discussion?

(Motion agreed to [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** Working meals. Would you like to keep it the same as it was at the last meeting?

We need a mover on that. Sorry, I'm rushing.

Monsieur St. Amand.

**Mr. Lloyd St. Amand (Brant, Lib.):** I move the motion on working meals, as set out in the distributed document.

(Motion agreed to [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** Would someone like to move the motion on witnesses' expenses?

Mr. Trost.

**Mr. Bradley Trost:** I so move, as it was last year.

**The Chair:** The same motion as last year on witnesses' expenses.

(Motion agreed to [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** Staff at an in camera meeting.

Ms. Bell.

**Ms. Catherine Bell:** I'll move that the motion on staff at in camera meetings be adopted as circulated.

**Mr. David Anderson:** I have an amendment to the motion, that in addition each party shall be permitted to have one party staff member attend in camera meetings.

We're not worried about party staff, but that's to give the whip's office a chance to have somebody in the meetings, if they choose to do that.

**The Chair:** Madame DeBellefeuille.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille:** The interpreter was not fast enough and I did not understand what Mr. Anderson said. I would like the interpreter repeat the amendment that Mr. Anderson just moved, please.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Mr. Anderson, could you repeat the amendment, please?

**Mr. David Anderson:** The motion would read that unless otherwise ordered, each committee member be allowed to be accompanied by one staff person at an in camera meeting. In

addition, each party shall be permitted to have one party staff member attend in camera meetings.

The rationale was to give our whip's office an opportunity to have somebody in the meeting as well.

**The Chair:** Mr. Boshcoff.

**Mr. Ken Boshcoff:** Yesterday we agreed to the amendment but deleted the words "party staff" and specified that the person be a member of committee, the research bureau or the whip's office, or a House leader, so that it wouldn't necessarily be someone from some other division not from Parliament. So we specified that.

• (0920)

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

Mr. Anderson, you've heard what Mr. Boshcoff has said. Does that work with what you intended?

**Mr. David Anderson:** Sure. Our intention was that it would be the whip's office, but if they want to expand it to research and...that would be fine.

**The Chair:** Is Mr. Boshcoff's friendly amendment agreed to?

**Mr. David Anderson:** Can we get a reading?

**The Chair:** Yes. Mr. Boshcoff, could you please read it again?

**Mr. Ken Boshcoff:** It would read that unless otherwise ordered, each committee member be allowed to be accompanied by one staff person at an in camera meeting, who may be of the member's staff, the research bureau, the House leader's office, or the whip's office.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Now, in camera meeting transcripts.

Mr. Anderson.

**Mr. David Anderson:** If someone wants to move the motion, I would like to make an amendment to it. Or I can make a new motion, whichever people would prefer.

**The Chair:** You can do that, because these are only what was there at the last meeting. We're starting from scratch.

**Mr. David Anderson:** Okay. I'll move that in camera meetings be transcribed and that the transcription be kept with the clerk of the committee for later consultation by members of Parliament, and that these transcripts be destroyed at the end of the session.

That is a motion that has been passed in a couple of committees—or one of them, anyway, in 2006. I didn't realize until yesterday that the in camera transcripts are kept permanently and are going to be opened up in 25 or 30 years, or whatever. I guess I always assumed that our in camera discussions were private, and I guess I assumed they were destroyed at some point.

So this is a suggestion we're making.

**The Chair:** Yes. In fact, the minutes of in camera meetings are kept at the archives, I believe, for 30 years and are then made public. I believe that's correct. I got that information from you, so it has to be right.

**Mr. Lloyd St. Amand:** Has Mr. Anderson proposed that amendment?

**The Chair:** Yes. The motion has been made.

**Mr. Lloyd St. Amand:** Mr. Chair, through you to Mr. Anderson, I haven't heard of a single instance in which the 30-year provision has been abused or violated, and at the risk of sounding overly colloquial, if it ain't broke, don't fix it. I think the provision as distributed should remain, and I'll be voting against the amendment.

**The Chair:** Is there any other discussion?

Go ahead, Madame DeBellefeuille.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I support what Mr. St. Amand just said. Personally, I have had to re-read some transcripts in the Clerk's office, and it was very important for me to re-read my own statements and those of my colleagues in order to clarify the substance of certain discussions. I think it is very important that there be rules to control and manage the archived documents from the in-camera meetings. Unlike Mr. Anderson, I believe it is important to maintain this rule which, during the last session, was fully justified—at least in my case—and allow me to go and check on what was said in the Clerk's office. It is important that those documents remain in the archives.

[*English*]

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

**Mr. David Anderson:** This amendment certainly wouldn't affect the ability of the committee members to have access to those transcripts. Part of my motion is that they do have that access, so the only change is that they be destroyed at the end of the session.

**The Chair:** I would ask the clerk to correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe that after the committee dies with the end of a session, or with the establishment of a new committee, those notes from in camera meetings aren't available to anyone anyway. They're available, of course, as long as the committee is operating. Is that correct?

• (0925)

**The Clerk:** That is my understanding.

**The Chair:** In that case, there would certainly be no problem with what you're asking for.

Mr. Boshcoff is next.

**Mr. Ken Boshcoff:** Thank you.

Just for that reason, I feel we shouldn't be destroying them at the end of the session if we don't have anything to fear.

**The Chair:** We've had the discussion. Is there any more discussion?

Shall we go to a vote then?

All those in favour of the motion—

**Mr. Lloyd St. Amand:** Do you mean the amendment or the motion?

**The Chair:** There was only a motion.

(Motion negatived)

**The Chair:** If there are any motions that anyone else wants to bring up, please do so. I'm just being guided by last year's....

Next is notice of motions.

**Mr. David Anderson:** What about in camera meetings?

**The Chair:** Oh, in camera transcripts, yes. Now we have to deal with the motion. Does someone wish to bring another motion before the committee on that?

Go ahead, Madame DeBellefeuille.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille:** I do not want to move another one, I want to move the one contained in the document, Mr. Chairman.

You will have to get use to wearing your earpiece regularly, because I often take the floor.

I just want to say that I move the motion as it appears in the document.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** You've heard the motion. Is there any discussion?

(Motion agreed to [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** Next is notice of motions.

