



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

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

---

ENVI • NUMBER 013 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

---

**EVIDENCE**

**Tuesday, May 3, 2016**

—  
**Chair**

**Mrs. Deborah Schulte**



## Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

Tuesday, May 3, 2016

•(1105)

[English]

**The Chair (Mrs. Deborah Schulte (King—Vaughan, Lib.)):** Good morning, everyone, and welcome.

I will introduce you, but I thought before I introduce you we have a little routine bit of business that we need to do with the committee that we didn't get to do the last time we were together and I think there was an interest to get it done fast. I'm just going to take a few minutes. I believe Mr. Fast would like to bring something forward for the committee's consideration.

**Hon. Ed Fast (Abbotsford, CPC):** Thank you, colleagues, for taking a little time to discuss this.

You may recall that when we first started meeting we established the order of speaking and the time that was allocated for each round. You may recall at that time I had suggested that we go with seven minutes in the first round of questioning. I believe there was a general agreement that even though we settled on six minutes the committee was open to revisiting the issue.

I've noticed, and I think you will probably have noticed, that in our questioning often we're just at that critical point in the process of questioning a witness and our time is up at six minutes. I would propose that we extend that first round of questioning to seven minutes. My motion lays out how it would play out after that.

The second part of my motion, and I'm prepared to sever that if it becomes contentious, is to address the issue of non-members asking questions at this table. I want to be very clear, we're not opposed to non-members asking questions at this table.

However, out of courtesy to each of the full-time members of this committee, the very least we can do is provide each full-time member of this committee an opportunity to speak before we allow a non-member to ask questions.

Each one of us comes prepared for these meetings. We spend a considerable amount of time briefing ourselves on the issues that will be discussed at this table. We come briefed to ask specific questions of specific witnesses. What I would not want to see happen is that one of our permanent members actually find himself or herself in a position where they were unable to ask a question because a non-member pre-empted us. My motion also includes that element of it.

If you look at what has happened over the last few months that we have met, at most of our meetings there is ample time at the end to ask supplementary questions. I believe that's the appropriate time for

a non-member to then have an opportunity to intervene and ask questions.

I think that lays out what my motion does. The only thing I would suggest we delete—and it wasn't my intention, this was an oversight—is, in the very last part of that motion, the words “or associate members.” That should be deleted. It would read:

and, that all committee members speak and ask questions of witnesses before a non-committee member present may speak and ask questions of witnesses.

I believe that's fair to the permanent members of this committee, but also allows in most cases a non-member to ask a question at the end of our meeting.

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

Before I open it for comments, I wanted something for clarification. In this committee up to now we've never had a situation where someone has spoken and denied an opportunity for a committee member to speak because somebody has always given up their time.

You're not speaking to that issue where somebody decides to give up their time to a non-member?

**Hon. Ed Fast:** Actually I am.

•(1110)

**The Chair:** You are.

**Hon. Ed Fast:** Yes, and my motion I believe implies that. It would be unfortunate if one of our members was unable to ask a question because one of the other members at this table chose to cede their time to a non-member.

Out of courtesy, if we're going to cede our time, I believe the first preference should be another member of this committee, and it's only after everyone has had a chance to speak that we offer an opportunity for non-members to speak.

**The Chair:** Thanks for that clarification. I'll open the floor to comments.

Mr. Casey.

**Mr. Sean Casey (Charlottetown, Lib.):** I've just substituted into the committee today and so I don't have the history. I'm not really aware of the evil this is trying to get at, but I think on the Liberal side I'm probably one of the few who was here in the last Parliament so I bring some history to the discussion.

I have two questions. One, is there a subcommittee on procedure and agenda in this committee? Two, what has motivated the motion? Was there an instance where a non-committee member was invited to speak and thereby members of the committee were prejudiced?

**The Chair:** Just quickly, we've had Elizabeth May come forward to the committee twice. In both cases, our side gave up part of their time for her to say something. At another opportunity, the NDP gave up their short three-minute questioning at the very end. They were the last ones to speak. That's the answer about what happened in here.

I ruled and we voted that we would allow her to speak. We looked at the procedure book. We have that ability to do that. We did everything within the rules, so there's nothing that's really happened here other than that. One Liberal person gave up half their time for her to have a chance to speak, and at the very end the NDP gave up their time for questioning of the minister when that opportunity came up.

**Mr. Sean Casey:** Now I understand. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Does anybody else have anything else to say on the matter before we bring it to a vote?

**Hon. Ed Fast:** Madam Chair, I don't know if in fact this is going to be contentious. I'd hate to see the first part of the motion voted against simply because the second part of the motion was unacceptable. I'd be glad to sever the two so that we vote on the first part of it, which is on the speaking times for the different rounds.

**The Chair:** I'm certainly willing to do that. I am mindful that we have a full panel, and I don't want this to take too long.

**Hon. Ed Fast:** It would take two votes right now.

**The Chair:** You're severing your motion and stopping it at—

**Hon. Ed Fast:** At three minutes.

**The Chair:** At three minutes. Okay.

**Mr. William Amos (Pontiac, Lib.):** I propose that this be brought to subcommittee and that we evaluate the merits of both the first portion and the second portion. I think it would be helpful if we were to have a further discussion amongst our colleagues on where we want to go.

**The Chair:** Mr. Eyking.

**Hon. Mark Eyking (Sydney—Victoria, Lib.):** If it's going to go to the subcommittee, I suggest you look at our procedures in the trade committee. We went through all this, and we have a new formula. I don't want to mix this up too much, but if you're going to take this over to subcommittee, just look at what's working for us.

**The Chair:** Mr. Fast.

**Hon. Ed Fast:** I have a couple of points.

Most of the committees, I understand, actually do use seven minutes for the first round, which is why I felt it was appropriate to bring this back. We had the discussion about it, and I think there was general agreement that we could revisit this.

The second issue is that I'm not a member of the subcommittee, and I'm the one bringing forward the motion. This motion has been on the table for over a month now, so we've all had a chance to

review it. I don't think there's anything that difficult about it. We either say yea or nay. I'd hate to see this delayed further.

I am cognizant, though, of the fact that we have three members present on the Liberal side of the table who are not regular members. If you want to defer the actual consideration of this motion to the next meeting, I'd be open to that.

**The Chair:** If you're presenting that and everyone's in favour, we can wait until next Thursday.

• (1115)

**Hon. Ed Fast:** We'll have all of our regular members here.

**The Chair:** That would be preferable, I think.

**An hon. member:** That would be better.

**Hon. Ed Fast:** Let's do that.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much. I definitely wanted to be respectful of your interest in bringing it forward, but I think that's the right idea.

Let's get back to our agenda. Thanks to all of you for that.

Thanks for your patience. I welcome our panel.

We have five departments and agencies in front of us today: the Office of the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development, with Julie Gelfand, George Stuetz, Francine Richard, and James Reinhart; the Department of the Environment, with Sue Milburn-Hopwood and Robert McLean; the Parks Canada Agency, with Nadine Crookes and Kevin McNamee; the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, with Kevin Stringer and Jeff MacDonald; and the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, with Allan MacDonald and Susan Waters.

Thanks very much to all of you for being here today. We have a very large group of panellists willing to share a lot of very important information with us. We will get right to it.

I think Julie Gelfand is up first.

**Ms. Julie Gelfand (Commissioner, Office of the Commissioner of the Environment and Sustainable Development):** Madam Chair, I'm pleased to present an overview of our audit work tabled in the House of Commons in 2012 and 2013 with regard to terrestrial and marine parks, and conservation areas.

I'm accompanied by George Stuetz, Francine Richard, and James Reinhart, directors who were responsible for these audits. I'd like to note that we have not audited actions taken since these reports were completed.

Canada is the second-largest country in the world and we have the longest coastline. With our small population, large land base, and coastline, Canada, unlike many other countries in the world, has the ability to establish large and linked protected areas. In effect, one of Canada's main approaches to protecting biodiversity is to establish protected areas to maintain habitats for wildlife including migratory birds and species at risk.

In 2012, we reported on the status of marine protected areas in Canada. This audit found that 20 years after Canada signed the Convention on Biological Diversity in 1992, only about 1% of our oceans and Great Lakes was protected. At the time of our audit, the Department of Fisheries and Oceans had established eight marine protected areas, and Parks Canada had officially established two national marine conservation areas, and two more were in the works.

Our audit showed that at the rate of progress we observed, it would take Canada many decades to establish a fully functioning network of marine protected areas and to achieve the international target of conserving 10% of marine areas. In the interim, significant conservation and economic benefits would not be realized.

Some of the economic benefits of marine biodiversity include fishing, both commercial and recreational, fish processing, and marine tourism. Together, these contributed \$7.6 billion to Canada's GDP in 2006.

[Translation]

In our fall 2013 audit of protected areas for wildlife, we found that Environment Canada had not met its responsibilities for preparing management plans and monitoring the condition of its protected areas.

Environment Canada's protected areas, including national wildlife and migratory bird sanctuaries, were roughly the size of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia combined.

Only about one quarter of national wildlife areas, and less than one third of migratory bird sanctuaries, were assessed as having adequate or excellent ecological integrity.

In addition, 90% of national wildlife areas did not have adequate management plans, and these plans were more than 20 years old.

Finally, monitoring was done sporadically. The department could not track ecosystem or species changes and address emerging threats.

We recommended that Environment Canada develop relevant management plans to ensure that its protected areas would fulfill their intended purpose as refuges for wildlife.

