



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

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

---

ENVI • NUMBER 011 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

---

**EVIDENCE**

**Tuesday, April 19, 2016**

—  
**Chair**

**Mrs. Deborah Schulte**



## Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

Tuesday, April 19, 2016

•(1105)

[English]

**The Chair (Mrs. Deborah Schulte (King—Vaughan, Lib.)):** Welcome to our committee meeting, everybody. We are delighted to have Minister McKenna with us today.

Minister McKenna, thank you very much for joining us today, with your staff. With you today are: from the Department of the Environment, Michael Martin, the deputy minister; from the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, Ron Hallman, president; and from the Parks Canada Agency, Daniel Watson, the chief executive officer.

Thank you very much for being with us today. We are very delighted to have you with us, Minister.

On what we're going to be doing today, pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), we have a briefing by the Minister of the Environment and Climate Change on her mandate letter. Pursuant to Standing Order 81(4), we have the main estimates 2016-17: vote 1 under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency; votes 1, 5, and 10 under Environment; and votes 1 and 5 under the Parks Canada Agency, as referred to the committee on Tuesday, February 23, 2016. We also have, pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), a study of the subject matter of supplementary estimates (C) 2015-16, votes 1c and 10c under Environment, and vote 1c under the Parks Canada Agency.

There's a lot in front of us today.

Thank you very much for joining us. I know that everybody's very anxious to get started

You have the floor.

**Hon. Catherine McKenna (Minister of Environment and Climate Change):** Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

Members of the committee, dear colleagues, I am obviously honoured to be here today with you for my first committee appearance as Minister of Environment and Climate Change.

[Translation]

I am delighted to tell you about the important work we have done since my appointment and explain the priorities of my mandate.

We are also here to present the 2016-2017 main estimates for Environment and Climate Change Canada, as well as for the two agencies under my responsibility: the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency and Parks Canada.

[English]

As you know, we have very hard-working public servants, and I'm delighted to be joined by three of them today. With me are Michael Martin, the deputy minister of Environment and Climate Change Canada; Ron Hallman, president of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency; and Daniel Watson, chief executive officer of the Parks Canada Agency.

They work very hard. I really do appreciate all the support they and their staff provide me. They will assist me in answering your questions, which I'm sure will be very interesting.

On a personal note, and as many of you know, I'm the mother of three young children. I entered politics to make the world a better place for them, our fellow citizens, and our country. That is why I was particularly delighted when the Prime Minister asked me to work on the issue of climate change, because in my view there is no greater challenge for our generation.

Madam Chair, as you are aware, my mandate letter is extensive, so today I'd like to focus my comments on three key areas: addressing climate change at home and with our international partners; the review of our environmental assessment process; and the accessibility and expansion of our national parks and marine conservation areas.

On climate change, first I'd like to highlight some of the key ways in which we have, in just five months, demonstrated our commitment to the environment and to fulfilling Canada's role in tackling climate change. Let's start with Paris.

[Translation]

Canada went to the Paris conference with broad ambitions and great determination.

We pushed for an ambitious and balanced agreement where every country will take concrete measures to limit the increase in the global mean temperature to well under 2 degrees Celsius and make efforts to limit the increase to 1.5 degrees.

My team succeeded in getting key results in the negotiations, notably the inclusion in the final agreement of language recognizing the rights of indigenous peoples internationally, and the text on the markets, which I personally helped negotiate.

We also announced \$2.65 billion to help the world's most vulnerable populations address climate change.

[English]

It was heartwarming to see nearly 200 countries come together in good faith to take action on climate change, but we all know that the agreement was just the beginning. The real work must take place in every country, at every level.

In that regard, I am happy to report that we have made tremendous progress on the bilateral stage. Just over a month ago, President Obama and Prime Minister Trudeau affirmed their common vision of a prosperous and sustainable North American economy. They both see the Paris agreement as a turning point. Our countries will sign the agreement this Friday in New York City, on Earth Day, along with at least 150 nations from around the world.

In Washington our leaders adopted a joint Canada-U.S. declaration. Among several important measures, it commits us to reducing methane from the oil and gas sector by 40% to 45%. That would be like taking every single car off the road in Ontario and Quebec. Taking this action on methane, which is 25 times more potent than carbon dioxide, is one of the most cost-effective ways to reduce emissions overall. Our objective is to publish new regulations in 2017.

We also took action to align our regulatory standards on emissions from heavy-duty vehicles, as well as to work to phase out HFCs. These are important measures to make it easier to do business in our integrated economies. Just last week, Canada and the U.S. were proud to endorse the World Bank initiative, zero routine flaring by 2030, to address the environmental and energy security impacts of oil and gas flaring.

Canada has committed to working with the U.S. and with the International Civil Aviation Organization to reduce emissions from international air travel and transportation. We're also focusing our efforts on the continental front by working with the United States and Mexico on an ambitious North American clean energy and environment agreement. Together we want to maintain a consistent set of shared environmental values on our continent, including creating a level playing field for business.

• (1110)

[Translation]

It goes without saying that our efforts to be a constructive partner on the international scene were matched—and even surpassed—by our efforts here in Canada.

Madam Chair, I am certain you will agree with me when I say that, in order to meet the challenge of climate change, we need a shared vision and collective solutions. It is with this goal in mind that the government is working closely with the provinces and territories and with Canada's indigenous peoples.

[English]

In March, first ministers adopted the Vancouver declaration, and announced the creation of four working groups that will make recommendations on clean technology, innovation and jobs, carbon pricing, specific mitigation opportunities, and adaptation and climate resilience. Their reports will be considered by the first ministers in October 2016 and will be used to develop the pan-Canadian framework for clean growth in climate change.

It is only by working together that we will enable our country to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, while building a stronger, more resilient low carbon economy that provides good jobs and great opportunities for all Canadians.

Budget 2016 made significant investments to support these objectives. This is the greenest budget in Canada's history. Throughout the budget we see measures to support clean economic growth. This is an important recognition of the imperatives that reach through to the heart of our economy and well-being. We will support climate change mitigation and adaptation through investments in green infrastructure, public transit, and energy efficient social infrastructure.

The \$5-billion investment in green infrastructure means cleaner water for Canadians as we modernize our waste water and waste water infrastructure.

It also means helping Canadians lower their energy bills by delivering energy efficiency programs to retrofit buildings and developing building codes that include requirements for climate resiliency.

We are also putting \$3.4 billion over three years into public transit to lower emissions and help improve the quality of life.

Starting in 2017-18, over two years, we'll invest a further \$125 million to enhance the green municipal fund, which supports innovative green infrastructure ideas for cities and towns across the country.

We will work together with the provinces and territories on how best to lever federal investments in the \$2-billion low carbon economy fund to realize incremental emission reductions.

We will advance the electrification of vehicle transportation in collaboration with provinces and territories. We will foster dialogue in the development of regional plans for clean electricity transmission to reduce emissions.

As part of Canada's Participation in Emission Innovation, we will double investments in clean energy, research, and development over five years and work with global partners to promote cleaner energy and better environmental outcomes.

We will advance efforts to eliminate the dependence on diesel in indigenous, remote, and northern communities and use renewable, clean energy as a replacement.

Finally, we will invest more than \$1 billion over four years starting in 2017-18 to support clean technology and innovation in the forestry, fisheries, mining, energy, and agriculture sectors that employ so many Canadians in different regions of our country.

Engaging Canadians on our plans and efforts to address climate change is something I view as essential. My department is developing an engagement strategy so that all Canadians from coast to coast to coast can take part in our efforts to create a climate-smart economy and country.

• (1115)

In fact, I'm delighted to announce that this coming Thursday we will launch an interactive website to collect Canadian views and smart solutions on how to fight climate change. Not only will all Canadians be able to feed their suggestions directly to the government; all suggestions received will be immediately published online in full. We hope citizens will be inspired by the ideas of their friends and neighbours.

The website will also offer Canadians the tools they need to hold town halls to engage their communities from the grassroots. I encourage all of you around this table to join the conversation online and be part of the solution, by making your suggestions or by hosting a town hall on climate change and clean growth in your communities.

I would also like to point out that on February 26 I launched a public consultation period for Canada's draft federal sustainable development strategy for 2016-19, and I look forward to the committee members' suggestions to help improve it.

In terms of the 2016-17 main estimates for Environment and Climate Change Canada, planned spending will be \$902.1 million. The decreases in the reference levels of some programs are mostly due to funding sunseting on March 31, 2016. Renewed and additional funding was announced in budget 2016. The details of those specific announcements will be proposed in supplementary estimates for consideration by the committee this year.

Madam Chair, I would now like to turn to the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency, which is also within my portfolio.

The government's priority is to rebuild the confidence of Canadians in environmental assessments. That is the only way to get resources to market responsibly in the 21st century. To accomplish this, we need a process that fully accounts for the many environmental, social, and economic considerations surrounding new projects and for the concerns of Canadians. We want to make sure that environmental assessment decisions are based on science, facts, and evidence and serve the public interest. Also, we need to work in partnership with indigenous peoples to ensure that their rights and interests are respected.

The review of the environmental assessment process will take time. That is why we have put in place interim principles to guide the assessment of major projects. These principles mean that no project will need to go back to square one, that decisions are based on science and traditional knowledge, that meaningful consultations with communities and indigenous peoples take place, and that we take into account direct and upstream greenhouse gas emissions. I look forward to working with the agency, my colleagues, provinces, industry, and other stakeholders on this important review.

I am pleased to note that budget 2016 proposes to provide \$14.2 million over four years to support the agency's activities and increase

its capacity to undertake more consultations with the public and indigenous groups. This additional funding will be reflected in future estimates documents. Currently, the planned spending for the agency is marked at \$30.9 million during 2016-17. This is consistent with funding levels for the last fiscal year.