You see what was at the last committee. Are there any suggestions for notice of motions?

Go ahead, Mr. Anderson.

**Mr. David Anderson:** I'm going to make a suggestion. It's a motion that's a little bit different from the one in front of us. The main change is that we go to 48 hours' notice on motions, so the motion would read that 48 hours' notice shall be required for any substantive motion to be considered by the committee, that the period of notice for that motion be calculated from the time the motion has been distributed to the members of the committee—so the 48 hours would start when we get the notice of motion—that the motion be distributed to members in both official languages, and that all motions received by the clerk shall be placed on the agenda of the first committee meeting following the period of notice. That ensures that those motions will come forward as well.

So there are four components to it—that there be 48 hours' notice, that the period of notice be calculated from when we get the motions from the clerk, that the motions be in both official languages, and that all motions be put on the agenda at the first meeting at which they're eligible to be on that agenda.

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

Certainly the first three components are what I've had at every committee I've ever been at since I came here: the 48 hours' notice, the time of the calculation of the 48 hours, and the last one, when it is placed on the agenda. So the committee has heard the motion.

Discussion on the motion?

Yes, Mr. Boshcoff.

**Mr. Ken Boshcoff:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I don't believe we would have any problem with changing it from 24 hours to 48 hours. There's no problem with both official languages, no problem about getting it at the first available committee meeting. The question, then—and this is the difference—is whether the 48 hours should start when the clerk receives the motion, as opposed to what has been proposed.

**The Chair:** Can I just ask the clerk to comment on that and what normally has been done with that? I know what it has been at committees I've been part of before, but in terms of the calculation of the 48 hours, when does that normally start? Or is there wide variation on that?

**The Clerk:** Mr. Chair, the practice on the committee has been to get them to me as soon as they can. So generally I've had them well in advance of the 24-hour requirement. In the absence of an instruction from the committee indicating a specific time, or any other kind of instruction from the committee, I defaulted to the interpretation that's given in the journals branch for the House, being 6 o'clock of the drop-off day during the week for notices of motion and 2 o'clock on Fridays for the notice of motion in that sense. From that point, from 6 o'clock, essentially what I used is two sleeps.

● (0930)

**The Chair:** But from the time the clerk has sent that to the members or...?

**The Clerk:** Well, it's two sleeps, regardless. If two nights have passed, then the notice requirement will have been fulfilled.

So if I send it, say, at 7 o'clock on a Monday evening and we have a meeting on a Wednesday, then that's fine because you have the Monday night, you have the Tuesday night, and the meeting is on the Wednesday. So two sleeps is the rule, in the absence of an instruction from the committee. Obviously it's up to the committee to decide its notice requirement.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Mr. Anderson.

**Mr. David Anderson:** I just think it's fair to people to have a time limit in here. The person who's sending the motion in, and/or their party, has a specific advantage if we don't have a particular time here. To me, it seems to be fair to everyone that when it goes out from the clerk—if you want to put it at 24 hours or whatever—everybody is operating on the same scale. I think 48 hours is a reasonable time for motions, especially with this committee. There don't seem to be many contentious issues, but it gives everybody a chance to be prepared on the issues, to deal with the motions, and everyone is treated fairly that way. There's no advantage to anyone to be sending motions in and trying to do anything with them.

**The Chair:** I'll just make a comment. I don't know how many of you have been having problems with your e-mail on the Hill here, but the clerk receiving a motion and the members receiving a motion are sometimes quite different, and that's the issue we're discussing here.

Again, if anyone would like to add to this, you understand why Mr. David Anderson has asked for it to be from the time members actually receive the motion, or at least until it's sent to members.

**Mr. Alan Tonks:** Mr. Chairman, the operating procedure we had worked very well. I would suggest that we change the motion to 48

hours, in keeping with the spirit of what has been presented. But I would ask the committee to stay with the direction that's given, which worked very well for the committee. The clerk was able to determine and inform the committee with respect to the motions that were given, and it worked very well. So I would simply say, "Let's go with the 48 hours but leave the procedure as in the motion here".

**The Chair:** Yes. That would be an amendment to Mr. Anderson's motion. Mr. Anderson's motion does specifically say that it's from the time the clerk sends it to the members.

I'm reading the motion from the last committee:

That 24 hours' notice be required for any substantive motion to be considered by the committee, unless the substantive motion relates directly to business then under consideration; and that the notice of motion be filed with the Clerk of the Committee and distributed to members in both official languages.

It really isn't clear in that motion when the clock starts ticking. If that's what you're asking for, Mr. Tonks, we're looking for something that isn't really very clear. To me it isn't clear, certainly, but I won't—

**Mr. Alan Tonks:** I thought that's what the clerk had said.

**Mr. David Anderson:** Can I make a suggestion?

**The Chair:** I do have a list here. Could we come back to you, Mr. Anderson?

Go ahead, Madame DeBellefeuille.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille:** Mr. Chairman, what I understood from the Clerk's explanation on the current rule and the one we worked with during the last session... First of all, I have to tell you that there was never really any problem during the last session. Many motions were tabled, and no one, neither from the opposition nor the government's side, complained about the fact that the rule was not really clear. There were no hitches. Things worked rather well, and if memory serves me well, we even sometimes found that it took quite a long time before our motion was tabled, because of the 24 hours rule.

I understand better now, thanks to the clerk's explanation. The interpreter said it was two sleeps depending on whether 14 or 18 hours were involved. I find that time period normal because when we want to table motions, time is often an issue, both on the government and the opposition sides. Contrary to my liberal colleagues, I rather agree with keeping the rule as it stands.

Perhaps we could debate your suggestion and clarify the hours for tabling, as the Clerk said earlier. However, I feel that the 24-hours period is sufficient, we experienced that. Moreover, the clarifications on the management of those 24-hours as the Clerk currently does suit me.

● (0935)

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I haven't heard disagreement on the 48 hours we were looking at, but I understand you are saying 24.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille:** I am talking about Mr. Anderson's amendment which I oppose. After we have debated it...

[English]

**The Chair:** There is no amendment; that's the only motion on the floor, just for clarity.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille:** All right.