• (1120)

[English]

In our fall 2013 audit of the conservation of migratory birds, we found that grassland bird populations had declined by 45% since the 1970s, mostly due to habitat destruction. However, efforts to conserve other bird species had been successful. From 1986 to 2012, Canada and the United States invested almost \$2 billion in the North American waterfowl management plan.

The plan resulted in securing eight million hectares of wetlands and uplands habitat in Canada, with increases in many different waterfowl populations. We also found in that audit that Environment Canada had a goal of developing 25 strategies for bird conservation regions by 2010. As of July 2013, nine of the 25 strategies were completed and four were in draft form. However, Environment Canada, essentially the Canadian wildlife service, had no budget to contribute to the implementation of these strategies, unlike under the North American waterfowl management plan.

[Translation]

In our fall 2013 audit of ecological integrity in national parks, we found that despite Parks Canada's significant efforts in many areas, the agency was struggling to protect ecosystems in Canada's parks.

Staffing in the science work stream was reduced by 33% in the 2013-14 fiscal year, compared with the average staffing during the previous seven years. In addition, in 2008, the agency allocated \$42,000 per park to implement ecological monitoring programs. The actual funding was subsequently reduced to \$15,000 per park.

At the time of our audit, Parks Canada had yet to assess the condition of 41% of park ecosystems in order to determine conservation requirements. Of the 59% it had assessed, many were in poor condition and a third were in decline. The agency had not clarified how and by when it intended to complete its assessments or address threats to the integrity of ecosystems in Canada's parks.

[English]

Protecting Canada's natural heritage is a challenge and an opportunity. The federal government has a global responsibility to carry out its important leadership role in protecting species and spaces, particularly in a large country like Canada. The economic benefits are significant. They include sustaining commercial and recreational fisheries, tourism, and the provision of ecosystem services such as clean water, climate control, and pollination.

Madam Chair, this concludes my opening remarks. I would like to sincerely thank you and your committee members for the invitation to appear today to speak about our past audit work. As parliamentarians, you play a crucial role in the accountability process. We would be happy to answer your questions.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Ms. Gelfand. I think we should have you as an honorary member of the committee. You're in front of us almost every time we have witnesses. We really appreciate what you bring to the committee.

Next up is the Department of the Environment.

**Ms. Sue Milburn-Hopwood (Acting Assistant Deputy Minister, Canadian Wildlife Service, Department of the Environment):** Good morning. My name is Sue Milburn-Hopwood, I am the acting assistant deputy minister for the Canadian wildlife service. We oversee Environment and Climate Change Canada's work on biodiversity and manage the department's protected areas program. Bob McLean, who is with me today, is the director general of assessment and regulatory affairs for the Canadian wildlife service, and until recent organizational changes, he was responsible for the Canadian wildlife service's work on biodiversity goals and targets, as well as our protected areas program.

Environment and Climate Change Canada is the federal department responsible for coordinating the implementation of the United Nations convention on biodiversity. This responsibility means we led the work to develop the 2020 biodiversity goals and targets that Canada announced in 2015.

Given this role, I'll provide some overall context on behalf of the federal departments represented here today, and then I'll talk about our own protected areas in the department.

I'll begin by describing what the term "protected areas" means, and the rationale for them. A good definition comes from the International Union for the Conservation of Nature, or IUCN. A protected area is a clearly defined geographic space, recognized, dedicated, and managed through legal or other effective means, to achieve the long-term conservation of nature with associated ecosystems, services, and cultural values.

Protected areas are referred to by many names. We have national or provincial parks, we have national wildlife areas, migratory bird sanctuaries, ecological or nature reserves, wilderness areas, community conservation areas, and even ecological gifts. These are the mainstay of biodiversity conservation.

By protecting the natural environment—our "natural capital" so to speak—protected areas contribute to maintaining the ecological services upon which we depend: clean water, protection from natural events such as flooding, and mitigation of the effects of drought. For indigenous communities, protected areas can provide a source of food and a place to sustain traditional practices. At the local level, protected areas can contribute to people's livelihoods and provide recreational as well as economic opportunities. Finally, and increasingly importantly, they have a role in helping mitigate and adapt to climate change. It has been estimated the global network of protected areas stores at least 15% of terrestrial carbon.

The role and importance of protected areas to conserving biodiversity has been recognized internationally. In October 2010, in Nagoya, Japan, parties to the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity agreed to the strategic plan for biodiversity for 2011-20, and the Aichi targets, as the basis for halting and eventually reversing the loss of the planet's biodiversity. In February of last year, based on the Aichi targets, Canada adopted the 2020 biodiversity goals and targets for Canada. They describe 19 medium-term results to be achieved through the collective efforts of both public and private partners. Our national targets were developed through engagement with provinces, territories, national indigenous organizations, non-government organizations, and others. These goals and targets are guiding our actions and our investments in many aspects of biodiversity, including the creation of new protected areas.

Consistent with the global target, the Canadian target for protected areas is that "by 2020, at least 17% of terrestrial areas and inland waters, and 10% of coastal and marine areas, are conserved through networks of protected areas or other effected area-based conservation measures". These targets are for Canada as a whole, and progress will be monitored at the national level.

All levels of government and sectors have important roles to play in conserving biodiversity. Canada's protected area system includes

federal, provincial, territorial, indigenous, and private conservation organizations that aim to create and manage protected areas.

To reach these goals, sustained effort will be needed for Canada to meet the 17% terrestrial target and the 10% marine target by 2020.

● (1125)

For the terrestrial target, Parks Canada and Environment and Climate Change Canada are working to develop a road map in collaboration with provinces and territories. Recently, at a Canadian Parks Council meeting with provinces and territories, there was agreement to establish a multi-jurisdictional working group, co-chaired with Alberta, which was tasked with developing that road map by May 2017.

In order to contribute to these conservation targets, some of the departments and agencies in the federal government can create protected areas through various types of legislation, and for different reasons.

At Environment and Climate Change Canada, we focus on protecting key biodiversity areas, places that are important for wildlife, particularly habitat for migratory birds and species at risk. We establish migratory bird sanctuaries under regulations pursuant to the Migratory Birds Convention Act, and we designate national wildlife areas under regulations under the Canada Wildlife Act. Ours is the second-largest protected area system in Canada, encompassing an area of 12.4 million hectares of terrestrial and marine habitat, an area twice the size of Nova Scotia. The Environment and Climate Change Canada system includes 54 national wildlife areas and 92 migratory bird sanctuaries.

As we have colleagues with us today from the Department of Fisheries and Oceans and the Parks Canada Agency, I'll make only brief comments about their protected areas. For its part, DFO focuses on marine ecosystems and species, protecting these under the Oceans Act. The Parks Canada Agency seeks to protect representative examples of Canada's natural landscapes and seascapes under the National Parks Act or under the National Marine Conservation Areas Act.

Currently 10% of terrestrial areas and inland waters, and 1% of marine and coastal areas, are protected. The federal government manages about half of the area currently protected in Canada. This includes 45% of terrestrial protected areas and 83% of marine protected areas. Other levels of government make up the majority of the remaining protected areas in Canada. For Environment and Climate Change Canada, our current protected areas network accounts for about 25% of the total area of all federal protected areas.

Environment and Climate Change Canada proposes to add two new national wildlife areas over the next two years. We anticipate establishing Scott Islands marine national wildlife area in 2017. The Scott Islands and surrounding waters together make up one of the most productive and biologically diverse marine ecosystems, particularly for seabirds, on the Pacific coast. The ocean waters provide a key foraging area for birds that nest on the islands, and also attract five million to 10 million migratory birds annually as they travel vast distances across the Pacific to feed, including some species that have been identified as being globally at risk. It contains important habitat for several marine mammal species as well. This will be the first marine national wildlife area in Canada. The Scott Islands marine national wildlife area will increase marine protection in Canada by 0.22%.

The second proposed area for establishment in 2017 is the Edézhzié national wildlife area in the Northwest Territories. This unique ecosystem is located west of Yellowknife, and is also known as the Horn Plateau. The richness and diversity of the Edézhzié has made this area a cultural and spiritual gathering place for the Dehcho and the Tlicho people. The establishment of the Edézhzié national wildlife area will protect 15,000 square kilometres of habitat for boreal caribou, migratory birds, and other wildlife.

• (1130)

**The Chair:** I'll just let you know that you have one minute left in the ten-minute presentation.

**Mrs. Sue Milburn-Hopwood:** Thank you very much. It is a bit of an overview for the rest of them.

I know that my colleagues from DFO and Parks Canada would join me in emphasizing the importance of involvement by indigenous governments and communities that have been integral to the establishment and management of many protected areas. In the case of Environment and Climate Change Canada, we've been working with various indigenous communities through the Northwest Territories protected areas strategy to establish new protected areas such as the Edézhzié National Wildlife Area.

Another example of the importance of indigenous community participation is in Nunavut where, under the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement, Inuit impact and benefit agreements have been concluded for the conservation areas in the Nunavut settlement area. In 2008, working with NTI and the regional Inuit associations, we concluded an umbrella agreement known as the IIBA, for five national wildlife areas and eight migratory bird sanctuaries. This IIBA resulted directly in the establishment of three new national wildlife areas. In addition, the IIBA has provided funding over seven years for environmentally sustainable tourism, employment, co-management and other opportunities for Inuit in the affected communities. I am very pleased to report that we recently completed negotiations with our Inuit partners on a renewed IIBA.

Beyond Environment and Climate Change Canada's formal protected areas program, the department has, for many years, played a leading or contributing role for various programs and initiatives that are protecting lands and waters that count toward the targets. For instance, we play a national leadership role in working in partnership with government and non-government organizations through our

stewardship programs to provide financial assistance or tax incentives to encourage Canadians to conserve land.

