



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

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

---

ENVI • NUMBER 001 • 1st SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

---

**EVIDENCE**

**Tuesday, June 21, 2011**

—  
**Chair**

**Mr. Mark Warawa**



## Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

•(1105)

[Translation]

**The Clerk of the Committee (Mrs. Marie-France Renaud):** Honourable members of the committee, I see a quorum.

[English]

I must inform members that the clerk of the committee can only receive motions for the election of the chair. The clerk cannot receive other types of motions, entertain points of order, nor participate in debate.

[Translation]

We can now move to the election of the chair.

Pursuant to Standing Order 106(2), the chair must be a member of the government party.

[English]

I am now ready to receive motions for the chair.

Ms. Duncan.

**Ms. Kirsty Duncan (Etobicoke North, Lib.):** I'd like to nominate Mark Warawa.

**The Clerk:** It has been moved by Ms. Duncan that Mr. Warawa be elected chair of the committee.

[Translation]

Are there any further motions?

[English]

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

(Motion agreed to)

**The Clerk:** Before inviting Mr. Warawa to take the chair, if the committee wishes, we will proceed to the election of vice-chairs.

[Translation]

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

I am now ready to receive nominations for the position of first vice-chair.

[English]

Mr. Lunney.

**Mr. James Lunney (Nanaimo—Alberni, CPC):** I would like to nominate Megan Leslie.

**The Clerk:** It has been moved by Mr. Lunney that Ms. Leslie be elected first vice-chair of the committee.

[Translation]

Are there any further motions?

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

(Motion agreed to)

**The Clerk:** I declare the motion carried and Ms. Leslie duly elected first vice-chair of the committee.

[English]

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

I am now prepared to receive a motion for the second vice-chair.

Mr. Woodworth.

**Mr. Stephen Woodworth (Kitchener Centre, CPC):** I will nominate Ms. Kirsty Duncan.

**The Clerk:** It has been moved by Mr. Woodworth that Ms. Duncan be elected as second vice-chair of the committee.

[Translation]

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

(Motion agreed to)

**The Clerk:** I declare the motion carried and Ms. Duncan duly elected second vice-chair of the committee.

[English]

I now invite Mr. Warawa to take the chair.

**The Chair (Mr. Mark Warawa) (Langley, CPC):** I would like to thank each of you for your support, and I thank the clerk for running a very efficient election of the chair and vice-chairs. I can see there is love in the air.

I'm sure that we each have a desire to see some substantial and very positive things for the environment. I look forward to working with each of you and making sure the committee is productive.

Our first order of business will be the adoption of routine motions so we know the rules of the committee.

Ms. Rempel.

**Ms. Michelle Rempel (Calgary Centre-North, CPC):** I'd like to move that the routine motions presented to the clerk entitled "Proposals From The Conservative Party" be adopted.

**The Chair:** We have a motion on the floor. Is there any discussion?

Ms. Leslie.

**Ms. Megan Leslie (Halifax, NDP):** I'm hoping we can go through them clause by clause.

**The Chair:** We can go through them clause by clause. That would be fine.

• (1110)

**Ms. Megan Leslie:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** We'll start with the first one. The first clause of the routine motions is that the committee retain the services of one or more analysts from the Library of Parliament, as needed, to assist the committee in its work. These services may be requested at the discretion of the chair.

This is under the title "Services of Analysts from the Library of Parliament".

We should have a mover for each one.

It is moved by Mr. Woodworth.

Is there any discussion?

Ms. Leslie.

**Ms. Megan Leslie:** I don't need necessarily to have the wording changed, as long as there is something understood. Normally a vice-chair would sit in on a meeting or cover one or two meetings at most, but I had a situation with the health committee last year when the chair was absent for an extended period of time, and we had a vice-chair.

As long as the last sentence here, "These services may be requested at the discretion of the chair", is understood to mean whoever is sitting in the chair, then I'm fine, as long as there is that understanding.

**Mr. James Lunney:** I'm sure that there is that understanding.

**Ms. Megan Leslie:** Thanks.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** The second motion is on the subcommittee on agenda and procedure: that the subcommittee on agenda and procedure be composed of five members, including the chair, the two vice-chairs, the parliamentary secretary, and a member of the Conservative Party.

Is there any discussion on that?

Go ahead, Ms. Rempel.

**Ms. Michelle Rempel:** No, that's all right.

**The Chair:** Is that so moved?

**Ms. Michelle Rempel:** I so move.

**The Chair:** Ms. Leslie.

**Ms. Megan Leslie:** Thank you.

I am fine with the composition. However, I have a problem with the quorum, because there are three Conservative members in the five-member composition. That means that a quorum of the

subcommittee could be three members, which means that there is no opposition member.