[English]

**The Chair:** Now we have Ms. Bell.

**Ms. Catherine Bell:** For clarification, the motion that Mr. Anderson put forward is 48 hours. If I put in a notice on a Friday and we meet on Tuesday, there's a weekend in between. I'm unclear; I didn't quite hear everything about when the clock starts ticking and how that works.

**The Chair:** That's what we are trying to clarify here. Mr. Anderson is saying in his motion that the clock starts ticking once the motion has been distributed to the members. Is that correct, Mr. Anderson? That can be quite a different time from the time the clerk receives it.

**Ms. Catherine Bell:** That's the piece I didn't quite get.

**The Chair:** That seems to be the only area I hear disagreement on.

Go ahead, Ms. Bell.

**Ms. Catherine Bell:** There's the calculation of the 48 hours, and then there was another piece; there didn't seem to be anything that resembled the original motion we had in the last session.

I have a problem, because it didn't sound to me like we could bring up any motion that related to the business of the committee. We would have to give 48 hours' notice for every motion. Is that correct?

**The Chair:** It would be for every substantive motion, but it certainly wouldn't include motions dealing with business before the committee. That can be done at any committee meeting at virtually any time. It wouldn't interfere in any way with that, just for clarity.

**Ms. Catherine Bell:** It's difficult, when I haven't seen the motion in writing, to—

**The Chair:** Yes. We have a written copy here, actually.

Mr. Anderson, can you read it one more time?

**Mr. David Anderson:** Well, I can. I'm also willing to make some adjustments here if it will speed this up. If this problem about the period of notice is a concern to the opposition—and it seems to be to Liberals in particular—we would really like the 48 hours. To me, that seems to be reasonable. It gives enough time: if you bring something in Tuesday, you have two days to consider it, and it can come up at the Thursday meeting.

So the period of notice is a good idea, I think, because it's fair to everybody. But if people don't want to support that, that's okay. But I would like to see the 48 hours' notice because I think in most of the committees it is that, and that gives us enough time in this busy schedule to see motions and study them a little bit before we come to committee with them.

I would suggest that if we vote on this and it's defeated, we would be willing to support 48 hours' notice on the original motion.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Madam Bell.

**Ms. Catherine Bell:** Yes, I do have a problem—

**The Chair:** She actually has the floor, Mr. Anderson.

So I was asking you to fill the time there, just for clarity.

• (0940)

**Ms. Catherine Bell:** Oh, sorry. Yes.

Now that I've seen the actual wording of it, I do have a bigger problem, and that is with the way it's worded. It does not say “unless the substantive motion relates directly to the business under consideration”, and that would mean it's at the discretion of the chair or in the interpretation of the chair of this motion, which could be anybody's, I guess. The way it's written, it really doesn't say that the substantive motion relates directly to the business, so that would mean we would have to give 48 hours' notice for every motion, even for business of the committee that we're dealing with. So I would have a problem with that, and I wouldn't be supporting it.

I don't have too much problem with 48 hours' notice. I do have a problem with the calculation of it, but if instead of 24 it said 48 and then the rest of the language we're already using, I'm fine with that.

**The Chair:** Just on “any substantive motion”, that's exactly what was in the motion the committee had last time.

**Ms. Catherine Bell:** Yes, but it's not in the new one.

**The Chair:** I think it says exactly the same in the new one. Am I missing something?

Oh, I understand. Yes, in the one that was before the committee last time it said “unless the substantive motion relates directly to the business then under consideration”.

Mr. Anderson, do you see the difference there?

**Mr. David Anderson:** Well, I'm willing to make that amendment as well, or have someone do that, but it sounds to me like the motion is going to be defeated as it is, from what I've heard. If someone wants to make that amendment, we'd be willing to support it. But if they're planning on voting against the motion, and it sounds like the Liberals were and Madam DeBellefeuille did not seem to be supporting it, so...

**The Chair:** Can we add that in as a friendly amendment? I haven't heard any negative reaction to that. Could we just add in, as a friendly amendment, after “committee”, on the third line after the comma, “unless this substantive motion relates directly to the business then under consideration”? I'm sure that was the intent.

Now, do I have a list?

Madame DeBellefeuille.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Perhaps with some clarification, I could support a 48-hour notice. During the last session, 48 hours meant two sleeps for us. The 48 hours must not become four sleeps.

If I can be assured that 48 hours represents two sleeps, I would be ready to support the 48-hour motion. Do you understand? It is all about time management.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Just for clarity, the explanation the clerk gave was for the 48 hours—two sleeps. I don't think there is any misunderstanding on that. All right?

With the friendly amendment in there, can we go to a vote on this motion now?

Mr. Boshcoff, you indicated before that you wanted to speak. My apologies.

**Mr. Ken Boshcoff:** Yes.

With all these friendly amendments and all that, I believe we've actually complicated what we had before us on this page, with the exception of going from 24 to 48 hours. So I'm going to support the original motion as presented to us, or that wasn't presented to us, at 48 hours. I will not be supporting the wordy, complicated thing here, because I just believe it's going to create a minefield later on. I'd go for the simpler wording we had.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** There are two others whom I've recognized here.

Madam Bell.

**Ms. Catherine Bell:** I still won't be able to support the motion, even with the amendments, because I'm not happy with the calculation of the 48 hours. I could support 48 hours and the substantive motion part, but not the calculation of hours. So, for me, it would be to defeat that motion and reintroduce the original one we had, with 48 hours instead of 24, if that's what's acceptable to people.

• (0945)

**The Chair:** Okay.

Finally, Monsieur Ouellet.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Christian Ouellet (Brome—Missisquoi, BQ):** Given that we had tabled friendly amendments, I do not agree that the 48 hours' notice leaves room for interpretation. We leave the interpretation of that to the clerk, which is fine, but if we change clerks, the interpretation may change. Why not clearly state that the motion must go over two nights? Everyone agrees on that, it is clear and simple. But a 48-hour notice leaves room for interpretation, which means that at some point in time, it could become three or four nights.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Actually, Monsieur Ouellet, it seems to me that there certainly wasn't clarity in terms of the timing, the clock, in the motion the committee had last time, either. So what we're looking for I think is clarity.

Mr. Anderson, could you clarify what you meant by that motion?