I'll just highlight a few quickly. Through our financial assistance and tax incentive initiatives, many non-government organizations make significant contributions to securing ecologically sensitive areas on private lands. Organizations such as the Nature Conservancy of Canada and Ducks Unlimited Canada are co-operating with us and other partners to conserve important habitat through initiatives like the natural areas conservation program, which has conserved nearly 400,000 hectares, and the tax incentive program, the ecological gifts program, which has protected 175,000 hectares of ecologically sensitive land.

Our work with the U.S., provinces, territories and conservation non-profits under the North American waterfowl management plan has protected eight million hectares of wetlands since 1986. This is a very active program that continues to protect those areas.

In conclusion, I hope I've been able to provide you with some useful information for your study about protected areas, the rationale for them, and how we're working collaboratively with partners to achieve Canada's 2020 conservation targets of 17% and 10%.

• (1135)

**The Chair:** Thank you very much for that detailed overview.

We now have Kevin Stringer of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans.

[Translation]

**Mr. Kevin Stringer (Senior Assistant Deputy Minister, Ecosystems and Fisheries Management, Department of Fisheries and Oceans):** Thank you very much.

[English]

My name is Kevin Stringer. I'm the assistant deputy minister for Ecosystems and Fisheries Management, Fisheries and Oceans.

Thank you very much for the invitation today.

You've heard from my Environment and Climate Change colleague on the broader approach to protection, as well as on the work that department is doing. My focus will be on the marine environment and the work that DFO is doing with colleagues here, but also with provinces, territories, etc.

[Translation]

For today, we would like to outline the government's efforts to meet its marine conservation objectives and enhance the federal network of marine protected areas.

We will also discuss our important partnerships with other federal departments, provinces, territories, indigenous groups and NGOs.

[English]

I have a few comments about why we believe this work is so important. It's a bit repetitive, but it really is not just about meeting the targets, it's about the importance of this work.

Marine ecosystems are essential to climate regulation through absorption of heat and greenhouse gases. They provide nutritious food and the foundation for managing sustainable fisheries and aquaculture; support the seafood industries and many other economic maritime sectors; provide habitat needed to support species population growth and recovery, including for species at risk; and provide shelter for species from predators and stresses caused by fisheries gear.

Many species provide vital ecosystem services, for example sponges filter nutrients from water, which is needed for coral reef abundance. Plankton produce much of the world's oxygen, another ecosystem service. Protecting coastal areas helps to buffer coastal lands from storm surges and floods, as well as prevent erosion and stabilize shorelines. I've got more, but there all of those things, and much more. Our oceans need protection, and we're committed to do it.

As you know, my minister has in his mandate to work with his colleagues here at the table and others to achieve 5% protection by 2017 and 10% by 2020. This is a fairly exciting target for our department and for all of us, as was said. So far, after 20 years with the Oceans Act, we've achieved almost, but not quite, 1%. We aim to be at 5% by next year and 10% by 2020.

We do have a number of tools. We have Oceans Act MPAs, where the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans may establish MPAs, marine protected areas, through regulations created under the Oceans Act. They have specific purposes to protect and conserve fisheries resources and their habitats, including marine mammals, endangered or threatened marine species, unique habitats, and marine areas of high biodiversity or biological productivity, etc. There are eight in place today.

Then there are NMCAs. Parks Canada can establish national marine conservation areas to protect and conserve a representative sampling of Canada's natural and cultural marine heritage and provide opportunities for public education and enjoyment.

There are also the NWAs. Environment and Climate Change Canada may establish marine national wildlife areas, which really speak mostly to migratory birds and endangered species for protection.

So different purposes, different tools, but the same overall objective in terms of protection.

Provinces also have responsibilities. They protect areas as well, as do indigenous groups.

Working on this really is an all-in effort. We have worked with many, but in addition to all of those tools we also have what are called other effective area-based conservation measures, fisheries closures, and other elements as well, and I'd be happy to talk about that later.

We have all, across our departments, enacted individual MPAs and various protections, and we will continue to do so. We will do them bigger, faster, and more substantive. At the same time, our focus more and more is on networks, on integrating the protection. An MPA network, which we're seeking to establish in the 13 bioregions across the oceans, including the Great Lakes, is a collection of individual MPAs and other conservation measures designed to work together to meet conservation objectives more effectively and comprehensively than just individual sites could achieve independently, and to use a range of tools, including all those that are effective, integrated, and complementary.

Moving forward on this will take an all-in process, both in meeting our targets and moving forward on networks. We can't get to our targets without active partnerships with federal government departments, with provinces, territories, indigenous groups, and working with environmental groups that have been passionate, driving us, and been very effective partners, particularly with our new mandate.

We're pleased to see that your study may include examination of the potential for indigenous conservation initiatives. It's an important measure for us, working with indigenous groups, respecting aboriginal rights, and having indigenous people as partners. With respect to provinces and territories, we have re-established our oceans task group, working with us on the targets and on the network work.

Finally, I do want to say we were very pleased to see that the oceans program and our 5% and 10% objectives received financial support in the budget, \$81.3 million over five years starting in 2016 and 2017. This will help us as we move forward.

It will be an all-in effort, with all players at the table. It is a unique challenge, but a wonderful opportunity to try to meet those targets, to build the networks, and to contribute to the objectives that I outlined earlier.

Thanks very much.

• (1140)

**The Chair:** Thank you very much. That was excellent.

Now we're going to listen to Kevin McNamee from Parks Canada.

**Mr. Kevin McNamee (Director, Protected Areas Establishment Branch, Parks Canada Agency):** Thank you for this opportunity, Madam Chair and honourable members.



With me today is Nadine Crookes, our newly appointed director for natural resource conservation and the former director of our aboriginal affairs secretariat.

In my remarks I will not be repeating some of the information provided to the committee through our questions and answers.

Parks Canada is the federal agency charged with managing a network of 46 national parks, four national marine conservation areas, which I will refer to as NMCAs, 168 national historic sites, and the Rouge National Urban Park. All told, this network protects almost 350,000 square kilometres of Canada's lands and waters, a size equivalent to one-third of Ontario.

• (1145)

[Translation]

Established in 1911, Parks Canada is the world's oldest national park service. In 1998, Parks Canada was established as a separate agency by Parliament to ensure that Canada's national parks, national marine conservation areas and related heritage areas are protected and presented by Parks Canada and for this and future generations.

[English]

In passing the Parks Canada Agency Act, Parliament declared it in the national interest for Parks Canada to protect nationally significant examples of Canada's natural and cultural heritage, include representative examples of Canada's land and marine regions in the system of national parks and NMCAs, maintain or restore the ecological integrity of national parks, ensure the ecologically sustainable use of NMCAs, and present that heritage through interpretive and educational programs for public understanding, appreciation, and enjoyment, thereby enhancing pride, encouraging stewardship, and giving expression to our identity as Canadians.

Protected from industrial development, national parks and NMCAs conserve ecosystem functions and wildlife habitat, welcome visitors, provide iconic visitor experiences, encourage research, protect traditional lands of importance to indigenous people, and undertake and inspire conservation actions beyond their boundaries. In short, we do not just establish new parks and NMCAs and then throw away the key. As Parliament has directed through the Canada National Parks Act since 1930, and the Canada National Marine Conservation Areas Act since 2002, our mandate is both to protect and ensure that visitors use, benefit, and enjoy these special places, leaving them unimpaired for future generations.

I'm now going to turn to systems expansion. The goal of the national park and NMCAs system is to protect representative areas. To date, 30 of 39 terrestrial regions are represented by one or more national parks and five of 29 marine regions by four NMCAs. In setting priorities for new parks and NMCAs, Parks Canada's focus is on candidate sites located in unrepresented natural regions. For example, budget 2016 provided funding to establish the proposed Thaidene Nëné national park reserve in the Northwest Territories. Thaidene Nëné, which means land of the ancestors in the Chipewyan language, and which you will hear more about on Thursday, features incredible landscapes with spectacular rivers, secluded bays, and inspiring scenery. Not only will this park protect parts of the annual ranges of all three barren ground caribou herds that range in this

region, it will ensure that the cultural connection of indigenous people to this place will be maintained for generations to come.

Budget 2016 also funds the establishment of an NMCA in Nunavut's Lancaster Sound to protect a seascape recognized internationally as one of the most significant ecological areas in the world. It is the ecological engine of the entire eastern Canadian Arctic marine ecosystem. A traditional knowledge study undertaken with local communities reinforces the importance of this area to Inuit and their culture, and is a critical source of country foods for their communities. Funding will also allow us to continue work on a new national park in the Manitoba Lowlands and proposed NMCAs in the southern Strait of Georgia and les Îles-de-la-Madeleine. We will also look to launch some new initiatives in the future.

Creating new national parks and NMCAs is about developing relationships and trust with other governments, indigenous people, local communities, and stakeholders. The work involved in establishing new sites includes undertaking ecological traditional knowledge and socio-economic studies; consulting stakeholders, communities, landowners, and the public; engaging and consulting indigenous people; defining boundaries; and negotiating agreements with provincial and territorial governments.

A critical part of our establishment process is the level of engagement with indigenous people. Of the lands and waters in Parks Canada's care, three-quarters are managed with the support of first nations, Inuit, and Métis. We have 30 co-operative management arrangements whereby we work collaboratively with indigenous people. More recently, new national parks have been established because indigenous peoples have agreed to set aside lands they use in such parks. For example, the Labrador Inuit agreed through their land claim to set aside one-third of their homeland within the Torngat Mountains National Park as a gift to Canada.

