



House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

ENVI • NUMBER 005 • 1st SESSION • 38th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Thursday, November 4, 2004

—
Chair

Mr. Alan Tonks

All parliamentary publications are available on the
"Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire" at the following address:

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

Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

Thursday, November 4, 2004

• (0905)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Alan Tonks (York South—Weston, Lib.)): If members could take their seats, please, we will begin the meeting.

Good morning, Mr. Minister, and your colleagues who are with you today.

Good morning, members of the committee and ladies and gentlemen.

On the agenda this morning for the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development, Mr. Minister, we are dealing with Bill C-7, an act to amend the Department of Canadian Heritage Act and the Parks Canada Agency Act and to make related amendments to other acts.

We have representatives from Parks Canada, Mr. Latourelle, chief executive officer; and from the Department of Justice, Alexandre Larouche, senior counsel and manager.

We will also be dealing with Bill C-15, which is an act to amend the Migratory Birds Convention Act, 1994, and the Canadian Environmental Protection Act. Accompanying the minister with respect to that bill, from the Department of Environment, Trevor Swerdfager, director general, Canadian Wildlife Service; Stephen Wendt, acting director, Migratory Birds Branch; and Asit Hazra, chief, Emergencies Prevention Division, Environmental Protection Service.

Mr. Minister, welcome. We'll certainly invite any comments upfront from you, and then we'll go to questions from members of the committee with respect to the bill.

Mr. Minister.

[Translation]

Hon. Stéphane Dion (Minister of the Environment) : Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Good morning, colleagues.

[English]

This is my first opportunity to be with the committee as the minister. I enjoyed the time I spent with you when I was a member of the committee.

Let me tell you that this committee has a great history of collaboration and good results with the government for the cause of the environment. I want to pay tribute to the former chair, who is just behind us. He has been great. I'm sure, Mr. Chair, that you realize

how much you have a duty to try to match the same level of quality. I'm very confident that you will receive the help of everyone, including me.

• (0910)

The Chair: It's a humbling experience, Minister. I can assure you of that.

Hon. Stéphane Dion: It's the same for me.

How do you want to proceed today? We have two bills. Do you want me to describe the two bills one after the other, or pause after one to open the discussion, and after that's discussed, talk about the other?

The Chair: The committee probably would prefer it if we do them one at a time, Minister. If you could address your comments to Bill C-7 first, then we'll have our questions on it.

Hon. Stéphane Dion: I'd prefer that too, to not mix the two topics.

The Chair: Thank you.

[Translation]

Hon. Stéphane Dion : If you agree, we will begin with Bill C-7, an Act to amend the Department of Canadian Heritage Act and the Parks Canada Agency Act and to make related amendments to other acts. This bill will give legislative effect to the Government reorganization that was announced on December 12, 2003, when the responsibility for the Parks Canada Agency was transferred from the Minister of Canadian Heritage to the Minister of the Environment.

This bill will also provide a legislative framework for the two Orders in Council that were implemented in December of 2003 and January of 2004 to effect this change. And it will formally acknowledge that Parks Canada is responsible for historic places in Canada, and for the design and implementation of federal government programs that relate to built heritage.

It will do so by updating the Department of Canadian Heritage Act and the Parks Canada Agency Act, and by amending the statutes that enable Parks Canada to deliver its mandate : the Canada National Parks Act, the Historic Sites and Monuments Act, the Canada National Marine Conservation Areas Act, the Species at Risk Act, the Canada Shipping Act, and the Heritage Railway Stations Protection Act.

[English]

My own opinion is that it's a technical change, but at the same time it has consequences. For this committee, the consequence is that this committee now has the responsibility for national parks.

I want to insist on something. It makes sense that national parks
[Translation]

and marine conservation areas.

[English]

are going to Environment Canada. The choice of the government has been to include historic sites, because the sense was that to leave historic sites to Heritage Canada, to split the two, would be too complicated, because in many places they have been integrated for years.

So we have—me as a minister and you as a committee—the responsibility for historic sites. Maybe it's a bit odd that it is at Environment Canada instead of Heritage Canada, but if we forget that....

As an individual, I care so much about the history of my country, the capacity to bring it to Canadians in a way that they have access to it, that I will be very committed to this task. I'm sure that will be the case for all of us. I just wanted to insist on it. Sometimes, on paper, a change may be...oh, why are they doing that? Once it's done, the responsibilities are on shoulders.

And I want to say that Stéphane Dion, the individual, and each of you, I'm sure, care so much about our historic sites that we will deal with them with the same determination we do with everything that is clearly linked to the environment and the nature of our great country.

[Translation]

It's important to remember our historic sites, particularly since we're facing a difficult situation, whether it be with respect to marine areas, national parks or historic sites.

The Auditor General stated in her 2003 report that there is a risk that many of these icons of Canada could be permanently lost if we don't take action now. In fact, only one third of the heritage assets managed by Parks Canada are in good condition. Without restoration and conservation, the remainder are at significant risk. Access to some of these places is now restricted to protect public health and safety. If you like, Mr. Latourelle can provide details in that regard.

The national challenge facing us is daunting. In just one generation, 20 per cent of the built heritage in our rural and urban communities has been permanently lost. Our challenge is really to ensure that Canada's heritage sites are protected for the benefit of Canadians, and that our historic buildings continue to provide valuable links to our past, and to contribute to Canada's sustainable economy and to the vitality of our communities.

I believe that we have a responsibility to conserve these special places, and that the best way to meet this challenge is for the federal government to take the lead in building a culture of heritage conservation in Canada, in partnership with provincial and territorial governments. We mustn't forget the 688 national historic sites that are not federally owned but for which we have indirect

responsibility, at the very least, a duty to work in close partnership with the provinces, the territories and all stakeholders.

I want to add that I am determined to take action, not only in relation to the national parks and marine conservation areas, but also our historic sites. I will certainly be making the argument that not acting now would only increase the costs of implementing such measures. Canada's national parks, national historic sites and national marine conservation areas contribute \$1.2 billion annually to our national gross domestic product, and provide 38,000 full-time jobs. Every dollar we invest in these places contributes \$3.50 to our GDP. So, there is more than a three-fold multiplier effect. In many cases, this contribution flows through small communities, rural areas and Aboriginal communities. For example, the Fortress of Louisbourg National Historic Site of Canada contributes \$16 million annually to Nova Scotia's GDP, and the equivalent of 280 full-time jobs.

In closing, I would simply like to say that I believe Canada's national parks, national historic sites and national marine conservation areas represent the soul of Canada and that they are a central part of who we are and what we are. They are places of magic and wonder and heritage. Together, we hold them in trust for the benefit of this and future generations. Canada has the distinction of having established the first national parks service in the world. Over the decades, our system of national parks has grown to include 41 national parks and park reserves. This legacy was made possible, in large part, through the support of provincial and territorial governments, Aboriginal people, and local communities. The creation and management of national parks is a delicate balance between protection of ecologically significant areas of important to wildlife, and meeting the economic and social needs of communities. It requires collaboration and understanding. We are fortunate, not only because this has occurred, but also because Canada is blessed with exceptional national treasures.

In March of 2003, the government allocated \$144 million over five years, and \$29 million annually thereafter, for Parks Canada to create and operate ten new national parks, and five new national marine conservation areas of Canada. This action plan has already produced two new national parks. Ultimately, we intend to ensure that each of the 39 natural regions of Canada is represented by at least one national park. The government is also working with partners to add an estimated 15,000 square kilometers to our system of national marine conservation areas. This represents a major step forward for the global conservation of marine habitat, and is consistent with the recent Speech from the Throne in which our government made a commitment to create new marine protected areas as part of the Ocean Action Plan.

● (0915)

These two initiatives—the Action Plan to expand our system of national parks and national marine conservation areas, and the Action Plan on Ecological Integrity—represent the most ambitious programs in this regard in over 100 years. I hope that I can count on your support for these initiatives and for Bill C-7.

● (0920)

[*English*]

It is perhaps only a technical initiative, but it is giving us a huge amount of responsibility. That is what I have tried to briefly describe in my presentation.

Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

Perhaps I can get a little direction from the committee. We have Bill C-15, which we'll have the minister present, and then we'll have questions on that. In the interest of time, would the committee agree to use obviously the order that we have, but narrow the time to 10 minutes for each party, and just use that as our general guideline? After the 40 minutes we would go into the next bill. I'm just trying to finish both bills in the timeframe of this committee meeting.

Is there any opposition to doing that? The Bloc Québécois would have 10 minutes, the Liberals would have 10 minutes, and the Conservatives and the NDP, 10 minutes. If there is any excess time, then we could have a general question period within that 40 minutes at the end.

Are there any problems with that? Seeing none...

If there are problems along the way, we can be flexible enough to go back to our questioning schedule.

Let's go in order, in 10-minute envelopes. We'll go first to Conservative Party representative Mr. Richardson.

Mr. Lee Richardson (Calgary Centre, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Mr. Minister. We do appreciate your appearance again at the committee. Let me say that with regard to your consideration of the committee from the outset, having met with us all previously, I very much appreciate your direction and attitude toward the committee and the House.