**Mr. David Anderson:** I just wanted to point out that the reason we brought in the calculation was so that the lack of clarity was taken out of there, so that when we receive the motion, the 48 hours start. You're right that the clerks may have a difference in how

quickly it takes them to get the motion out, but everyone will be treated fairly on the committee then, because the motion will come out and we'll have 48 hours' consideration. I would think that supporting this would actually take out some of the concerns you have about different clerks treating the time schedule differently.

We're trying to be fair here. I thought this would actually be more fair to Ms. Bell, for example, because I'm sure she has more work to do than some of the rest of us because of the load she has. It would give everyone the same amount of time to consider motions, rather than they come out, you don't know when it started, you have to get the things organized and then come to committee meetings.

I don't want to belabour it.

**The Chair:** Okay, let's go to the question.

The question is on the motion that Mr. Anderson brought forth, with the friendly amendment, which added in "unless a substantive motion relates directly to the business then under consideration". We'll read the whole motion, just to be sure that everyone's on the same page here.

**The Clerk:** The motion reads:

That forty-eight (48) hours notice shall be required for any substantive motion to be considered by the Committee, unless the substantive motion relates directly to business then under consideration; And that the period of notice be calculated from the time the motion has been distributed to the members of the committee by the Clerk of the Committee; And that the motion shall be distributed to members in both official languages; And that all motions received by the Clerk shall be placed upon the agenda of the first committee meeting following the period of notice.

**The Chair:** You have heard the motion.

(Motion as amended negated)

**The Chair:** Mr. Boshcoff.

**Mr. Ken Boshcoff:** Mr. Chairman, with all respect, I'd like to propose the notice of motion as it appears in the distributed material, with the change to 48 hours.

**The Chair:** Okay. You've all heard the motion. You have it in front of you, just with that one change.

Any discussion? Okay, I'll go to the vote.

(Motion as amended agreed to [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** Now, unless there are other motions.... It is up to the committee entirely what motions it wants to deal with here.

Mr. Trost.

**Mr. Bradley Trost:** Since we're already working here with motions and so forth, I'd like to move a motion about motions deemed abandoned, and then also make sure we always get to move through all motions so that everyone gets to deal with them. Here's the motion I'm proposing on the motions deemed abandoned:

All motions shall be moved by their sponsor within two meetings of their first being listed on the agenda as committee business, failing which the motion shall be deemed abandoned by the mover and shall be dispensed with and may no longer be subject to committee consideration.

Essentially, the idea behind the motion is that if we're going to move a motion, we should deal with the motion.

I have a French version of it too, but I'm pretty sure that translation took care of that fairly well.

So that's the motion I'm moving.

● (0950)

**The Chair:** Would you like to hear it again?

**An hon. member:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Mr. Trost, please, would you read it again, so we get the translation again.

**Mr. Bradley Trost:** Yes.

All motions shall be moved by their sponsor within two meetings of their first being listed on the agenda as committee business, failing which the motion shall be deemed abandoned by the mover and shall be dispensed with and may no longer be subject to committee consideration.

This doesn't block off anyone from bringing back the same motion later on. You can do it again. Give another—what did we agree on just two seconds ago?—48 hours' notice, and do it over again.

**The Chair:** Mr. Boshcoff.

**Mr. Ken Boshcoff:** Thank you.

Mr. Chair, I will especially be voting against this, having been a victim of a filibuster in the springtime. Not only was my motion lost because of a filibuster, but so was the Bloc's and so was the NDP's. So I just cannot go along with this.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Mr. Anderson.

**Mr. David Anderson:** This actually has nothing to do with filibusters and nothing to do with the situation that Mr. Boshcoff found himself in. It has to do with people bringing forward a notice of motion and then not bringing the motion itself forward. If a motion comes forward and there's a filibuster going on, that doesn't guarantee, with or without this, that it is going to be discussed. This has to do with people presenting a notice of motion and then not being prepared to deal with their motion.

So the suggestion is that if you want to bring a notice of motion forward, the person who made that notice of motion has two meetings to move the motion. Then it's up to the committee to decide when the committee wants to deal with the motion. So it doesn't have anything to do with the situation Mr. Boshcoff found himself in, unless he had chosen not to move that motion, if he left it as a notice of motion and didn't make it into a regular motion last spring.

**The Chair:** Mr. Trost.

**Mr. Bradley Trost:** I was just going to make the same basic point as Mr. Anderson. If they want to make an amendment to make it clear you cannot filibuster motions to death on this in some way, I would view that as a friendly amendment.

The purpose is to get the motion on so that it can be dealt with. There's nothing in here, from my reading of it, that would allow—and again I'm open to a friendly amendment—a motion to be filibustered to death. All it says is that “motions shall be moved”. Once they're moved, you can do what you want with them at that point, but there's no way, then, that you could filibuster to death. If they want to get some explanation for it, I'm open to that.

**The Chair:** Monsieur St. Amand.

**Mr. Lloyd St. Amand:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The premise of this motion just doesn't exist. If you were to listen to Mr. Anderson and Mr. Trost, one would get the impression that this committee—and perhaps other committees—is laden with motions that are cluttering up the agenda and that are being tabled and tabled and tabled interminably. That's not my experience on this committee, so, frankly, the motion is anticipating a problem that has never existed, and I dare say won't exist, and I see absolutely no reason whatsoever for this motion to be passed.

**The Chair:** Monsieur Ouellet.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Christian Ouellet:** Mr. Chairman, that is precisely what I was going to ask for. I would like to know why this motion is being tabled. What difficulties, over the course of previous sessions, have made it such that this motion is put forward at the committee today?

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Mr. Anderson, would you like to respond to that?

**Mr. David Anderson:** There have been situations in other committees where members have brought forward a notice of motion but have never brought forward the motion itself. That notice of motion sat there interminably, without members having to deal with the motion. They could bring it forward at any time.

We're suggesting that if we're going to bring forward motions in good conscience that we have two meetings to bring them forward, and the committee will deal with them as it deals with every other motion. It's either to have people make motions or leave them off the notice of motion paper, so we know what we're dealing with.

● (0955)

**The Chair:** Is there any other discussion on this motion?

(Motion negated)

**The Chair:** Unless there is another motion that the committee would like to bring forward, we will go to time limits for witnesses' statements and questioning.