Madam Chair, I would now like to bring your attention to the important work that is being done by Parks Canada and point out my priorities for that portfolio, which I know so many Canadians enjoy, especially as summer approaches.

I am sure everyone will agree with me when I say that our national parks, marine conservation areas, and national historic sites connect Canadians with their natural heritage. My priorities are to preserve and expand our national park system and marine conservation areas while respecting their ecological integrity.

In that regard, I can report that we have had very fruitful discussions with the Government of Ontario as well as with interested citizens to advance the completion of Rouge National Urban Park. I hope that we will soon be able to make an announcement.

You will have noted, of course that budget 2016 provides \$42.4 million over five years to continue developing new national parks and national marine conservation areas, including the Lancaster Sound National Marine Conservation Area in Nunavut and the Thaidene Nëné National Park in the Northwest Territories.

• (1120)

[*Translation*]

We are also in the process of developing programs and services to allow more Canadians to enjoy our national parks, marine areas and historic sites. In this respect, I am delighted that the 2016 budget includes \$83.3 million over five years for Parks Canada to allow free admission for all visitors.

I am sure that all the committee members will agree that this is an excellent way to celebrate our country's 150th anniversary and encourage new citizens and youth to learn more about our natural environment and our history.

[*English*]

Finally, I would like to say that I have learned to appreciate the essential role protected areas play in conserving nature and helping to mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change. I believe that we need to scale up our efforts to conserve the healthy, resilient ecosystems that we all depend on for our well-being. That is why I am pleased that budget 2016 is providing \$81.3 million over five years to support marine conservation activities, including the designation of new marine protected areas. We are certainly determined to deliver on our promise to protect at least 17% of our land and 10% of our oceans by 2020.

In terms of the 2016-17 main estimates for Parks Canada, the planned spending for this fiscal year is \$1.17 billion. The increase this fiscal year is mostly due to investment funding that Parks Canada has received to address infrastructure needs in national parks and national historic sites across Canada. Of course, all new funding announced in budget 2016 will be reflected in future estimate documents.

In conclusion, I want to stress how important it is to me that we work in the spirit of collaboration—within our own government and across party lines; with other jurisdictions in Canada and abroad; with individual Canadians, the private sector, and scientists; with NGOs, local communities, and indigenous peoples.

I would like to thank all of you for the important work you are doing as members of this committee. As parliamentarians, we are invested with a very important task when it comes to issues related to creating a clean environment and a sustainable economy for the benefit of all Canadians, as well as future generations of Canadians. As a new minister, I value your insights and welcome your suggestions, and I am very happy to take your questions.

*Merci.*

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Minister.

Everybody is very anxious to get on to asking the important questions. We will start with Mr. Shields, please.

**Mr. Martin Shields (Bow River, CPC):** Welcome, Minister. We are glad to have you here.

One of the things you mentioned here was the \$2-billion investment that you are looking forward to working with. With that \$2 billion, one of the first things that happen is that people want to know how to access it. Is it through provinces and then municipalities, or is it private sector? When announcements are made, people always want to know, “Where is the door? How do we get to it, and how do we disperse it?” That is the first step.

The second part would be the \$50 million elsewhere, for the natural resource sector, that has been talked about as well. Is that part of the \$2 billion, or is the \$50 million for the resource sector separate?

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** I believe you were referring first to the \$2-billion low carbon economy fund.

**Mr. Martin Shields:** Yes, I'm sorry.

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** The \$2-billion low carbon economy fund that was announced in the budget is intended to be funds that we would leverage to help reduce emissions in the most efficient way. As you know, we are going through a process with the provinces and territories. At the first ministers' meeting, the Prime Minister and the provinces and territories agreed that we need to meet our international obligations, so this is part of that discussion. We now have four working groups that have been set up: one is on carbon pricing; one is on mitigation opportunities; one is on clean jobs, technology, and innovation; and one is on adaptation.

As we go through that process, we are having discussions. The process has already started. We are having discussions with provinces and territories, and we will be listening to their suggestions about how we can support them to reduce emissions.

We are going to be considering the most effective ways to support opportunities to reduce emissions, and we are really looking forward to hearing from the provinces and territories about their ideas and how we can help them.

I should also say that municipalities have a huge role to play, and we certainly recognize this. We have funding that has been set aside through the Federation of Canadian Municipalities. They have a green municipal fund, I believe it is called. We have set aside money, and that would be to help municipalities that are looking at projects to reduce emissions. I have had many meetings with municipalities across the country that are very committed to reducing their emissions.

The second part of funding I believe you are referring to is about clean technology in the natural resource sector.

● (1125)

**Mr. Martin Shields:** That's right.

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** I think that's also important, because clearly there are ways we can develop our natural resources in a cleaner way. We had our announcement with the United States, which is a good example of that. We announced we are going to reduce emissions from methane, and from oil and gas, by 40% to 45%. This is a great example of how the economy and the environment go together. There's now low-cost innovation that allows you to, in an efficient way, reduce emissions from that sector.

Once again, in the process we're going through with the provinces and territories, in discussions with business and the natural resource sector, and with environmental NGOs and other groups, we'll be receiving suggestions about how we can develop our natural resources in more sustainable ways. That's what we'll be looking at, and where we will most effectively deploy what are significant but limited dollars.

**Mr. Martin Shields:** The \$50 million is a separate piece from the \$2 billion?

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** The \$2 billion low carbon economy fund is a separate fund. We also have money for clean tech, which is part of the budget. There are different pieces for the clean tech, and we're also looking at the natural resource sector and how we clean it.

**Mr. Martin Shields:** That's important, in the sense that people understand when you're looking at numbers and where you can apply.

It's interesting you mentioned the municipalities. The big city guys—I was vice-president of Alberta municipalities association—are getting to be a stronger and stronger voice and work closely together. To have them at the table...I know you're working with the provinces, but the major cities in this country are beginning to have a strong voice, and probably some movement, as you identified. I hope the municipalities...I know FCM's there. That group out there, as an entity on its own, needs to be part of this discussion.

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** I think that is an excellent point. There's been a lot of focus on the provinces and territories, but approximately 40% of the emissions we have are within the control of municipalities. That's why, when I went to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, I said, “Look, I know you want to be partners.”

Many municipalities—from Ottawa, which just announced its climate plan, to Vancouver, which has been a leader—have plans to do the same exercise we're doing: reduce their emissions by a certain percentage. I've said I would like to see every municipality have a plan where they are going to, in a systemic way, look at how they are going to reduce emissions, and then come to the federal government with suggestions about how we can support these initiatives that are going to have real reductions in emissions. What are the types of projects? That is something that is absolutely in my radar, and thank you very much for bringing that up.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

Mike Bossio.

**Mr. Mike Bossio (Hastings—Lennox and Addington, Lib.):** Thank you so much, Minister, for being here today, as well as your staff. We appreciate your coming out to meet with us.

Our committee has just spent a number of meetings studying the FSDA and the FSDS. One of the key deficiencies identified has been making government more accountable around the FSDA and SDGs. It has been suggested we need to legislate that the government must use the three pillars of social, economic, and environmental consideration in all decisions of program development or projects; that we should legislate that long-term objectives be established, and short-, medium-, and long-term targets and goals be set to meet these long-term sustainability objectives; that these goals and targets should meet the requirements of the SMART process; that we should take a whole-of-government approach and create a central agency, for example elevating the minister of environment and sustainable development to a sustainability, or like Wales has done, the minister for the well-being of future generations; and that we should increase the enforcement capability of the environment commissioner or sustainable development commissioner, whatever that title might be, to enforce compliance with stated goals and also to create a forward-looking agent to hold government accountable to the long-term objectives, once again for the well-being of future generations.

Can you please share your thoughts on these objectives and on these proposals?

• (1130)

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** I appreciate all the hard work. I know the committee has been looking at our FSDS and looking at different options.

I had a chance to read David Boyd's submission, and I think you referred to many points that he raised. I'm certainly interested in hearing about how we can improve it.

You will laugh possibly, but if you ask any of the members of cabinet, all I do is tell them that we need a whole-of-government approach when it comes to tackling climate change, and making sure that we have a strategy in place that shows that we are a leader. That's what we want to be.

It's challenging. Certainly looking at what the opportunities are across the board to bring together different departments, I think is part of the FSDS. I think we have close to 40 departments, or we maybe have more than 40, that are involved. It is a bit of a challenge. I think everyone is extremely committed to looking at how we can do better, but it's something that requires work.

What we did this year, and, as I say, the report is not perfect.... That's why it's a draft, and I certainly appreciate the feedback of the committee. We did link it with the UN sustainable development goals. I think that's very important. The sustainable development goals are something that I certainly care deeply about. They obviously go beyond just environmental goals. They talk about tackling poverty. The sustainable development strategy, the act, is looking at how government across the board tackles environmental issues.

It's not necessarily a perfect fix, but they are certainly goals that are aligned with what government is doing. There could not be a better example than climate change. That is certainly cross-cutting, and it fits extraordinarily well with the sustainable development goal to tackle climate change.

I certainly welcome suggestions and comments, and I know the commissioner has appeared here. I'm looking forward to hearing from you.

We also have public consultations that are ongoing across Canada to receive suggestions from all Canadians. I'm very active when I meet with anyone, with business, environmental groups, indigenous groups, climate activists, when I meet with youth. I say please, please provide your suggestions about how we can strengthen what government is doing and really be a leader.

**Mr. Mike Bossio:** I'm really proud of our government moving forward on climate change and beginning to establish a carbon pricing mechanism for energy and carbon, but the elephant in the room, which many don't talk about, is consumption itself.