With regard to this bill, we have no substantive argument with the premise at all. In my view, the initial part of the bill, merely transferring this from the Minister of Canadian Heritage to the Minister of the Environment, is something that's welcome. Certainly the minister spoke on a personal and individual basis of his pleasure in having this transferred back to the department that he is responsible for. I think you would find very little argument certainly among my constituents, who are large users of Banff National Park. I'm sure anyone who enjoys Banff National Park and the integrity of that park would agree with me that we are also very pleased to have it under a ministry of your direction as opposed to Sheila Copps'.

In any event, with that, Minister, I don't have any specific questions. I just wanted to comment that the Conservative Party is pleased with this direction, with your direction thus far in the

department, with the open nature of your process. We appreciate that and hope that we can continue this cooperation.

The Chair: Mr. Jean, did you have anything to add to that?

Mr. Brian Jean (Fort McMurray—Athabasca, CPC): Just briefly.

I also am very pleased to see this new merger. I think it's necessary for Canadians and necessary for our future. It will encourage utilization and make sure our parks are used. As well, being from northern Alberta, I'd like to see sustainable, long-term usage of the parks to make sure that future generations have it, and I think this is the marriage that will do it.

Thank you.

The Chair: Minister, did you wish to reply to either of those members?

Hon. Stéphane Dion: I just want to thank my two colleagues. I'm looking forward to a very positive collaboration.

Banff is a good example of the difficulties we have. We need always to find a good balance, because there is a lot of economic development there. It makes sense in terms of the communities and the economic health of the province and the country, and our capacity to welcome tourists in good facilities, but at the same time, we have to protect nature. If nature is not there, then there is no park.

This is a very good example. The highway is particularly dangerous there, much more so than the average in the province of Alberta. That's why I'm very pleased to have announced recently funding of \$50 million to try to improve the situation. At the same time, I need to find money to improve nature, which is always the difficulty we have, and to create new natural parks when we don't necessarily have all the funding we need to keep the ones we do have in good shape.

For us, this will always be something to look at with a lot of attention, to balance the economic development with the ecological integrity, to keep the parks we have in good shape and to create some new ones where otherwise we may lose the nature that we do have.

An example is the Okanagan Valley, with its salts and its desert ecosystem. If we don't act, we may put that at risk, but it will be very costly to protect the ecosystem there. Development is already there.

I'm sure you're aware of all the difficulties we have to face and to discuss between us in order to find good solutions.

● (0925)

The Chair: Thank you, Minister.

Mr. Bigras.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, BQ) : Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, as you know, we have already expressed our support in principle for the bill you have tabled. Listening to you this morning, I could have sworn that you were personally behind these amendments to the legislation. Indeed, you stated that you feel very, very strongly about the history of Canada. I even had the feeling I was hearing the Minister of Canadian Heritage speak.

I do have one question, though, not because I don't support the bill—quite the contrary. I'm just wondering to what extent you will make a distinction between the need to maintain the ecological integrity of our historic places, canals and museums for which Parks Canada is responsible and those activities which fall within the purview of Canadian Heritage.

As I understand the spirit of this bill, the goal is to better protect the ecological integrity of these various places or areas by transferring them from Canadian Heritage to Environment Canada. What I need from you is some reassurance or affirmation that the action you take in future will indeed be aimed at preserving the ecological integrity of these areas, places and museums, and not, to the detriment of that ecological integrity—and I won't use the term “propaganda”—to engage in large-scale promotion of Canada. It is a well-known fact, Minister, that you are one of its strongest advocates. What concerns me, and you referred to this earlier, is that one third of these sites are already in such a disastrous state as to be dangerous.

Consequently, Minister, I would like to explain how you can guarantee us that ecological integrity is indeed the most fundamental objective here, with a view to ensuring that the spirit of the bill that you tabled at first reading will be honoured.

Hon. Stéphane Dion : Thank you very much. You have given me an opportunity to express just how proud I am to be following in the footsteps of my predecessor, Mr. David Anderson. The two bills I am presenting here today are his, and he deserves the credit for them.

If I focussed this morning on historical sites, it is because I assumed that the nature of our country and protecting our ecosystems is something all of us at this table feel strongly about. Also, the fact that through these changes, we are inheriting responsibility for historic sites in Canada might have seemed surprising. That is why I wanted to place special emphasis on that particular question.

However, as Minister of the Environment, it is clear to me that the national parks are a critical component of the lever available to us to protect our ecosystems and biodiversity, and to strengthen all Canadians' awareness of environmental issues.

Those linkages are not without relevance for our sense of history. We will certainly be able to reconcile all of these things.

Mr. Christian Simard (Beauport—Limoilou, BQ) : Minister, in a previous life, before the creation of the Agency, I worked at Forillon National Park and at Parks Canada's Quebec City office. I have stayed in pretty close contact with Parks Canada employees and I can tell you that since the Agency was created, they have been and continue to be extremely depressed and lack motivation. In the past,

these employees were very proud of what they were doing in the national parks and of the chance to tell our history.

They now say they are forced to manage bare-bones budgets in a highly centralizing Agency that lacks resources. They have also told me that there was de facto recognition by Parks Canada of the existence of the Quebec nation, since it was Quebec historians recounting Quebec's history. I am wondering whether there is not a danger, given that the historians are now in Ottawa and may not have that type of sensibility, that there may be some deviation from the history of the Quebec nation. They have fundamental concerns in that regard. Parks Canada used to be known for its highly experienced and competent historians, who had developed fabulous interpretation centres.

These days in my riding, you would see that Cartier-Brébeuf Park, where Jacques Cartier spent the winter of 1535, is neither an object of pride nor a place you would want to visit. Frost fencing encloses the small park. The replica of Jacques Cartier's boat has disappeared, having rotted. The interpretation centre now looks more like a hangar. Jacques Cartier is part of Quebec's history, and this is an absolute disgrace for all concerned.

In a way, if steps are not taken to preserve these sites, even though we're not opposed to a bill setting out the responsibilities of one department as opposed to another, we can't really work up much enthusiasm for it. The Parks Canada Agency is known to have a tendency to create protected areas but then do absolutely nothing. What this means is that people think that these sites are being conserved and protected, when that is not in fact the case. I can tell you the situation now is even worse than it was previously.

I would be interested in hearing your comments on that.

● (0930)

Hon. Stéphane Dion : Thank you very much. I fully agree that this is a concern. I myself have met with many employees and unions. My welcome gift was a strike in the national parks. So, I share your sentiment that this is an area that we all have to pay close attention to.

You mentioned that in many cases, once a protected area has been created, the necessary maintenance and development do not unfold as planned. The difficulty is always to choose whether to create new parks or properly maintain the ones we already have. My initial reaction would have been that we should focus on maintaining what we have. However, in recent months, I have received a steady stream of requests for new parks to be created; sometimes just the idea of having to say no breaks my heart. Why? Because if we don't establish these special areas, we won't have an opportunity to do so in future, because we will already have lost these ecosystems. When an ecosystem becomes endangered, it is difficult for environmental officials to refuse such requests, because then they are shouldering a tremendous responsibility for potentially irreparable harm.

However, that uses up money that could be devoted to proper maintenance of the parks we already have. So, there will be very intense budget discussions with the Minister of Finance of these issues. I want to thank you for drawing attention to our current problems.

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Bigras, three minutes.

[Translation]

Mr. Bernard Bigras : Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Minister, I think you have just...

[English]

The Chair: Sorry, one minute.

[Translation]

Mr. Bernard Bigras: ... put your finger on the real issue, in a sense. That was the very point I made in my speech in the House of Commons. We have two choices.

Do you not think a better approach would be to invest in the parks we already have, rather than creating new conservation areas and parks? Personally, I love camping with my family and I visit La Mauricie National Park at least twice a year. I can tell you that the parks are in very bad shape.

In terms of strategic priorities, should we not be investing in the parks we already have, rather than creating new ones? That way, we wouldn't be creating new conservation areas right and left that will not be maintained. By expanding our goals, we end up no longer targeting the one that underpins the needed action.

Hon. Stéphane Dion: I couldn't agree with you more on that. I would simply add that if we run the risk of losing an endangered ecosystem forever, we may want to consider protecting it legally by making it into a park, even if that means we will have to wait to develop it, once we have looked after the ones we already have.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

Members, just remember it is the bill that is the focus. I appreciate this is an opportunity to ask those questions of the minister, but thank you.

Mr. McGuinty, and then we'll have 10 minutes, Mr. Wilfert.

• (0935)

Mr. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.): Good morning, Mr. Minister, and thank you for joining us this morning.

[Translation]

It's a great pleasure to see you again. I want to thank all of our guests this morning.

[English]

Mr. Minister, in terms of the practical impacts of this combination, which appears to me to be overdue—and congratulations for shepherding this through, based on the work of your predecessors—what are the practical implications on a financial level? For example, would the budget of Parks Canada be affected? Will there be greater synergy between your department and Parks Canada? I would assume there would be more capacity for pursuing, for example, the reference of our honourable colleague, Mr. Bigras, to ecological integrity concerns that are building on the work of the panel that was performed for Minister Coppins at the time. Will there be opportunities

for synergy—perhaps even increased funding levels—to deal with some of the challenges we're facing in the parks?

Hon. Stéphane Dion: I hope so, and I will do my best to give to Parks Canada the resources they need to help a situation that is very, very difficult.

