



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

# **Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure of the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development**

---

SENV • NUMBER 004 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

---

**EVIDENCE**

**Tuesday, May 10, 2016**

—

**Chair**

**Mrs. Deborah Schulte**



## Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure of the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

Tuesday, May 10, 2016

• (1305)

[English]

**The Chair (Mrs. Deborah Schulte (King—Vaughan, Lib.)):** I call our subcommittee to order, please. Thanks for everyone's patience today. It's been an interesting day.

There are three things I want to work on, and we've already taken care of one.

We're going to hear the witnesses on the 17th. There were two meetings on our schedule. One was to draft instructions, and the other was to review the report. There's another week out there that we may need to think about, but I am aware that there may be some stuff coming to us in June that may end up taking up that spot. I just wanted to put that out there.

We now have four witnesses who are coming on the 17th. There were some other people who were trying to get in to talk to us, and I want to possibly get Penny's and Tim's assistance at this part of the meeting just to suggest four. Five is not bad. I don't want to go back to six, if we can avoid it, because it really doesn't give us that full time that we need. So we have four on the 17th. Is there one other group that has requested to come forward to us?

If you want to look at your package, there's a sheet of all the people we approached to try to have come forward to us. They're on that list, and we approached as many as we could—almost all of them—to try to see if we could fit them in. Some couldn't come; some declined. Just the way it worked out, we couldn't fit everybody in. However, there are some highlighted in yellow who were a priority for the members of the committee. We have an opportunity for one more spot. I wouldn't mind hearing from Penny and Tim if there is anybody who has come forward, because we had people who also approached us who might be appropriate for having that one other spot that we have available on the 17th.

John.

**Mr. John Aldag (Cloverdale—Langley City, Lib.):** I was just going to say, given that we've heard a lot about seeing a need to consult with indigenous communities, I'm wondering if the Assembly of First Nations could be seen as a priority. We've heard from some panel, but not anybody with that umbrella voice, and I would find it to be very useful to hear from the Assembly of First Nations.

**The Chair:** We invited them, and I don't think they even got back to us.

**Mr. John Aldag:** Could we try again?

**The Chair:** We could try again, but they did not respond.

**Mr. William Amos (Pontiac, Lib.):** A lot of these requests, I think the challenge—

**The Chair:** They just get so many.

**Mr. William Amos:** They get bogged down, and it comes down to the persistence of us to have them.

**The Chair:** Cynara did persist. However, if one of you has a contact that you want to try to use to see if you can get them to come forward, I would say let's try because we've tried through the formal channels.

Mr. Stetski.

**Mr. Wayne Stetski (Kootenay—Columbia, NDP):** Kevin Van Tighem would be a good witness. He's been a superintendent with national parks, I believe, in the past. He has a lot of history so it might be interesting to get his perspective.

**The Chair:** We did have a couple of witnesses who came forward with the parks already, right?

I'm open to discussions around the table.

Mr. Eglinski.

**Mr. Jim Eglinski (Yellowhead, CPC):** It's very important to kind of give a twist to our people and talk to the mayor of the town of Jasper, which is a municipality operating within a national park, about the demographics of how that works, the controls that are placed on him, and the things that they're doing as a municipality within a park that oversees them.

• (1310)

**The Chair:** I'm open to that.

Mr. Stetski.

**Mr. Wayne Stetski:** It would be interesting to hear from the town of Jasper, but so far we've been hearing from groups that have a very broad perspective around conservation. The town of Jasper... There's only Banff, Jasper, and Waterton. They are the only three communities that are inside a national park.

**Mr. John Aldag:** There's Prince Albert and Riding Mountain.

**Mr. Wayne Stetski:** I'm just not sure what the overall value to the committee would be. It's a relatively small percentage of conservation that gets impacted by a town like Jasper.

**Mr. Jim Eglinski:** I think a lot of it deals with the conservation that they're doing within the town itself, the town limits and the impact of tourism, which is part of the discussion that we've held here. Tourism is impacting on our parks, and I think that they have a very strong perspective in that regard.

**The Chair:** I wouldn't mind turning to Penny and Tim just for a second because they're looking to see what we have heard so far and where our study is going.

Do you have some suggestions, or anyone that we haven't heard from who you think would be very important for us to hear from?