Carbon is one piece of the climate change model, sustainable development goals. To me, consumption is the core of the issue around climate change, and carbon pricing is the first time that we're actually pricing the consumption into our economic model.

What do you feel is the next area of consumption that we should consider pricing into that economic model?

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** Thank you for that, because I agree it's an important point. Carbon pricing is key.

I was in Washington this week, speaking with CEOs and environmentalists and political leaders about the importance of carbon pricing. We need to price what we want less of, pollution, and reward behaviour, reward cleaner solutions. That is an important mechanism.

I would say that we aren't quite there yet. I'm glad you're very optimistic. We have a process to go through with the provinces and territories.

It depends. When you talk about pricing consumption, I think there are a number of different models. One area that I think a lot about, where we can do a lot better, is efficiency. We're wasteful when you look at where emissions are coming from: buildings and vehicles. Those are huge areas. If we had efficiency standards, we could produce less pollution. That's part, once again, of the working group process that has been established.

• (1135)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Cullen.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP):** Thank you, Minister, for being here. Thank you to all your officials as well.

Congratulations again on your appointment. It's such a critical role. Also, congratulations for your commitment, Canada's commitment, to limiting emissions to 1.5° above pre-industrial 1990 levels.

Did your department consider any kind of a home retrofit program in budget 2016?

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** Thank you very much, and thanks for your work in this regard.

We're looking at a whole range of different measures. One thing I'm very proud of in our budget, and something that I advocated for very strongly, is we that have significant investments in social infrastructure.

I advocated for that, and ministers were all on board. If we're going to build social housing, we need to make sure that it's extremely efficient. That's not only retrofits, which it does include, but it's also new housing, because it just makes economic sense.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** And I think that's laudable.

We've had previous home retrofit programs that were wildly popular and proved themselves under a government analysis to be effective as well for both homeowners reducing their costs and also for reducing our GHG emissions. As you just mentioned, buildings contribute quite a bit.

Just say yes or no. Did you consider it? Will you consider it in the future?

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** As you know, we're in discussions with provinces and territories, but through that process we have different working groups. One of the working groups is on mitigation. As part of that, there are working subgroups—I won't name all of them—but one of them is on buildings. Different groups have spoken to me about different structures of retrofit programs, so we'll be looking at all solutions in that regard.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** This wasn't a trick or a complicated question. All I wanted to know is, did your government consider a home retrofit program in drawing up budget 2016? Yes, you considered it and rejected it for now; no, you didn't consider it. That's all I'm looking for.

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** We are always looking for solutions so we consider all solutions. In our budget you saw the significant investments we're putting into all sorts of areas—

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** I understand.

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:**—so retrofits in social housing was one of them.

We now are in a process where we want to hear from the provinces and territories—

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Okay, that's fine.

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:**—about how we can make the most cost-effective investments because we have obviously limited resources—

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Minister, you'll understand my time is very limited.

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:**—and so we will be considering them.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** I'm trying to keep my questions fairly brief and straightforward in order to get as many questions through as we can.

Your party committed to removing the subsidy to oil and gas; in fact, here is the quote: “We will fulfill [Canada's] G20 commitment”—which the previous government made in 2009—“and phase out subsidies for the fossil fuel industry”.

Yet budget 2016 locks in those very same subsidies until 2025. Does this not both open and shut the door at the same time? Is this not the sucking and blowing we've seen from federal governments for years when it comes to carbon emissions?

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** I'm very glad to reconfirm our commitment to eliminating fossil fuel subsidies. That is extremely important; in fact, we reiterated this in our declaration with the United States.

I am working with the finance minister on looking at how we can do that.

Today I was actually at an announcement with Céline Bak, with Analytica, talking about how we need more innovation in the clean tech sector, so that is part of this. We need to be looking at opportunities for clean tech companies to succeed.

In direct answer to your question, yes, we are looking at how we can eliminate fossil fuel subsidies.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Yet that wasn't your commitment to the Canadian people. Your commitment to the Canadian people is, “We will fulfill [Canada's] G-20 commitment”, which was already six years old at the time that you made the commitment. Now we're looking at another 10 years to go by before any action is done on this.

Here is a question. When will Canada's emissions begin to go down?

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** I'm hoping as soon as possible. We had a government unfortunately for the last 10 years—

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Agreed.

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:**—that did not make the necessary investments or create the necessary market signals that were key to doing that.



You can't bend a curve overnight—

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Sure.

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** —so, as you know, we are now working through a process with the provinces and territories that is really about how we're going to be serious about making a commitment.

I have always said that Canadians expect a plan, and we are developing that plan, which includes putting a price on carbon, which includes looking at specific opportunities to reduce emissions through the mitigation working group. Any suggestions would certainly be welcome in that regard.

● (1140)

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Sure. Oh, we have many.

Somewhere between “not overnight” and “as soon as possible” isn't much of a date. Canadians do want to know when that curve bends.

When we go to New York and sign that commitment on Earth Day we will be using Mr. Harper's targets that are woeful and inadequate in meeting our global commitments.

Here's the last question. You committed to this 1.5°C ambition. When asked in Paris whether you had done any translation as to what that target would actually mean for Canada, or if any analysis had been done, your response was “no”. You understand the preoccupation from Canadians who have been through this movie before, where a commitment was made without a plan to get there. Why was no analysis done before Canada put its signature on a 1.5°C emission curve?

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** I was very proud to be a part of the Canadian delegation in Paris. I was very proud that we worked very constructively with other partners in the international community. We know that we need to reduce our emissions below 2°C, striving for 1.5°C. That is what we worked extremely hard to get 195 countries to agree to, and now we are doing the hard work to figure out what the plan is so that Canada can meet its international obligations. I take that extremely seriously, and at the end of six months you will see the plan to do that.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Fisher.

**Mr. Darren Fisher (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, Lib.):** Thank you, Minister and gentlemen.

Minister, as per your mandate letter, you're to work with the Minister of Infrastructure and Communities to make new investments in green infrastructure. I've said it before, and I've said it here at this committee, real environmental leadership starts with us here in government. I'll use a few examples from here on the Hill.

You walk into a washroom in Centre Block, the radiator's blasting at 110 degrees, and someone's opened a window because it's too hot. We have gas-powered vans driving around in circles all day long, driving MPs around, when we should have electric. We should have charging stations. We should have bike racks. We should have bike-share. I would happily take a bike and go down to Confederation after each meeting.

There are many other opportunities just right here, not counting the federal government across the board, and not counting what you've spoken about with municipal governments. I know that in my municipality, Halifax Regional Municipality, they did the solar city program. Now there's the green municipal fund as well.

There are a lot of people doing individual things at government, but what ways do you think we can lead by example—us specifically—to send the message to industry and Canadians that we're serious about this in the hope that they will follow our example?

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** Thank you very much. That is a really critical question. Nothing drives me crazier than the example you said, where you have a furnace blowing and it's so hot you have to open the window.

We know we can do a lot better. In government procurement, clearly we need to be doing a lot more and thinking across the board on how we do better. I provided one example, that of social housing. We cannot be supporting social housing providers without having some expectation that we'll be building energy-efficient housing. Certainly, through the infrastructure money we're investing, whether it's in social infrastructure, obviously public transit, or green infrastructure, we need to make sure we have standards so that we actually get reductions in emissions.

In terms of the whole-of-government approach, I think that's very important. We're looking at Government of Canada buildings. How do we ensure that they are at the highest standards when it comes to efficiency?

In terms of electric vehicles, I'm hopefully changing soon—I'm looking at my deputy—to an electric vehicle. I have a hybrid, but I would really like to have an electric vehicle. We have an electric vehicle charging station at Environment and Climate Change Canada, but we should have that across the board. Our fleet should be electric vehicles. We absolutely do need to be leading by example.

On a personal note, I'm a huge cyclist. It just drives me crazy that there are no bike racks out in front of Parliament Hill. I think if you have them out there, people will see, and be reminded, that often it's actually faster to get around by bike.

I'm happy to lend you a bike, Darren.

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** I'm happy to take it.

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** I think you're absolutely right that there are lots of ways where, in particular through procurement, we can do a better job, department by department, looking at how to ensure that we have the best practices.

I will give a shout-out to many provinces, that they look at how they can reduce their emissions, how they become a net zero government. I think there are certainly ways we could do better. I'd be very interested in hearing the committee's view in this regard.

The good news is that as part of the working group process with the provinces and territories, as part of the mitigation working group, there's a sub-working group on government procurement, where I'll be challenging our government to look at what we are doing.

• (1145)

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** If your job is to protect Canada's fresh water by using education, geomapping, watershed protection, and investments in better waste water treatment, and you're committed to setting higher air quality standards, you probably know that I've introduced my private member's bill, which I'll put in a plug for, the national strategy for the safe disposal of lamps containing mercury act. My bill requests that you work with provincial and territorial governments across Canada to develop a strong strategy to keep mercury out of our waterways and our air.

Can you let us know here in the committee what other measures you're taking that would complement this strategy?

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** Thank you very much. I appreciate your bill. We are studying the bill. Clearly the safe disposal of mercury-containing lamps is a very important issue.

We're looking at a variety of different ways that we can reduce waste water. As you may recall, one of the first things I had to address was the issue of waste water disposal in Montreal. That was a really tough file. But why was I having to make a decision, which was the best decision, based on the science? I had to do it because the infrastructure was just not there.

I think you've seen the commitments on infrastructure in terms of fresh water. We have a number of different programs. I'm happy to follow up with you. I think I'm going to run out of time here.

**The Chair:** You've got within a minute. You're okay.

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** Air quality is certainly something we look at, along with all the measures we can be taking to ensure that we have cleaner air. In terms of specific measures, probably my deputy can talk more about some examples

I certainly appreciate when we get thoughtful suggestions from parliamentarians about things we could be doing better. Both water and air are very big priorities for the department.

