



House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

ENVI • NUMBER 023 • 3rd SESSION • 40th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Thursday, June 10, 2010

—
Chair

Mr. James Bezan

Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

Thursday, June 10, 2010

• (1530)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake, CPC)): Good afternoon, everyone.

We're continuing our discussion we had on Tuesday: pursuant to Standing Order 32(5), amending schedule 2 to the Canada National Marine Conservation Areas Act, together with a report to Parliament on the Gwaii Haanas national marine conservation area reserve and Haida heritage site, which was referred to the committee on June 7, 2010.

I want to welcome back to the table Alan Latourelle, chief executive officer of Parks Canada; Ron Hallman, the director general; and Kevin McNamee, director, parks establishment. And from the Department of Justice, we have Lucie Bourbonnière, acting executive director and senior counsel, legal services, Parks Canada Agency.

Ms. Duncan.

Ms. Linda Duncan (Edmonton—Strathcona, NDP): I would like to move that we limit the time. I think everybody wants to get on to other matters. We really appreciate the officials providing their time again, but frankly, I'm a bit surprised that the Parks Canada officials are here again, because I'm not sure we had further questions. But it was nice of them to come back.

The Chair: You're making a motion to limit the time. What timeframe are you talking about?

Ms. Linda Duncan: I would suggest one round of questions per party.

The Chair: Okay, one round of questions.

We have a motion on the table. It's a dilatory motion. Does everybody understand the motion?

Mr. Jeff Watson (Essex, CPC): What does that work out to in minutes?

The Chair: If we go with the seven-minute round, if it's four questions—

A voice: Plus the statement, or no?

Mr. Mark Warawa (Langley, CPC): One complete round?

The Chair: You're saying one round? And routine proceedings dictate the first round is seven minutes. We're bound by these routine proceedings, unless we decide to change them. But we have it on the table. This is non-debatable.

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

The Chair: Mr. Warawa.

Mr. Mark Warawa: In the spirit of working together on this, there is nothing wrong... I have to word this in such a way that it meets the criteria of a point of order. There would be nothing wrong with my sharing my time with a member from another party, so they would have an opportunity to speak. Is that correct?

The Chair: Yes. There's nothing wrong with your doing that.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Thank you.

The Chair: With that, are there any opening statements from our witnesses? No. Okay, we'll continue with questions.

Seven minutes, Mr. McGuinty.

Mr. David McGuinty (Ottawa South, Lib.): Thanks, Mr. Chair.

Thank you very much for being here again, gentlemen from Parks Canada and Madame Bourbonnière.

Mrs. Lucie Bourbonnière (Acting Executive Director and Senior Counsel, Legal Services, Parks Canada Agency, Department of Justice): You can call me Lucie.

Mr. David McGuinty: *Enchanté*, Lucie.

Perhaps, Lucie, you've had a chance to look at this. Even though this announcement, this regulatory change, contemplates a longer-term management and zoning plan, can you assure Canadians that what is being contemplated in this interim management and zoning plan is in conformity with the Convention on Biological Diversity and the obligations that Canada signed on to under that treaty?

Could someone confirm that?

Mr. Alan Latourelle (Chief Executive Officer, Parks Canada Agency): Yes. I'll take that question, Mr. Chair.

Following your question last Tuesday, we thoroughly reviewed the interim management plan and can confirm that it meets our obligation, or is consistent with our obligation, under the Convention on Biological Diversity.

Several components of the convention deal with broader issues in terms of system plans. And we do have one in Canada in terms of the national marine conservation areas system plan, for example, the approach we are taking to management, the legislation, which the specific national marine conservation area would be brought under.

The interim management plan is focused on ecologically sustainable use, which is consistent with our international obligation but also meets our obligation under the national marine conservation area.

Several other components, such as promotion of public education and enjoyment and working with aboriginal communities, are integral to this plan.

• (1535)

Mr. David McGuinty: In terms of where we're going... I'm not sure if you're in a position, Mr. Latourelle, to know. We don't know. The government hasn't revealed its position, for example, on the ongoing conference of the parties, negotiations for the new and improved Convention on Biological Diversity. Most of the NGOs have been asking a myriad of MPs if they have any idea. We have no idea what Canada is saying. We're not even sure if we have a position.