It may be that because Environment Canada is a smaller department than Heritage Canada, which is a mega-department, the capacity for the minister to focus on parks will be higher, although Madam Coppins was very committed to that.

My own inclination is certainly to consolidate the ones we have, although we have an international commitment to increase the superfluities of our protected areas. As I said to our colleague, each time an ecosystem is endangered, the pressure to do something is great and is legitimate.

We will therefore have to balance a lot of different considerations, and I will work very, very closely with Mr. Latourelle and all his team. As I said, because of the fact the department is smaller, we will be able to put, really, all the ecology and the biodiversity more at the centre of the decision-making process in Ottawa.

The Chair: Mr. Scarpaleggia, then Mr. Wilfert.

[Translation]

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia (Lac-Saint-Louis, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to say that when we talk about Canadian historic sites, we are necessarily talking about the history of Quebec as well. For example, when I pass the historic Lachine Canal, it reminds me how proud I am to be a Quebecker, because this canal played a major role in opening up the North American continent.

My question, Minister, has to do with groups asking for sites to be designated historic. Very often, they are ultimately looking for a grant from Parks Canada to conduct restoration work or something similar.

In the past, I have noted that it is sometimes better to lower expectations. A few years ago, there was only \$60 million in the fund set aside for restoring historic sites. Along the same lines as what my colleague, Mr. McGuinty, was saying, I would like to know what you can do to obtain additional funding to beef up that budget.

Hon. Stéphane Dion: I am not able to announce anything today, although that is one of our many requests and is part of a whole package which is extremely important.

I have already talked about the importance of our national historic sites. However, as you can see, we have a great many demands being made of us. I can't possibly satisfy all those demands; however, I do understand that there are some pressing needs.

Over the next three years, however, we have absolutely no funding available to work with third parties.

• (0940)

[English]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Scarpaleggia.

Mr. Wilfert.

Hon. Bryon Wilfert (Richmond Hill, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Minister.

A comment on the issue of the protection of national and cultural heritage. I would remind members of this committee that there is no substantive policy provision changes or financial ones, but in listening to the minister and in listening to my colleagues, I can assure you, Minister, that we will do our utmost to flag and to promote very strongly additional funds for the department generally. But specifically, since we have lost 20% of our built heritage since the 1970s, it is really incumbent upon us to make sure that we do our utmost, not only in the area of preservation, but also to provide the financial tools to ensure that the integrity of the existing sites and parks are maintained. We do a lot of expansion, but it is really the maintenance that is critical.

The only question I have, actually, is not for the minister; it's for you, Mr. Chairman. From what I'm hearing around the table, I assume that at some point we will proceed with the bill and we will deal with it today.

The Chair: Of course, Mr. Wilfert, the chair will take its direction from the committee and we'll deal with that when we've finished our question period.

Hon. Bryon Wilfert: That was my understanding of the meeting.

The Chair: I appreciate that.

Hon. Bryon Wilfert: Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

Are there any other questions from this side?

Ms. Ratansi, you have four minutes.

Ms. Yasmin Ratansi (Don Valley East, Lib.): Mr. Minister, thank you for being here. I guess it's a very well thought transfer.

As an accountant, my only question is, is there any cost involved in transferring this from Heritage Canada?

Hon. Stéphane Dion: The answer is no. I wanted to keep my money for opening the Lachine Canal, as we have done. Now that the Lachine Canal is open, we need to know what to do with it. But it has been \$36 million. So it's the kind of investment, in answer to my colleague opposite, that I want to make, and I'm very happy that there is no bureaucratic cost in this transfer.

The Chair: Thank you.

We'll now go to Mr. Cullen.

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): Thank you very much, Mr. Chair, and thank you, Mr. Minister, for coming by.

It's interesting to hear you say, with respect to the transfer, there have not been any costs. According to people I've been talking with, in the previous transfer there were costs of \$20 million to \$25 million incurred, or some figure such as that, so I wouldn't mind some clarification on why that was.

That's my first question.

Of course, as my colleagues who commend the transfer said, this makes more sense. I do express equal concern around the resourcing of this with the expression of ambition to expand the system in the

reports we're hearing from people on the ground and from people on the committee.

I also have some concern around the language within the act, particularly around proposed section 2.1, the designation of the minister being a member of the Queen's Privy Council. My question is, why is the language vague? Why not name the Minister of the Environment as the lead? Why put it to this further decision that someone in the Privy Council will hold this title? Why not get specific and name it?

Also, I would encourage consideration to some amendment to this so that whenever the switch should be made again, if it needs to be made again in the future—I'm sure five years ago that wasn't the intention to switch it back, but here we are—that it does return to Parliament. Hearing the sentiments from my colleagues and from across the country about how important this is for Canadians...to be making decisions behind closed doors about transfers and my perception of costs and the dismay that creates within the staff. The devil is in the details, and I'm wondering if there's any devil scurrying around in this bill. Why not bring it back to Parliament, and why not make the language more clear?

I'll leave that, and then I have a few more to follow up on.

Hon. Stéphane Dion: Thank you so much, dear colleague.

My understanding is that the Prime Minister has the prerogative to decide how he will set his cabinet, so this kind of language is the usual one that is used. That's my understanding.

About the fact that this transfer does not cost any bureaucratic money, it's the case, but maybe Mr. Latourelle wants to speak about what happened in the past.

Mr. Alan Latourelle (Chief Executive Officer, Parks Canada Agency): I think the biggest change is in the past transition between ministers of Parks Canada. Parks Canada was not a separate agency, so we were part of different departments. In 1993, for example, Parks Canada moved from, at that time, Environment to Heritage. So all of our infrastructure, all of our corporate services, were linked. As we went through the process there were negotiations, resources allocated to the two organizations.

This time around it's quite different because Parks Canada is a separate agency and it has its own budget. So the whole budget of Parks Canada and its support systems have been transferred, and I now report to the Minister of the Environment. There are no cost implications for us.

• (0945)

Mr. Nathan Cullen: So you're not expecting any. Okay, good.

Just on the decision, bringing it back to Parliament or making a decision just within cabinet, there was some expression that it's a messy business to have to go through this, costly or cumbersome. I can't help but express that I think the complexity is important. No, it is not the quickest thing to do, but it is important to hear from people across the country and to go through this procedure.

My assumption is that this act would change this. The government would no longer have to go back to the House in order to secure the transfer of Parks Canada again in the future. Is that correct?

Hon. Stéphane Dion: Can you comment on this?

Mr. Alan Latourelle: The other point I think I'd like to add, and there are some concerns because if it changes from department to department and the overall direction of Parks Canada.... The members need to be aware that this is dealing with the Parks Canada Agency Act, the organization. But, for example, in terms of our national parks, the National Parks Act of Canada is really what governs them. So in terms of ecological integrity, only if that act is changed will ecological integrity not be the first priority, and I don't foresee that.

Basically, we have other acts that govern Parks Canada operations and that ensure that ecological integrity in this case is the primary responsibility of Parks Canada.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: Okay.

I have just one more question. I'm curious, with the expression of new parks and the ambition to have new places, what does consultation look like right now with respect to the first nations of Canada? A lot of the places I've seen are unceded territory where treaties may or may not exist. How favourable has the process been, and what is your approach?

I hear disturbing stories of Monsieur Chrétien when he was in the seat just pointing at areas outside a plane and deciding they were going to be parks. That's something we simply can't have in this day and age.

Hon. Stéphane Dion: Yes, it was the beginning of the 1970s. At that time Mr. Chrétien was voted the minister for national parks and he had a lot of responsibilities. He was able to make the decisions on his own, and thanks to his decisions we have saved a lot of superficialities for the protection of our ecosystems.

You're right to say that we are in another world today. I cannot be like this, deciding what will be a national park. We are not in 1970; we are in 2004.

And you're right to say that one important consideration is the aboriginal peoples, both in creating a park, because, historically speaking, some parks have been created within the process of a negotiation for land claims and self-government.... And once the parks exist, how do we make sure the aboriginal populations are well involved in the enjoyment, development, and protection of the park, and make sure they have good training to do so? It's a responsibility that we must keep the same level of quality, and we cannot afford, as conservationists, to put that at risk.

This is for me one of the preoccupations I have, and I have already spoken to Mr. Latourelle about how, in our action plan, we will make sure the aboriginal peoples of Canada will have a very important role to play.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: One last comment on that. The Gwaii Haanas park that sits on the Queen Charlotte Islands, there's an account—SMFRA is what it's called for various reasons, the South Moresby account. That's sitting within cabinet and it needs to be transferred over. It would be a strong declaration to first nations to finally make the transfer of payments to that. We can take that up later with perhaps some of your staff.

I think first nations are looking for a strong sentiment from you and your colleagues that it will be an inclusion process; it won't be an afterthought, it won't be something down the line—particularly in the areas I represent.

Thank you for your—

Hon. Stéphane Dion: Please, we should discuss it.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: I would love to do that.

Thank you very much for your answers today.

• (0950)

The Chair: Members of the committee, the only group who has not exhausted its ten minutes is the Conservatives. Mr. Jean has indicated that he would like to have a comment to take up the balance of his time.

Mr. Jean.