Who would like to bring forth a motion on this?

Mr. Allen.

**Mr. Mike Allen (Tobique—Mactaquac, CPC):** Mr. Chair, I'd like to see what we did in the last committee in the rounds of questioning, which I think worked pretty well.

With good time management, in most cases we were able to get multiple rounds in. The first round was seven minutes. Sometimes it went over, but mostly it was seven minutes. Round one was typically the Liberal Party, the Bloc, New Democratic Party, and then the Conservative Party. All other rounds after that were five minutes. The second round was the Liberal Party, the Bloc, and the Conservatives. The third round was Liberal, Conservative, Liberal, and then Conservative. And then in round four we went to the full parties again: the Liberal Party, Bloc, New Democratic, and Conservative Party.

I think that allowed a fair distribution for all the committee members to participate—split their time, if that was the case. But the first round being seven minutes allowed the party in its first round to get a good chance.

When you look at that in an hour-and-a-half meeting, the Conservatives and the Liberals ended up with almost 30 minutes each, and the Bloc and the NDP ended up with almost 20 minutes each. I think that was a pretty fair distribution.

**The Chair:** You've heard the motion. You actually have it in front of you. It is the same as the committee operated under last time, with the exception of seven minutes in round one. That's the change from the last committee.

I would like to bring something up here, if you would indulge me. You have witnesses being given 10 minutes for their opening statements. I don't know how often this committee has groups of witnesses, where there may be three or four people making presentations. Could we change that to a lesser amount, possibly at the discretion of the chair if there are, let's say, three witnesses or more? Otherwise, if you have four people giving 10-minute statements, that's 40 minutes taken up with statements.

That's something to consider. I'm putting it out for your consideration. We did that at the other committees.

Madame DeBellefeuille.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille:** Mr. Chairman, if we rely on what happened during the last session, our committee is likely to have more than one witness per meeting, and we could provide you with examples. Often, when we received several groups of witnesses, we were frustrated because after the presentations, there was not that much time left to ask questions and have exchanges. In fact, the real objective of having witnesses is to be able to ask them questions, to get answers and to better be able to understand the presentations and the issues emerging from them. I more or less agree with your motion because during the last session, the chair was really rather flexible and sometimes allowed members, in their passion, to ask questions. You could review the timekeeping. Some members—and I think that Mr. Allen was a witness to this—had more than seven minutes, which meant that people in the third round rarely had time to intervene, because we are people who are passionate about our subject.

I accept Mr. Trost's motion to keep seven minutes for the first round and to maintain what is written in the document that was presented to us. I will accept Mr. Allen's amendment.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** We'll go to the question.

Is the motion agreed to?

(Motion agreed to [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** Are there any other routine motions the committee would like to bring forward?

Seeing none, is there any other business?

Yes, Mr. Boshcoff.

**Mr. Ken Boshcoff:** On the routine motion, no. I just have a submission.

**The Chair:** Okay. We're through with routine motions.

Is there any other business the committee wishes to deal with today?

Yes, Mr. Boshcoff.

Mr. Trost, did you have your hand up as well?

Go ahead, Mr. Boshcoff.

• (1000)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Ken Boshcoff:** I would like to move the following motion: That the Standing Committee on Natural Resources study the implications of the development of the Keystone pipeline and report to the House of Commons.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Are we getting into a discussion of committee business? If we are, then let's do that. Let's put all the business the committee may want to deal with before the committee, have a discussion, and decide on that.

A motion like this certainly would require the 48 hours' notice, I would assume.

Mr. Boshcoff.

**Mr. Ken Boshcoff:** Thank you.

I'm not really trying to complicate things. When we're discussing the agenda and the business, it can wait until then. I'm just filing it now.

**The Chair:** When would the committee like to do that? The next order of business is to have a discussion about committee business.

Yes, Mr. Anderson.

**Mr. David Anderson:** I would like to ask a question about the routine orders.

**The Chair:** Okay. A question.

We're going to give a little leeway and revert to the previous business, and then we'll go to you.

Mr. Anderson.

**Mr. David Anderson:** I'm wondering what the policy of the committee has been in the past with regard to minority reports. I'm new here, and I know the different committees have various policies. I'm just wondering if we know what that is. At the agriculture and agrifood committee there's been some flexibility, but normally you had up to 72 hours to get the report in. I'm wondering if that's a fairly standard procedure.

**The Chair:** You've heard Mr. Anderson's comment and question. I'm looking for some discussion on that and whether we wish to go to a motion on that.

Mr. Tonks.

**Mr. Alan Tonks:** Mr. Chair, I think something as important as minority reports and so on are governed by the Standing Orders of the House, and they always predominate. The clerk can outline what those Standing Orders are, but we've never denied a minority report. I don't know how you could, because the Standing Orders provide for that.

**The Chair:** Mr. Tonks, at the last committee I chaired the government was denied a minority report on more than one occasion.

**Mr. Alan Tonks:** It's never happened on this committee.

**The Chair:** That's good to hear.

**Mr. Alan Tonks:** You can't imagine that happening.

Maybe the clerk could research that. If the committee isn't satisfied with that, then a motion could be brought forward.

**The Chair:** Thank you for that, Mr. Tonks.

I know the clerk has researched it because I asked him about that before.

Go ahead.

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

There's no standing order that governs dissenting or supplementary opinions. The practice has been that after the committee has adopted a substantive report, there's a motion, or the party that wants to append this supplementary dissenting opinion seeks support of the committee, either by way of a motion or just by seeking the consent of the committee to append that report. Then it's up to the committee to allow that or not. The committee has often decided length and deadlines in terms of when that party has to submit its dissenting or supplementary opinion.

In the case of the oil sands, for instance, that's what happened.

**The Chair:** That's one way, and then other committees do have a motion on the books so they know how it will be handled. That's what Mr. Anderson is suggesting. It was on a different topic, though.

Mr. Allen.

•(1005)

**Mr. Mike Allen:** Is this on Mr. Anderson's discussion?

**The Chair:** It is.

**Mr. Mike Allen:** I just wanted to mention that I'm glad the clerk clarified that, because there was nothing in the Standing Orders last time, and on the oil sands report we made an agreement that a minority report would be accepted from each of the parties, which would be appended to the report, assuming it was less than five pages. That's what we agreed to, and it probably would be very good for us to have some kind of an agreement on that before we go down the road.