**The Chair:** We are out of time now. If somebody wants to pick up on that line of questioning, we can carry on with that later, if you don't mind.

Mr. Aldag.

**Mr. John Aldag (Cloverdale—Langley City, Lib.):** I have some questions, and I'm going to start with parks, something that's near and dear to me. I was really excited to see that our campaign commitment for providing free access to national parks and historic sites in 2017 is there, and that we've put in \$83.3 million over five years for allowing free admission in 2017 and then, I believe, for students beyond the five-year period.

I did have the chance to be in Banff-Lake Louise two weekends ago, a place where I've spent some time in my career. As we prepare for the free admission, what sort of thought is also going into maintaining the ecological and cultural integrity of our parks and sites? We have some time to prepare for 2017, but I know that already on a summer's day in Lake Louise there is no parking, and

I'm wondering, with the money that's coming, if there will be any opportunities to mitigate the perhaps increased visitation.

I'm not criticizing. It's a wonderful thing that we're providing access, but what measures will we be able to take as Parks Canada to mitigate some of the perhaps renewed interest in parks and sites that will be generated in 2017 and hopefully beyond?

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** Thank you.

Also, thank you for all of your work over I don't know how many years. It's a lot of years. Maybe you don't want to say.

**Mr. John Aldag:** Thirty-three.

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

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** That's on parks and also historic sites, as you've reminded me.

I was very excited that as part of my mandate letter and as part of budget 2016 we announced free access to national parks for our 150th birthday. I could not think of a better way to celebrate the beauty of Canada than through free access.

I think you raise an important point for some parks. As you say, some mountain parks already have a large number of visitors. We have some parks that see fewer than 100 people a year, so there's certainly a huge variety in parks.

I was in Banff National Park, where I made a really exciting announcement about support for infrastructure there. We had a discussion about this. I think it's important to have discussions about how we maintain the ecological integrity of our parks, which is paramount, as you say, while at the same time getting more people out to our parks to enjoy them, not just because they're free, but to see them and then make a lifelong commitment to coming to our parks.

We are having discussions, particularly with parks where they already see a high volume of visitors, to look at how we can ensure this. Maybe we can promote it so that people come at different times or go to different areas. Also, overall, how do we ensure that we maintain the ecological integrity of our parks?

I think that is absolutely manageable, and I think it is a really exciting opportunity for our country. What I'm also focused on is looking at what programs we can expand, and what are the new programs, the new opportunities for Canadians who do not see our national parks. For lower-income Canadians or new immigrants, how do we make parks more accessible to them?

I think it is really important that parks aren't just for people who can afford to get to parks or who are used to canoe-tripping or building campfires. There are a lot of Canadians who have never had the opportunity to go to a park, and it's a bit daunting for them. We're expanding our Learn to Camp program. We have a number of other programs that we're promoting to get disadvantaged Canadians and new Canadians to parks.

I'm also excited to be able to talk about two other programs. Starting in 2018, we will have free access to national parks for Canadian youth, children 18 and under, and new Canadians in the first year in which they get citizenship.

These are great initiatives, but they're not everything. We need to be thinking about how we get people there. How do we facilitate transportation there? How do we facilitate camp experiences?

• (1150)

**Mr. John Aldag:** That's excellent. Thank you.

Yes, they're very exciting programs, and I encourage you to continue with them. I know that Canadians will thoroughly enjoy the parks and sites in 2017 and beyond, as they have for more than 100 years.

You mentioned buildings contributing to greenhouse gases. I was also delighted to see in the budget the \$20 million over the next two years in the national cost-sharing program. I have a quick question on how the agency is ramping up to deliver those funds to the third party historic sites. I've had great feedback already from the network of sites. They're saying that it's so nice to see the government doing this—to go to what Mr. Cullen raised—and to see a specific segment of the built heritage actually having investments made so that it doesn't have to be knocked down and we can actually retain these architectural gems that we have across the country.

Do you have a comment or two on how we'll be dealing with the investment in our built heritage?

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** I'll say something quickly and then I will pass it on to the head of Parks Canada.

Certainly sometimes we forget about national historic sites in all of our excitement in talking about parks, and they are very important to us. We are putting significant investments into them, and it is important that they're not falling down and that we encourage Canadians to get there.

Maybe on the specifics, I will pass it on.

**Mr. Daniel Watson (Chief Executive Officer, Parks Canada Agency):** This is an area that's been of great interest to provinces, municipalities, and some other players in the country for a long time, as you may well know. They've been asking for this for a number of years, so we're working closely with them through an existing federal, provincial, and territorial working group to sort out the details. We expect to have these rolled out before too long, and there is a big backlog of demand in this very area.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

Mr. Fast.

**Hon. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC):** Thank you, Minister, for appearing before committee. It's good to have you here for the first time.

You have often said that the environment and the economy go hand in hand, and I fully agree with you.

As you move forward with your commitment to impose carbon pricing on Canadians, on the provinces and on the territories, have you given thought to how you're going to ensure that you maintain a level playing field for Canadian businesses vis-à-vis their competitors around the world? I'm thinking of the United States, which in a perfect world would move in lockstep with us in implementing our approaches to climate change. The reality is that we typically move at a different pace from the United States. The same is true for all of our key competitors around the world.

I have spoken to many Canadian businesses that appreciate that Canada has to do its part to address the environmental challenges that face us, but they are deathly afraid that the playing field will be dramatically tilted against them if Canada moves forward with aggressive climate change policy and specifically carbon pricing if, in fact, some of the key competitors do not follow suit.

What I'd want to hear from you is the approach you will be bringing to the table to assure our businesses that they will continue to be able to thrive within the global market.

• (1155)

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** Carbon pricing is clearly a key part of the first ministers' process; the first ministers all endorse carbon pricing.

I have actually had discussions with Canadian business, and they ask us to please go ahead with carbon pricing because it is the most efficient mechanism to reduce emissions and to foster innovation. In fact, we already have an internal price on carbon.

Just last week before I went to Washington where I spoke—Canada is a member of the Carbon Pricing Leadership coalition—the Mining Association of Canada endorsed carbon pricing. I should point out that the members of the Mining Association of Canada that called for carbon pricing include Suncor and Shell. This is clearly a signal from the business community in Canada that this is something we should be doing.

Internationally there's a lot of good progress.

I should also talk about the leadership of the provinces. With the leadership of the provinces, more than 80% of Canadians will be living in a jurisdiction that has or will have a price for carbon. Currently, B.C. and Alberta have a tax. Ontario will be joining with Quebec and California in a cap-and-trade system.

We already have carbon pricing, so I think the question is how we ensure that it's across the country and that it actually reduces carbon pollution.

**Hon. Ed Fast:** Minister, my apologies because my time is short.

My question was: how will you ensure that Canadian businesses will not now be playing on an unlevelled playing field once carbon pricing policies have been imposed on them?

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** I think you do that in two ways.

One is working internationally. Next year, in 2017, China will be introducing a cap-and-trade system. When China does that, it will be a game-changer because most companies and businesses are looking to do business in China. That is a very important signal.

Absolutely we need to consider competitiveness, and I would say it will make our companies more competitive if they reduce pollution. We have 195 countries that have signalled that they are moving to a lower carbon economy.

I've always said we need to be thoughtful, and that is why we are sitting down with provinces and territories to discuss carbon pricing to understand the different systems and to understand concerns from business, the provinces, and the territories. Businesses have the opportunity and have said that they will be providing submissions to different working groups, including the carbon pricing working group.

I'm very interested in discussing this with them and looking at the different measures you can take to address carbon leakage, and I think that we will come up with and design a good system that addresses that, but that also ultimately makes us more competitive in the future.

**Hon. Ed Fast:** Thank you for that. I hope you do listen to the provinces and territories, because many of them have carbon-intensive, trade-sensitive industries that have to be protected. These industries generally acknowledge that they have to do their part, but what they don't want to do is compete on an un-level playing field.

I want to challenge you. I'm glad you mentioned the Mining Association of Canada. I was aware that they would be supporting carbon pricing, but they made it conditional. It was a very clear position, and that was that it should be a revenue-neutral carbon pricing regime.

Are you able to commit at this table, based on the request and the commitment made by the Mining Association of Canada, that whatever carbon pricing mechanism you will implement will be truly revenue neutral—not an Alberta type of revenue-neutral, but truly revenue-neutral?

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** We are very excited by the Mining Association of Canada's support.

We have said that we are working with the provinces and territories. It is really up to the provinces and territories to design the system that meets their needs. As you said, provinces and territories don't want things imposed on them that aren't going to make sense.

I trust the judgment of the premiers of provinces and territories to design a system that they think is the most effective.

• (1200)

**The Chair:** Perfect. Thank you for that good timing.

Mr. Amos.

**Mr. William Amos (Pontiac, Lib.):** Thank you, Minister, for coming. Thank you to the officials. This is really exciting. It's a real privilege to be able to ask you some questions.

I'll start off by looking for a bit more meat on the bone around the environmental assessment review process. I think many Canadians feel that if there were a signature challenge of the previous government, it was their devolution of authority to the provinces around environmental assessment and an unwillingness to be serious about ensuring that projects are promoted sustainably.

What can you tell us about what the consultation looks like? I understand that it's going to take time, and I understand that it's going to take consultations with various players, but can you shed a bit more light on how Canadians can expect that process to roll out?

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** Thank you very much for all your work on environmental issues through your career.

As you all know, my mandate in the mandate letter is to restore the confidence of Canadians in our environmental assessment process. There are concerns with the changes that were made in CEAA 2012, so we are doing two things.