**Mr. Tim Williams (Committee Researcher):** There was a potential for a completely new meeting to be held in the next weeks and that was going to be discussed at this subcommittee meeting.

**The Chair:** Yes, and that all went to heck in a handbag.

**Mr. Tim Williams:** Yes, I understand.

When members of the committee were asked to submit their witnesses, they were asked to prioritize them. As possibilities, we suggested the three who were prioritized and had not been heard.

There was a request from West Coast Environmental Law. From our perspective, we haven't heard a lot about marine protected areas. We've heard a lot about terrestrial. One of the focuses of West Coast Environmental Law is on the marine side of things. That's why Penny and I suggested West Coast Environmental Law as a possibility as well.

**The Chair:** Thank you for that.

Mr. Amos.

**Mr. William Amos:** To respond to Mr. Eglinski's point around usefulness of municipal input, I would agree. I would simply suggest, though, that if we do succeed—and I think we will—in getting some travel, it will be a great time to meet with the municipalities in this particular context.

If we go to a particular protected area that involves a municipality, then we can have a meeting then and there. The opportunities to meet with Jasper or elsewhere aren't solely in the next couple of meetings.

I would recommend that we prioritize Stewart Elgie, whose experience on these issues is extensive to the point of having been involved for 35 years, and having litigated all sorts of different cases. He will have a legal perspective that would at least be the equal of West Coast Environmental Law. They're both great.

**The Chair:** The point that was being addressed by Tim was that we hadn't heard a lot from marine. Do you think Stewart Elgie is going to talk about marine?

**Mr. William Amos:** Having been a colleague of his at the University of Ottawa...He was the founder of Ecojustice and Boreal Canada. He is now the founder of Sustainable Prosperity. They are all major national institutions. His expertise spans the gamut, including marine, so to the extent that we want to focus on marine, we can.

• (1315)

**The Chair:** Mr. Stetski.

**Mr. Wayne Stetski:** West Coast Environmental Law would be a new aspect to the committee and I agree there has been very little focus so far on marine conservation.

**The Chair:** So you're supportive of that one.

Mr. Eglinski.

**Mr. Jim Eglinski:** If that's the theme we're going down, then I would like to see the Pacific Salmon Foundation brought in or on the list if we're going to move away from.... It would be very important. It ties in with West Coast Environmental Law.

**The Chair:** Cynara is just sharing with me some of the people she had already gone through. She had already invited the Atlantic salmon group and they declined. That's not specifically this group, but there was another group that declined to come.

**Mr. Jim Eglinski:** We could give them a call. I think it would fit together.

**The Chair:** I'm hearing three ideas. We have the town of Jasper, focusing on the difficulties of being a municipality within a park boundary and the unique things they're doing to add to the environmental aspect of the park.

We have Stewart Elgie, the lawyer, who pretty well knows everything about everything. He may want to come and talk about a lot.

We also have the Pacific Salmon Foundation, which might be a nice way of tackling a bit of the fish aspect that we haven't heard much from or West Coast Environmental Law.

Mr. Eglinski.

**Mr. Jim Eglinski:** The suggestion is to maybe keep Jasper outside of this. If we're talking fish, it's kind of not fishy there, it's a little dry country. If we were to consider them as part of our tour, it would be very beneficial, and I would be quite willing to say, let's stick with the west coast fishing segment.

**The Chair:** If we got to do it on a trip.

**Mr. Jim Eglinski:** Yes, and it would be a great place to go for a trip.

**The Chair:** If you want, we can pause this for a minute, although I think we're pretty close. We can pause it, talk about a trip, and what we might be able to include in a trip, and that might inform us a bit more about whether there is anybody we want to add to the 17th. Do you want to do that? Do you want to move to a possible trip?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** Let's do that, and then we'll come back to this, because that might help us understand what we can tackle in another way, as you suggested.

Discussions with many of you, on the side, have been that there would be value in going and seeing those who are trying to deal with the challenges in Banff, with the numbers of visitors who are coming, and balancing that with the needs of the ecological viability of the place. That was brought forward. I thought that was interesting.