**The Chair:** Mr. Anderson.

**Mr. David Anderson:** I'm willing to make a motion, but if the committee has a general agreement that people are allowed to have a reasonable amount of time to prepare a minority report and that's how we'll operate, we're certainly willing to work within those boundaries. I know on some of the other committees the dissenting report can't be longer than the report itself. That seems to work well.

Sometimes you get one-paragraph reports and other times they're 65 pages. I think the reasonable time constrains people to come up with something that's useful.

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

Mr. St. Amand.

**Mr. Lloyd St. Amand:** Mr. Chair, through you to the clerk, for my own education and clarification, I didn't realize until you mentioned it, Mr. Chair, that a minority report could be denied. If I can ask the clerk, does that have something to do with the impact of the chair signing the report or signing off on the report? Does that have anything to do with it at all?

**The Chair:** There simply is no requirement that a minority report be allowed. The committee is the master of its own destiny. That particular committee decided its destiny was not to allow minority reports in some cases.

**Mr. Lloyd St. Amand:** So once the chair has signed the report it's a *fait accompli* and it goes to the House?

**The Chair:** I don't know if I understand the question. The clerk seems to, so go ahead.

**The Clerk:** I can read the excerpt in the *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, if it will help clarify things for members.

A committee report reflects the opinion of the committee and not that of the individual members. Members of the committee who disagree with the decision of a majority may not present a separate report. There is no provision in the Standing Orders or the practices of the House for presenting minority reports. Where one or several members of a standing committee are in disagreement with the committee's report or wish to make supplementary comments, the committee may decide to append such opinions to the report, after the signature of the Chair. Dissenting or supplementary opinions may be presented by any member of the committee. Although committees have the power to append these opinions to their reports, they are not obliged to do so. In agreeing to append a dissenting or a supplementary opinion, the committee will often specify the maximum length of the text, the deadline for submission to the clerk and whether it is to be submitted in one or both official languages.

**The Chair:** All right.

I believe Ms. Bell is next.

**Ms. Catherine Bell:** Having heard the ruling from the procedures manual, I don't know that it would be necessary to have any other agreement at this committee. I think it's pretty clear from those rules what we can do. I think on an as and when needed basis, if we're putting forward a report, at that time we could pass our ability to append minority or supplementary reports. I don't think we need a hard and fast rule at this committee, because who knows what's going to come up, what the circumstances are, and what the issue might be. I'd rather we could be flexible. Those rules spell it out pretty clearly to me what we can do at this committee. I think we're well served by them.

**The Chair:** Madam Bell, I think that's exactly what Mr. Anderson was saying: he doesn't want the committee to have the discretion on particular reports to deny minority reports. If you have a motion that governs the committee activities, then every member would know they will have a right to attach a minority report, which is generally allowed but on occasion is not. I think that's the point here.

**Ms. Catherine Bell:** I missed something there.

**The Chair:** It protects all members of the committee and will allow a minority report to be within the guidelines the committee chooses to set.

• (1010)

**Mr. Alan Tonks:** Mr. Chairman, Mr. Anderson has indicated that if there's a consensus, let's abide by the practice of this committee, which is once we've received a report we discuss whether a minority report is wished. I can't remember the committee ever turning that down. For my part, I would never do that. Maybe if there is anybody who feels differently about that.... I think we should go with the practice of the committee and deal with it at the time we submit a report.

**The Chair:** Mr. Anderson.

**Mr. David Anderson:** We're more than willing to support that.

**The Chair:** You have heard that there will be an unwritten agreement to accept minority reports under the terms set by the committee. Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** It is agreed.

That wasn't a motion.

Is there any other business that we should deal with today?

Mr. Trost.

**Mr. Bradley Trost:** This is a bit of a question.

**The Chair:** My apologies, Mr. Trost. Actually, we reverted to the order of business that we had been dealing with before, and Madam DeBellefeuille was on the speaking list.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just wanted to make the members of the committee aware that today, at 10 o'clock, the National Energy Board is tabling its report on energy futures, on different technologies and on Canada's energy needs for 2005 to 2030. I would find it most interesting if we could, during next Tuesday's meeting, welcome officials from the National Energy Board so that they could answer our questions and we could have a discussion with them. This would be very topical, and in my opinion, it would be a wonderful opening subject. It would be good to have an exchange on the report that they are tabling right now.

I also believe that everyone would agree that it would be interesting, Mr. Chairman, to devote at least one meeting to analyze our department's estimates, as we have to make our recommendations by December, I believe. Last year, we did not have the pleasure to see and better understand our department. I think it is the duty of committee members to ask questions of departmental officials on the estimates they request and that have to be passed in December.

I have several subjects I would like to see on the agenda and I would like us to have an exchange, but for the next meeting, I would really like to invite representatives of the National Energy Board to appear. I don't know what the other committee members think of that.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** If I could, I'd just have the clerk remind the committee of what legislation has been referred to this committee already. That's maybe an important reminder before we decide on the business.

Okay, Mr. Clerk.

[*Translation*]

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

For the moment, Bill C-5 has been referred to the committee. This remains on the committee's agenda, and must be considered, as the committee wishes. There are also, as Ms. DeBellefeuille mentioned, the estimates. The period ends December 10 and the estimates must be tabled in the House three days before the final designated opposition day. That is not yet clear, but that is the rule. Finally, you have three days before December 10 to report to the House.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Mr. Anderson.

**Mr. David Anderson:** We're having a discussion about the future agenda of the committee now.

**The Chair:** We seem to be, yes.

**Mr. David Anderson:** I'm here as parliamentary secretary, and the minister would like to offer his time on Tuesday to come before the committee. He's not going to have a lot of time after that, but he's willing to come the first day of our committee meeting. So if the committee would be willing to hear from the minister for one hour, and the bureaucrats for the second hour on Tuesday, he would be glad to be here.

**The Chair:** On what issue, Mr. Anderson?

**Mr. David Anderson:** We'd like to start off on the Nuclear Liability and Compensation Act, Bill C-5, which has been referred to the committee. We feel it would be in the interest of the committee to study Bill C-5 and to take a look at it over the next few weeks, or however long the committee decides it needs to spend on that issue.