The use of co-operative management boards with indigenous members to manage national parks is a meaningful way for indigenous peoples to continue stewardship, in partnership with Parks Canada, over their traditionally used land on their own terms, including directing how we use traditional knowledge to inform decisions.

All told, Parks Canada works with more than 300 indigenous communities. These strong local relationships with indigenous people are essential to delivering our mandate, and they contribute to the process of reconciliation between Canada and indigenous people. These relationships are founded on a shared vision that protecting land and waters is essential to the well-being of us all.

The conservation and restoration of ecological integrity in national parks is Parks Canada's first priority. Our conservation and restoration program involves currently 33 projects across 27 sites and an investment of \$84 million over five years, the largest in the agency's history.

For example, prescribed burns provide an important tool in our work to restore the ecological integrity of park ecosystems. The objective of one prescribed burn in Kootenay National Park is the restoration of important Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep habitat, returning closed forest to what was historically open montane habitat.

Another project, in the Gulf Islands National Park, is restoring clam garden eco-cultural landscapes using traditional and scientific knowledge. Park staff are working with Coast Salish first nations to rebuild the first clam gardens in the Pacific Northwest. The gardens are improving the state of the park reserve's intertidal ecosystem, restoring an ancient seafood farm, and connecting indigenous youth with their cultural history.

Parks Canada has also invested significantly in recovery efforts for several species at risk across Canada. Successes include the restoration of savannah habitat in Point Pelee National Park in Ontario, required by several species at risk, including many Carolinian forest species.

With respect to climate change, according to scientists the global network of protected areas is already helping the world to mitigate and adapt to climate change. Maintaining large, healthy ecosystems within protected areas helps to increase their resilience against climate change and to reduce impacts from extreme weather events. Establishing a larger network of well-managed protected areas in national parks and locating new NMCAs adjacent to existing national parks will result in more resilient ecosystems that can buffer climate change impacts, provide habitat for native species over a long period, and continue to evolve and adapt to changing climatic conditions.

With respect to inspiring a new generation, while nature has shaped this country's heritage, over the last decade many have expressed growing concern over our society's disconnection from nature. The barriers to nature include growing urbanization, attraction to technology, and our indoor, sedentary lifestyle. Evidence is mounting that this loss of connection to nature is impacting our physical and mental well-being and changing attitudes and ethics vis-à-vis conservation.

National parks and other protected areas with new visitor experience programs and outreach programs are well positioned to find novel ways to ingrain the importance of connecting people and nature across all sectors of society in order to maintain a culture of conservation among a new generation.

• (1150)

In conclusion, Madam Chair, from Parks Canada's perspective the key attributes to success in establishing and managing protected areas are political leadership and commitment; public and stakeholder support; funding; engagement, collaboration, and ongoing consultation with indigenous peoples in communities while respecting modern and historical treaties—and I stress ongoing consulta-

tion, not just doing it once—utilizing science and traditional knowledge to inform decisions; and finally, recognizing that the work we undertake is to contribute to the overall conservation and health of our planet.

Thank you.

• (1155)

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

I apologize for rushing people along with their presentations. It's incredibly important information that you're sharing with us. It's just unfortunate that we are so limited in our time to hear you.

The next person up will be Allan MacDonald.

**Mr. Allan MacDonald (Director General, Implementation Branch, Treaties and Aboriginal Government, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** Thanks very much, Chair and honourable members, and thank you for the opportunity to appear here today.

I want to thank my colleagues for their presentations.

My remarks today, I think, are going to be more contextual, reflecting broader relationship issues and the variety of land management regimes we have with indigenous people across the country, whether it's on reserve, under self-government or claims, or in the north.

I want to acknowledge and introduce my colleagues, Mark Hopkins from Northern Affairs, and Susan Waters from lands and economic development.

I'll start by saying that indigenous peoples' relationships to Canada's lands, waters, and natural resources are integral to their cultures and livelihoods. This relationship varies with the governance and geographic landscape across the nation. In the south, for example, indigenous lands are largely first nations reserve lands that are federal lands under federal jurisdiction.

The northern context is very different. Lands are mostly managed through modern treaty agreements in the territories, and the north is a key component of our Canadian identity, in part because of its uniqueness. It makes up 40% of Canada's land mass and two-thirds of our coastline, and is home to unique species, significant non-renewable resources, an extreme Arctic climate, limited infrastructure, and vast topography. It is within this context that Canada applies its long-standing commitment to the protection of the northern environment and to the sustainable development of its resources for the benefit of Arctic residents and all Canadians, both now and in the future.

Moving forward on conservation matters, north or south, indigenous peoples will need to be meaningfully consulted and involved in a manner that respects aboriginal treaty rights, seeks to balance indigenous interests with other societal interests, and leverages opportunities to establish a meaningful dialogue with indigenous groups in support of building relationships.

I just want to talk a little about first nations reserves. More than 3.5 million hectares of land in Canada are first nations reserve lands, which continue to grow as land is added to fulfill legal obligations from historic treaties and specific claims, and for community growth and economic development. The majority of first nations reserve land is governed under the Indian Act, which provides authority for environment and land management, including by-law-making authority. While the minister has jurisdiction and responsibility over the land, the control and use of the land rests with the first nations.

That changes under self-government. Self-government allows indigenous groups to govern their internal affairs and assume greater responsibility and control over community decision-making. Comprehensive self-government agreements address the structure and accountability of indigenous governments, their law-making powers, financial arrangements, and responsibilities for providing programs and services and to work in partnership with other governments and the private sector to promote such issues as environmental protection and to improve social conditions.

Sectoral self-government agreements, such as under the First Nations Land Management Act, provide signatory first nations the authority to make laws in relation to reserve lands, resources, and the environment. The act specifically allows first nations to opt out of the Indian Act provisions related to land management.

On first nations reserves, Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada works with first nations communities on land protection measures through a combination of programs, policies, and partnerships with other departments. Our department and first nations communities support environmental conservation and protection through the environmental review process, where the department and first nations assess projects taking place on reserve to minimize or avoid adverse environmental effects before they occur, and to incorporate environmental factors into decision-making.

Our department and first nations communities also have legal obligations pertaining to environmental conservation and protection through a number of pieces of federal environmental legislation. However, provincial laws that manage environmental risk do not apply on reserve land.

Moving on to comprehensive land claims and modern treaties, currently there are 28 constitutionally protected modern treaties in effect across Canada, covering 40% of the nation's land mass, including most of the north. Modern treaties put in place concrete measures to achieve reconciliation, to promote strong and sustainable indigenous communities, and to establish intergovernmental relationships between the treaty partners. Many modern treaties also include self-government arrangements.

Treaties clarify rights and obligations around the ownership and management of lands and resources, and promote self-determination and joint decision-making. Importantly, treaties transfer ownership of lands and resources to indigenous signatories. Treaty holders have the power to make and enact laws on the use, management, and conservation of the signatory-owned lands and resources, and signatories often have right-of-access to crown lands for harvesting and traditional use, and the right to be involved in resource management decision-making in areas where the crown has the primary responsibility.

Land use planning is particularly relevant in this area. The land use planning process is a major component of the land or resource management landscape under modern treaties, especially in northern territories. Northern treaties mandate that the treaty partners collaborate to develop regional land use plans laying out how lands and resources are to be used, while balancing the interests of the respective parties in areas like environmental protection, social and cultural protection and promotion, and economic development.

• (1200)

The northern treaties put in place independent land use planning boards, or councils, that are mandated to lead the land use planning process. Some plans are currently in place, for example, in the Northern Yukon and in the Sahtu and Gwich'in treaty settlement areas in the Northwest Territories. Modern treaties have specific provisions and obligations relating to federal conservation measures, and they are often the basis for the creation and management of national parks and protected areas.

The Government of Canada is legally obligated to consult with its indigenous treaty partners on the establishment of conservation or protected areas in proximity to a treaty. The treaties often require Canada to enter into it with its treaty partners and with the intent of putting impacts and benefits agreements in place, as my colleague from Environment mentioned, to mitigate potential impacts on the rights of treaty holders and to leverage opportunities for economic development and co-management in treaty communities.

Modern treaties also put in place unique governance arrangements through institutions of public government, and they are mandated to coordinate decision-making related to lands and resources in treaty settlement areas.

On the ground, modern treaties have led to strong co-management relationships between Canada and its indigenous treaty partners and leveraged socio-economic benefits for communities. Plans can support the integration of first nations and Inuit culture and heritage into parks programming, protect resources of natural and cultural significance to the treaty signatories, and promote training, employment and economic opportunities for treaty beneficiaries.

In conclusion, and to echo all of my federal colleagues so far, I think it would be integral to address how indigenous communities and governments can and should contribute to how Canada plans to move forward to meet its conservation goals. Existing aboriginal and treaty rights, and the unique interests and priorities of indigenous Canadians, must inform this important work.

Thank you for the opportunity to address you today, and we welcome any questions you might have.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much to all of you for your excellent overview and identification of the issues involved.

We're going to turn it over to questioning now, and the first up is Mr. Eglinski. Thank you.

**Mr. Jim Eglinski (Yellowhead, CPC):** Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you to all the presenters today, and thank you for the work you're doing to conserve our areas in Canada.

My question will go to Sue Milburn-Hopwood. In looking at the statements you made regarding the Aichi targets, we have a lot of work to do. I notice you talked a lot about development through and engagement with provinces, territories, national indigenous organizations, non-government organizations, and others. I've travelled extensively through western Canada and been very aware of different provincial programs, such as the Willmore Wilderness Park in Alberta, the Tweedsmuir Park in British Columbia, the Nechako wilderness area by northwestern British Columbia, and many others. Thank you very much for mentioning the Horn Plateau, which you are now looking at as an area. I've flown over that many times, and it is one of the great beautiful spots of Canada. Most people don't get to see it. I've seen it many times. Thank you.