There also was a discussion on the importance of where we're moving forward in our study looking at first nations, and how we can work better with them on our protected areas and how we might consider including that into meeting our targets, and how they do things and it's different. There was a suggestion of the Haida Gwaii area. There was also a suggestion of the Great Bear Rainforest. These are two areas that are really well led by first nations. They've done things a little differently, and we might want to consider that before we actually draft our instructions.

I'll just frame the discussions I've had with people.

Then there were some of the issues to the north, in the Northwest Territories, and we had a speaker here talking about that, and how maybe we need to think differently about how we want to move forward on our parks.

Then there was a bit on the east coast, but mostly it was to the west and to the north. There was Waterton Lakes, which was Mr. Shields'...we have to go to Waterton Lakes. I've been to Waterton Lakes, and I think there's an element of interest there because it straddles the border. There's the U.S. and the things that they're doing, and there's us. So there was that aspect as well, to see the two aspects there, and what they do better than us, what we do better than them, and how it works on the landscape.

Waterton Lakes, Banff, Haida Gwaii, Great Bear Rainforest, and something to the north were all in the discussions that I had with people. I thought personally all of them had validity in our research.

Okay, I'm opening the floor.

Mr. Eglinski.

**Mr. Jim Eglinski:** Banff and Jasper would do the same thing. I am from the west and know the west coast very well, British Columbia, all parts of it, Alberta, and the Northwest Territories, if you're talking about the Great Bear region...I think it's the transportation to and from that's going to become a nightmare. If we're looking as a group, we're probably better off either staying to the west side of the country or going to the east side of the country. We could take in Haida quite easily. We can probably find, if we put our minds together, aboriginal groups that are doing great conservation work in British Columbia and in Alberta.

With the travel time, to try to go from Haida to Calgary or to Edmonton, or wherever place we go, and then trying to say we're going to go way up north, we're going to run out of time. The logistics are going to be very difficult. But I think if we looked at coming across, and tying in the national parks going over to British Columbia, it's doable within three, four, five days, whatever we're

going to put in there. I think we could still get a good cross-section of what you want to see.

• (1320)

**The Chair:** Overall, we all agree that a trip is a good thing to do with the committee. I'm getting that sense from everyone I've spoken to.

Mr. Aldag.

**Mr. John Aldag:** I've given some thought to a possible itinerary. Aside from what Jim has said, I do see Banff and Jasper as a bit of a different piece. I think there are different perspectives from both. In my mind, the itinerary was that everybody meet in Edmonton, do Jasper, Lake Louise, Banff; if there's time, scoot down to Waterton, and then over to the west coast. It is a bit of an issue with getting into northern B.C., or north central.

I just wanted to throw out that the Pacific Rim and Gulf Islands National Parks are two other parks on the island that have very interesting first nations issues. We've heard today on the marine side that the Strait of Georgia is tied to the Gulf Islands, and the Pacific Rim has some quite interesting things. If we could make it to Gwaii Haanas as well, and take in some of the island, that would be, to me, a bonus. Logistically, it may be a bit easier to consider that Vancouver Island piece as well, or in addition to, depending on timing.

I just wanted to say Jasper, Lake Louise, Banff would be one nice chunk, and then the Gulf Islands and Pacific Rim would be another to consider.

It gives Maligne Lake and Banff-Bow Valley Study.... There are some really interesting pieces there.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP):** I have some questions before suggestions. How long do folks want to spend and what are we trying to learn? If the first nations component of conservation is really important, then that gives you a sense. If it's those extremely popular, high-traffic places, and the challenges they face, that starts to focus. If it's both those things, that's fine, as well.

I know the logistics quite well, certainly. I was in Haida Gwaii last week and the central coast at the same time. I can run you through logistics, if you want. Haida Gwaii is surprisingly not that bad. It's an hour-and-thirty-minute flight from Vancouver, and you land anywhere you want to be.

**The Chair:** I was thinking we would need at least five to seven days to make it worth it.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** I think you're in that range.

To do a Jasper area thing...one or two days just to get around there. Waterton is an extra little chunk that you could consider. Then you're just looking at flying from Calgary or Edmonton to Vancouver, and then either to Vancouver Island....

The Pacific Rim is a bit tricky to get to. Sometimes you'll find weird logistics. A place that's directionally only a few hundred kilometres away is more of a hassle. It's three ferries plus a four-hour drive versus some place that can be quite far but that's one plane stop. It's the way it is on the west coast sometimes, because of the ferries and everything else.