Mr. Brian Jean: Thank you.

Sometimes it's an advantage going first and sometimes it's not. After hearing my colleagues from the Bloc discuss some of the issues in Quebec, I thought it would be appropriate for me to comment.

First, I think it's commendable that you are taking the approach to set aside more land for parks rather than less at this time. I think that's a good approach. Even if we can't maintain them, at least we can set them aside and make sure that development doesn't happen within them so they're not lost forever.

Second, I would invite you to northeastern Alberta, up to Fort McMurray. Most people who visit that area always comment on the oil sands and go up there for them. I would like to invite you up there to look at the other natural wonders that are there, such as Wood Buffalo National Park and the sand dunes in that area, which are, quite frankly, in my opinion, a natural wonder of the world. Lake Athabasca, again, is right on the shield and it's just an incredible and beautiful area that will be lost forever if something is not done in that area.

I would just like to comment that I have spent some time in Quebec, and in Ontario now, for the first time really. I've driven around, and I'm very impressed with the national parks here. We don't have to worry about the ones in northeastern Alberta, at least not about the infrastructure because there isn't any infrastructure. There aren't even outside toilets.

So as far as infrastructure in northeastern Alberta and setting aside those things, I think it's long overdue to give some attention to those areas rather than just the oil sands themselves and the gas that comes out of this area.

Just as a matter of history, the oldest community in Alberta is in my area, Fort Chipewyan. It is in a state of destitution, especially for the aboriginals in that area, notwithstanding that it's part of Wood Buffalo National Park and there is a lot of potential there for the aboriginals to maintain those sites. Again, Fort McMurray and that area has been responsible for much of the development in western Canada, and it certainly has much the same history as Quebec and the rest of Canada, being the trade route for salt, fur, and fish over the years.

I would like to say it would be good, Minister, if it would be possible sometime in the future to give some attention to those areas that are really neglected. If we don't set them aside at this stage—the development in the area has expanded tenfold in the last fifteen years—and if we don't do something, we're going to lose them forever. And those areas are incredible.

The Chair: Mr. Minister.

Hon. Stéphane Dion: Thank you so much. You would be very good as a tourist developer. You have good arguments for your province. And you're right, there are a lot of things to do in Alberta. As you know, we're well involved in Alberta. It's the province where the parks have been the most developed in Canada, and for good reason. The capacity there is tremendous, but the needs are huge, and I'm well aware of that.

The Chair: Thank you, Minister, and thank you, members.

I think that was a very fulsome discussion. The questions and answers, I think, give you a very clear indication, Minister, of the interest and depth of knowledge that each of the members have with respect to their regions and provinces. I know that you and your officials were listening to both your answers and the questions.

From the chair's perspective...and I'm sure those who are listening from across Canada, watching these proceedings, can be sure that the spirit and the substance of the bill is in fact going to be the guide to the stewardship with respect to the parks, and I think that's what we all have an interest in maintaining.

This is the first bill we're going through for which, as far as I'm aware, there are no amendments. When we do have amendments we go through them individually, but I would seek the consent of the committee to simply put the bill as if it were a clause-by-clause consideration. We have clauses 1 to 28. I would entertain a motion, if I have consent to do so, and I don't see anybody opposed to it, to put the clauses 1 to 28 as they were approved.

Let us go, with the exception of clause 4 because Mr. Cullen has something on clause 4. May I take the bill as approved, clauses 1 to 28, with the exception of clause 4?

(Clauses 1 to 3 inclusive agreed to)

(Clauses 5 to 28 inclusive agreed to)

(On clause 4)

• (0955)

The Chair: Mr. Cullen.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: This speaks to my question earlier around the process of how the parks get shifted around. While the committee is now in agreement and we have strong support for where Parks is ending up, my concern is within clause 4, that this designation happens within cabinet, behind closed doors. That is a concern for me. I'm concerned that given that it's such an important piece of the Canadian identity and such an important piece of who we are as a nation, it can happen without the discretion of Parliament seeing it. From my understanding—and I'm new to this game, and I'll take the committee's discretion on this—it seems as though this clause is an important one not to have here. I would like us to go through what has been described to me as a cumbersome procedure when the government would like to move it around again. I've had some non-government agencies describe concerns about the future and ask if government could not just simply transfer it to Industry, or could they transfer it to Transportation, or transfer it to any department they so wish without Parliament having oversight. Procedurally, I'm out in the grey zone here, but try to understand what my intention is.

I believe that switching the mandate, not so much the mandate but who has prerogative over parks in Canada, should go through the process that we are experiencing right now. I don't feel this is a cumbersome move. That is my recommendation to the committee. I'm not 100% sure that this is the clause that we need to amend or strike, but this is the feeling I'm getting from the questions. I haven't been satisfied with the answers so far.

The Chair: Can I, as chair, make a comment on that?

You have the sense of the concern that has been raised. The clause we're talking about is clause 4:

The Act is amended by adding the following after section 2:

2.1 The Governor in Council may designate a member of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada to be the Minister for the purposes of this Act.

I think the question raised by the member is, is this a mechanism that is vague, that suggests that maybe the spirit of this may not be implemented in a fulsome way? Correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Cullen, but...

Mr. Nathan Cullen: There is no malcontent on this. It is forecasting five, ten, fifteen years down the road as government shifts around ministries and shifts around prerogatives and directions. Heaven forbid, if there were a different government in power and it had a very different sentiment and didn't express the minister's passion for ecological integrity, for example.

I'm concerned that these types of amendments allow a government to simply make the switch, perhaps change the mandate and focus in the switch, and have a minister with less enthusiasm and passion—and I don't mean this with any flippancy; this is a serious concern. A clause like this allows the move to be made and Parliament not to be consulted, and what's done is done. Suddenly, our parks become Disneyland and other things driven by a profit motive and not ecological integrity.

The Chair: Minister, would you like to respond or direct that to your officials?

Hon. Stéphane Dion: I would like to say that I would not portray a governor in council as something done behind closed doors. There is a process and this must be done officially. It is not behind closed doors any more than by the process you suggest. There may also be costs with what you suggest as a process. That's why it is the way it is now, and it is the prerogative of the Prime Minister in addition to this.

Perhaps Mr. Latourelle wants to add to this.

Mr. Alan Latourelle: In regard to some of the issues you raised concerning, for example, national parks specifically, and how we manage them and the orientation of them, clearly, that is governed by the National Parks Act, which, again, puts ecological integrity as the first priority. Should that change in the future, it would require an act of Parliament. In terms of ensuring that our national parks are protected and that ecological integrity is the first priority as to how we manage those parks, it is clearly in the National Parks Act. Any changes to that would require an act of Parliament.

The Chair: Mr. Wilfert.

• (1000)

Hon. Bryon Wilfert: Mr. Chairman, I was going to say we're talking about two different acts here. That's fine. I understand Mr. Cullen's concern, but I certainly would assure him that any changes in terms of integrity issues would be debated in Parliament, and rightfully so.

I would also point out that public opinion, I'm sure, would come down very hard if it was ever suggested to go to Industry or any other area. This is an excellent fit. The issue of integrity that we talked about in the House would certainly be dealt with in a very open and transparent way.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair: All right.

Mr. Cullen, we're both learning in terms of process. If you wanted to be on record with respect to at least your current concerns with respect to this, you could simply vote on division and then your vote would be recorded as opposed.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: Thank you, Chair.

The Chair: If there are no further questions, I'll put clause 4.

(Clause 4 agreed to on division)

The Chair: Shall the title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Shall the bill carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Shall I report Bill C-7 to the House without amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Minister.

We'll now go on to Bill C-15, an Act to amend the Migratory Birds Convention Act, 1994, and the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, 1999. Members of the committee, it seems that this process worked fairly well. Can I have your approval up front that we follow the same procedure?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: All right.

Mr. Minister.

Hon. Stéphane Dion: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank all my colleagues for the unanimous support for the bill we just mentioned. You mentioned that my officials are listening to my answers to the questions, and let me tell you that I believe that up to now they have enjoyed both and it's going well.

The other one is Bill C-15. Let's call it the birds' bill. This bill also came from the initiative of my predecessor. I am very pleased to bring it back to Parliament because I have received a lot of requests to do this from so many sides.

[*Translation*]

This bill addresses the hundreds of thousands of seabirds that are killed—some 300,000 according to estimates—every year in Canada's marine waters, through contamination by oily waste discharged illegal by ships.

All it takes is a single drop of oil the size of a quarter to kill one of our murres, puffins, dovebies or gulls. That drop of oil penetrates the natural defences of the birds affected and damages the unique structure of their feathers, which normally repel water and resist cold. The oil decreases the bird insulation, waterproofing and buoyancy, leading to death by hypothermia or starvation.

In addition, oil contains many harmful substances that, when ingested or inhaled by birds as they attempt to clean themselves, poison their internal organs and lead to debilitating or fatal consequences. Once oiled, the birds carry on a desperate fight against the elements as the cold of the ocean drains away their energy. It takes them days to die, and it is a battle they never win. The spectacle of dead and dying birds coming ashore covered in oil has raised the anger of the public and attention of the media, and rightly so.

Bill C-15 will increase our ability to take enforcement action against those shipowners and operators who try to save money or time at the expense of our ecosystems health, by illegally discharging oily wastes overboard.