My concern is when we're looking at these areas, I wonder if you could explain—in relationship to the provinces, the territories, and even dropping down into some municipalities that have protected areas—are these included in our total numbers you look at in Canada and represent? Can you tell me the criteria for how you make one area acceptable and another area not acceptable?

• (1205)

**Mrs. Sue Milburn-Hopwood:** I'll give an overview, and then I'll ask Bob to get into some of the specifics.

There is an IUCN classification system that we use to classify them. We are in the process of counting the various types of protected areas, and some are more protected than others. Yes, we put this all together in a big database and have good accounting. In some of the areas, particularly some of the private protected areas, we've spent the last couple of years counting them. They make up less than the larger government tracts of land, but still they're making progress. They need to be recognized as protected areas, so we have spent some time to make sure we have all of the numbers. I don't know the specifics of the particular protected areas you've mentioned, but much of the effort under way is not just with the federal government, it's also provincial and territorial efforts.

**Mr. Jim Eglinski:** I guess my concern is whether there is some way to look at those targeted numbers and whether you could bring those targeted numbers back to us. I'm concerned that a lot of the provinces and even down to municipalities are doing great work in the same areas that we are working on federally. Should we not be

recognizing a lot of these if they fit within the guidelines that you are talking about?

What I'm concerned about is whether as federal groups we are looking at these other programs to see if they fit within those. If they are fitting in—and there are some enormously large tracts of land out there set up by the provinces—are we including them in our numbers?

I think if we are not, we are not doing fair justice to Canadians in other parts of the country. I was wondering if those numbers could be made available or whether you have looked at that.

**Mr. Robert McLean (Director General, Assessment and Regulatory Affairs, Canadian Wildlife Service, Department of the Environment):** The quick answer is yes. Absolutely, the intent is to report not only on federal, provincial, and territorial government protected areas, but also to capture in our database, which we're building right now, those other areas to which you refer, whether they are indigenous protected areas, whether they are municipal and even including areas that have been protected through programs that Sue mentioned during her presentation. Nature Conservancy of Canada and Ducks Unlimited Canada are acquiring and protecting lands. They have many tens of thousands of hectares now. Those areas would be captured in the national reporting that we would undertake.

**Mr. Jim Eglinski:** I have a quick question. I believe recently we have started to look at some of our large military bases and reserve areas. Are we going to continue looking at them? I'm thinking more now of say the Cold Lake military area, which encompasses a great part of Alberta and Saskatchewan. Are we looking at those and possibly tying them in?

**Mr. Robert McLean:** The quick answer is yes. Again, we would very much like to capture in the national tracking and reporting areas that really deliver those protected area and biodiversity conservation outcomes.

Sue mentioned the IUCN criteria. There are six criteria there. Presenters also referred to other affected area-based conservation measures.

We think there's opportunity to identify even more areas than we have contemplated to date in the national reporting that we do. Those could include areas managed by others, such as the Department of National Defence. I'll not comment specifically on the Cold Lake Air Weapons Range.

I would comment on Suffield. I would be remiss if I didn't talk about Canadian Forces Base Suffield, which is a national wildlife area managed by the Minister of National Defence under Environment and Climate Change Canada legislation.

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

I'm sorry to cut you off. We started late and if we have a full round, we're going to run out of time.

I also want to make sure that I introduce those joining us, who are not normally at the table. Paul Lefebvre and Roger Cuzner are on the Liberal side, and Wayne Stetski is on the NDP side. I want to make sure people are aware that you're here.

We now have questioning from Mr. Amos. Thank you.

● (1210)

**Mr. William Amos:** Thank you to our witnesses.

This is an issue that I know is near and dear to the hearts of everyone in this room, and I don't think for a moment that this should be considered a partisan issue. If anything, this is one of the very few issues in Canada on which we can all say that we agree and we want to do better.

That's the starting point for my comments. In fact, the reason I am sitting here today, and what motivated me to become an environmental lawyer, is my father, who worked for many years at Parks Canada. I really appreciate all the civil servants who are here and who have a similar level of dedication towards conserving our natural areas. To start, I take that as a given.

When I ask questions, I'll be looking for very brief responses. In particular, I would really appreciate undertakings to provide written additional responses. I don't have enough time to get through all the issues I want to get through, and you won't have enough time to answer, so I would really appreciate it if you just simply say that you will provide further responses in writing at a later date.

My first question goes to the 2020 Aichi targets of 17% on the land and 10% on the ocean, which are meant to be a step towards the long-term goal of "living in harmony with nature". I think we can agree that they're laudable targets. Our government committed to achieving them, but this isn't an end point. This is just a milestone on the way to something much greater. I liken it to trying to get to the moon. We're trying to achieve something much greater.

In fact, last night there was a talk hosted by CPAWS, where they spoke about E. O. Wilson, the pre-eminent American scientist who coined the term "biodiversity" and who is making the case that we need to protect half of the earth, so 17% is clearly just along the way here. He made a statement on similar lines in the joint U.S.-Canada statement at the state dinner and committed to looking substantially beyond the 17% and 10% targets.

My question is, what is being done in each of your departments to get us there, to get us beyond 17% and 10%? What is the plan? I'd appreciate specifically comments from Parks Canada on this orally, but if I could have a written response on that, it would be very helpful.

**Mr. Kevin McNamee:** Thank you for your question, Mr. Amos. In fact, it was your father who convinced me to join Parks Canada, and I now sit in the chair he used to occupy.

In terms of percentages, the national parks system and the national marine conservation area system, if they are to be completed, will substantially surpass.... Certainly, they will make a significant contribution to those targets, so those systems plans are designed to go beyond 2020. If anything, at some point we're going to have to start to look at our national park system plan to update it, but those are our long-term plans.

In addition, Mark Hopkins is here, and if I may answer the question in terms of a new conservation goal for the Arctic, which the president and the Prime Minister challenged each country to come up with, we're looking at what would be an appropriate consultation process that would engage territorial governments, indigenous peoples, etc. That's the kind of work we're looking at, and we can follow up with further details.

**Mr. William Amos:** I'd like to follow up on that and go to ecological integrity, which I think is core legislatively but also scientifically to all of what we're trying to achieve with these targets. My understanding is that the percentage of the budget of Parks Canada that is spent towards conservation and the restoration of ecological integrity is around 7%. Is that an accurate figure? If so, why is it so low?

**Mr. Kevin McNamee:** We'll have to get back to you on whether that is an accurate figure or not and respond to the question.

However, I do reiterate that several years ago we were accorded approximately \$85 million plus to invest in conservation and restoration projects, and again I reiterate: the largest amount in the agency's history. Through a successive number of budgets, as we have provided the committee with, there is an extensive amount of funding that has gone into the creation of new national parks and marine conservation areas, with a significant portion of that going toward furthering our relationships with aboriginal people. We'll get back to you on that.

● (1215)

**The Chair:** We are going to have to move on, because you won't have time to answer another question.

Mr. Stetski, go ahead.

**Mr. Wayne Stetski (Kootenay—Columbia, NDP):** For the benefit of the committee, I will be here throughout the duration of this study, acting for Nathan. I have spent my entire life working with Manitoba Parks, BC Parks, and national parks, so I have a very deep personal interest in this discussion.

Thank you all very much for being here. My first question for the witnesses is this. The targets are there, and I hope they are interim targets, as Mr. Amos mentioned. There was some talk last night about a 50% target across the globe, and I think at some point there should be a discussion across government on what the long-term target should be.

Just looking at the representation from the different departments that are here, I am wondering who is coordinating the overall effort to get to these, 10% of marine territory and 17% of our land. I am almost thinking that there should be something like a protected areas accord, similar to the health accord, which involves provincial ministers and territorial ministers. Somebody needs to take leadership overall on how Canada is going to get to these interim targets of 10% and 17%, and then make sure that we get there. I am not even sure who to ask, which is part of my challenge, I guess, since you are from different departments.

**Mr. Kevin McNamee:** I'll take a swing.

First of all, as Mr. Stringer pointed out, the mandate letters for both the Minister of Fisheries, Oceans and the Canadian Coast Guard as well as our Minister of Environment and Climate Change have provided that mandate on the marine side. Under the Oceans Act, it is DFO that has the lead for that, and we are working with them collaboratively, as is Environment Canada.

On the terrestrial side, again, our two departments are collaborating, but Parks Canada and the Government of Alberta have agreed to co-chair a federal, provincial, and territorial working group to work on that path.

There is some leadership. At the same time, there is a strong element of collaboration through various federal, provincial, and territorial bodies that exist.

**Mr. Wayne Stetski:** Again, you may need to send this in written form, because there might not be time today. I am interested in how many FTEs each department is allocating towards the goal. We know from the priorities and planning report that Parks Canada, for example, is allotting only four people for the national park establishment and three people for the marine conservation establishment across all of Canada, so seven people in total. Is that enough, and does that give enough priority to this conservation initiative?

**Mr. Kevin McNamee:** In part, I think we can get back to you with better numbers. As the director of protected areas establishment and conservation, I am not sure when those numbers are from. We have some more staff, and through budget 2016-17 we will be able to add some additional staff.

On the other hand, I think it is important to point out that, certainly within our agency, we engage the Parks Canada team of executive leaders and people who are located in the field, people who work in the aboriginal affairs directorate, and people who work across the agency. It is not just seven people having the job within the branch that delivers new areas. It requires a team, and we have that across Parks Canada. They may not be checked into that box, but they work, help, and contribute.