**The Chair:** It's also a matter of finding the groups that have the time available to entertain us, to a certain extent, or work with us.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** I've spoken to the Haida briefly, because Minister McKenna is going up there in July and she wanted some help facilitating. They're quite keen. Depending on when the committee would want to go, Haida Gwaii in the summer is a very popular place, but it doesn't have the range of hotels you're going to get in Nanaimo or Kelowna, so bringing a crew in.... Also, the Haida would want to host you properly. We'd just need some lead time. You'd eat well.

• (1325)

**The Chair:** Do we all agree on the two aspects we're trying to understand?

One is that balance between visitors.... We heard that in the witness statements. You have that interest in the mandate letters to increase people coming to the parks, and then the balance with the ecological integrity of the parks. There's that, and how that's being met in certain places.

I thought the first nations discussions we had were very enlightening. Obviously, there's a lot more to learn that we need to incorporate as we move forward on this.

Do we all agree that those two would be our goals?

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Then, under that purview, are we including the north? That was going to be my last point...the logistics to then head to an Iqaluit type of thing.

**The Chair:** I think we would have to see what the logistics would allow for.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Interestingly again, with some of our most northern places the easiest way to get there is from Ottawa, not from the west coast. Your two-and-a-half or three-hour flight from here, plus a little jumper, gets you somewhere very interesting. In doing Alberta, B.C., the west coast, and then trying to incorporate a northern piece, the only place we'd go north would be Yukon.... When you get into the territories and into Iqaluit it's logistically very interesting. I suppose you could try.

**A voice:** Edmonton.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** You could try Edmonton, but still....

**A voice:** Yellowknife.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Yes, Yellowknife.... It's strange but with the squished nature of our country, here is the place where you'd want to do some really interesting northern stuff. That's where the traffic is.

**The Chair:** We would have to try to have somebody look at the logistics and see what's possible.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** By somebody are we thinking of anybody?

**Mr. Jim Eglinski:** If John would be willing, I'm willing to sit down with him, throw some things around, and come back. We both know the areas fairly well.

**The Chair:** Mr. Amos is waiting for his turn to talk.

**Mr. William Amos:** I vote for seven days. Gwaii Haanas will be great in September. The tourists will be gone.

I haven't heard anything, but I would like to hear—maybe from Mr. Cullen, briefly, after I have gone through my list—about Great Bear transport, because I think that if you are going to Gwaii Haanas, it could make sense to hit Great Bear as well.

I think it is very valuable for us to go to the north. My personal great interest in this one is the aboriginal collaborative piece. I think that is the more original piece. I think we have been discussing since time immemorial industrial pressures and visitor usage pressures, and what the right balance is. We can repeat that—and I look forward to a visit to Banff and Jasper to continue that discussion—but it would be just another chapter in the same book that has been going on for a while.

If my opinion were to be asked for, Gwaii Haanas and Great Bear are top drawer, and pretty much anywhere in the north would be exceptional. Reading the Nature Canada submissions and looking at proposed areas, which are not a sure thing, right now I think Thaidene Néné is pretty close to a sure thing. Going to a place that is pretty close to a sure thing—or going to a place that maybe is not, but where we can have a look and maybe add our weight to a conservation initiative—would be better. Maybe the Edézhíe plateau or the Mackenzie valley.... There are a couple of others, and those could be explored, but I think the north would be....

**The Chair:** One would be...to learn the lessons that got that one to its place and how we may be able to apply that to the new place.

**Mr. William Amos:** Yes, and another would be a place that is on its way. What is the nature of the discussions? What is working? What is not working? I can see the value of the ex post, and I can see the value of the during.

Anyway, those are my opinions.

**The Chair:** Okay. Cynara wanted to say a few things.

**The Clerk of the Subcommittee (Ms. Cynara Corbin):** I had a quick question in terms of formulating a travel plan and looking at the logistics. Do you have a preference? You have indicated that it might be complicated to fly from the west to the north, whereas there are more flights from Ottawa.

Would you see this as two separate trips—five days out west, then come back to Ottawa, and then go a week later—or do you prefer to just do it all together at once?