We know that seabirds are found in the millions off our Atlantic and Pacific coasts and we suspect that we have bird oiling problems wherever large numbers of birds share the ocean with busy international ship traffic.

In fact, coasts in our Atlantic region are among the most important on the planet for seabirds, throughout the year. Also, the large seabird populations there are present in areas that are among the busiest shipping routes in the North Atlantic. And what complicates things even more is that most of these ships are only passing through; they do not necessarily enter our ports. So, we're dealing with a difficult situation, with large populations of seabirds, large numbers of ships and especially ships only passing through our waters.

We have also realized that over time, the gap between the Canadian penalty regime and those used in other countries, particularly the United States, has grown. As a result, calls for higher fines in Canada have, quite legitimately, been common.

•(1005)

[English]

This is not Canada's only legislation that addresses marine pollution. The Canada Shipping Act deals with the business of shipping and it has rules about pollution abatement equipment, logbooks, and so on that often make it the first point of reference in a case of oil pollution. So the adjustment to this act is very important. The environmental legislation in the bill I am proposing is amended to ensure full complementarity with the Canada Shipping Act. I'm saying that especially because the industry had some concerns about it and I'm confident we have fixed it.

Environment Canada, Transport Canada, and the Canadian Coast Guard intend to work together with the full suite of legislation and in conformity with international law to apprehend polluting ships. But what this bill is doing especially is to remove any ambiguity about the way the Migratory Birds Convention Act of 1994 and the Canadian Environmental Protection Act of 1999 work when they are enforced in the exclusive economic zone and when enforcement actions that must be taken against ships' crews are necessary. So this is the first thing, to extend our capacity to act far beyond the way it was before.

We need to send a message to the courts also in regard to the Migratory Birds Convention Act amendments specifying sentencing criteria. We also need to ensure that our enforcement officers have

the protection of the Criminal Code if people attempt to thwart them with bribery or assault.

These amendments will increase the maximum fine under the act to \$1 million, combined with provisions for a larger fine for repeat offences. It will provide sentencing guidelines so that penalties will be imposed that appropriately reflect the damage done to the environment.

[Translation]

Allow me to provide you with some details. For an individual or a ship convicted by summary proceeding, the maximum fines will increase to \$300,000, from \$100,000. For offences under the Criminal Code, fines will rise from \$250,000 to \$1 million. For any subsequent action, the penalty will be doubled, meaning an increase from \$300,000 to \$600,000 in one case, and from \$1 million to \$2 million in the others. There will also be an option to increase the penalties for every day that an offence was committed. As you can see, we're in a whole new ballgame.

[English]

The increased maximum fine brings the legislation into better conformity with the modern business of shipping, which is big business now.

Many ships ply Canadian waters far from the sight of land. It has not been easy to determine which ships are responsible for the many discharges of oil into marine waters. For this reason, some ship operators may think they will never get caught. Furthermore, without laws providing for fines that are proportionate to the environmental cost, some members of the shipping industry may believe it costs less to risk the fine than it does to discharge their waste legally when they arrive in port.

The increase in fines, as well as other provisions in the bill relating to the keeping of ships' records, will also better harmonize our approach with that of the United States, where fines for illegal discharges have been much higher than in Canada. With this bill, we are ensuring that those in charge of ships no longer think Canada is a place where they can illegally release pollution into marine waters with impunity.

With the increase in fines, we are working to influence ship operators' risk-benefit analysis in favour of the birds. Countries around the world have been trying to tighten legislation and enforcement in this area. Unfortunately, ships continue to pollute and birds keep dying by the hundreds of thousands. Canada is now among the world's riskiest places for birds on the sea. Our legislation must be brought up to date, with clear and practical enforcement powers so that the international shipping community will hear this message loud and clear. They want to have clarity and predictability, which the bill will provide for them.

Canada will not tolerate the senseless slaughter of birds by crews who hope to save a little time or money by flouting international codes and Canadian environmental laws. The measures described in this bill strengthen the commitments we have already made in the international conventions and that we have also made to Canadians to conserve biodiversity and to protect our natural heritage. Let this bill be a symbol of that care.

Oceans contribute billions of dollars to the Canadian economy, and ocean ecosystems support the health of our environment and our citizens. As committed in the Speech from the Throne, the government will contribute to the development of new ocean technologies, establish a network for marine protected areas, implement integrated management plans, and enhance enforcement of rules governing oceans and fisheries. Among these undertakings, this bill will not only stop the abuses of sea birds caught in oil slicks, but it will also demonstrate the commitment by Canada to its larger vision for a sustainable future for ocean resources.

Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

• (1010)

The Chair: Thank you, Minister.

We'll go to the Conservative Party.

Mr. Lee Richardson: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thanks again, Mr. Minister.

I suspect you may not get as pleasurable a ride again through committee as you will today. Here is another bill, I think, with a very good intent. I think we could only suggest it's a little late in coming, but even late is better than not at all.

I can recall, as a guy from the prairies, taking my small children to the beautiful beaches of our east coast and the absolutely devastating impact it had on my little girl to see those beautiful beaches on a sunny day and an oil-soaked bird flapping in its last movements on the beach, dying there. It's a tragic waste, a useless destruction of our offshore birds. I must say we're very pleased the government is taking action to hopefully resolve this problem.

It seems senseless, and you wonder why we investigate to find that many of these large, often foreign, shipping companies have little regard for our coastal waters and can simply get away with it. I was concerned to find that these large ships can get away with it because our coasts are inadequately monitored and surveyed. You're addressing that. For financial reasons, many of them simply wanted to avoid the costs of dumping bilge water legally in the port, or, even worse, the fines in Canada have been just too low, so they would just as soon risk getting caught. The chances of them being prosecuted are minimized because of the cross-jurisdictions between our various departments in Canada. Who is responsible for these things?

These are things that I see you have addressed in the bill. I think it can only be of benefit to our coasts and our marine waters that you are finally addressing these issues.

The other area I'm pleased about is that we will iron out these past jurisdictional problems between various government departments claiming responsibility for the protection of our coasts. I would ask you to confirm that it is your intent in the bill. We have Environment Canada responsible for the protection of migratory birds and the

marine environment; Transport Canada responsible for regulating shipping, pollution, and surveillance; the Department of Fisheries and Oceans...the coast guard responsible for marine pollution; and the Department of Justice handling legal matters. It just seems so complicated to stop something that so obviously needs to be stopped in our offshore waters and that is preventable. It's a tragic loss and waste to have this lack of protection for the birds offshore.

With that, I must say we are pleased to see this bill. I'm sorry it has taken so long to come forward. I appreciate your initiative in bringing this bill forward; we really have no objections to the intent of the bill.

Again, thank you for bringing it forward.

• (1015)

Hon. Stéphane Dion: Thank you so much, dear colleague, and thank you for the fact that we agree so much on the necessity of protecting our birds and the ecosystem.

On the necessity of having more clarification about the capacity of each body of government to work in a cohesive way, I fully agree. A memorandum of understanding on exactly how we will proceed through this bill, to be sure that the intent of the act will be on the sea, will be released before Christmas, I understand.

The Chair: Mr. Jean.

Mr. Brian Jean: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I do have some questions this morning.

As a litigator who actually argued on the other side for many years on these kinds of cases, I have some experience, and I compliment the writers and drafters of this particular bill in the use of their standard in law for search and seizure of boats. I think it's enough that it's not so far away that it can't be done, and I would like to compliment them on that.

I am concerned about some things. I didn't notice it in the bill, but first, is there a prohibition to ships entering some waterways—for instance, areas that are particularly sensitive to migratory birds and have been identified as vulnerable areas? Under this bill, is there any action to prohibit them from entering those areas?

Hon. Stéphane Dion: In the bill, have we identified some areas? It's not by areas that we are—

Mr. Brian Jean: It's a general perspective.

The next question I have is whether there are accounting provisions for dumping waste. Is there some measurement to take where an officer can enter the ship and see whether, obviously, bilge water has been dumped, and if so, a type of accounting provision that would enable someone to see that obviously they didn't dump it at the port facility, and since they would have had to have some waste, they would have dumped it on the open sea? Is there in the act any type of accounting provision for that?

Hon. Stéphane Dion: Mr. Swerdfager, please take the question.

Mr. Trevor Swerdfager (Director General, Canadian Wildlife Service, Environmental Conservation Service, Department of the Environment): There's nothing in the bill that specifically says provisions of that nature will be put in place.

Let me make sure I understand your question properly, though. I think what you're getting at is that if you went onto a vessel, you'd want to be able to say what has gone where, essentially, in terms of the substance flow.

There is a logbook for that. Operators are required to document where they move fluids from, from A to B. They are required to document in the logs whether or not substances have gone over the side in port. They're not required to have a document if they've violated the law, but they do keep very, very detailed records of where within the hull the fluids move. That can be inspected, and the bill does talk about the ability to seize those records should an inspector or enforcement officer wish to do so.

• (1020)

Mr. Brian Jean: I've also seen that the bill actually has penalties for destroying the documents or hiding them, and so on, and I think that's commendable.