**Mr. Wayne Stetski:** I fell off the conservation bandwagon for three years and became mayor of Cranbrook. I worked with a lot of developers who were required to set aside 5% of the land for green space. I became very interested in quality as well as quantity.

When you are looking to fill these targets of 10% and 17%, do you have the science capability to make sure we are getting the best pieces of land from a quality perspective as well as hectares in quantity?

• (1220)

**Mr. Kevin Stringer:** I am happy to respond to that one from the marine side.

One of the reasons we are still in the game in terms of getting from 1% to 5% by next year, and 10% by 2020, is the amount of science we have done. Most of the investment in the oceans program is largely about identifying where the ecologically and biologically significant areas are, where the corals and sponges are, and where the areas that need protecting for various life processes of species are. We have done a lot of science, and we are quite confident in terms of

having identified those areas. It is difficult to do in the marine environment, but that work is largely done.

I would note that you mentioned industry. Industry is going to be an important partner in this, as well. Fishermen and indigenous groups have an enormous amount of local information that we are going to have to depend on in terms of being confident about areas that need to be protected and how we actually protect them.

**The Chair:** We're just about out of time, Mr. Stetski. You won't have time to ask another question, but you will get a second round.

Next up is Mr. Aldag.

**Mr. John Aldag (Cloverdale—Langley City, Lib.):** Thanks to all the witnesses for coming in today.

I spent my career, 32 years, with Parks Canada. Heritage conservation is something that's very near and dear to me. I spent my early years listening to things like the green plan and the Brundtland commission and our commitments to conservation.

I'll tell you, I'm proud of the accomplishments we've made as a public service and government over the years. I'll also tell you that I'm frustrated that we haven't gone far enough fast enough. The kinds of questions and answers I'd like to get to today are your thoughts on how we can achieve these objectives that we have before us. We had persons from Parks Canada come in, and the comment was made that it will take us decades to complete the systems plan. I simply say that it's not good enough.

We have a plan that was developed in the 1970s. We know the 39 regions. It's like, what's left...and not only what's left to complete, but are the existing areas...? We saw with the Nahanni a great example of recognizing that the ecological integrity wasn't possible there, and we saw a great expansion through collaboration with first nations, with the indigenous communities. I think there are huge opportunities related to our reconciliation agenda with aboriginal communities, using protected spaces to do some great work there.

I would just throw that out to each of you. I won't leave it wide open; I'll get into some specifics.

Kevin, I'll start with you, just because I know your program probably the best. What do we need to do to push through? What would it take to complete the systems plan in four years? How can we get there? To me, the time has passed to do the planning. Now it's time for action. How do we support you in completing the systems plan, or this phase of it?

**Mr. Kevin McNamee:** I suppose I can't just give a response similar to the one for Mr. Amos, that I'll get back to you in writing.

Part of what I want to emphasize goes back to my concluding remarks on the kinds of things that I think would certainly help in terms of completing a systems plan: political leadership and commitment. I think we have enjoyed that going back to 1989 and the green plan. There's also public and stakeholder support.

It's not just about science. I would say to the committee that you can have the best science, and you can have different levels of science input. We have a good idea of the areas we want to protect. But it really does take the time to build the necessary trust and commitment you need from other governments that are prepared to transfer the land, the surface, and the subsurface to us, and securing the trust of indigenous communities and people. We have found in some places that takes time. Sometimes they're ahead of us, sometimes we're ahead of them. Having the ongoing support and funding to be able to invest in delivering those relationships is critical.

I will not say to the committee that we can absolutely do that in four years, because I think our track record is that in some communities where they're changing leadership, changing conditions, it does take time. I think all of us in each department are facing that challenge of meeting the targets, but building it in such a way that we are respectful of the nation-to-nation relationship that we need to address.

I think consistent leadership, consistent commitment, consistent funding, consistent support, at times making the necessary decisions around particular boundaries—that's the way to go.

● (1225)

**Mr. John Aldag:** Before I move on, I will give you a chance to send us something in writing. I have requested this before, but we haven't received it yet. I'd simply like an update on the systems plan, where we're at and what areas we have identified, study areas or zones or regions we have identified. Just give us a sense of where the whole Parks Canada systems plan is at, and its advancement.

I'd like to move my questioning now to Environment Canada for a quick comment. There were some comments made about migratory bird sanctuaries and national wildlife areas. I've looked for things like systems plans and I haven't found anything. It may be in a website that I simply haven't found.

What guides Environment Canada in determining areas for setting aside for conservation? Perhaps you can give updates on that, if you have an intact or valid plan, and on where you're at. What guides the expansion of the systems of migratory bird sanctuaries and national wildlife areas and those other kinds of things under your jurisdiction?

You can give it to us in writing as well.

**Mrs. Sue Milburn-Hopwood:** We'll have to follow up on it in writing, but in one area particularly, migratory birds, we've just completed over 20 or so bird conservation area plans. We can certainly provide you with them. They are all laid out on the website, and you can access them.

Increasingly, as our mandate includes not just migratory birds but also species at risk, recent work within the Canadian wildlife service is looking at how we look at both preventing species becoming species at risk, but also addressing the areas where the species are at

risk, and looking at those areas to focus our efforts. We can provide you more detail in writing.

**Mr. John Aldag:** Particularly the context for how you develop those target areas and what else is there. Is your system of migratory bird sanctuaries now complete or is more to come, and what guides that?

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Amos.

**Mr. William Amos:** I'll ask a broad question and ask for brief responses orally, and then in writing to follow up.

I hope our civil service will say they need a lot more money; they need the investment; they want to fight for more investment in conservation. It's not just about conservation, as Mr. Stringer pointed out so nicely, this is about our natural capital infrastructure. We need to invest in it. It's about our tourism economies as well. We know this is good value. But I feel as though we need the wherewithal as politicians. We need the information brought to our attention, so we can make the case at the political level for the budget that is really required to achieve our conservation objectives.

I'd like some frank responses, please. What do we need to put a human on the moon, so to speak? What do we need to complete our systems plan? What kind of serious investment is required?

**Ms. Julie Gelfand:** A couple of the protected area systems have almost zero money. When you look at national wildlife areas, they have a little more money than migratory bird sanctuaries, probably nothing. There's no money for bird conservation regions and conservation strategies. There's lots of money for the North American waterfowl management plan protecting ducks; protecting other bird species, not so much. National Parks has the most significant budget. I'm not throwing in the DFO thing. I haven't figured out where they rank. You need to know there are a couple of systems of protected areas that have almost zero funding.

● (1230)

**Mr. Kevin McNamee:** Here is an example of what I provided to the committee.

We received significant funding in budget 2003. We finally expended all the funds under that budget by 2010-11. We delivered over 100,000 square kilometres. I can get you the numbers. My point is we got a fair amount of funding, but it took time to negotiate the necessary agreements from provincial governments to get them to agree to transfer the surface and subsurface to Canada to manage as national parks. It took significant time in communities to gain the necessary level of support and to negotiate impact and benefit agreements. To a certain extent it was the time it took to build trust. Part of our history is a history of expropriation in Atlantic Canada and elsewhere. In some communities we still encounter a fear that's what we're going to do. Sometimes the federal government is not necessarily welcomed when it arrives in a community. A whole range of other issues casts some distrust. We are not going to force the creation of a new national park or an NMCA on a community.

We invest the time and the funding to achieve those relationships. It's difficult, and sometimes there may not necessarily be the level of support to achieve it, but we work through it. I think we've demonstrated a tremendous record of success through the last couple of decades, but it is taking time.

**Mr. William Amos:** There was a line item in the budget for a bike trail to connect Banff and Jasper National Parks, I believe—some \$60-odd million more infrastructure. My recollection from Mr. Watson's testimony previously was that the total amount of funding available for parks' establishment anticipated for this year was \$44 million. I'm just wondering, with respect to parks management plans that are in place, where this trail fits into the bigger picture of our expenditures.

**Mr. Kevin McNamee:** I hate to pull the "that's not an issue I'm familiar with"...but it's not an issue I am familiar with. I haven't been involved in the planning in that.

Again, on the national park and the national marine conservation area side, we receive budgetary allocations to do the necessary planning and consultation. A significant portion of that provides financial support to aboriginal communities so that they have the capacity to engage with us, and then the funding under budget 2016 is adequate to establish both Thaidene Nëné and Lancaster Sound, once we get the agreements.

I'm sorry I can't give you a comparison between what the money in the budget buys you for the Jasper trail and establishment.

**Mr. William Amos:** Thank you for following up on just explaining what the proposal is about and why it appeared in the budget without prior consultation. I wasn't aware of it. There are a lot of people who weren't aware. That would be helpful to know.

**Mr. Kevin McNamee:** We'll get back to the committee on that one.

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

We're moving on to Mr. Fast.

**Hon. Ed Fast:** Thank you to all of you for your very helpful contribution to this discussion. I think you will have noticed that I didn't cut my teeth on the conservation side. I was reasonably prolific on the user side, having explored places like the Chilcotin Trail, the West Coast Trail, Bowron Lakes, the Skyline Trail and the Rockwall in the Rockies, Stein Valley—all spectacular areas. I've

come to very much appreciate the responsibility that rests on our shoulders to protect those natural areas.

I'd like to go back to Mr. McNamee, and Mr. Stringer, you can jump in as well.

We've talked a fair bit about the protected areas, the marine and terrestrial protected areas, and our targets of 10% and 17%. How optimistic are you that we're actually going to achieve those 2020 targets? I want a frank assessment of that.