There are a number of other areas and directions we'd also suggest that we'd like to go, but the priority is to get the minister here to discuss with him the issue of the Nuclear Liability and Compensation Act and then to spend some time working through that bill and hearing witnesses on that.

We have other suggestions as well in terms of some things to do with mapping, emergency response—the natural resources role in that—and some regulatory processes, those kinds of things, but I'd certainly love to hear from the other committee members.

I also understand you had a report you were working on last spring that was not finalized. There may be some interest in finalizing that as well.

• (1015)

**The Chair:** Mr. Tonks.

**Mr. Alan Tonks:** Pursuant to the last comment, Mr. Chairman, our oil sands report was submitted to the government. We had a government response, as I recall, but the committee never had an opportunity to reflect on that report, with that response, with the minister. I'd like to say that I'm very pleased, and I'm sure the committee is as well, that the minister is going to be at the next committee meeting, as early as that.

Certainly I'm not suggesting that this will be the last time we have an opportunity to question him on that report, but members of the committee may have some initial questions on that report, the government's response. Some members were not on the committee. Perhaps the government's response on the report could be distributed, and the minister at least is aware that there may be some questions on that, if that's in keeping with the intent of the minister coming.

I'm sure the minister realizes that we're not going to have a comprehensive analysis of that response, but some members of the committee may have some questions.

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

Mr. Anderson was suggesting that the minister come for the Nuclear Liability and Compensation Act bill, but as you know, when a minister comes, the questioning is up to the members.

Mr. Trost.

**Mr. Bradley Trost:** I'm sorry, I think I missed some of this in the translation earlier; I need a bit of clarification on priority of legislation versus reports.

I remember that when I sat on the industry committee we had a practice of one day a week for legislation, one day a week for reports.

I was wondering, through the clerk, is there anything in particular, or do we as committee dictate totally our own agenda on that?

Again, some of that may have been referenced when I was fiddling with my mike during translation earlier.

**The Chair:** The answer is that it's up to the committee to decide. Legislation is usually given priority.

**Mr. Bradley Trost:** That's practice. That's not set.

**The Chair:** That's right. The committee determines its destiny.

Yes, Madam Bell...or do you go by Ms.?

**Ms. Catherine Bell:** Ms. Bell. Madam Bell is my mother.

Just for clarification, are we now putting forward items for study for future committee meetings, or is that...?

**The Chair:** Yes, we've gotten into the future business of the committee.

**Ms. Catherine Bell:** Then I have a number of proposals.

**The Chair:** I might suggest, members, that we've had several items brought forth already, and we want to make sure that everybody's items are allowed and that those who don't have items they would like to see discussed here be given a chance too. Could we decide today on the business of the committee for next week maybe, or for Tuesday certainly? If everyone could send their suggestions for future business to the clerk, we could come back and

discuss where we go from there. So if we could take care of next week maybe, then we could decide on the agenda beyond that at a future date.

Ms. Bell, you have the floor.

**Ms. Catherine Bell:** But if I don't put my suggestions out there, I'm not sure, they might be the things we want to talk about next week....? So I should put them out there?

• (1020)

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Ms. Catherine Bell:** Okay.

First I'd like to suggest a comprehensive, in-depth study of the forest sector. Given the problems that are coming up in Atlantic Canada, in Ontario, in Quebec, and also in British Columbia with forestry, I think it's something we should study. We've spent a lot on energy and oil and gas and electricity. This is a big chunk of our natural resources and I think we need to look at it for the future. I'd like to suggest some meetings on that.

Also, in British Columbia we have a moratorium on offshore oil and gas drilling and tanker traffic. There is some controversy around that. I'd like an opportunity to put that on the agenda of the natural resources committee to talk about the moratorium. I think it bears consideration. It's part of the oil and gas overall study, I think, so we could maybe add it to those discussions. I think it's an important piece that we haven't talked about at this point.

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

The minister apparently has arranged that he could come on Tuesday on the Nuclear Liability and Compensation Act. Rather than getting into everybody's lists here, should we get agreement on that first or discuss that and then have everyone send in their suggestions for future business beyond that? I think it would be quite difficult to pick from a long list of things. Of course, legislation usually is what the committee deals with first, but that's up to the committee.

Regarding the Nuclear Liability and Compensation Act, you'd indicated that the minister actually said he would be available, Mr. Anderson?

**Mr. David Anderson:** He's available on Tuesday if the committee would like to have him come. He'll give us an hour, and then there would be an hour with the bureaucrats involved with the act.

My question for the committee is, would that hour with the bureaucrats be enough time, or do you want to use an hour on Tuesday and two hours on Thursday? Do you want to give them Thursday's meeting? Do you want to move on to something else? Do you want to start hearing witnesses on that on Thursday? What would you like to do? We're all familiar with the act—it's not that complicated—so I'm not sure if you need more than an hour with the bureaucrats to meet your needs.

**The Chair:** Okay, we're going to continue with the list.

Madame DeBellefeuille.

**Mr. Christian Ouellet:** She wasn't through.

**The Chair:** You weren't finished the list, Ms. Bell? I apologize for interrupting.

But could we agree that rather than making lists here, members send them to the clerk and deal with them in that fashion?

**Ms. Catherine Bell:** I have just one more, which would be the estimates, which we haven't talked about yet. I think that's something we should bring to the committee. I also wanted to support the Keystone pipeline hearings. The other one was the Nuclear Liability and Compensation Act. That one was on my list as well.

**The Chair:** The supplementary estimates have been tabled in the House, so the committee will be expected to deal with those normally at some time.

I will continue with the list. The clerk has suggested that if you could have your suggestions for future business into him on Tuesday...should we agree to have the minister and the officials from the department on Tuesday, then on Thursday we could have a discussion on that.

Monsieur St. Amand.