I would move that the quorum of the subcommittee shall consist of at least three members, including one opposition member.

**The Chair:** It is so moved. That is a friendly amendment.

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

**The Chair:** Next is on reduced quorum: that the chair be authorized to hold meetings to receive evidence and to have that evidence printed when a quorum is not present, provided that at least four members are present, including one member from each recognized party. That would be the Conservative Party, the NDP, and the Liberal Party.

And further: In the case of previously scheduled meetings taking place outside the parliamentary precinct, the committee members in attendance shall only be required to wait for 15 minutes following the designated start of the meeting before they may proceed to hear witnesses and receive evidence, regardless of whether opposition or government members are present.

Ms. Rempel, are you moving this?

**Ms. Michelle Rempel:** I so move.

**The Chair:** Is there any discussion on this clause?

Ms. Duncan.

**Ms. Kirsty Duncan:** I would ask that instead of one "from each recognized party" it be "one member from the opposition". It is at the end of the first paragraph under "Reduced Quorum".

**The Chair:** Is there any further discussion on that?

Are you moving that as an amendment, or is it accepted as a friendly amendment?

**Ms. Michelle Rempel:** It is accepted as a friendly amendment.

**The Chair:** It is accepted as a friendly amendment.

I'm used to local government. I will learn the rules of the committee.

You have accepted that. Is there any further discussion?

• (1115)

**Ms. Megan Leslie:** There is no further discussion, but can I just have a little bit of time?

**The Chair:** Yes, we'll just pause for a moment.

**Mr. Stephen Woodworth:** Could you repeat the wording of the amendment, please?

**The Chair:** At the end of the first paragraph under "Reduced Quorum", instead of it saying "including one member from each recognized party" it would say "including one member from the opposition".

Is there any further discussion?

One moment.

**Ms. Michelle Rempel:** This implies that this is a member of the committee, correct?

**The Chair:** Yes, it is.

**Ms. Michelle Rempel:** That's fine.

**The Chair:** So if you wanted to have a replacement, that person would have to sign the proper forms to be a replacement. Okay?

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

**The Chair:** Next on the list is distribution of documents: that only the clerk of the committee be authorized to distribute to the members of the committee any documents, including motions; that all documents that are to be distributed among the committee members must be in both official languages; and that the clerk shall advise all members appearing before the committee of this requirement.

**An hon. member:** So moved.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Next we have staff at in camera meetings. The motion reads that each committee member in attendance shall be permitted to have one staff member attend any in camera meetings; in addition, each party shall be permitted to have one staff member from a House officer attend in camera meetings.

**An hon. member:** So moved.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Now, on in camera transcripts, it states 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.

Is there discussion on this?

Ms. Leslie.

**Ms. Megan Leslie:** This is not on the motion; I'm fine with the motion. But I was hoping to take this opportunity to ask the chair... It can be really embarrassing when you say what happened in a meeting, not realizing that it was in camera, or not realizing that the agenda would come out the day after or something like that.

So I was hoping that the chair would try to remember to always remind us when we're in camera. It changes throughout a meeting. Remind people that we're not in camera or that the agenda we come up with at a meeting will be published in 24 hours, etc. It's just so we don't get into that problem, because we've all done it, and it's embarrassing.

**The Chair:** That's a very good idea. I will do my best to remind the committee to respect the confidentiality of in camera meetings.

**Ms. Megan Leslie:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Woodworth.

**Mr. Stephen Woodworth:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

At the justice committee, from which I came a little while ago, Mr. Brian Jean proposed a variation of this, which rather struck me as being a good one. His point was that in camera proceedings are confidential to the committee, and therefore by allowing transcripts of in camera proceedings to be available to all members of Parliament, we're kind of going against the notion that the meeting is in camera for committee members.

What the justice committee did was substitute for the word "Parliament" the words "the committee", and therefore simply made it clear that the transcripts were available only to the committee members. Now, that might include someone who was acting as a committee member at the time the meeting in camera occurred, or it might include also some member of the committee afterward, but it would only be a member of the committee.

If that's acceptable as a friendly amendment, I'll propose that.

• (1120)

**The Chair:** We'll do this properly, I think. Instead of having friendly amendments, we'll do it properly and we'll have amendments.

So you're moving an amendment?

**Mr. Stephen Woodworth:** As an amendment, yes.

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

**Ms. Megan Leslie:** I think that's fine.

**The Chair:** Okay.

(Amendment agreed to)

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

**The Chair:** The next motion is on working meals: that the committee hereby authorize the clerk of the committee, in consultation with the chair, to make the necessary arrangements to provide for working meals, as may be required, and that the cost of these meals be charged to the committee budget.