One is addressing projects that are currently under review. For those projects, we announced interim principles. What is great is that I work very closely with the Minister of Natural Resources. This doesn't always happen in governments, but we are absolutely aligned. Getting our resources to market has to be done in a sustainable way, which means that we need to be working together.

Those principles include ensuring that decisions are made on evidence, facts, and science as well as traditional knowledge; that we have proper consultation with communities; that we engage with indigenous peoples; that we look at upstream greenhouse gas emissions.

That's on the interim process. Now, with the review of our environmental assessment process, we're looking at various options. Obviously, there would be an opportunity for the committee to provide any feedback on what the committee believes building confidence in our environmental process would look like. Legislative changes would come to the committee.

We are still listening to various groups. We've met with indigenous groups, with environmental groups, with business, to try to determine the best way to move forward in a very timely fashion. We understand that we need to be doing this in a timely fashion so that we have a robust, modern environmental assessment process that has the confidence of Canadians.

**Mr. William Amos:** I'd like to return to the line of questions that Mr. Bossio was pursuing around the Federal Sustainable Development Act. We obviously have taken it upon ourselves as part of our unanimously agreed work agenda to evaluate not only the strategy that is proposed, but more broadly, the act itself. Of course, the purpose of the FSDA is to ensure accountability and transparency in the federal government system, and obviously it represents a major opportunity. The federal government itself is a huge enterprise that spends billions of dollars and there are many opportunities to make major gains on climate files and on others as well.

You've got an interesting view. You've seen the whole of government, how it operates from the core out. What can you tell us so far from what you've seen about what you would like to see improved in the government operations?

Also, if you're so inclined, I'd invite your officials to comment as well. The federal government system isn't perfect in terms of how it operates. There must be ways to improve it. We're looking at making recommendations on that, but I wonder if you could provide us with some initial remarks as we contemplate it ourselves.

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** I can't say that in five months I know everything about how government operates, and procurement is a particularly complicated area.

As I said, what I see as the opportunity but also the challenge is that I have a very clear mandate to reduce emissions, including with our own government, but as the Minister of Environment and Climate Change I'm not the minister responsible for a lot of procurement in most areas except, obviously, within the agencies and the department. Goodwill clearly exists across the board—everyone is extraordinarily supportive from the ministers to the officials—to my mandate to reduce emissions, for Canada to take a significant step, to demonstrate that we get it, that we need to be a leader when it comes to reducing emissions. The challenge really is to figure out how to translate that.

That's why I really put it out to the committee but also to Canadians: how do we do that? How do we ensure that we have a whole-of-government approach and not just to climate change, because it goes beyond climate change, it goes to air quality, to water, to these other areas that we were discussing? How do we ensure that we have tangible objectives that are measurable so that we can ensure that we are actually reaching them and measuring them, but also that it's across government? I don't know that I have those solutions but I certainly appreciate the thoughts of the committee and of Canadians on the draft that was put out there.

• (1205)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I'd like to welcome Marilyn Gladu who's joining us today at committee.

**Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC):** Thanks to the minister and her team for coming today.

I'll be looking for concise answers and I'll say thank you when I've heard enough of the answer because I want to make the best use of my time.

My first question is this: being that Canada's contribution to the overall global footprint is less than 2%, what tangible temperature decrease do we expect to see from the billions of dollars being spent on climate change?

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** I think everyone needs to be doing their part. Canada has to be doing its part and unfortunately right now we're going in the wrong direction when it comes to emissions.

If we don't, if every country doesn't do its part, then we are never going to be below 2 and be below 1.5. That is why we're working so hard to come up with our strategy to reduce emissions. There wasn't

a lot of action, in fact we went in the wrong direction for the last 10 years—

**Ms. Marilyn Gladu:** Thanks very much.

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** —so we need to be serious.

**Ms. Marilyn Gladu:** My concern then is that if we spend our billions we still may accomplish nothing because we're not significant. I'm not saying we shouldn't do something. I'm just arguing that perhaps the approach should be to leverage our technology to the substantive contributors.

In my second question, I want to talk about my riding of Sarnia—Lambton, which as you may know has a large number of refineries including Shell and Suncor, which you've talked about, and ExxonMobil as well. We also have NOVA Chemicals, which is looking at doing a billion-dollar polyethylene project all coming from the Marcellus shale gas based on methane. Obviously, for my riding it's a huge concern for them at a time when electricity prices from Ontario are 17¢ a kilowatt hour and they're looking at the cap-and-trade system being brought in, and they're concerned about a second federal price either on carbon or on methane.

Our industry locally is transitioning to the bio-economy so we have BioAmber; we have a bio-refinery from Comet; we have huge innovations in renewable energy and clean tech and we're in the transition phase. My concern is, what will the government do to recognize that these are very tough economic times and we have these multinational companies that have choices about whether to invest there or not. We want to make sure that we don't over-punish them while we're transitioning to the bio-economy.

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** I totally agree with you. We need to ensure that resources get developed but in a sustainable way. It is challenging. It can be challenging, but what I believe a carbon price does is that it is just a market mechanism that rewards.... It prices what we don't want, which is pollution. If you can reduce the pollution, then it is cheaper. I think that is the proper type of incentive. As I said, I am working with the provinces and territories. I am very interested in hearing from business, their perspective, as well as environmental NGOs, indigenous leaders, and all Canadians, about how we go forward. This is a huge opportunity for Canada.

As I said, today I was in an announcement with—

• (1210)

**Ms. Marilyn Gladu:** Thank you. That's fine.

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** —the clean tech industry. Unfortunately, we are going in the wrong direction when it comes to clean tech. We could be a world leader. Those are opportunities as well.

**Ms. Marilyn Gladu:** Thank you. I would like to invite you to come to Sarnia, because our Lambton College is a leader in clean tech and there is a lot going on.

I didn't see anything in budget 2016 about Lake Erie. You know that Lake Erie is turning green from algae and is rather in a crisis state. Coming from southwestern Ontario, I am wondering how your government is going to address that crisis.

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** I will talk in general terms, and then in terms of Lake Erie specifically, I will turn it over to the deputy.

Protecting our waters is really important, our fresh water, and looking at, as you say... Whether it is algal bloom or other pollutants, we work very closely...including with the United States. It is something I can perhaps get back to you on, or else I'll ask my deputy if he would like to add something.

**Mr. Michael Martin (Deputy Minister, Department of the Environment):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

There was a specific commitment in budget 2016 to renew funding for one year for Lake Erie.

**Ms. Marilyn Gladu:** I have a quick question on the environmental assessment process. Recognizing that we are looking to make sure that projects move forward, I see that we have added a greenhouse gas emissions assessment of upstream and downstream impacts, which I am used to as a chemical engineer working 32 years with companies like Shell. They have those processes.

However, I didn't see that any criteria for what is acceptable has been established. Has that been established, or is there still no way of judging, once you have all the data, whether it is okay or not?

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** When we do environmental assessments, we do assessments based on the science and the facts. That is why it is very important to look at greenhouse gas emissions, both direct and upstream. Clearly, it is a project-by-project approach, and then there is a determination of significance by the environmental assessment agency. Project by project, we will consider what the greenhouse gas emissions are, both upstream and direct, in order to inform my decision.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

Mr. Cullen, go ahead.

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

I am going to cede my time to somebody who apparently has some opinion on this matter. Ms. May could ask a few minutes of questions, please.

**The Chair:** It's over to Ms. May.

**Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP):** I'd like to say a huge thank you to Nathan Cullen.

Minister, thank you. Again, I want to say that you didn't oversell what you did in Paris. You performed an enormous role in the success of the treaty and getting 1.5 in there.

I want to correct something in your written statement, if you'll forgive me. It is not the greenest budget in Canada's history. You would need to look at the 1993 budget or the 2005 budget for the greenest budgets. You could say this is definitely the greenest budget lately. I want to try to address as many points as I can in the time I have.

**The Chair:** You have three minutes.

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** The first one is related to Paris, very directly. As Nathan Cullen mentioned, our current target is still the one that was tabled by the previous government in May of last year. Since the Paris agreement works on the principle of ratcheting up, we know that the aggregate of all targets of all governments, if achieved, takes us to as high as 3.7 degrees Celsius above the global average temperature before the industrial revolution. It is urgent that countries begin removing their INDCs, ratcheting up, and tabling new ones.

I know you are in a tension with what the provinces are willing to take, and what businesses are ready to take, but without federal leadership in tabling a more ambitious target, how do we get other countries to withdraw their INDCs and ratchet up as well? This is my first question: When will you move the old INDC—which you have referred to as the floor—out of the way and start getting us somewhere near a ceiling?

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** Well, thank you very much. That's kind of you. I appreciate those kind words. I appreciate the fact you were there supporting the government in Paris.

You're absolutely right. The commitments of all governments do not translate to striving below 1.5. They don't, and that's why the ratcheting up mechanism every five years is going to be critical.

In terms of where we will be, and in terms of our international commitment, make no mistake about it, the federal government is going to show leadership on this. I don't think there's any point in putting a new target out and saying, "wow, we're great, we've got an ambitious target", but once again we don't have a plan to get there.

While six months is not as fast as some would like, I think that is how you move forward in a thoughtful way. As we have heard, different provinces and territories have different challenges and different opportunities. We need to sit down with them and figure out how we can support them.

I've said that our target is a floor and not a ceiling. At the end of six months my job is to provide the Prime Minister with a recommendation.

• (1215)

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** Okay. Thank you.

I have a very specific question.

**The Chair:** We have three minutes, and we're out of time. I'm so sorry.

**Ms. Elizabeth May:** I was hoping to get a question in about the Southern Strait of Georgia Marine Conservation Area.

**The Chair:** I'm sorry.

We're going to start now on a third round of questioning, to give everybody a chance. I think this a wonderful opportunity, and we can take advantage of our time.