Does the bill itself offer any incentives for operators to actually dump at our port facilities? I know it's a penalty bill, and you know, laws work on benefit or penalty, but sometimes an incentive is much better than a penalty.

Hon. Stéphane Dion: Yes, but it is not current practice in Canada to reward people for respecting the law. They are supposed to respect the law. You don't give them a reward for that.

Mr. Brian Jean: Absolutely, but with respect, Minister, I'm more interested in the birds than I am in how it works.

Hon. Stéphane Dion: I understand, but if we start here, you understand that it may be a precedent that will put us in great difficulty, that our law to protect the birds and animals or whatever will be weakened if we start to say, if you respect the law, you will have...I don't know what.

Mr. Brian Jean: I understand. The process is of interest to me, but the result is ultimately the only concern I have.

Hon. Stéphane Dion: I understand.

Mr. Brian Jean: I have two more issues, but the main concern I have is in regard to enforcement. I'm not going to make any political statements regarding our military or our coast guard, but I certainly am concerned about enforcement. Currently on the west coast we're analyzing less than one percent of the ships in our seas, in our seaways. I am very concerned about that. Are we going to see any substantial funding for helicopters and patrol ships or the utilization of our military to do what our coast guard currently can't and

additional funding to be able to actually do something with this bill, or is it going to be a bill that is great substantively but there is no action carried out? That is a great concern of mine.

Hon. Stéphane Dion: I understand your concern, certainly, that the law must be enforced. My own department spends about \$700,000 for that, and we estimate our need to be \$3 million. So it's part of the expenditure review process and this is what I'm asking, but it's only a piece. You also need the cost of surveillance and enforcement, borne by Transport Canada and the coast guard, not to mention the navy, as you said, which is much more costly than the money I need for my own department.

We have other solutions that are less costly, though, that will help us, new technological capacity. We have the pilot project contributed by the Canada Shipping Act, which has been only about \$300,000 annually, and that will give us by radar and satellite some capacity to see not only where the ships are but also where the oil is in the sea. This may be a very effective way to proceed that we didn't have in the past. With all these means put together, I am confident that we will be able to make sure our birds will be protected.

The Chair: I wonder if I could go to Mr. Bigras, and if we have enough time, we'll come back to you, with the committee's support.

Mr. Bigras.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Bigras: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, I can't help but recall the example of Bill C-34, which we studied in committee last spring. Indeed, the Committee went full steam ahead with passage of the bill, without even so much as deigning to hear a single witness. I remember quite clearly, Mr. Chairman, that at the time, you were a member of the Committee, and that the government majority came in with its steamroller to force the bill down the Committee's throat, flatly refusing to hear from certain witnesses.

For the sake of transparency, even if we were supportive of the principle underlying the bill, it would have been useful to hear from certain witnesses with a view to improving it.

This is probably a good piece of legislation. However, I want to be sure there are no loopholes. We all know that the shipping industry involves a very complex system of numbered companies, such that some companies might be able to escape punishment. Does the bill include the necessary guarantees that will make it impossible for shipping interests with numbered companies to escape prosecution? I see that as a fundamental point.

Second, some people, including the Shipping Federation of Canada, believe that the penalty provisions of the bill could violate human rights. When Bill C-34 was tabled, the Shipping Federation of Canada told us that there were a number of issues related to the penalty regime that could contravene the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Do you believe the bill is consistent with the Charter?

Third, clause 41, which deals with the principle of due diligence, could well allow certain companies to get around the legislation, even though that is not explicitly stated. A captain, engineer, manager, owner or board member could use the due diligence defence to avoid liability. Indeed, clause 41 provides a defence where it says "shall take all reasonable care". So, could counsel declare that the board member, captain or owner had taken all reasonable care?

I'm raising these questions to try and improve the bill and eliminate any possible loopholes, because I do think that we need tougher penalties, this being a major problem at this time. I want people to realize that we are here to improve the bill.

I would like the Minister to answer my three questions.

• (1025)

Hon. Stéphane Dion: Thank you for your questions.

As regards the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, that issue has been closely examined by the Department of Justice. We are on solid ground here.

In terms of the due diligence defence, in my view, such a defence could only be considered in a case involving an accident, where oil had been spilled unintentionally. It can't be used as a loophole. The captain must have taken all reasonable care. This refers to the speed with which the spill was detected. Most accidental spills—because it can happen—are detectable and can be corrected. We're talking about spills lasting about 20 minutes or covering an area of about 10 kilometres, because every linear kilometre of a slick represents about two minutes worth of oil being discharged into the water.

So, in normal circumstances, any spill lasting more than 20 minutes, either intentional or accidental, will probably be considered significant. I consider that to be completely reasonable and I don't think it could be used as a loophole.

As regards numbered companies, I would ask for some assistance from my officials.

[English]

The Chair: On penalties with respect to the charter, did you have that answered, Mr. Bigras?

• (1030)

[Translation]

Hon. Stéphane Dion: Yes, I did answer it. I believe both the letter and spirit of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms are adhered to in this bill.

Mr. Bernard Bigras: I understand, Mr. Chairman, but that is not the view of the Shipping Federation of Canada. I would like to hear what is behind that difference of opinion.

According to you, there are no loopholes here. I am going to wait to get an answer to my question, because the issue of numbered

companies is quite important. We have to ensure there are no potential loopholes here.

Hon. Stéphane Dion: The Shipping Federation of Canada met with my advisors yesterday, and I will ask Mr. Swerdfager to indicate what they discussed at that meeting.

[English]

Mr. Trevor Swerdfager: We met with representatives from the federation two days ago. We reviewed the bill in some detail with them. They had a number of concerns, some of which the member has identified, around Charter of Rights applications and the extent to which it would be appropriate to detain foreign vessels and foreign captains, if you will. They also had a number of questions regarding the connection between the contents of the bill and international shipping provisions, both in Canada and in the international framework context.

I don't wish to speak for them, of course, but we did go through the concerns they had in quite a bit of detail. We felt—and we feel that they felt—those concerns were addressed and resolved. In particular, they were comfortable with the discussion we had on the issues around the charter. While I for sure wouldn't want to try in any way to represent their views here today, certainly the discussion we had with them suggested that they were quite comfortable with the contents of the bill, as we went through it with them, particularly on this issue.

The Chair: Mr. Simard.

[Translation]

Mr. Christian Simard: Minister, as the saying goes, striving to better, oft we mar what is well. In this case, on reading the bill, the question that comes to mind is : why make things simple when you can make them complicated?

I have a question about liability. The Library of Parliament has provided us with briefing notes regarding the different pieces of legislation that apply in this area, namely the Canada Shipping Act, 2001, for which regulations are still pending, the Canada Shipping Act, and the Canada National Marine Conservation Areas Act.

Also, who will actually be responsible for implementing the bill? There are several references here to game officers. Should we not be talking about the Coast Guard instead? Cases have come before the court where the Crown abandoned the proceedings because the situation was so complicated that no one could have figured it out and because natural justice did not apply to the offender.

This seems to be a bill that was drafted quickly, that is a clone of Bill C-34 and that may have been poorly drafted to make it easier to enforce.

Those are my concerns. I'm not convinced we have taken the best or most effective approach here. I would prefer to support this bill, not only because of the principle behind it, but because I have been given real answers to all these questions.

Reading Ms. Gélinas' report on the MARPOL convention, it is clear that she literally boxes the ears of Transport Canada because there have been fewer and fewer aerial observations. In the last ten years, there have been fewer than there were previously, and there are few verifiable results. Consequently, the MARPOL convention on the dumping of waste at sea has turned out to be a total and complete failure.

Here very heavy penalties are being imposed and game officers are being entrusted with a responsibility they're not used to fulfilling. I'm afraid this will result in chaos and that we will ultimately have completely missed the point of this bill.

Hon. Stéphane Dion: I have to say I don't share that concern. On the contrary, this bill will allow us to avoid the kind of complications you have referred to and harmonize all these different pieces of legislation so that we can all work together and pull in the same direction. That is precisely the purpose of this bill.

Mr. Christian Simard: But who will be responsible for enforcing it? Transport Canada, Fisheries and Oceans Canada or Environment Canada?

Hon. Stéphane Dion: The Minister of the Environment will be responsible, but that doesn't mean I will be acting alone. I will be working with the other departments. That cooperation is critical, and the intent of this bill is to give us the means to do that.

M. Swerdfager might want to add something.

[English]

Mr. Trevor Swerdfager: As the minister mentioned earlier, the significant part of the implementation plan for this bill is to address the questions just raised, and also those raised at the outset by the gentleman who's walking to get a coffee right now.

We are going to work very hard to put in place a memorandum of understanding between the departments with interests in marine conservation. The conservation regime at sea is a complex one, and as has been identified, there are a number of pieces of legislation that do apply to that area. Because the situation is complex, different legislative tools are required, but with the memorandum of understanding our intention is to coordinate the application of this law.

Very clearly, the responsibility for it rests with the Minister of the Environment, but he and his colleagues and officials will be working closely with National Defence, Coast Guard, Transport, Fisheries and Oceans, and on occasion, where necessary, with provincial and territorial government agencies, to ensure we don't have operational chaos at sea—that very much the opposite is the case. The bill provides the legislative clarity for us to do that.

•(1035)

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Scarpaleggia.