In the fall we will have committee meetings scheduled from eleven o'clock to one, so they will be basically working meetings. We'll have lunch provided, and that's what this motion is about.

Is there any discussion on this motion? Everybody wants to have lunch?

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Next is on witnesses' expenses: that, if requested, reasonable travel, accommodation, and living expenses be reimbursed to the witnesses, not exceeding two representatives per organization; and that in exceptional circumstances payment for more representatives may be made at the discretion of the chair.

I expect we will use teleconferencing and video conferencing as much as possible to keep expenses down.

**Mr. James Lunney:** That gives a lot of the power to the chair.

**The Chair:** It's at the discretion of the chair, but I commit to making sure we'll do it as economically as possible.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Next is on notice of motions: that 48 hours' notice be required for any substantive motion to be considered by the committee; that the motion shall be filed and distributed to members in both official languages; and that completed motions that are received by close of business shall be distributed to members the same day.

I think what's also important is that we clarify what is meant by 48 hours, because 48 hours doesn't necessarily mean 48 hours. In O'Brien and Bosc, it's defined as two sleeps. To be practical, it is suggested that it be by four o'clock and then two sleeps. That allows adequate time for translation and for distribution of the documents. It's just a clarification.

Is that acceptable to the mover?

**An hon. member:** Yes.

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

Mr. Lunney.

**Mr. James Lunney:** It seems to me 48 hours is standard. The "two sleeps" concept I haven't heard spelled out that way before, and it's perhaps helpful for everybody to have that understanding, so I appreciate your mentioning it.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

It's in O'Brien and Bosc.

**Mrs. Stella Ambler (Mississauga South, CPC):** At the other committee I'm on, that same clause has another piece in it about 4 p.m. Let's say a motion is put forward on Friday night at 6 o'clock, then 48 hours only takes us to Sunday evening. We might want to put "wherever possible by 4 p.m. of the business day".

It says "Motions that are received by close of business (4 p.m.) shall be distributed the same day". That's slightly different. I'm just concerned about a Friday evening situation.

**The Chair:** The Friday evening would be Friday by 4 o'clock, and then that would give you the two sleeps, and actually more.

• (1125)

**Mrs. Stella Ambler:** Okay.

**The Chair:** We can put that criterion in.

**Mrs. Stella Ambler:** It's sort of included, it's assumed.

**The Chair:** It's on page 1052 of O'Brien and Bosc.

**Mrs. Stella Ambler:** Okay. I didn't get to that page.

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

**The Chair:** I have a five-hour flight home. I had a good sleep that night.

**Mrs. Stella Ambler:** My flight's shorter than yours.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Mr. Woodworth, you had a question?

**Mr. Stephen Woodworth:** Thank you.

I have always understood, and my understanding may be faulty, that a substantive motion that arises from business under consideration does not require notice. I was thinking that I should be happy with the wording that we have before us. It just talks about substantive motions. I notice that the principal routine motions distributed by the clerk have a specific exception that says "unless the substantive motion relates directly to the business then under consideration", whereas the motion that we're considering doesn't have that exception.

However we proceed, I want to be absolutely clear about whether when we are considering an item and someone wants to submit a motion to amend, even if it's substantive, if it arises out of the discussion we don't have to stop everything and give 48 hours' notice. I'm not sure if that requires the kind of exception that's in the draft the clerk gave out. I don't think it necessarily does, as long as it's on the record that motions that arise in the course of considering a matter, even if they're substantive, don't require notice.

Did I say that clearly enough?

**The Chair:** You did, Mr. Woodworth, and my understanding is that if we're discussing issues related to SARA and there is a motion on SARA, if it is relevant to the discussion, even if it is substantive, it would still be accepted.

Ms. Leslie.

**Ms. Megan Leslie:** I just wanted to note that the House deadline for Fridays is 2 p.m., I believe.

**The Chair:** I want to make it practical for the clerk. Maybe the clerk could speak to this.

**The Clerk:** It is 2 p.m., but the rest of the week it's 6 p.m. We want to avoid having the 6 p.m. during the week because we don't work until 8 p.m., so 4 p.m. would be for all week. I don't mind if it's 4 p.m. on Friday.

**Ms. Megan Leslie:** Okay.

Whatever works for you, I support.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

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

**The Chair:** Rounds of questioning: that the witnesses from any one organization shall be allowed ten minutes to make their opening statement. During the questioning of witnesses, there shall be allocated seven minutes for the first round of questioning and thereafter five minutes shall be allocated to each questioner in the second and subsequent rounds of questioning.