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** It is not a terrible thought, simply because the north is its own thing entirely. To go in for a day into the north and say, “Tick, got it” is a bit offensive and wrong.

•(1330)

**The Chair:** I sit on the liaison committee, which is dealing with all the budgets that are coming through, which is why I am anxious to get this in. What is clear is that if we were to do the trip when the House is sitting, they are not going to let us all go. Budget-wise, we are trying to get people not to all go. Maybe we could do two trips. Some would go to one, and some would go to the other. That is a possibility.

**Mr. John Aldag:** Just leave it at subcommittee.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** I think we should bring that to a vote. Are we in camera?

**The Chair:** No, we are not.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** You guys need to earn how to use in camera.

**The Chair:** There is the two-trip possibility. Why don't we look at that possibility? We also need to see if there is a way of doing it in one. I think one isn't going to be a lot of time for people. If we all get a chance to go, I would like to try for us to all go in one, if it will work. It really comes down to whether it will work.

Go ahead, Mr. Eglinski.

**Mr. Jim Eglinski:** What I would suggest is—if we are doing the parks, Waterton and the west coast—that we do the northern part by utilizing a charter aircraft. We all go up together in one aircraft. We could leave one morning and be there within two hours. We could have a full day there and then come back in the evening, in a full day.

You could never do that commercially, but you could do it with a charter aircraft.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** That is what is happening with the fisheries committee right now. It is a bit hectic.

**Mr. Jim Eglinski:** Yes. I know most of the outfits in Alberta. It can be quite easily arranged and take us exactly where we would like to go, or very close to where we would like to go.

**The Chair:** We have some work to do, to try to see what might work.

**Mr. John Aldag:** I wanted to reiterate that if we end up in the Vancouver area, I would really like to see the Gulf Islands and the marine park piece put in, because we are not going to get that. There is a marine component with Gwaii Haanas, but that would be the only place we would be touching that.

If we go to the north, probably not....

**Mr. William Amos:** There is actually a lot of marine....

**Mr. John Aldag:** If we are passing through Vancouver, the Gulf Islands are right there. It would be a perfect one to hit, even if we don't make it to Pacific Rim.

**The Chair:** There are only so many hours in a day, but yes; we will have to see. We want to make the visits actually meaningful, with discussions with people, not just “hi, 'bye”. You want to be able

to get in and have some good discussions and some tours and things, and that takes a good chunk of the day. Isn't that right?

**Mr. John Aldag:** There are some fascinating aboriginal first nations components to that marine establishment.

**The Chair:** We are going to run out of time, if we're not careful. Cynara wants to ask a couple of quick questions.

**The Clerk:** There's just one other thing to clarify. I see this trip as a site visit trip rather than public consultations. The international trade committee right now is going to Montreal and Toronto. Having a committee room set up like that is not what you're looking for, is it?

**The Chair:** That's not what—

**Mr. Jim Eglinski:** I was just speaking earlier. Maybe we could then have the mayor of Jasper speak to us.

**The Clerk:** Oh, right, there would be meetings with stakeholders. It just wouldn't be in a public forum.

**Mr. Jim Eglinski:** Okay. No, it's more an information tour.

**The Chair:** We're not doing a formal committee hearing in other locations; we're just going to meet with people. Isn't that right?

Okay.

**Mr. William Amos:** The only circumstance in which I could see it as interesting and useful is in the context of the Northwest Passage. There have been proposals made for significant and multiple MPAs, national marine conservation areas. It could be quite interesting, as a hearing location for.... We haven't discussed that location—

**Mr. Jim Eglinski:** —you mean discussed the yeas or nays.

**The Chair:** Are you talking about whether it should or should not happen?

**Mr. William Amos:** I don't think the proposals are going to be along the lines of whether it should or shouldn't happen; I think it's going to be more a question of where and how. But I think this is a really interesting opportunity for us to engage in a different way. I think that in general community meetings are probably better, for what we're trying to do.

**The Chair:** I think you just got off the protected areas question. Well, it's somewhat involved in marine conservation.

So there's another thought. We'll add it to the mix of what we might do, depending on the time. We're going to have to chart out a timeline to see what's going to fit in.

Now we need to think about timing.

Your comments back to me when I suggested we might do it in September, because people's families have gone back to school and what have you, so that they have a little bit of time, is that you have sessions that you're already scheduling.