[Translation]

Mr. Francis Scarpaleggia: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I was pleased to have an opportunity to take part in the debate on Bill C-15. Perhaps I should put this question to the Minister of Finance, but you may be able to enlighten me as well.

In the course of the debate, an opposition member spent a great deal of time underscoring the fact that companies that violate the law will be able to deduct any fines from their taxable income. I thought I had read somewhere that we had closed that loophole in the last budget. Do you know? No.

Second, I was wondering if you could give us any information about the *Tecum Sea* case. According to my information, the government suddenly ended the proceedings. Apparently that has raised some questions. Could you talk a little bit about that?

Hon. Stéphane Dion: That's the reason we're here. I don't know the details of the case, but I do know that is one of the reasons why we need this bill.

At the present time, we're in a bit of a fix in terms of the 12-mile zone. As soon as someone enters the 200-mile economic zone, we can't really take action. That may well have been exactly what happened in this case.

[English]

Mr. Trevor Swerdfager: The case the member refers to is what has sparked much of the discussion of this very bill. I won't describe all the details, but essentially a slick was observed via satellite. We directed aircraft out to observe the slick. We detained the ship and it was brought back to port. As we moved through the process of laying charges and ultimately moving it to the court process, some uncertainty became quite apparent around the legislative base for having conducted our actions and subsequently laying charges.

Essentially, the legal gaps—perceived gaps or potential gaps—that were identified as part of that case have motivated the development of this bill. So if we were to have another *Tecum Sea* incident tomorrow—let's pretend the bill was passed today—this bill would resolve the legislative and jurisdictional issues we encountered at that point and ensure that the enforcement of the act is done in a more effective way, pursuant to the needs of vessels and marine traffic, than was the case with *Tecum Sea*.

[Translation]

Hon. Stéphane Dion : So, we are expanding the zone where we can operate, bringing in tougher penalties and ensuring better protection for our officers in the field.

M. Francis Scarpaleggia : Thank you.

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Ratansi.

Ms. Yasmin Ratansi: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

I commend you for bringing this bill. It's very timely, and I hope once we implement it you're going to take our experience, the best practices, over to other parts of the world, because there we have lots of beaches and lots of species that need protection as well.

My question is on the practicality of the enforcement. I understand that this bill clarifies what is the normal operation of the ship, what are the incinerations that take place, and how ships cannot go away to the exclusive economic zone. But you require a synergy between a lot of departments like Environment Canada, Transport Canada, Fisheries, and the Canadian Space Agency, because you will need surveillance. Has that been proceduralized to ensure that we do have effective and practical enforcement? I think it enhances all the questions that were asked previously.

Number two, surveillance alone cannot just get you what you're looking for. You will need employees of the ships to come out and... not snitch, really, but talk about it. I know the bill does try to protect them, but what has been the experience in the past? Have people been more forthcoming, or have they been more concerned about their jobs?

The third question deals with foreign ships. As I see it in subclause 9(1), foreign ships can seek refuge in the exclusive economic zone. Maybe I'm misreading it, so if you could, help me out.

• (1040)

Hon. Stéphane Dion: To start with the third question, the intent of the bill is that the act will give us the capacity to address the issue even if we are in the economic zone. Assuming the situation in which the ship would try to escape and go into the international zone, the high seas, we still have the capacity to try to catch this ship and bring it back to Canada if the offence has been done within the economic zone.

Ms. Yasmin Ratansi: Even though it's a foreign ship?

Hon. Stéphane Dion: Yes. It would not make a difference. An offence is an offence. If you are in the city and there is a foreigner who is doing something against the law, we will not close our eyes because he's a foreigner. It would be the same principle.

Another question was the same as that of another colleague. How will we make sure everybody will work together? A memorandum of understanding will be released before Christmas on this one.

And the third question was?

Ms. Yasmin Ratansi: The third one was, what has been your practical experience with employees from the ship coming forth and giving you evidence about—

Hon. Stéphane Dion: They are protected by the bill. This is another thing the bill will do. If you want more details, I may ask one of my officials to develop more at this point, but it's an important point.

Mr. Trevor Swerdfager: There are exceptions, but for the most part the experience with the people coming forward is that we haven't had a lot of that kind of thing. This bill and the program that will flow from it will do a couple of things.

First of all, as the minister has pointed out, it contains very explicit provisions for what one might refer to as the whistle-blower scenario. It's very clearly stipulated that those provisions are in the act to provide legislative protection to those individuals who do that.

Equally important, though, is the operationalization, if you will, of the bill. It's very much oriented toward delivering a program that

does a number of things. The coordination aspect that has been raised a number of times is absolutely critical. Equally, a big part of the program that we are in the process of building now and of which we have the rudiments in place already is an outreach and communication program, so that we can work with individual crews, with their captains, so that we can say to them that this is the legislative regime, these are the environmental impacts of the activities that you are possibly conducting, so that we can hopefully bring along a higher degree of voluntarily compliance. I think we all know that if we were to try to impose or implement any legislation through total enforcement, that is not where the government wishes to be at the end of the day.

We wish to encourage crews to behave, if you will, in a way that's positive in the first place. The memorandum of understanding that the minister has referred to will allow us to ensure that we have operational coordination on the enforcement operations side of things. The information, outreach training, and that kind of stuff, on all three coasts, will be a very important part of the program rollout even though you won't see those words per se in the bill because it's the program delivery component.

Hon. Stéphane Dion: And to protect the people who give us information.

Mr. Trevor Swerdfager: Absolutely.

The Chair: We have a few minutes left.

Mr. Wilfert and Mr. McGuinty.

Hon. Bryon Wilfert: As far as Bill C-34 is concerned, there obviously were deficiencies in it. This bill attempts, I think, to address those deficiencies. Do you believe that in fact they have been addressed satisfactorily?

I also want to ask you about the issue on enforcement. There was an issue with regard to the *Tecum Sea* issue. I know that the fisheries committee was extremely unhappy with the turf war that went on in terms of enforcement. There was an MOU signed. Obviously we want to ensure that any legislation adopted by Parliament will in fact have the appropriate enforcement levers.

Who is going to be enforcing this, in your view?

• (1045)

Mr. Trevor Swerdfager: With respect to your first question, sir, the efficiencies that were identified and so on, we do believe they are maintained in the current version of the bill. We have, with this document, made some small changes to some very minor drafting errors that were in the first one. Those have been picked up. We're quite confident that this has been addressed.

With regard to enforcement, I would just illustrate with a small anecdote, if I may, the way we see enforcement working, based on how it's happened in the past. When a ship leaves port, RADARSAT, an earth observation satellite, flies over. It measures wave reflectants off the sea. If oil is put onto the water, the wave patterns change. They are dampened, essentially. So RADARSAT basically detects the absence of a wave pattern.

So as in previous cases, *Tecum Sea* and a few others, RADARSAT flies over. It detects this anomaly on the surface. The image is beamed down to an interpretation centre in Richmond, B.C. That image is usually analyzed within approximately half an hour. The image is then sent to, in this case, previously, Halifax. The image then is processed very quickly by people in Transport Canada and the coast guard. If aircraft are available—they're already flying their regular patrol—they're vectored over the ship to take visual observation. They can't physically take a sample of oil off the sea, of course, but they can take photos of the hull, the identification number, the slick, and so on. We then are in a position where Environment Canada enforcement officers can direct the ship back to port, if that's what's required, or in extreme cases, perhaps go out and inspect it.

It requires coordination, therefore, between a number of operational agencies. The authority for enforcing the Migratory Birds Convention Act and the Canadian Environmental Protection Act very clearly will rest with the Minister of the Environment. The operational delivery of that has in the past involved, and will in the future involve, a high degree of coordination between agencies.

Has our coordination been perfect in the past? No. Will it be perfect in the future? Probably not. We're going to get as close to that as we can. Our problem in the past has been that the legislative base we're working on has been unclear. This bill will fix that. As bureaucrats, we are very confident that we can ensure that the operational delivery of that will fix what you've referred to as a "turf war". We'll make sure that works.

Hon. Bryon Wilfert: I think that is absolutely critical in terms of the enforcement. Otherwise, we're not going to get very far. I deplore any type of turf wars, obviously.

I do believe this is critical, and I would again like to thank Mr. Richardson. There is no question that inaction is not an option here. I support—

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Wilfert. We're out of time now.

Yes, when he's saying nice things, let him talk.

Just for the interest of the committee, up to this point each of the delegations, if I may use that term, have asked for a little bit of an extension of time. Mr. McGuinty has asked for time, and Mr. Jean has a question. I would suggest that we go to Mr. Cullen and then allow the five minutes for whoever wishes to take it. Then we'll try to bring this to a close.

Mr. Cullen.

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

It's wonderful to see this great harmony between the parties today. I would actually like to support something Mr. Jean said and make a political statement. I don't think we have the resources to pull this

off. My concern is not so much within this act but the ability to actually go and find these polluters. The *Tecum Sea* scenario you're describing is ideal, where we were able to actually have a vector in research and find it and deliver it. I'm concerned that we'll not be able to do this into the future, and whether this bill gives us enough resources to allocate.... That's my concern primarily.