That is moved by Ms. Rempel.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** The last is speaking order: the order of questions for the first round of questioning shall be as follows: Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Liberal. Questioning during the second round shall alternate between the government members and opposition members in the following fashion: Conservative, NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, based on the principle that each committee member should have a full opportunity to question the witnesses. If time permits, further rounds shall repeat the pattern of the first two at the discretion of the chair.

If we do the math, every person would have an opportunity for a question before anybody would have a second opportunity, being 12 members.

You've moved this. Now we'll have a discussion.

Ms. Leslie.

**Ms. Megan Leslie:** Thank you.

I sat on the ethics committee last week, and we had a lengthy discussion about speaking order, as you can imagine. We talked about the fact that yes, everybody should get one shot before they get a second round, if you're looking at it through the lens of each person having the ability to ask questions. But we know it doesn't break down by person, it breaks down by party. We talked at length about the fact that in fairness there are many occasions when you want to ask a follow-up because of evidence that has come out during questioning. In fairness, it makes sense to have a second round for the Liberals.

I believe it was also at the government operations committee as well as the ethics committee that the order they adopted was first round, at seven minutes, New Democrat, Conservative, Liberal, Conservative. At second round, at five minutes, the order they adopted was New Democrat, Conservative, New Democrat, Conservative, New Democrat, Conservative, Conservative, Liberal. I certainly support the idea of the Liberals getting a round in the five-minute round.

• (1130)

**The Chair:** So you're making an amendment?

**Ms. Megan Leslie:** Yes.

**The Chair:** We have an amendment to the motion on the floor.

If you're speaking to the amendment, Mr. Woodworth.

**Mr. Stephen Woodworth:** Yes. I just want to sound a note of caution that I haven't done the math to work out how much time is going to be required, but essentially the amendment extends the time for questioning. I'm more comfortable with leaving that to the discretion of the chair, as the original provides. I don't feel really strongly about it, but I have a bit of caution on it.

**The Chair:** Ms. Leslie.

**Ms. Megan Leslie:** Sorry, I made a mistake. You're right. I'm willing to stand corrected, but I think I made a mistake. I had one too many Conservatives. It would go N, C, N, C, N, C, L. I'm pretty sure that's what they adopted. Again, I'll stand corrected if I'm wrong.

**The Chair:** That is your motion now?

**Ms. Megan Leslie:** Yes. Thank you.

**The Chair:** You've clarified your motion.

Mr. Woodworth.

**Mr. Stephen Woodworth:** I'm afraid I like that even less, because I don't see any particular reason why a Conservative member should have to lose his or her place in favour of giving a Liberal a second shot at it. I would definitely not support that.

**The Chair:** Any further discussion on the amendment?

Ms. Duncan.

**Ms. Kirsty Duncan:** Mr. Chair, I'd like to thank Ms. Leslie. That's really fair, open, and decent.

I'll just go back to some statistics from earlier Parliaments. I'd like to present an argument. If we look back to the last majority Parliament, which was from 2000 to 2004, the speaking allotment per cycle was 12 minutes, 12 minutes, 12 minutes, 12 minutes, 12 minutes, across the board. Everyone got 20% of the time. In fairness,

I would like to support Ms. Leslie and I would ask that this be recognized.

**The Chair:** Is there any other discussion on the amendment?

**Mr. James Lunney:** I have a comment.

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

**Mr. James Lunney:** While I appreciate the spirit of what you're trying to accomplish here, during that 37th Parliament I don't think that was universal at all the committees. It might have been at some, but certainly at the health committee and fisheries, which I was serving on, the formula was somewhat different. It was ten minutes and went from there.

Nevertheless, I think there's room for accommodation here, and from my perspective the request is a reasonable one.

**The Chair:** I'll just remind all members to make their comments or questions through the chair and not to another member.

We have Ms. Duncan and Mr. Woodworth.

**Ms. Kirsty Duncan:** Mr. Chair, I would thank Mr. Lunney for recognizing the fairness in this. Just to be clear, it was actually the committee on national defence and veterans affairs where it was even across the board.

• (1135)

**The Chair:** Mr. Woodworth.

**Mr. Stephen Woodworth:** Maybe things went a little too fast for my slow mind. Could I have the revised order that Ms. Leslie was proposing? What I thought I heard was a substitution cutting off a Conservative in order to make room for a Liberal. If I could just have it again from the chair, that would be good, the first and second rounds that are being proposed in this amendment.

**The Chair:** This is referring to the second round, and Ms. Leslie can—

**Ms. Michelle Rempel:** Mr. Chair, there's no alteration to the first round.

**The Chair:** I'm going to refer to Ms. Leslie to clarify her motion.

**Ms. Megan Leslie:** I had proposed just a switch in order so that it would lead off with a New Democrat. As far as I'm concerned, it's six of one, a half dozen of the other, but I'm just following procedure from the last Parliament, where the opposition led off the questioning. It's not a huge issue for me.