• (1335)

**Mr. Jim Eglinski:** Our national caucus is meeting in eastern Canada, our Alberta caucus is meeting in September, and I think the Ukrainian Friendship Group... well, that doesn't affect you all anyway, so I wouldn't even worry about it. If you can't go, you can't go, I guess. It's bad for our three.

**The Chair:** I had proposed the week before we come back. Most people would have done whatever they are going to do with their families and now be basically getting ramped up to come back, so I propose that we think about the week before we come back.

**The Clerk:** I think September 19 is when the House comes back, but I can check.

So, are you saying the week of the 12th, or is that the week of your caucus?

**Mr. Jim Eglinski:** No. We're done by the 12th.

**The Chair:** Okay. If you're done by the 12th, what about that week? How is everybody for that week?

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** I'm just checking when our national caucus is meeting.

**The Chair:** Do we have any caucus at that time?

**Mr. John Aldag:** I'm just trying to find it. It's three days in late August in rural Quebec.

**The Chair:** We're looking at the 11th, 12th, 13th. We would go out on the Sunday and then we have that week. We could maybe go out on the 11th, couldn't we?

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** For our national caucus, we have the 13th to the 15th. I'm sorry.

**The Clerk:** You may be able to get permission to go when the House is sitting. The House would have to approve it in June.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Why is there an aversion to travelling while the House is sitting?

**The Chair:** It's only because there's a good chance that we won't all be able to go. There will be a limit; they won't let everybody out.

**Mr. Jim Eglinski:** Lots of people won't be able to go anyway. We're going to have conflicts.

Why don't we shoot for that first week that we're back? There's not going to be that much going on.

**The Chair:** So, the Labour Day... You have something the following week. Labour Day, or that week, which is at the end of August, many people take.... I don't want to speak for the rest of the committee, but lots of people take their holidays right before school goes back. There are caucuses on the 5th and 6th, but we're talking about the previous week, which would be the end of August and

beginning of September. I just know that many families do their family things then.

**Mr. Jim Eglinski:** What about mid-summer?

**The Chair:** Okay, what we're going to do is send out a little chart. You give us your available weeks, and then we're going to hone in on the majority of people, between August and September.

If we go during the first week back, there's very little chance that all of us will get a chance to go. They don't want the whole committee out of the House.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Really? Committees travel all the time, though.

**The Chair:** We're trying to get the precedent whereby we're not having everybody on the committee go. There is a cost issue. But in the summer it would be the same cost.

• (1340)

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** I didn't know the directive—

**The Chair:** It's not a directive yet.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** The environment committee, in my experience, almost never travels. This is one of the least travelling committees on the Hill—which is fine.

**The Chair:** Oh, I know. The budget we have is very little, and we have so much to do.

Yes, that gets back to those two trips. If we have to split it up, then we go for the two trips, and some people go to the North and some go....

Mr. Amos.

**Mr. William Amos:** Could we look for a week in mid-August and look for a shorter period for the North, in September, in between the two caucus meeting times?

**The Chair:** It would have to be when the House is sitting, because in September, one party has its caucus and another has its caucus, and then you're into that week, which is August-September.

But the first week back, is that what you mean?

**Mr. Jim Eglinski:** Yes, I meant the first week back.

**The Chair:** Okay.

All right. We're going to send out a little "give us your things for August and September"—

**Mr. Jim Eglinski:** If we were to come halfway the week before the 19th and overlapped for a couple of days, that would be the smart thing.

**The Chair:** Nathan, your caucus goes all the way to the 15th, is that right?

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Yes.

**The Chair:** But we could leave, could we, on the 16th, and then go over the weekend and on into the next week? That's a possibility, too.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Yes.

**Mr. Jim Eglinski:** That would probably work with a lot of people.

The only thing I'm looking at is that if people from eastern Canada are going to fly to the west and look at these things, to split it up into another trip means double the amount in airfares, in a sense—

**The Chair:** Yes, you're coming and then you're going back. It doesn't make any sense.

**Mr. Jim Eglinski:** If we organize it, then, we're all down there, we go, and we get it done with.

**The Chair:** Okay, I will talk to the whip and get that sorted, and if you're okay to go on the 16th, 17th, 18th and into the next week....