**Mr. Lloyd St. Amand:** This is not a list, but I just wanted to agree with Mr. Anderson's overture vis-à-vis the minister. I think the minister should properly be here next Tuesday. I think an hour is adequate, and I think that's the only time available to him. I don't think the complexities of the act are such that we need to hear from the bureaucrats for more than one hour. So I think hearing the minister and the bureaucrats next Tuesday is adequate, and perhaps Thursday, if there are witnesses available on the act, we can deal with the witnesses a week from today. Again, because it's not extraordinarily complicated, I would prefer that three meetings from now, on Tuesday, November 27, we begin a study of the motion that's been brought by Mr. Boshcoff and concurred in by Ms. Bell, that we begin to review the Keystone project, which has a tight timeframe.

• (1025)

**The Chair:** I'm hearing a suggestion here—and I think there may be agreement, so I want to put it to the committee—that we have the minister on Tuesday for an hour and officials for an hour on the Nuclear Liability and Compensation Act. Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** Beyond that, Monsieur St. Amand is suggesting that we schedule the Thursday to deal with the legislation as well. What if the committee decides at that time that we need more time? If the committee decides we need more time, should we leave it open then to go into the Tuesday after or maybe Tuesday and Thursday to finish the discussion on the Nuclear Liability and Compensation Act?

**Mr. Lloyd St. Amand:** I considered that possibility, but I discounted it. I think on Tuesday, the 27th, we should undertake a study of the Keystone project.

**The Chair:** Okay, the committee has heard the suggestion. Let's go to the discussion on the Tuesday after then.

We'll continue with the list, though, as it was.

Madame DeBellefeuille

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I support Mr. Anderson's proposal that we study the bill. However, I really want to make you aware of our responsibility to question the minister on the supplementary estimates requested. I would be remiss—I believe Mr. Anderson would agree with me—if I did not invite the minister to free up some time before the deadline right away, so that we can welcome him and question him. I think it is important.

I'm really emphasizing this because during the last session, the Minister of Natural Resources was very busy and was often called up to travel across the country and abroad. It was therefore very complicated to mesh the committee and the minister's timetables, and I understand that very well. If he is quickly made aware of our intent and our wish to study the estimates responsibly, I believe the parliamentary secretary could make him aware of the issue and plan a meeting that will take the deadlines into account, so that we can support the supplementary estimates or not.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you very much for that suggestion.

I will put that to the committee. It has been suggested that we request the minister come to the committee with respect to the supplementary estimates. Is there any discussion on that? Is it agreed that we request the minister to come?

**Mr. David Anderson:** This is in addition to Tuesday's meeting.

**The Chair:** Yes.

Okay, it's agreed. The clerk will put that request in to the minister.

Now, to next Tuesday's business, which is Mr. Boshcoff's motion.

I just want to say that we have a half-hour left of the meeting. Mr. Allen is next on the list, and I have you on the list, Mr. Trost.

Mr. Allen.

**Mr. Mike Allen:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I think Mr. St. Amand's points were well made with respect to next week. I completely disagree with the Keystone pipeline. In the following week. I don't necessarily believe that might be in the best interest of all the committee, or that all of the committee is interested in that as a top priority.

I think we can dispatch with the Nuclear Liability and Compensation Act pretty quickly. That should be our top priority for next week, and then the submissions that will be to the clerk by Tuesday. I would suggest that we might want to allocate time at that following Tuesday meeting to decide what the priority of the committee is going to be. That would allow us to secure witnesses for the following Thursday.

Quite frankly, I think we need all the committee members here to decide what that agenda is going to be and what the priorities are going to be. I'm not willing to say I'm going to support the Keystone pipeline at this point in time.

I suggest that next week should be on nuclear liability, and then the following Tuesday we, as a committee, should decide what our priority will be.

•(1030)

**The Chair:** Okay. I think there are two parts to Mr. Allen's suggestion. One is—and this is just a reminder to me—could you all get your suggestions in for witnesses for next Thursday on the Nuclear Liability and Compensation Act? Would you get those in to the clerk this week?

Yes, Mr. Anderson.

**Mr. David Anderson:** Does the committee think it's going to be able to dispense with the Nuclear Liability and Compensation Act in two meetings? Is it the intention that we'll be done with that bill next Thursday, or is it the intention that you want to come back to it later?

The House will leave it here for a while, but it's not obligated to leave it with us forever. If we can dispense with it in two meetings, that would be great, from our perspective. Then we can move on to other things. But I don't want to be working against the committee members. I'm just wondering what your opinion is on that.

It seems to be generally acknowledged that two meetings might be enough on that bill. Is that accurate?

**The Chair:** Ms. Bell.

**Ms. Catherine Bell:** Can I ask when we're supposed to have our list in for witnesses on nuclear liability?

We're meeting with the minister on Tuesday, and then one more meeting is being suggested. I don't want to limit it if something comes up that we think we want to study further. Who knows what's going to come out with the witnesses.

**The Chair:** I believe that was also Mr. Anderson's point—that we have to make sure we do allow enough time to discuss that—but to have witnesses in for Thursday, we have to invite them by Monday afternoon, I would suggest.

**Ms. Catherine Bell:** Yes. I was just wondering when. That's okay.

**The Chair:** If you could have them in by Monday noon to the clerk, we will have a discussion on that and take it from there.

Mr. Trost was next.

**Mr. Bradley Trost:** Mr. Allen by and large covered most of my comments.

I'm just going to say that things like the Keystone pipeline project may be very good to study; I just don't have enough information on that one way or the other to make a decision. Could the members send me some more information? It's not quite like Ms. Bell's suggestion of the general forestry sector, which is easier.

I would agree with Mr. Allen's remarks. We have next week taken up with the Nuclear Liability and Compensation Act, and then we can sit down and have one meeting to figure out what we want to cover. The Keystone pipeline project might fit perfectly, particularly if the members could get more information to the rest of us; it might be helpful at that point.

**The Chair:** Could we do that at the Tuesday meeting, a week from next Tuesday? I don't have the dates right in front of me. Could we do that, and have the meeting to discuss the future business of the committee at that time? Is that agreed?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** Okay, it is agreed.

I think we've probably covered the business we have to cover at this meeting. Is there any further business?

I have a reminder of the timelines. The recommendations for business should be submitted to the clerk by next Tuesday, and the witness lists by Monday noon, in order to give the clerk time to invite the witnesses so we can actually get them there. All right?

Is there any further business for this committee at this time?

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.**