The second round would be, and I will use the first letters, N, C, N, C, N, C, L. This recognizes the truth of how we do things in committee, which is that it's rare for it to go member by member. It's more usual to go party by party, with certain members of the party asking the majority of the questions.

**The Chair:** Mr. Woodworth.

**Mr. Stephen Woodworth:** If that's correct, then my interpretation—

**Ms. Megan Leslie:** Then C at the end.

**Mr. Stephen Woodworth:** See, this is where I am left in some confusion, because what Ms. Leslie said a moment ago allows an opportunity for five Conservative members to speak but not six. And I am not in favour of that, because I don't see why I should have to give up my opportunity to speak in order to give a Liberal a second opportunity to speak. So if I'm reading that correctly, I just don't see how I can support this amendment.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

The next speaker is Ms. Leslie, and then Ms. Rempel.

**Ms. Megan Leslie:** Would you accept a C at the end, because that would be the correct number?

**Ms. Michelle Rempel:** I'd like to suggest the order of N, C, N, C, N, C, C, L.

**The Chair:** I'm just going to clarify what we have as an understanding. What is being proposed in this amendment is NDP, Conservative, Liberal, Conservative, for the first round of seven minutes each.

In the second round what is being proposed in this amendment is NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Conservative, Liberal. That's what's being proposed in this amendment.

So we're still speaking to the amendment.

**Mr. James Lunney:** Mr. Chair, could you repeat that again? Is this the second round? What about the first round?

**The Chair:** The first round is NDP, Conservative, Liberal, Conservative.

**Ms. Michelle Rempel:** Mr. Chair, could I suggest that you actually divide this into two motions, where we're voting on the first and then the second rounds, so that we can be clear?

**The Chair:** We've started with one motion, which was a motion on speaking order from Ms. Rempel.

We have an amendment, and the amendment is to change the order for both the first and second rounds.

The original motion dealt with both rounds, so the amendment is also dealing with both rounds. So it's first and second, so we'll keep it together.

The amendment that is on the table is NDP, Conservative, Liberal, Conservative. That's the first round for seven minutes each.

The second round is NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Conservative, Liberal.

• (1140)

**Ms. Michelle Rempel:** Mr. Chair, could I propose a compromise—that we retain the first round of questioning in the order that is presented on the paper and then the second round of questioning the way you've presented?

**The Chair:** We'll stay with the amendment. If you don't support the amendment, then we can have another amendment made, if the committee so wishes. Otherwise, I think this is going to get quite confusing.

So we'll stay with the amendment and either support it or not. Then if we don't, we can come up with another amendment if we so desire.

We have Mr. Woodworth speaking to the amendment.

**Mr. Stephen Woodworth:** Thank you.

Now that we've made it clear, at least, that no Conservatives are going to lose their spot, I wish to first of all reiterate my earlier caution about adding time to the questioning.

And I also want to say something else. While I sympathize with my Liberal colleague, the fact of the matter is the composition of Parliament has changed. There are reduced numbers of Liberals in the House. And the questioning on committee should reflect the composition of the committee, which is in fact a reflection of the composition of the House.

This amendment in fact proposes to give the Liberal member double the rights of any other member on this committee by allowing a Liberal member an opportunity to have one seven-minute round and one five-minute round, whereas poor members such as myself will have only one round. That's not fair. The composition of the committee reflects the composition of the House. And the order of questioning should give everybody on the committee equal opportunity.

While I'm sympathetic to the Liberals' situation, in that they find themselves in with reduced numbers, I don't see why a Liberal should have two rounds of questioning when everybody else gets only one. So with great respect to any of my colleagues who disagree with me, I still think I'm going to oppose this amendment.

**The Chair:** We now have Ms. Duncan.

**Ms. Kirsty Duncan:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm a very ethical person, and I don't find that any of that discussion was respectful.

I'm going to come back to the 2000.... We are a party. It's not "the Liberal", "the Liberal". The last majority Parliament was 2000 to 2004, and I'll tell you how it was. The Liberals at that time were 53.8% of the House. The Conservatives were 15.4%. And then I can go through the parties. Despite that fact, everyone was given equal opportunity—20% of the speaking allotment, 12 minutes. So the first round was seven minutes for each party, and the second round was five minutes for each party, in the same order. What they had hoped to do was garner the questions of all people and of all parties to get good perspective, because we want the best for the environment.

I would support this motion and I would ask that we try to get as many perspectives as possible on something so important as the environment.