Mr. Fast.

**Hon. Ed Fast:** Well, thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you again, Minister.

In your previous comments to my questions, you made a bold statement, and I think I'm quoting you correctly, that all premiers endorsed carbon pricing at the summit in Vancouver. If I were to ask Premier Brad Wall whether he agreed with that sentiment, I believe you think he would.

I would challenge the assertion that every single premier has endorsed carbon pricing.

Your comments?

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** In the Vancouver declaration, which was agreed to by the provinces and territories, and the federal government—I can find the language—they agreed that carbon pricing is part of the solution.

I am happy—

**Hon. Ed Fast:** With respect, Minister—

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** —to have a robust discussion.

**Hon. Ed Fast:** Minister, I've read that declaration, and it does not do such thing. With the greatest of respect, what the declaration does is commit the premiers and the federal government to go back and establish four working groups. One of those working groups is to continue to study carbon pricing, but there is no formal endorsement or commitment to a national carbon price by all of the premiers.

I challenge you at this table to prove to us that in fact that is not the case.

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** It is difficult for me to prove what someone believes. I can go back to the Vancouver declaration, where it's quite clear that we have a working group and a commitment that carbon pricing is a part of the solution.

You know I am heartened we have so many people who are coming around to the fact that carbon pricing is critical. Ontario Conservative Leader, and former MP, Patrick Brown said, "Climate change is a fact. It is a threat. It is man-made. We have to do something about it, and that something includes putting a price on carbon."

As I've said, the Mining Association of Canada.... I know premiers obviously care about what the business community is saying. I would say the business community is saying put a price on carbon.

As I've said, I was out in Washington, and I was with the CEOs of leading companies, including energy companies. They said, "put a price on carbon. We are so heartened to see Canada's leadership. You know we need your support to make this happen everywhere. This is key".

**Hon. Ed Fast:** Thank you.

By the way, I'm not debating about the merits of carbon pricing. It was a clear statement you had made that all the premiers had endorsed carbon pricing, I don't believe they did.

Now, my follow-up question—

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** I'm going to quote, if you let me quote—

**Hon. Ed Fast:** I'm running out of time.

My follow-up question has to do with this. You made a statement that all environmental assessments under CEPA need to be done based on science. I agree with you on that. You won't find me challenging that.

But, Minister Carr, the Minister of Natural Resources, has said that ultimately the decision will be a political one made by cabinet.

That is disheartening for me, when we have the National Energy Board in place, and we have a process in place that is supposed to be science-based. In fact, even your Member of Parliament for Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon, this past week, articulated that he believed the NEB should have the final say.

Yet we have Minister Carr saying this is a thoroughly political decision that will be made by cabinet. Which is it?

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** I will point you to this. First, ministers commit to transition to a low carbon economy by adopting a broad range of domestic measures, including carbon pricing mechanisms.

To your point about environmental assessments, when there's an environmental assessment I am tasked, or the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency is tasked, to provide a report and look at the significant environmental effects. Assuming there are significant environmental effects then a decision needs to be made, and ultimately it will go to cabinet. That is not a change. That is actually the process. What we have said is that decisions need to be made on science, evidence, facts. They need to take into account the public consultations. They need to take into account the views of indigenous peoples, engagement with indigenous peoples; and they need to consider the greenhouse gas emissions, both direct and upstream.

•(1220)

**Hon. Ed Fast:** Minister, when Minister Carr says this is going to be a political decision, by definition it means you're going to go off science as the basis for that decision. That should be of concern not only to you as the minister responsible and who is committed to science, but it should be of concern to all Canadians that decisions that go through a thorough, scientific-based process at the end of the day are based on politics. That is a frightening thought.

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** I would say that's a surprise, given that the previous government's decisions were generally based on politics.

**Hon. Ed Fast:** They weren't.

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** However, I will say there's an environmental assessment process where they look at the facts, the evidence, the science, consultations. We are looking at upstream greenhouse gas emissions and the overall impact. Assuming a decision is made that there are some significant environmental impacts for major project decisions—so for a particular decision—then it is up to cabinet. Cabinet makes the decision considering all of the facts.

**The Chair:** You're right at the end of the time there.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Gerretsen.

**Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.):** Welcome, Minister, to our committee meeting. I just want to start by saying that I'm extremely delighted to hear that there could be more effort put towards leading by example, and particularly around the Hill. My wife and I are on our second electric vehicle, and it's so discouraging when I drive up to the Hill here and see that there isn't a single electric charging station. In addition to that, I live in a brand new building that was just built in Ottawa that doesn't have an electric car charger in it. If we're going to be projecting this onto the private world, we have to start leading by example, and I'm extremely delighted to hear that you're committed to that.

My questioning was going to centre on carbon pricing, but I appreciate the fact that a lot of it has already been discussed. Notwithstanding the fact that you indicated already that you are looking forward to the provinces coming together with a model, I'm wondering if you have any sense as to what form that carbon pricing will take.

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** Thank you very much. On my list is electric vehicle charging stations on Parliament Hill. I hear you on that.

In terms of carbon pricing, as I said, we already are in a situation through the leadership of the provinces; four provinces in particular...80% of Canadians will live in a jurisdiction where there's a price on carbon. Alberta and B.C. have a tax, and Ontario and Quebec, cap and trade. This is why we do need to have a discussion to understand how these different systems interrelate, what the concerns are. I understand there are provinces that may have different views or concerns. In the north there are very legitimate concerns about the impact on carbon price on the cost of living, which is already very expensive. Those are things that I certainly take seriously, and that's why we need to have this discussion.

As I said, I'm very heartened by the positive atmosphere where we see environmental leaders and business leaders saying the same thing. They are saying, let's use the most efficient mechanism, a market mechanism, where we reduce what we don't want, pollution, and foster what we do want, which is clean innovation because that's not a hardship, that's where the economy and the jobs of the future are, and that's the direction. If we can get this right, China alone will require, I believe, \$30 trillion of investments in clean technology—\$30 trillion. I was with the Governor of the Bank of England on a panel discussing this subject

If we can find solutions here, those are solutions that we can export, and that is really key. I think carbon pricing is certainly part of the solution. That's why I hear so many companies saying, let's provide the certainty that we like, let's reward what we are looking for, solutions that reduce emissions when it comes to natural resources that foster innovation and clean tech. We need to go through this discussion. It is not an easy discussion. I don't doubt that people have different views, which is why I am very excited about sitting down with everyone because I think this is really a win-win. I certainly approach the discussions with the provinces and territories in a very positive spirit because I know Canadians expect us to do our job in terms of reducing emissions, but they also believe that the environment and the economy go together, and carbon pricing is part of the solution.

•(1225)

**Mr. Mark Gerretsen:** I just want to touch on something that relates to my riding specifically. Perhaps, if you don't have the answer right now, you could turn it over to your deputy or somebody else.

I come from the riding of Kingston, which was rich in industrial activity many years ago. As a result, we now have many brownfields in the area. A number of different programs have come along, such as municipalities offering a reduction of property taxes, in order to rehabilitate these brownfields.

What is the government's approach with respect to helping municipalities to rehabilitate brownfields so that these areas, quite often in the centre of municipalities, can start to see life again? Otherwise, they are just sitting there vacant, because they're completely contaminated by the toxic substances that have been put into the land.

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** Contaminated sites and the remediation of contaminated sites is extremely important. Actually, it also plays a role in tackling climate change. I'm originally from Hamilton. We have one of the most contaminated sites, which we're also working on. I recognize how important it is for communities, and what an opportunity it is.



We have a federal contaminated sites action plan. It was established in 2005. Its primary objective is to reduce environmental and health risks from federal contaminated sites.

I guess I will pass it on to the deputy, because I know we have funding allocated in budget 2016 that will go towards the remediation of contaminated sites.

**Mr. Michael Martin:** Yes, as the minister has said, the program has been renewed for funding through 2019, and there were additional funds committed in budget 2016 in order to continue to reduce the overall inventory of federal contaminated sites.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

We'll go back to Mr. Cullen.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Great. I'll start with some good news. I think the Department of Public Works and Government Services has already agreed to our request to put up a charging station on Parliament Hill, so I'll take one off the list.

Have you ever been to Haida Gwaii, Minister?

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** It's interesting that you should ask, because I am planning on going this summer.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Fantastic. I will see you there. Bring your kids. Mine will be there. For those who have never been, if you want to see the true power of Canada and the beauty of the Haida people in action, come up to the northwest of British Columbia.

I have a question about Bill C-38. We talked about this terrible omnibus bill that came through. It not only changed environmental assessments, it also slashed a number of the budgets in your department. Does budget 2016 seek to restore the funding that was cut, in terms of water quality management and greenhouse gas emissions monitoring? Do you have a sense of that? If you don't, could you get back to the committee with an assessment, perhaps from your department, as to what was cut in Bill C-38 and what you hope to restore in terms of that critical funding?

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** In terms of budget 2016, I think there were some concerns about funding subject to a sunset clause. The good news is budget 2016 continues most of that funding.

You know, I have looked into and asked about the impacts, or how we might address any cuts. I feel confident that we have looked at the programs. I think some of the cuts were addressed to programs that were not core to the mandate.

I'm going to pass it over to my deputy.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Let me ask a specific question for a very quick response. If we can't measure, we can't manage. We can't improve water quality if we're not measuring it. We can't improve on our greenhouse gas emissions if we're not measuring them.

Is it possible—not now—to provide the committee with an assessment of what has been cut over that number of years, and whether there have been efforts to restore that funding, or even improve it?