By the way, I did appreciate, Mr. McNamee, your effort to explain all the work that's required to actually move forward with adding additional areas for protection. There's the science involved, and then beyond that there's the community consultations involved. You mentioned that it is not government's desire to impose national parks where local communities oppose them. One that's certainly close to where I live would be the South Okanagan area, where there was a proposal for a national park, opposed by many and supported by many. These are the challenges you face.

How optimistic are you that we're actually going to achieve those targets by 2020, or is that a stretch?

● (1235)

**Mr. Kevin McNamee:** I'm going to say I'm quite optimistic, and the reason I say that is this country demonstrated, during the 1990s, that it could triple the amount of protected area in Canada through something that was called the Endangered Spaces Campaign that featured, as Mr. Stringer said, an all-in approach by governments, conservation organizations like some that you will hear from on Thursday—the Nature Conservancy, Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society—indigenous people, industry contributing by voluntarily giving up hydrocarbon leases in a number of proposed areas like Gwaii Haanas and Grasslands National Park. There's a lot of public support around it. I think in part given the government's direction to engage indigenous communities respectfully on a nation-to-nation basis, there is a large degree of broad support for achieving these goals, and with the funding and investment that we've had, we should be able to make some good progress.

**Mr. Kevin Stringer:** Let me just add, one of the interesting results, I would say, or consequences of having the formal mandate on the marine side of 5% and 10% is it's galvanized people.

It's galvanized my department. It enabled us to go forward with the budget and say, folks, if we're going to do this, we absolutely have to have a reinvestment.

It's galvanized the town. Our colleagues around this table have come together to say, God, how on earth are we going to do this? It's moved us out of, I guess we'll get to this one next year, and this one next year. It got us out of our comfort zone and thinking about different things.



It's galvanized the stakeholders. We've had environmental groups come and say, we can help. Here are some thoughts. We've had the fisheries industry, the oil and gas industry, and others come and say, okay, we get it. This is going to happen. This didn't use to happen. They've said, we could help, and If you could just do it this way.

Without having that in the public domain, it would be much harder. It's still going to be enormously difficult. We do have a lot of science work done and a lot of prep work done. We have the provinces. We've re-established that group. It's galvanized everyone, and that's actually made a huge difference.

I share the optimism. I would say, and I've often said to our own staff, that we're really excited about this, and we're also a little bit terrified. Our objective is to keep this higher than this, and to keep everybody moving—and so far, so good.

**Hon. Ed Fast:** Can I ask, over what period of time has this galvanization taken place?

**Mr. Kevin Stringer:** From November 4 to November 5, I would say, when we saw the mandate letter.

It really was when we saw that, and it's all in the public domain. We all got it in our mandate letters. We connected in November. We connected with environmental groups and brought them together as a group in early December. We've been talking to others, as well.

It's been less than six months, since we've seen that. You can see it coming together. We are now looking at doing things differently.

For us, it means larger protected areas, different ways to do it, finding a different way to decrease the amount of time it takes—instead of seven years to do an MPA, it has to take less—and identifying what types of things can count that we haven't really thought about. Are there some fisheries closures where we can change how we do it so that they would count? It's these types of things.

There's been an enormous amount of work not only in our department, not only in government, but among all the players. It really is, as I say, an all-in process.

• (1240)

**The Chair:** Thank you

Mr. Aldag.

**Mr. John Aldag:** Where to go? I have so many questions.

With Fisheries, we'll continue with some of what we've been talking about.

I was looking at the presentation. You spoke about five of 13 priority marine bioregions. You've just been speaking about galvanizing, getting things moving.

This goes back to my previous question about systems plans for Fisheries and Oceans. Perhaps you could give us a written submission simply on what's there. I'm concerned, or curious, about the other eight priority marine bioregions, what the plans are there, how they fit in. Your comments were, we protected 1% of oceans over 20 years, and now we have a year to get to the 5%. That's a concern. It's good to see that people are rallying behind the challenge

that's been put out there. Perhaps we could get your thoughts on how we...or if there's anything else you want to comment on.

I'd also like to then move it to anybody working within systems plans, on how we position those for the future, the next generation of thinking on protected areas.

We'll start with Fisheries on the current system plan, the remaining bioregions, and then move to the future planning that's needed.

**Mr. Kevin Stringer:** Let me start by saying, just building on that galvanized.... On setting these targets of 5% and 10%, I would say the 10% is going to be easier to achieve than the 5% by next year.

Our longer-term objective is those 13 bioregions and to establish MPA networks in those 13 bioregions that achieve a number of objectives: that they're connected; that they're related; that they're replicated; and that we have a different set, a broad set, of protections in those areas. Once we have that in all 13 bioregions.... That's our plan.

The great benefit of the 5% and 10% objectives is they are gathering the community in a way it hasn't been gathered before. We believe we can ride that to achieve the longer-term objective. As we're moving ahead on the 5% and 10%, we're talking to everybody, as I am here, about that longer-term objective. It's certainly about getting to the 5% and 10%, but that contributes to that longer-term objective, which we think is the right way forward in terms of MPA networks, different types of protections, with all of the principles associated with that.

**Mr. John Aldag:** Just for Environment Canada and Parks, if you have thoughts on the next version of system plans guiding you, and what's going to direct us, if you could give us those in writing, that would be appreciated.

I did want to raise a couple of quick things.

I found a figure that says that Canada is 152nd of 240 jurisdictions for percentage of lands protected, so when we start talking about these targets of 17% and 10%, our previous response talked about biodiversity, and I think that really needs to be what's guiding us. I do get really concerned when we are driven only by targets.

So when we talk about these future systems plans, we have to look at our biodiversity goals and how we will achieve those.

I'm just trying to—

**The Chair:** You have two minutes to get it out there.

**Mr. John Aldag:** Let's get a minute maybe from Environment and then a minute from Parks on this idea of the future of systems plans moving beyond just the target thinking and into something richer.

What point are we at in Parks specifically, which has been with this plan since the 1970s? Has any thought been given to moving beyond that and what that might look like?

**Mr. Kevin McNamee:** As I've mentioned before, we acknowledge that in the next several years we're going to have to start to look at what the next version will be in terms of the national parks systems plan, but currently we are focused on getting the areas in the unrepresented ones. In terms of our marine systems plan, as I mentioned, we have only five of 29 represented, so we will continue to work on that plan.

I do want to stress that it is not just a question of percentages. It is a question of where these places are located.

A national park reserve in the south Okanagan would add about 0.001 to the target, yet it is incredibly rich in terms of biological diversity, so it's important in these systems plans that we look at what we are contributing to a target and, as Kevin said, that we use that to drive us to get new areas. However, when we are designing them, part of the future and current plan is to look at key areas, to make sure that they're representative or that important bird habitats and things like that are effectively and equitably managed and well connected. It's that notion of connecting these protected areas that is really essential.

Again, I'm sure you'll be hearing about that on Thursday and we'll be addressing that through our work.

• (1245)

**The Chair:** I know, Mr. Cuzner, that you wanted to ask something very quickly, and you have maybe 30 seconds.

**Mr. Rodger Cuzner (Cape Breton—Canso, Lib.):** I don't know if I'll be able to do it in 30 seconds.

It's about St. Anns Bank. The concern there is that there's going to be a relocation of effort. We saw it in the area 19 crab fishery when the guys from area 12 came over and fished right on that line and it really hit the...so you guys put in a one-mile buffer and it worked out really well. However, with St. Anns Bank, they think that the intensity of the effort is going to increase down by St. Paul's.

Are you concerned at all that rather than a distribution of effort, there's an intensity of the effort in St. Paul's, and it has had an unintended consequence?

**Mr. Kevin Stringer:** I'm going to ask Jeff to speak to the specifics.

I would just say we're talking about this. We need to move forward on marine protected areas and on different types of protections. Human activities are taking place out in these areas. We do work closely with fisheries groups and we also work with other industries. There are challenges and there are impacts.

That is why it has taken as long as it has, but I'll ask Jeff to speak to the specifics on the St. Anns issue.

**Mr. Jeff MacDonald (Director General, Oceans and Fisheries Policy, Department of Fisheries and Oceans):** Just with regard to the question from the member in terms of increasing the intensity of effort, there obviously has been ongoing dialogue in terms of the establishment of that particular MPA, and part of the dialogue is related to not only the question of intensity of effort but also the benefits of marine protected areas and the potential for spillover effect for a particular species.

I know that DFO staff have had those conversations with all of their fleets, and it's an ongoing part of the establishment of the MPA. As Kevin said, it's an important consideration and the industry makes an important contribution to MPA planning as well as to the design of it. One of the emerging areas in terms of MPA research is that of the benefit of the spillover effect, and that's been part of the dialogue on the establishment of St. Anns Bank, for example.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much. You know, it's difficult because it's a privilege to have all of you in front of us to get a chance to ask questions. It's hard when we don't have as much time as we need. I'm going to add a bit more time for the two questioners who follow, to make up for the extra time I gave the Liberals.

Mr. Shields, you normally have five minutes, but I'm going to give you seven. Go ahead.

**Mr. Martin Shields (Bow River, CPC):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

Mr. McLean, thank you for bringing up the Suffield base and National Defence. They need some help. We have a huge problem there, and it needs to be solved. I hope you have some influence and you don't introduce another species, so we get another problem. We have to take care of the elk because they shouldn't have been there. Are you going to get that one fixed? You brought it up, so I'm guessing you know the Suffield base.

**Mr. Robert McLean:** Thank you very much for the question. I'd like to check with our region with respect to the plans and the discussions we would be having with the Department of National Defence on how to manage that issue. Perhaps we can get back to you in writing.