**The Chair:** Ms. Leslie, and then Mr. Woodworth.

**Ms. Megan Leslie:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'll keep it brief.

Obviously I don't have a lot invested in changing the speaking order, except I do think it's fair. The Conservatives are going to win every vote. They're going to win every vote. They're going to win every motion. They're going to win everything we put forward. So in just a little bit of fairness to the opposition parties, I think it's fair to let them ask another round of questions.

Thanks.

**The Chair:** Thank you.



Mr. Woodworth.

**Mr. Stephen Woodworth:** First of all, I don't quite know how anyone could take offence to my earlier remarks. But that being said, I sometimes say things in ways I'm not conscious of, so if anyone took offence to or found anything disrespectful in what I said earlier, I didn't intend it so and I apologize. I wasn't even conscious of it.

That being said, however, I think that by allowing each member an opportunity to speak and to question once we are hearing a variety of perspectives. And there is no need to allow any member a second round, unless we all get a second round.

• (1145)

**The Chair:** Mr. Lunney.

**Mr. James Lunney:** Just for the record, in the 37th Parliament the Liberal majority had 173 members. The Canadian Alliance was the official opposition with 66. And the PCs had 12. So together that was 78, which is certainly more than 15% of the House. I think there's room to come to some accommodation here. But let's just be accurate for the record.

**Ms. Kirsty Duncan:** Fair enough.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Ms. Rempel.

**Ms. Michelle Rempel:** My comments are complete.

(Amendment negatived)

**The Chair:** We're back to the main motion, and the main motion has been read. Is there any discussion on the main motion?

Ms. Rempel.

**Ms. Michelle Rempel:** I'd like to propose an amendment that the first round of questioning remain the same and that the second round of questioning be as follows: New Democrat, Conservative, New Democrat, Conservative, New Democrat, Conservative, Conservative, Liberal.

**The Chair:** That's an amendment. What is being proposed is that the first round of questioning stay the same and that the second round of questioning be dealt with differently, as proposed.

The first round of questioning will be Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Liberal. The second round of questioning, in what is being proposed, will be NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Conservative, Liberal, which is what was being proposed by the NDP in their previous amending motion. It provides the Liberals with a second opportunity to question. That is the amending motion now.

Is there any discussion on that amendment?

(Amendment agreed to)

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

**The Chair:** Thank you. We've completed our routine motions.

The discussion of future business we will leave until the fall session, because we have no directions yet from the House as to what they would like us to consider. Likely SARA will be referred back to us, but we can't assume that. We are in the middle of actually getting towards the end of the study on SARA. We had just started CEAA, but that has to be referred to the committee before we can

officially begin that. So we'll wait until the beginning of the fall session and then create a work plan of what we'll be discussing.

I'd like to take this opportunity to maybe do a quick round table so that we can get to know each other a little bit. Take maybe two minutes or a minute and a half to just share where you are from.

We'll start with you, Stella, and just work around the table, including the analysts and the clerk.

**Mrs. Stella Ambler:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

My name is Stella Ambler, and I am from the riding of Mississauga South. I am very excited for this opportunity to serve on this committee. It was definitely at the top of my list.

My riding borders Lake Ontario, and a number of my constituents are very concerned about water quality issues and air quality. We fought the battle recently against a power plant in the riding, so I familiarized myself at that time with many air quality issues that would have resulted.

It's a keen interest of mine for that reason, but also from a business perspective. I was a member of the green committee on the Mississauga Board of Trade. I think there are great opportunities we can take advantage of where businesses can be part business and small and medium enterprises can be part of making the environment a better place. I'd like to be able to examine those kinds of issues and have this issue be not just one of government and coming from the top and regulating but be what private enterprise can do to be part of the process of making the environment a better place.

• (1150)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Woodworth.

**Mr. Stephen Woodworth:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I am from Kitchener Centre, in the Region of Waterloo, which of course is one of the new high-tech hubs of Canada and the world. I was elected in 2008, after having practised law for almost 30 years. And if the definition of retirement is leaving what you have been doing to do something you really enjoy, then you could say that I am retired and quite enjoying my work as a member of Parliament.

I suppose I have two personal reflections on our work for the environment committee. One is that my lifelong passion has been wilderness canoeing, and I've spent many a happy hour paddling through the lakes and rivers of northern Ontario and Quebec. So I am certainly quite sensitive to the question of protecting our natural environment and quite aware that in fact it's said that a true Canadian is one who has a love for the natural environment.

However, I want to say also that my own home has running through it the Grand River watershed, the greatest river in southern Ontario. And it provides an excellent example of how nature and man can co-exist in balance, whether it's deer or beaver. That river runs right through the middle of a metropolis, so I think a lot can be learned. In fact, we're hoping to set up an agency on water studies, based in the Grand River watershed, so we'll learn a lot from that experience at this table.

Thank you.

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

Mr. Toet.