You're okay to do that?

**Mr. Jim Eglinski:** I think I'm okay.

**The Chair:** The rest of us are probably okay to do it.

We're going the 16th, 17th, 18th...so it will be Friday, Saturday, Sunday, and then into that first week that we're back.

Okay?

**Mr. John Aldag:** For...?

**The Chair:** For a trip. If we can work it all in together, we will; if not, we'll have to try to split up for two.

We need two things before we all run to the House. We have to go back to the witnesses.

We now are pretty sure that we're going to be doing a trip, travelling. Given that, and given that we may get a chance to do Jasper and that, who do we need to hear from?

We had West Coast Environmental Law, we had Pacific Salmon Foundation, we had Stewart Elgie. We'd likely try to wrap the town of Jasper in, with a visit to them. All right?

**Mr. John Aldag:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Okay. So, we have three, and you supported.... I'm sorry, Tim, you supported—

**Mr. Tim Williams:** I suggested.

**The Chair:** —you suggested West Coast Environmental Law.

**Mr. Tim Williams:** Yes.

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** I put the green budget in there, just as a paying mechanism, and how do the finances work on it. The green budget is just many...you get one shot, and you get everybody's opinion.

**The Chair:** They're submitting a brief to us. We need to decide who we...?

**Mr. William Amos:** Why don't we pick one each and go for it?

**The Chair:** No, because we only have one spot. We have just moved four over to the 17th. We only have one spot, so who do we offer it up to? Let's have two because one might say no.

Do you want to try West Coast Environmental Law or the Pacific Salmon Foundation?

**An hon. member:** Those would be my thoughts.

**The Chair:** West Coast? Pacific Salmon?

**Mr. Jim Eglinski:** I thought that's what we agreed on.

**Mr. William Amos:** I'm for Mr. Elgie.

**The Chair:** You're for Mr. Elgie.

Where are you, John?

**Mr. John Aldag:** I've had some good dealings with the Pacific Salmon group, if we're looking at marine.

**The Chair:** Okay, and Jim you're for Pacific Salmon?

**Mr. Jim Eglinski:** Yes.

**The Chair:** You're for Pacific salmon?

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Okay, so let's try first for the Pacific Salmon, then as a backup West Coast, because that carries on with the marine issue.

For witnesses for the CEPA study and the climate change study, we need to start putting some names....

Let's tackle CEPA first. We have the 19th. We have the Canadian Consumer Specialty Products Association, and the Canadian Environmental Law Association.

The challenge is we need to start doing the invitations. Does anybody have any problems with May 19 because we need to do—

• (1345)

**The Clerk:** That's already booked.

**The Chair:** Let's look at the other ones, and if we can start working on the 7th, the 9th, and the 14th, the clerk will be most grateful because it's a lot of work to call these people and try and get them in, and she doesn't want to leave it too late.

Are you okay with what we have there? We've tried to kind of keep them in the buckets again, so there's some focus in the presentations.

If you have any issues, let us know, otherwise we're going to start moving forward on these witnesses, if you're all right with that.

The last one is climate change. We only have the two days, but we've come forward with some ideas on the climate change based on what everybody put together, and Tim and Penny's experience, right?

What do you think about these?

**Mr. Nathan Cullen:** We don't have any government witnesses coming in.

**The Chair:** Yes, I'm noticing that. I would say Pembina probably would be one of the ones we would like to hear from.

Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada was one that we proposed. We should put that in there.

We'll Environment and Climate Change Canada.

Oh yes, a Facebook discussion. The motion we wanted to have on the table was to start looking into doing it. How does everybody feel about Facebook and having a Facebook for our committee? It's a bit different, but times are changing.

**Mr. William Amos:** Can we have the options presented to us?

**The Chair:** Sure, that would be great.

You either are or aren't. It's like some people tweet, some people don't.

Okay, so what we're going to do is we're going to move together as a committee to have it investigated and see what needs to be—

Jim, are you okay with that?

**Mr. Jim Eglinski:** Yes, a draft proposal brought forward so we can take a look at it.

**The Chair:** All in favour?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

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

The meeting is adjourned.

---







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

---

### SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

---

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

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

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

---

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

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

---

### PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

---

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

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

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

---

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