Do you know anything about this? Have you been able to run that up the flagpole, so to speak, to see whether what's coming down the track will be factored in here?

Mr. Alan Latourelle: Our responsibility in Parks Canada is to ensure that as we develop management plans, or in this case an interim management plan, we are consistent, first, with our national obligations under current legislation, the Canada National Marine Conservation Areas Act, and consistent with the Convention on Biological Diversity and its objectives and program of work, which we are. We cannot forecast how this will or will not change in the future, so the plan we have developed is based on our current obligations.

Mr. David McGuinty: While you're on the subject, I would presume that you have no information about what is being pursued at those negotiations.

Mr. Alan Latourelle: I am not aware of them.

Mr. David McGuinty: Okay, thank you.

Can I ask a second question? It deals with the announcement made Tuesday by Gail Shea, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. She announced that two sites have been tapped for designation as marine protected areas. I understand there is an area of what they call Hecate Strait and Queen Charlotte Sound.

I am asking the same kind of question I asked on Tuesday, and that is about the whole question of offshore oil and gas and offshore oil and gas transportation. Seeing the announcement of the two sites, I'm wondering whether that means the government is now moving to uphold the 1972 moratorium. We've been asking that over and over again, and we've never had a clear answer.

Can someone help us understand if that is the case—or will oil tankers somehow be allowed to travel through protected areas, the same way, for example, that seismic testing is now being allowed in Lancaster Sound? Can you help us understand how this agreement is going to connect as one entire west coast Pacific oceanshed, if I can call it that?

Mr. Alan Latourelle: I cannot speak for the Department of Fisheries and Oceans; I want that to be clear. In terms of Parks Canada and the Gwaii Haanas national marine conservation area reserve proposal, the information we have is that there will be no tanker traffic within 60 kilometres of the national marine conservation area.

Mr. David McGuinty: Has that been reduced to writing somewhere in the agreement?

Mr. Alan Latourelle: That is not in the agreement. The agreement before you is focused on the area that we own and operate, which is the national marine conservation area.

Mr. David McGuinty: Okay, so nobody from Parks Canada—and I assume Ms. Bourbonnière neither—is able to help Canadians understand how all this connects?

I ask because there's a really important overriding question here about tanker travel. There's even a lot of pressure being placed on the Vancouver port authority now. They're seeing three to four tankers a month now coming into the port. There's inexorable pressure being put now, and we want to get some assurances, if this is going to happen, about how it links with the larger question of offshore oil and gas and transportation of oil.

Can you tell us how this all fits together?

• (1540)

Mr. Alan Latourelle: In terms of offshore oil exploration, as you are aware, there is no drilling allowed in the NMCA, in the proposed area. From a Parks Canada perspective, I think that's a significant accomplishment in ensuring that this place is protected for future generations.

In terms of the broader issues, I will let my colleague Kevin McNamee make a few comments on that.

Mr. David McGuinty: Mr. McNamee, if you could, while you're addressing that, it's not so much inside the NMCA, but what we've just learned from the Gulf of Mexico, where property owners in the Florida Keys are already seeing their property prices down 15 to 20 points.

Mr. Kevin McNamee (Director, Parks Establishment, Parks Canada Agency): There are a couple of things your question touches on, Mr. McGuinty.

First of all, there was an announcement by the federal government to look at an area of interest for a future marine protected area in Hecate Strait. Our interim management plan, consistent with the work plan under the Convention on Biological Diversity, does speak to our working collaboratively together in the future, when there are other marine protected areas, to deal with a range of management issues.

With respect to the Enbridge proposal that we were asked about at the last meeting, the maps that were filed by Enbridge with the National Energy Board—which are on their website—indicate that they are proposing a route 60 kilometres offshore. It's the responsibility of the National Energy Board to take a look at a range of those issues under their terms of reference.

Our authority and our ability to deal with such issues from a regulatory perspective is within the boundary of the national marine conservation area. But again, I stress, consistent with the convention, the interim management plan does speak about working with a range of other federal authorities in a non-regulatory manner to look at the future of the area. But we must have it designated first, before we can start to look at those issues in detail.