**Mr. Michael Martin:** I think the question may relate to budget 2012 reductions that were made across the government in order to help the government achieve its deficit reduction goals. The core

monitoring programs of the Department of Environment and Climate Change were not affected.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** We have a number of documents showing that some of those core programs were, in fact, impacted. We'll put a written question through to your office, and with the endorsement of the minister, we can get some answers.

Bill C-38 very specifically went after our environmental assessment. I can't help but smile ironically when I hear my Conservative colleagues talk about this decision around the assessment of projects to be a political one, because it was in fact the Conservatives who made the choice to take it away from the National Energy Board exclusively and put it into the hands of cabinet.

Have you considered moving it out of the hands of cabinet and back towards the regulator, which is supposed to be non-political and dispassionate about these things, using the science that we so trust?

• (1230)

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** Once again, one of my majority priorities is helping to restore confidence in Canada's environmental assessments.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** It's a great way to do that.

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** Well, we are going to be going through a process where we will receive comments about what is the best way forward, how we modernize the system, how we rebuild trust, and how we ensure that we are making decisions based on science and evidence. I think that I will be very interested in hearing the views of the committee in that regard.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** So hear my view on this. The fact that the Conservatives, under Mr. Harper, chose to make this decision inherently political and now decry it is a level of strangeness that I can't approach, yet moving it back away from the hands of cabinet would be going a long way to restoring the public's faith that the arbitrator is impartial—as opposed to political—in making these decisions.

You mentioned that GHG upstream impacts will be considered. Why not downstream?

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** Well, first of all, we're looking at direct GHG emissions. We're looking at upstream GHG emissions. Downstream GHG emissions are actually going to be addressed through mitigation in many of the different working groups, but I can talk about how we just issued regulations that provide more detail about how to calculate upstream emissions, which is challenging. I will pass it on to my deputy to talk about downstream—

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Before we get there, though, oil produced in Canada that remains in Canada is captured in Canada in terms of the GHG emissions, but if we send it to China, it's not really fair to say that it will somehow be handled in some other process that we're not aware of, unless Beijing has told us something different.

It's just a simple question. If it's carbon being emitted from a Canadian source upstream, when it gets used—wherever it gets used on the planet—has it been contemplated to account for that as well when measuring the GHG impacts of our fossil fuels?

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** I will pass that question over to my deputy.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Okay. Thank you. I thought that would be a policy question.

**Mr. Michael Martin:** Analytically, it is possible to do an analysis of downstream—

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Impossible or possible?

**Mr. Michael Martin:** It is possible—

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Good.

**Mr. Michael Martin:** —to do an analysis of downstream emissions, but it is very challenging. Even in the upstream emissions methodology that we've published, we described some of what have become qualitative issues that relate to alternative sources.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** I think we're up for a challenge.

Here's my last question to you, Minister. Do you have date when you and Minister Garneau are planning to bring in the legislative tanker ban on the north coast that your party committed to?

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** Well, that is something that is also with Transport Canada, so there are discussions ongoing now and the lead minister would be in a better position to—

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Is there any date contemplated between you and the minister?

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** I think it would be better to discuss it with the lead minister.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Hmm. That's too bad.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

Our last questioning round is Mr. Bossio's.

**Mr. Mike Bossio:** Thank you, Chair. I'll be sharing my time with Mr. Aldag.

Once again, thank you, Minister. I have one quick question.

We're also doing a review of CEPA. We know that toxic chemicals are in our environment: in our food, our land, our water, and our air. The difficulty we have is the virtual elimination of these chemicals. How do we better define what is a persistent, bioaccumulative, and inherently toxic substance and, by doing so, more effectively virtually eliminate them from our environment?

Will you work with the Minister of Health to put in resources required to conduct this analysis more quickly so that we can establish, for example, reasonable use drinking water standards? The reason I say this is that in my own riding there's a landfill that is emitting 1,4-dioxane, a highly toxic substance. It's very difficult to hold the company accountable for this contamination of the surrounding environment because there's no drinking water standard for it, whereas throughout many other jurisdictions we already have drinking water standards. We're way, way behind on these types of standards.

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** Thank you very much.

I'm very pleased that you're going to be undertaking a review of CEPA. CEPA is really critical. It's the basis for environmental and health protection.

I will assure you that I work very closely with the Minister of Health in this regard. We need to look at how the act can be approved to address some of the concerns you've raised. Certainly, I'm happy to work with the committee in this regard to hear your suggestions and how we can support your work.

● (1235)

**Mr. Mike Bossio:** Thank you.

**Mr. John Aldag:** There's another study we're going to be doing, starting when we come back from our next constituency week. It's on protected areas. It will be looking at meeting some of the targets, the 17% of terrestrial and inland water areas by 2020, and 5% of marine and coastal areas by 2017 and 10% by 2020. I hope to be hearing more from the departments as we get into that study.

I'm just wondering, to start, if you could make a comment on the progress of parks establishment, both national parks and marine conservation areas, to help establish a bit of a baseline of where we're at. Then if you want to throw in what Ms. May had asked about, the status of the negotiations on the Southern Strait of Georgia National Marine Conservation Area, I'd love to hear about that.

Another piece I'll throw in is the level of funding you had mentioned, I think \$43.3 million over five years, to help with the establishment process. Will that be enough on the parks side to continue along the agenda?

The final piece is on an unrelated topic. We've been hearing a lot about sunken ships. I'm wondering if there's a strategy or any work being done with Fisheries and Oceans to deal with some of the issues of sunken ships because of the work we will be doing on marine protected areas.

There's a lot there.

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** I guess I'll start with the last one. Obviously it's for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, but I know that's something he is looking at very closely.

We are very committed to our 2020 biodiversity goals and targets. As you said, it's 17% land and 10% ocean. Those are ambitious targets, you're absolutely right. In terms of meeting 17%, we need to work, and we are, with the provinces and territories, because a lot of that land would be provincial land. We're working with them to reach it. I can tell you right now that 10.4% of terrestrial areas are protected right now, so there's a ways to go in that regard—0.9%, so a ways to go when it comes to marine areas that are protected.

In budget 2016 you saw that there was funding, that you identified, for Thaidene Néné as well as Lancaster Sound. So that is a start.

We also committed, in our agreement with the United States, on the part where we looked at the Arctic and we looked at what we can be doing more and increasing the areas that are protected there. We do have a strategy. It requires a lot of work to establish new protected areas. It includes a lot of work with indigenous peoples often, and the communities that are there. I am confident that going forward we will meet or exceed those targets.

I will ask the head of Parks Canada to also give an answer.

**Mr. Daniel Watson:** As has been asked, particularly in relation to the national marine conservation area of the Southern Strait of Georgia, that is an area where we're continuing ongoing consultations, particularly with indigenous groups in that area and other interested players. That's moving along well.

In terms of park creation, it's a very detailed process that takes a long time because of the range of interests out there, particularly with indigenous peoples. As many members of this committee would know, we have a very different level and expectation of engagement with indigenous people today than in the days when we first set up our national parks.

With regard to the question of the \$42.4 million to do parks establishment, in the parks system plan, that work began with the creation of Banff National Park in the 1880s. We will eventually get to covering off all 39 ecoregions within the country, but that is a process that will take decades to complete. We certainly have a range of parks that we're working on now that will help us get, as the minister has said, to the 17% terrestrial target, working closely with the provinces and territories, that will be major contributors.

**The Chair:** I just wanted to thank you very much for giving us the full two hours. It allowed us to have questioning by everyone around the table. It was really nice to have that opportunity.

Before we move to a vote on the main estimates, does anybody have any questions on the amounts that have been brought forward for us to vote on? Now is our opportunity, before we let the minister and her department heads go.

Are there any questions on the main estimates?

• (1240)

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Very specifically, if the minister, or perhaps Mr. Martin might be able to....

We're going through a CEAA assessment of the Pacific NorthWest LNG project right now. There are a number of first nations chiefs in Ottawa today, as you might know.

One of the questions we had about estimates was whether there are any enhancement to the participation of first nations people in these environmental assessments, and particularly towards the Pacific NorthWest project and assessment. As you know, it's somewhat controversial, and there's a number of outstanding issues around the protection of Lelu Island.

It's a question about the budget estimates during the enhancement.

**The Chair:** It's sort of in there.

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** I'm happy to take this question.

Obviously, engagement with indigenous peoples is key. I know the agency has worked extraordinarily hard in terms of all projects,

but with Pacific NorthWest, they are working extraordinarily hard. I think there are five communities, am I right? Or is it six?

**Mr. Ron Hallman (President, Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency):** Five.

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** There are five communities that are directly affected. We've been working with the different communities to get their views, consult, to engage with them.

I will ask the head of CEAA to provide some comments in that regard.

**Mr. Ron Hallman:** Madam Chair, in terms of funding for the indigenous groups to participate in the EA, the agency has funds to provide participant funding monies to those groups that wish to participate at various stages throughout the EA process. Each time we go back to consult with them again, we make monies available as well.

**The Chair:** Okay, thank you.

Ms. Gladu.

**Ms. Marilyn Gladu:** I just have one question, and it's about infrastructure to support the damage that we're seeing in the permafrost. I saw some horrific photos. Is there any money in this budget to go towards that infrastructure?

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** You're talking about the permafrost that is melting, which is a very significant issue with indigenous communities. We are committed to supporting adaptation. There is funding.

We are also going through the process with the provinces and territories. I have spoken with the ITK, representing the Inuit. They are very engaged with this process. Northern communities generally are weighing into this, and we will be looking at what more we can do to address adaptation.

That is a really important point. It's not just about how we reduce emissions. We have already seen, in particular with indigenous peoples, that their lifestyle is under threat.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Mr. Shields, quickly, because I'm trying to focus on getting to vote on the main estimates.