**Mr. Lawrence Toet (Elmwood—Transcona, CPC):** I am Lawrence Toet. I am from Elmwood—Transcona, a suburb of the city of Winnipeg in the beautiful province of Manitoba, land of a hundred thousand lakes.

I'm going to keep it really short. I think, knowing that I'm from the land of a hundred thousand lakes, you will know that the environment is a very precious thing to me. And I want to see it maintained, although I'm sad right now to see that probably we have under a hundred thousand lakes due to the flooding we're having. Many of those lakes have combined. And we'd like to see that mitigated and fixed too.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** I saw a commercial on TV for tourism there, so thank you for being here.

Mr. Lunney.

**Mr. James Lunney:** I'm James Lunney, from Nanaimo—Alberni. That's on the far west coast, and my riding is where the far west meets the far east, with just a little bit of water in between us.

While Canada has fourteen UNESCO-recognized biosphere reserves, two of them are in British Columbia and both of them are in my riding. There is a lot of interest in the environment in Nanaimo—Alberni.

It's a beautiful part of Canada. If you haven't visited, you need to come out. We can use the stimulation of the economy.

I was elected in 2000 as a member of the Canadian Alliance and I have served on a number of committees.

In my background I served for 24 years as a health care professional, as a doctor of chiropractic. But prior to that, I have something in common with colleagues on my left and right, both being from Manitoba. I grew up in Manitoba and my B.Sc. is in zoology and chemistry from the University of Manitoba. So I'm interested in how things work in human physiology but also in the environment.

I look forward to working with you on the environment committee.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Sopuck.

**Mr. Robert Sopuck (Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette, CPC):** I am Robert Sopuck, from Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette. I have been in the environmental and natural resources management field for about 35 years, starting off life as a fisheries biologist. I did work on the original Mackenzie Valley pipeline, environmental studies in the Berger commission days. I did work in the Arctic.

Also, my wife and I live on a 480-acre farm south of Riding Mountain National Park. We live in the biosphere reserve, and 320 acres of our farm are under a conservation agreement with the Nature Conservancy of Canada.

In other environmental work I've done, I was environmental director at a paper mill; I worked in the area of agricultural wildlife policy for the Delta Waterfowl Foundation; and I did a project called Smart Green, which was an analysis of Canadian environmental policy for the Frontier Centre for Public Policy. I even spent the winter of 2009-2010 doing environmental work in the oil sands, living in an oil sands camp. So I have had a fair bit of background in the environment field.

I was elected in the byelection of 2010 and re-elected this May, of course.

My last point is that from my time in the Arctic, living with the Inuit, I do have an Inuit nickname, and that's Pungniq. You'll have to ask the Minister of Health what that means.

● (1155)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Bob.

**An hon. member:** “Guy with big smile and little hair”.

**The Chair:** Ms. Rempel.

**Ms. Michelle Rempel:** I'm Michelle Rempel. My riding is Calgary Centre-North. I was elected for the first time in this last election of 2011.

My educational background is in economics. I've spent my career in intellectual property management, technology commercialization, managerial consulting, and partnership research administration.

**The Chair:** Tim.

**Mr. Tim Williams (Committee Researcher):** I'm Tim Williams, with the Library of Parliament. I've been the analyst assigned to the environment and sustainable development committee for about 10 or 11 years now. I saw the Species at Risk Act through its last iteration.

As for my education, it's as a plant physiologist and biochemist. I came to Ottawa to do a post-doctoral fellowship at Carleton University in the ecophysiology of the boreal forest and ended up here.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Tim.

Also from the Library of Parliament is Penny, who is on maternity leave and is returning in the fall, I understand.

If you'd like something researched, the Library of Parliament is there for every member of the committee. They do excellent work.

Thank you.

Madame Renaud.

[*Translation*]

**The Clerk:** My name is Marie-France Renaud. I am the clerk of this committee. I have been a procedural clerk in the House for at least six years. I love being a committee clerk. If you have questions on procedure, on organization or on inviting witnesses, I am the person to contact. You can do so any time during the day. That's about all.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

**Mrs. Isabelle Dumas (Procedural Clerk):** Good morning. My name is Isabelle Dumas. I am also a procedural clerk in the Committees Branch. Since no committee has been assigned to me at present, I will probably be visiting other committees. I will go with some colleagues to see how things work in all the committees. I have been working for the House for four years.

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Ms. Leslie.

[Translation]

**Ms. Megan Leslie:** Good morning.

My name is Megan Leslie. I am the member for Halifax. My goal is to bring justice in our communities, be it environmental, social or economic justice.

[English]

My background is law. I have worked a lot on the intersection of poverty and environment as that relates to law and have experience working on energy efficiency or demand-side management program design in Nova Scotia.