**Mr. Martin Shields:** Good. I look forward to that one. Thank you.

There's a piece here I think is missing. You're talking about a lot of expansion. I'm familiar with Parks. By the way, Waterton Park is the best national park in Canada. If you haven't been there, you should go there. There's an issue out there, with my having met with tourism, and having met with some other people about the future trends for employment. You employ a sector of community and leadership, in a sense, for what we want to do in our parks. They're drastically short of people now, and the prediction is within 10 years they will be 50% shorter of the leadership types of people who will build our tourism industry in this type of area. It's decreasing now, our tourism in this area, because of lack of manpower.

Are you in the schools? Are you meeting with the school counsellors? Are you developing programs for employment in this sector? We're not getting it.

• (1250)

**Mr. Kevin McNamee:** Unfortunately I can't respond with details to your question, so we can get back to you. At the same time, I'd say over the last 10 years we have been doing more to work in partnership with the tourism industry, in terms of looking at how we can deliver iconic visitor experiences that are consistent with national park ideas.

In particular—and maybe I'm going to ask Nadine to speak to this—we've put a lot of emphasis on indigenous tourism. I don't know if you want to add something to that.

All of this, in part, will lead to better leadership that you're talking about.

**Ms. Nadine Crookes (Director, Natural Resource Conservation Branch, Parks Canada Agency):** Yes. Thank you for taking the opportunity to address this.

In the area of indigenous tourism, but more broadly with the tourism industry, Parks Canada has invested a lot of time and effort in researching and working with community members. There are the 300 Kevin referenced at the beginning of his speech. We are trying to understand the trends, the needs, the capacity issues, the trajectory in terms of what visitors are looking for, the visitors who don't come and what they're looking for, and trying to find ways and means of developing those partnerships that are consistent with national park ideals.

**Mr. Martin Shields:** You don't have a program for schools. You're not in the schools. You're not talking to school counsellors. If you don't get there, people are not going to go into these professions. The projections of shortage of employees means—I go back to Mr. Aldag—there won't be people in the parks. They won't be there. If you don't have a constituency, you don't have a support base out there. Canadians are not there, and the iconic tourists won't be there if you don't have trained people. If you don't get into the school systems, and show them the opportunities, we're going to be done because nobody's going to be there.

**Ms. Nadine Crookes:** Right. We do have programs that are offered by individual parks in our 44 parks across the system that work on specific projects. For example, in Pacific Rim National Park reserve, out on the west coast of British Columbia, we have a species at risk program reintroducing Pink Sand-verbena into our dune system. We do work with schools, with scout groups, and with others to actively involve those community members in the reintroduction.

**Mr. Martin Shields:** Okay, you're getting closer.

**Mr. Kevin McNamee:** We'll get closer in writing.

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

**Mr. Martin Shields:** In the 2014 budget there was about \$250 million. I've heard you explain about the length of time, and I understand that process. Is there enough money? Mr. Amos asked, is it about the money or is it about the process?

**Mr. Kevin McNamee:** I think the funding that you're specifically referring to was not for establishment. It might have been for capital, or—

**Mr. Martin Shields:** Canada's national conservation plan.

**Mr. Kevin McNamee:** I guess your question wasn't more about the funding.

It is about both. It is about, as I mentioned, having the necessary funding, but also building the necessary relationships so that we have funding to advance a number of extremely important sites. Thaidene Nëné and Lancaster Sound are probably going to be our next two sites, and both of them are extremely important ecologically. These will be as the result of negotiated agreements

with indigenous people. You'll be hearing from one of the communities, Lutsel K'e, tomorrow.

These places are going to offer some very iconic visitor experiences. We have the funding to do those too. We just need to get the agreements.

**Mr. Martin Shields:** Could we find out what point the national conservation plan is at now? Is that something we can get?

**Mr. Robert McLean:** Yes. In the interest of using our time well, perhaps we can follow up in writing with the different components of the national conservation plan and where things stand.

**The Chair:** That would be great.

You have a second left, if Ms. Gelfand wants to add.

**Ms. Julie Gelfand:** I just want to indicate that when we looked at the audit of Environment Canada's protected areas and their bird conservation regions, as an example, we found that they've developed these strategies; they haven't actually identified what funds they need in order to protect the birds.

I think things are different in Parks Canada, which has been, I want to say, the rich cousin of Environment Canada's protected area system. I'm not sure. They have a system plan at Parks Canada, but there is no system plan for national wildlife areas. There are different criteria; there is no system plan, the way there is in Parks Canada. They're very different creatures, but generally I'm not sure Environment Canada has....

We noted in our audit that there wasn't enough funding for management plans for national wildlife areas, for example; that they were 20 years old; and that there was not enough funding for bird conservation strategies. I think funding is an issue in certain protected areas.

Thanks.

• (1255)

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

We have our last questioner, Mr. Stetski.

I'm giving you five minutes rather than your normal three.

**Mr. Wayne Stetski:** Thank you.

Let me start by saying that I appreciate the work you're all doing on behalf of conservation and protected areas and the environment.

I talked earlier about three things. I'm going to add a fourth, which will become my question.

I think the federal government needs to set a long-term, big picture vision or goal for conservation in general. Whether it's the 50% that we heard about last night at the CPAWS event or some other target, I think the federal government does need to set leadership around this vision for the future.

I talked briefly about federal government leadership and about coordinating and bringing together everybody to deliver on the 10% and the 17%. That is a role I think the federal government needs to take on. Whether it's through a protected areas accord based on the health accord model or in some other way, it will take good coordination to get there.

The third thing is the need for quality areas, not just quantity areas, and the importance of science and of having scientists available to actually help deliver on it.

The fourth one is really around management, monitoring, and reporting moving forward. In fall 2013 the commissioner of the environment issued the report and as part of it noted that as of 2011 Parks Canada had not yet assessed the condition of ecological integrity for 41% of the parks system. The commissioner also noted that of the ecosystems that had been assessed, 34% were found to be in decline.

I raise all of this because government has committed, and rightly so, to restoring ecological integrity as a priority in our national parks system. As we look to significantly increase our protected areas—and this was a challenge in B.C. when we doubled the parks system back in the nineties—how will government ensure that there are sufficient resources for putting monitoring and reporting on ecological integrity in place and for managing these protected areas? You need to be committed long-term to the management and monitoring of these areas as we proceed down this path to increasing the number of areas that are protected.

**Mr. Kevin McNamee:** I'll start off by simply pointing out that for the last several decades, through the various budget allocations we have gotten for creating new national parks and national marine conservation areas, part of our budget ask and part of what is funded is to do exactly what you said. Built within the funding framework are funds for doing ecological monitoring and reporting within the specific park that is established. In addition, funding is also provided to work with indigenous communities through impact and benefit agreements, co-operative management boards, and other things, to collaboratively engage in not just scientific monitoring but monitoring of resources that are of importance to indigenous people and communities.

**Ms. Nadine Crookes:** I would add that in Parks Canada, as you know, our ecological integrity monitoring program every ten years leads to a "state of park" report for each and every individual park and site, which then informs the actions that our strategies are taking in our management plans.

More recently, what we've been able to do is link that program to our conservation and restoration, the \$84-million program that Kevin iterated earlier, in terms of restoration actions to help mitigate or to make improvements in those ecosystems in decline that you're speaking about.

To date, we have managed to complete 120 ecological indicators, which are at the ecosystem level, for our 44 national parks, including 600 measures, nine of which are indigenous knowledge measures. We have some room to grow there but are certainly working towards having good science to inform our decisions and our actions.

● (1300)

**The Chair:** You were within your one minute.

**Mr. Wayne Stetski:** I'd like to hear briefly from the other organizations. As was mentioned earlier, although Parks Canada is not a very rich cousin, they have had more money than the rest of you agencies have had to look after your protected areas.

Just to get a quick snapshot, are you comfortable and confident that you will have more money in the future to manage the new protected areas?

**Mr. Jeff MacDonald:** I'll try to answer the first part of the question, with regard to the management monitoring and reporting, especially on ecological integrity.

As Kevin Stringer explained in his speech, our objectives under the Oceans Act for MPAs, for example, are slightly different. We don't necessarily have the representativeness and visitor experience part as our mandate; for us it's really about biodiversity and the protection of the marine environment.

In that regard, both under the national conservation plan and in budget 2016, the funds that were invested in the program included ongoing monitoring funding, which is A-base funding; it is not just funding that will expire in four years.

Over and above that, as Kevin said earlier, we have invested significantly in our scientific capacity, both in terms of the health of the oceans research, but also our basic oceanography. In the recent budget, there was also a reinvestment in DFO science capacity, which will of course aid us a lot in reporting on ecological integrity, not only of marine protected areas, but of the bioregions in Canada's oceans as well.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much to all of you for kicking off this new topic for us. We appreciate the expertise you've shared, and the information. There is quite a bit that you've been asked to provide in written form; there will be quite a lot coming to us, I hope. We'll be looking forward to it.

We don't have a lot of time with this study; we have the four sessions. Please, if you could, give us that information as fast as possible. It would be most helpful. Again, thanks very much.

Before the committee leaves the table and we close the meeting, I have one issue that I need to talk to people about.

We've been asked, by the Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association to join them on the 17th for a round table on the environment, climate change, and energy panel. The problem is, the only time available is 11:15 until noon. Unfortunately, we are actually doing our report at that time—May 17 is our final report for the sustainable... Oh, I'm sorry; it's the drafting instructions for this one.

I want to give the message that unfortunately none of us will be able to attend, and I didn't want to say that without checking with you. I think everybody is going to want to be here for that day's meeting.

Thank you very much. The meeting is now 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>