Again, I assume the intention and the philosophy of this is to internalize the cost of pollution to companies, that when in their general operation of business they pollute the environment, that has to be an internalized cost. To that effect, and maybe I can get some clarity on this, when a fine is levied on a company, can they simply write that off on their taxes? Is there still sitting within Canadian tax law the ability to receive a \$100,000 fine, write that off in taxes, and thereby externalize the cost once more? Are we finding them and only shifting the cost? I'm not sure the knowledge of that exists here.

I also hope, with respect to the coordination of this effort between the various departments, that there's a lowest common denominator effect, that the trigger for enforcing this comes from the department that is most sensitive to it, whether it's yourself or the Department of Transport. I am curious to hear you speculate on the potential effect of this bill on future offshore oil and gas developments within areas that have sensitive migratory bird routes. The question was put forward, will this restrict shipping access into areas that we know, and the answer was no.

In particular, I'm thinking of the Hecate Strait off the west coast of British Columbia, which has a significant number of migratory birds and has proposed development of offshore oil and gas. Would this type of bill have any causal effect on companies that are seeking to transport oil through that region? Will it start to prevent something like the *Exxon Valdez* even being present in an area that is highly sensitive? Will there be such a high cost of doing business that companies won't be interested in being there because of bills like this?

•(1050)

Hon. Stéphane Dion: The intent of the bill is to create fines severe enough to make them change their mind, the fact that they take that into account in their annual plan. It's why the fines are much more severe than used to be the case. It's why our capacity to go to the economic zone will be clarified in the bill. According to resources that we will put in to enforce it, I have started to answer what my department intends to do, what MOU we will have to have with the other departments.

Maybe my officials have something to add about that, and also the new technological capacities we will have with radar and the satellite, as well as the question of why we didn't identify some sensitive regions and will we have the capacity to enforce that.

Mr. Trevor Swerdfager: With respect to the enforcement capacity, the department will be allocating approximately \$3.8 million to the delivery of this component of the migratory bird program. We have spoken today about the bill and its content. I think it's important to reflect on the minister's introductory remarks, that we're very much interested in migratory bird conservation. This is an aspect of it, an important one. Seabirds are important to us, but it is one part of an overall migratory bird program.

The enforcement and the delivery of this part of the bill, if I reflect on the question earlier, around information outreach education will also be part of the delivery of the program. The resources we are devoting to it will be, as you say, in the neighbourhood of about \$4 million and will allow us to hire some new enforcement officers and will allow us to make better use of satellite technology. The technology is evolving very rapidly; frankly, it's hard to keep up with. So we're working on that aspect as well.

Will they be adequate resources? I think they will certainly make a substantial initial investment in building the program, and as it unfolds over time, we'll see where we end up in terms of the capacity.

Insofar as the business, I think if I understood your question properly, it was whether we are going to be identifying special conservation areas. Is that what you were coming at?

Mr. Nathan Cullen: I'll be in Calgary in a couple of weeks talking to oil developers. They're interested in the offshore. They're going to say, boy, does this thing prevent us from looking at drilling offshore in Canada, particularly where there are any birds flying, because our ships can't come into an offshore rig with a potential fine of a million dollars?

Mr. Trevor Swerdfager: This bill will not have, in our view, at least, any impact on the offshore oil and gas regime on all three coasts. Essentially what we're doing is we're saying this legislation—the Migratory Birds Convention Act, the Canadian Environmental Protection Act—will be more effectively enforced and applied in the exclusive economic zone. So for operators, whether they are fixed platforms or whatever, their legislative base, their legislative regime, will not be substantially changed by this act in policy terms. What we're doing is projecting its application out to the edge of the economic zone.

Anyone planning offshore oil and gas developments or conducting them today will be covered by a regime that has for the most part

been in place but has now been extended clearly out, particularly to address moving vessels more than anything else.

•(1055)

Mr. Nathan Cullen: On the question with respect to externalizing or internalizing costs of pollution, I don't know if any of your colleagues can comment. My concern is that a company is going to be able to just factor this in as a cost of doing business, write off fines against their taxes, and simply make it part of the equation of doing business: Of course, we're going to spill, and we can write it down.

Mr. Trevor Swerdfager: We are scurrying around trying to find out what is happening with the Income Tax Act. We know some of the issues that have been raised are being developed that way. We don't have an answer for you right now on those provisions specifically. Some of these questions, I must admit, have caught us a bit by surprise.

Hon. Bryon Wilfert: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. You cannot write off fines.

The Chair: That's a point of information, not a point of order.

Hon. Bryon Wilfert: We've heard this before. I had hoped you would have intervened to say no, in fact it cannot. That legislation was dealt with in the House.

The Chair: I appreciate your reminding the chair. I will try to be a little more vigilant in terms of bringing that information forward—even if I had known it.

Mr. Cullen, you still have a few minutes.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: I have one last question.

In terms of bringing these fines in line with what's happening in the U.S., do we have any comparison about the amount of money spent by the U.S. on the resources to actually go out and monitor ships—a comparison of how much the Americans are spending? I know we're bringing our fines in order. This goes back to Mr. Jean's point. Do we have the ability to actually enforce, comparable to what the U.S. is doing?

I flew down with a ship's captain just last week, who said, if you're going to spill, you spill in Canada, because (a) they won't find you, and (b) if they do find you, they won't fine you, so to speak.

I'm wondering, are our costs in line with what the Americans are doing in terms of enforcement and surveillance? Has it ever been studied?

Hon. Stéphane Dion: My understanding is that the bill will put us at a level of fines, of severity, comparable with the U.S. That's not the case now.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: It's not the fines I'm concerned about. Are we spending as much money on finding the polluters?

Hon. Stéphane Dion: Oh, finding.

Mr. Trevor Swerdfager: The problem we have in enforcing is different. Predominantly, what happens is the vessels come into port in the United States, because the United States, of course, is the biggest single destination for shipping traffic in the world. The enforcement programming in the United States doesn't have the same, if you will, high seas requirement that ours does, because they can wait until ships come into port. They can board them and they can inspect them close to sea. They don't have to conduct the high seas inspection and surveillance that we do.

If you're a ship operator and you're violating international pollution standards with respect to shipping, with respect to oil or whatever, and you come into the States, you know they are going to inspect you. And the frequency of visits is so high that if they don't catch you the first or second or third time, they're going to get you, because ships keep coming back. The very nature of the enforcement activity is somewhat different.

As the minister has pointed out, though, what we are doing under this piece of legislation is ensuring that should a violation be detected and successfully retained and so on, the fine structure we have in place will be very closely parallel to that which is in place in the United States. I emphasize that the United States' regulatory and enforcement regime is different; therefore, the fine mechanisms are different.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: I have one last question.

Mr. Jean pointed out how few ships are actually inspected when they come into Canadian ports under the current resources. I'm wondering, what's \$3.8 million going to buy us in terms of the percentage of ships going through our economic zone that will be inspected?

If this act is enacted, over the next year, if 100 ships pass through our exclusive economic zone, how many of them will actually be looked at? How much will this money actually buy us? Are we looking at one in 100? Are we hoping for one in 1,000? What's the level of frequency of ships passing through that will actually be seen by us and inspected or monitored, either by satellite or...? Are we looking at any sort of frequency?

I want to put the fear of God into some of these captains so that they know there's a good chance they're going to be inspected. Is \$3.8 million going to inspect 10 ships over the next year? I want to know what kind of intensity this is going to be. Do we have anything on that?

Hon. Stéphane Dion: Satellites will be able to see everybody, each ship and each oil...

[*Translation*]

discharge of oil in our waters.

[*English*]

What we will do with it depends on whether we see something. If we see nothing, there is no reason to.

• (1100)

Mr. Nathan Cullen: So is that 100%? We'll see every ship passing through our zone?

Hon. Stéphane Dion: Through satellite, certainly.

Is that correct?

Mr. Trevor Swerdfager: We'll not inspect every ship.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: Of course not, but we're going to be able to look at every ship that passes through our zone, through satellite, and detect spillage?

Hon. Stéphane Dion: Yes.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: That's interesting.

The Chair: Members of the committee, the chair is in a quandary. I have been informed that we have to be out of here. The health committee is coming in. I'm looking for some direction. We do not have any amendments. I'm going to suggest, while I do appreciate that there are a couple of other questions, that we go to the clause.... It's a question of whether we adjourn and then have to come back.

My suggestion would be that we make allowance for that, since we don't have any amendments, that we do as we did in the other bill, which is that I have a motion—and I'm seeking consent—and we move the bill clause by clause. We can finish this bill today, but I need that motion.

Mr. Bigras.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Bigras : You won't get a motion from me, that's for sure. You are basically asking us to rush through our consideration of this bill. I think we're moving a little too quickly.

In my opinion, we should not be proceeding this quickly. We still have questions to ask, but you are telling us that we can't ask any more questions. There are a number of questions that we would like to put to departmental officials. I don't think we should proceed with clause by clause consideration at this time.

[*English*]

The Chair: Excuse me. Then I don't have consent.

I'll have a motion to adjourn, and we'll return to this.

Thank you very much, Minister and officials.

We'll deal with this at the next meeting.

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

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

**Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:
Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique « Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire » à l'adresse suivante :
<http://www.parl.gc.ca>**

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.