**Mr. Martin Shields:** On money for funding invasive species, we deal with the municipalities ending up in the province with aquatic zebra mussels and the rest of it. You have invasive species, but I don't see any money in there to deal with the issue.

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** Protection of our freshwater is absolutely key.

There is funding. I will refer to my deputy, who seems to have it right there, to talk about this.

**Mr. Michael Martin:** There was one specific commitment made in budget 2016. It was \$197.1 million over five years for Fisheries and Oceans to increase ocean and freshwater science monitoring, and research overall.

**Mr. Martin Shields:** It doesn't do anything about invasive species.

There are zebra mussels—

**Mr. Michael Martin:** There is an existing program.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Cullen, very brief.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Very briefly, there were some program cuts in that budget you referred to earlier, Mr. Martin, with respect to the global environmental monitoring system, GEMS, as it's often known. Is that funding going to be replaced?

A second question is that there were cuts to the environmental emergencies program as well. Are those funding cuts going to be replaced in 2016 in your estimates?

**Mr. Michael Martin:** The answer to both questions is no.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Can we ask why?

**Mr. Michael Martin:** The GEMS program is run by UNEP. We remain a part of it. We contribute science in support of the GEMS program. Previously, we were actually the host of the GEMS program. We are not renewing that. That was a decision taken some years ago.

Specifically on environmental emergencies, we looked hard at our business model on environmental emergencies to try to find the most effective way to do it, and we consolidated all our efforts into a single centre in Montreal. It's highly technology enabled. We believe it provides a superior level of service.

However, there are issues related to implementation in terms of how we quickly ensure that we have people on the ground to respond, to help, to contribute to the response of an environmental emergency. We are continuing to look at that.

● (1245)

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** That was the specific question: we have not lost any people on the ground. When that program was cut, there was great concern about it.

**The Chair:** Mr. Cullen—

**Mr. Mark Gerretsen:** I have a point of order, Madam Chair.

**The Chair:** Yes, really what we're supposed to be doing at this point in time... We had quite a few rounds of questioning, and I gave additional rounds of questioning so that you could get at some of those things. Right now, however, we're trying to vote on the main estimates. Let me move into that, please, so that we don't run out of time.

While we're doing that, Minister, thank you for giving us so much time with your department heads. We really appreciate it and the excellent answers to our questions. There's obviously lots more discussion to be had, and you've left the door open for us to keep the dialogue going with you and your department.

**Hon. Catherine McKenna:** I want to thank all of you for all your hard work; I really appreciate it. Regardless of what party you're from, I know you're all committed to protecting our environment and tackling climate change and growing a clean economy.

Thank you. I look forward to your suggestions on a whole range of issues.

**The Chair:** Pursuant to Standing Order 81(4), I call the votes on the main estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2017. Vote 1 under the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency; votes 1, 5, and 10 under Environment; and votes 1 and 5 under Parks Canada Agency were referred to the standing committee on February 23, 2016.

We are now going to vote.

CANADIAN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AGENCY  
Vote 1—Program expenditures.....\$27,512,578

(Vote 1 agreed to)

ENVIRONMENT  
Vote 1—Operating expenditures.....\$605,313,460

Vote 5—Capital expenditures.....\$60,539,382  
Vote 10—Grants and contributions.....\$154,303,510

(Votes 1, 5, and 10 agreed to)

PARKS CANADA AGENCY  
Vote 1—Program expenditures.....\$997,202,390  
Vote 5—Payments to the New Parks and Historic Sites Account.....\$500,000

(Votes 1 and 5 agreed to)

**The Chair:** Shall I report the main estimates to the House?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** This will be my first report to the House. Thank you for that.

The next order of business, which we weren't able to do at the last meeting is doing a press release that we talked about quite some time ago.

We're just putting it around again for you to have in front of you when we try to move it.

I believe it's very important, as I think we all do, for the public to know what we're doing here and to have a sense of what we're doing in our work plan. I'm anxious to get it out. We've had a month or more. We're working on the work plan; I'd like the public to know about it in a formal way.

Does anybody have any discussion on this item, or can we move to adopt this as our first press release for the committee?

**An hon. member:** I so move.

**The Chair:** It is moved.

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

**The Chair:** Was there any other business?

I had one item, which Mr. Fast brought forward.

You had suggested our taking part in a climate...Startup Canada.

**A voice:** [*Inaudible—Editor*]

**The Chair:** Okay, maybe it wasn't Mr. Fast; my apologies.

**Hon. Ed Fast:** No, it wasn't me. I'm looking a little puzzled here. I was responding to your request.

**The Chair:** Okay. I remember seeing some dialogue back and forth. We were given an invitation to participate in Startup Canada Day. I believe your response was that you were going to go, Mr. Fast.

I just want to make sure that I'm bringing it to everyone's attention. It's a policy round table on the Hill, and I want to make sure we're all aware of it. If we can have some members there, I think it would be very helpful.

Mr. Fast, you have said you will be attending. Is there anyone else?

• (1250)

**Hon. Ed Fast:** Ms. Gladu might be wanting to go.

**Ms. Marilyn Gladu:** I'm going, although I'm not like habitually one of you.

**The Chair:** That's okay. We welcome everyone.

Do let me know, please. If you could let me know by the end of the day.

Mr. Bossio, are you planning on going?

**Mr. Mike Bossio:** I have House duty, but I will be there for the second half of it.

**The Chair:** That's great, because it would be good for us to have a showing there. If you could let me know, I would make sure they are aware that we have a good showing at the event.

Was there anything else?

Mr. Cullen.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** This is a motion that was submitted I believe Friday of last week, Chair, if I have my dates right.

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Considering the testimony we just had from the minister and her officials, I think this is most apropos. It seeks to have the committee simply follow the motion we adopted on February 25 to look at climate change and our international efforts to limit global temperature rises to 1.5° above pre-industrial levels, as was committed to by this government and reiterated today.

These were some of the key elements we talked about. The committee has discussed this at the subcommittee level numerous times and also at the larger committee level. I think this is absolutely fitting with the testimony and the priority that we've heard from the government. I look forward to everyone's support.

**The Chair:** I appreciate very much you leaving it to discuss it at the end of the meeting, so that we could get all that time with the minister.

I'll open it for discussion. I know we had a bit of discussion of this on the Thursday, so we can just carry on.

Mr. Gerretsen.

**Mr. Mark Gerretsen:** Thank you very much, Madam Chair, and in anticipation of this motion I drafted a bit of an amendment.

I respect the fact that we have juggled things around a couple of times. I appreciate the fact that things haven't been going exactly as we had planned originally, but I do think it's important that we finish the work we have set out to do in the order we had set out to do it originally.

I would move an amendment that we replace the words “the committee hold at least four meetings up to report its findings to the House” and replace that with “the committee hold two meetings as adopted at the committee on April 14, which would be on June 21 and June 23.” I put forward that amendment, Madam Chair.

**The Chair:** You're moving that amendment.

**Mr. Mark Gerretsen:** I'm moving that amendment.

**The Chair:** To the motion that's on the floor.

**Mr. Mark Gerretsen:** It's a friendly amendment.

**The Chair:** Okay. Any discussion on the amendment?

Mr. Cullen.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** I'll try to keep this brief. I appreciate the efforts by Mark.

There are two simultaneous things happening here. One is the substance of what I'm trying to get done, which is something that everybody says they want to get done, but as Mark has said has been bumped around and shuffled as we've readjusted our calendar a few times.

The second thing is the way this committee is going to work. We struck a subcommittee and the subcommittee hashes things out. Previous to our last meeting I think the subcommittee had spent about an hour or more even, a fair amount of time working out a schedule that we then presented, and which the committee changed again.

It begs the question of what you asked us as a subcommittee to do. If all we're going to do is bring back our recommendations and you're going to change them again, we just burned an hour of all of our collective work lives to repeat the conversation. We can't keep doing it is my point because it's not effective for the subcommittee's time and I would argue also for the committee's time. Why have one? It's meant to save time, not make more. We've only been making more time and more effort.

I'm not going to vote for the subamendment simply because it allows those two meetings to remain at the end of the committee's calendar. I like Dominic LeBlanc a lot, he likes his summers a lot, and I'm not fully confident that week the House will even sit. Usually it's a rumour.

We haven't had this particular House leader in charge of the calendar before, so we'll see what happens. That gives me great concern because as we heard from the minister today—and I'll end here, Chair, because I don't want to take up time—that her deadline is September 4 according to when the minister made the commitment to bring back a greenhouse gas target for the country. That was six months after the Vancouver agreement.

With this committee not having dipped its toe substantively at all into climate change for those first six, seven, and eight months of Parliament, and it will be 10 months by then, it seems to me counterintuitive simply because it's the name of the ministry, and climate change is pressing.

I'll be voting against the subamendment. I think it simply reverts. I'm voting for the main motion.

•(1255)

**The Chair:** It's an amendment.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** That's an amendment.

**The Chair:** Did anyone else want to say anything before we put it to a vote?

(Amendment agreed to)

**The Chair:** Now we will move the amended motion.

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

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

Mr. Fast.

**Hon. Ed Fast:** I just want to make sure that my motion about the rotation for questions be considered at our next meeting, if at all possible.

**The Chair:** Okay. We'll do that at the end of the next meeting.

Just to be clear, at the next meeting we are going to try to finish and submit our drafting instructions for the sustainable development strategy and act, so come prepared for lots of focused discussion. Then we will make sure we will save time for you to bring that forward.

Mr. Amos.

**Mr. William Amos:** I'm wondering if the clerk could update us on any discussions around the use of a Facebook page.

**The Chair:** We can make sure we have that on the record. I think you brought that up at the last meeting.

**Mr. William Amos:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thanks very much, everybody. That was a great meeting.

The meeting is adjourned.

---









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.

---

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.

---

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