Mr. David McGuinty: Can I ask then, because you've opened the door, Mr. McNamee, is Parks Canada making representations to the NEB as part of its Arctic assessment, or are you going to speak to the NEB now that we've taken this important step for an MPA in this particularly sensitive area? For an oil slick, 60 kilometres is not a long way, as we're learning now, and there's huge pressure. The B.C. government is in favour.

I don't assume Parks Canada is shy or self-effacing to the extent that you're not comfortable making representations with respect to your mandate to a regulator like the NEB. Are you doing that?

Mr. Alan Latourelle: There are a few points I'd like to make. First—and this is consistent across Canada in all of our programs, be they national parks, national historic sites, or national marine conservation areas—where we have areas of interest we're working in, we do not as an agency participate in processes until such time as we have a formal national park established or a national marine conservation area, or the same for national historic sites.

So once we have the Gwaii Haanas national marine conservation area reserve established, clearly, we will be looking at all of those issues in developing our strategies as an agency. We have not made a decision one way or the other at this point, because we were in the planning stage.

Mr. David McGuinty: Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you.

Monsieur Bigras.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, BQ): Thank you, Mr. Chair. I will be sharing my time with my colleague, Mr. Ouellet.

Once again, welcome to the committee.

I would like to know whether there has ever been any exploratory drilling in the proposed protected area.

Mr. Kevin McNamee: Yes, there has. In the 1960s, especially between 1968 and 1969, a company drilled 8 or 9 holes underground, but, at the time, it was outside the boundaries of our marine conservation area. We were told that it did not involve any resources intended for exploitation.

• (1545)

Mr. Bernard Bigras: I read the discussions surrounding the bill passed in 2001 and resulting in the Marine Conservation Areas Act. Among other things, I read the committee's exchanges from October 30, 2001. Parliamentarians were called upon to discuss section 13. As you said yourself, it prohibits anyone from exploring or exploiting hydrocarbons. That is clear.

Is it possible, however, that the original wording put forward by the government was different, indicating instead that the minister could permit the use of directional drilling equipment, in the case of sub-seabed drilling for hydrocarbons, from a point outside a marine conservation area? I believe there was an amendment, given that, in the beginning, it was possible to undertake what was known as directional drilling, which consists of drilling outside the marine conservation area for possible oil.

My understanding is that there is no problem under that legislation. But would it be possible to use directional drilling to look for resources from outside the marine conservation area?

Mr. Alan Latourelle: Mr. Chair, I can assure you that our legislation does not permit directional drilling there.

Mr. Bernard Bigras: That is not my question. I want to know whether it might be possible under other pieces of legislation. There are the Canada National Parks Act and the Marine Conservation Areas Act, I know, but could directional drilling be possible under other acts? Have you looked into that before?

Mr. Alan Latourelle: Various components of our legislation are important and need to be clarified. First of all, we need to have ownership of the marine floor. And we do, which ensures we have the control. Second, our legislation makes it very clear that drilling is not allowed. I am not aware of other acts that might...

Mr. Bernard Bigras: Does Natural Resources Canada, for example, have other acts that might apply?

Mr. Alan Latourelle: No.

Mr. Bernard Bigras: You are certain of that?

Mr. Alan Latourelle: I will ask my colleague to confirm that.

Mr. Bernard Bigras: Do you know what I mean? I just want to be certain of that.

Mrs. Lucie Bourbonnière: There are certain principles of interpretation that may apply in such a situation. If drilling were permitted under another law of very general application and, as a result, that general law conflicted with this act, which is very specific, this act would take precedence and apply, because it clearly prohibits the activity in question.

Mr. Bernard Bigras: This act takes precedence over the others?

Mrs. Lucie Bourbonnière: It overrides laws of general application.

Mr. Bernard Bigras: If there were ever an issue, it would involve a legal challenge.

Mrs. Lucie Bourbonnière: Yes.

Mr. Bernard Bigras: Very well.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Christian Ouellet (Brome—Missisquoi, BQ): Thank you for being here today. I know this marine space is rich in plankton and, by extension, is rich in marine life.

How do you intend to protect that marine life? Will fishing regulations be implemented? If so, what would they be, in your opinion?

Mr. Alan Latourelle: Under the interim management plan, basically there will not be any fishing in 3% of the area. I want that to be clear. We assessed the ecological and scientific hot spots. In some of the places identified, it will not be possible to remove fish, for example.