I was a part of the creation of Canada's first arm's-length, ratepayer-funded, demand-side management agency. If you know what that is, you are a member of a small group of people.

I very much look forward to being on this committee with everybody.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Hyer.

**Mr. Bruce Hyer (Thunder Bay—Superior North, NDP):** Wow. This is quite the makeup so far. I am quite impressed.

I was elected in 2008 in the Thunder Bay—Superior North riding. I am a biologist and a forester, and a scientist in caribou and boreal ecology. I am a former regulator for the State of Connecticut. I was a senior environmental analyst for the State of Connecticut a long, long time ago. Until I got elected, I was a consultant in a variety of ecotourism, forestry, and biology issues.

I still own two small businesses, one of which is three wilderness lodges. One is accessible by VIA Rail, one by float plane, and one you can drive to. You're all invited, individually or collectively. I think we should have some meetings there. Let me know.

**Voices:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Bruce Hyer:** I'm really pleased to be an associate to our critic Megan on environment and have been named associate critic for biodiversity and national parks, which really pleases me. I hope we will make real gains, as a subset of this committee, on fresh water, salt water, and Arctic protected areas this year. I am encouraged by some of what I'm hearing on the other side about that.

I also believe that every single person here believes in the environment, cares for the environment, and will debate vigorously how we achieve these ends. I am really looking forward to it.

Thanks very much.

• (1200)

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

Ms. Liu.

[Translation]

**Ms. Laurin Liu (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, NDP):** Good afternoon. My name is Laurin Liu and I am the member for Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, Quebec. This riding includes the cities of Saint-Eustache, Deux-Montagnes, Boisbriand and Sainte-Marthe-sur-le-Lac.

[English]

As you can tell from the name of my riding, it also borders a river.

I might add that in the name of intergenerational equity I also have a personal stake in this issue, so I very much look forward to working with you.

I also have the honour of serving as the deputy environment critic for the NDP.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Madam St-Denis.

[Translation]

**Ms. Lise St-Denis (Saint-Maurice—Champlain, NDP):** Good afternoon. My name is Lise St-Denis. I am the new member for Saint-Maurice—Champlain. I have just been elected. I am particularly interested in climate change because its effects are becoming more and more serious. It doesn't seem like much, but the rivers in Saskatchewan, Manitoba and Quebec are bursting their banks. It is definitely because of the temperature. Though the climate has something to do with it, climate change probably plays a role too. This is something that interests me a great deal.

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Ms. Duncan.

**Ms. Kirsty Duncan:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

It's so interesting to hear what everybody has done. I'm really looking forward to being on this committee and working with everyone.

The environment was my life. I taught environment at university for many years. I also taught infectious disease. I taught in a business school how business could be good to the environment and to human health. I also spent a lot of time in the Arctic.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I've had the great pleasure of working with some of you since 2004. I began with the justice committee, and as of 2006 was with the environment committee.

I'm very optimistic about this committee being so rich in experience and qualifications. If we work together it will be amazing what can be accomplished.

In the last Parliament I went to Taiwan and was on a delegation with Ms. Duncan. We had a wonderful time experiencing Taiwan, but on the side, also talking about the environment. I mentioned to her that it would be wonderful to work together in the environment committee, and here we are.

I encourage each of you to meet with one another. Go out for coffee with each other. As we work together it could be quite amazing what we could accomplish.

Yes, there will be different positions from the different parties, but even in today's meeting we have listened to one another and adjusted what was being proposed. So we can continue to work together.

Ms. Rempel.

**Ms. Michelle Rempel:** I move to adjourn.

**The Chair:** We have a motion to adjourn and it's non-debatable.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** The meeting is adjourned.

---







**MAIL  POSTE**

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

**Lettermail**

**Poste-lettre**

**1782711  
Ottawa**

*If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:*  
Publishing and Depository Services  
Public Works and Government Services Canada  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5

*En cas de non-livraison,  
retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :*  
Les Éditions et Services de dépôt  
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada  
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5

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

### **SPEAKER'S PERMISSION**

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Additional copies may be obtained from: Publishing and  
Depository Services  
Public Works and Government Services Canada  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5  
Telephone: 613-941-5995 or 1-800-635-7943  
Fax: 613-954-5779 or 1-800-565-7757  
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca  
http://publications.gc.ca

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the  
following address: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

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

### **PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT**

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les  
Éditions et Services de dépôt  
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada  
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5  
Téléphone : 613-941-5995 ou 1-800-635-7943  
Télécopieur : 613-954-5779 ou 1-800-565-7757  
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca  
http://publications.gc.ca

Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à  
l'adresse suivante : <http://www.parl.gc.ca>