Mr. Christian Ouellet: There will not be any removal?

Mr. Alan Latourelle: That is right. In other places, the principle of sustainable removal will apply. We are going to work with the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, as well as the Haida community, on a permanent management plan that will assess all of these issues. To ensure that this ecology is protected in the long term, Parks Canada will implement a science-based program that will rely upon knowledge from universities and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, and the traditional knowledge of the Haida community. Our objective and legal obligation is to protect the ecology in the long term and to ensure that all activities are sustainable.

• (1550)

Mr. Christian Ouellet: Will this program that you are going to set up evolve, based on the marine life conditions?

Mr. Alan Latourelle: It is the notion of continuous management. When science or community consultations provide us with more information, we will act accordingly. That is really the approach Australia has taken. It involves learning to work with the communities and scientific experts and taking long-term measures jointly. That is the approach we prefer at Parks Canada.

Mr. Christian Ouellet: You know that not very far from here, to the south, they fish using nets, trawl nets, which have a devastating effect on the marine floor. If removal were possible, would fishing be prohibited so as not to destroy the marine floor?

Mr. Alan Latourelle: That is in our legislation.

Mr. Christian Ouellet: It is already in there? So you will favour sport fishing instead.

Mr. Alan Latourelle: Yes, but there will still be some commercial fishing. Some major changes will be made, including an ecosystem-based approach to managing this protected area. We are going to work with the Haida community and our federal partners—the Department of Fisheries and Oceans—but we will also undertake public consultations and establish an advisory committee on managing the marine park.

Mr. Christian Ouellet: Will Parks Canada or the Department of Fisheries and Oceans be the one implementing that legislation or those evolving regulations?

Mr. Alan Latourelle: The Minister of Fisheries and Oceans will be responsible for managing the fisheries, but the applicable legislation and strategy will depend on the issues and circumstances involved, so as to ensure long-term protection.

Mr. Christian Ouellet: If I understand correctly, you retain the control.

Mr. Alan Latourelle: Yes, but in this case, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans also has control, as well as authority when it comes to managing fisheries.

Mr. Christian Ouellet: So you have to agree with one another.

Thank you.

[English]

The Chair: Merci.

Ms. Duncan.

Ms. Linda Duncan: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I just have a quick question, and then I'm going to turn it over to my colleague, Nathan Cullen.

I asked the question on Tuesday, but now that we have Ms. Bourbonnière here, I'd like to ask the question again, because I'm not familiar with this legislation. I have some familiarity with the Parks Canada legislation.

I remain puzzled why this is going to be a marine park reserve and not immediately a park. It's my understanding that usually the reason you go to a reserve is because there are matters unresolved—for example, a land claim—but it's my understanding that the land claim is resolved. I am also curious to know if there is a difference in legal ramifications if it's a reserve and hasn't been formalized yet as a park.

Mrs. Lucie Bourbonnière: The land claim is not resolved, and the regime that's applicable is in essence the same.

Mr. Alan Latourelle: The only difference, I would say, is one is having clear title to the land, for example, in a national park, because we have the reserve concept also. So unless all of the rights have been extinguished—and in the case that there are still land claims, those rights have not been extinguished—we have the reserve concept in our legislation, in national parks and the national marine conservation area.

Ms. Linda Duncan: I have one other quick question.

I understand that there is obviously to-ing and fro-ing on boundaries and that the buffer area around the land is pretty tight. As part of the discussion of the other marine protected areas, are there discussions about potentially expanding that buffer area, given the potential tanker traffic? And was Parks Canada consulted in the decision to lift the moratorium on tanker traffic through that area?

• (1555)

Mr. Kevin McNamee: On the tanker traffic issue, I'm not aware of our having participated in consultations or having been consulted, in part because we are not aware of tanker traffic that goes within the ten-kilometre area. So we're not aware of that.

With respect to the buffer, there's no formal buffer associated with this national marine conservation area reserve and there have been no discussions about changing the boundary. The boundary was agreed to in 1988 and has always been the subject of and put on maps in the 1988 agreement and in the two agreements that we have signed with the Haida, one in 1993 and one in 2010.

As I referenced before, when other marine protected areas are established, along with this one, there is an opportunity for the various departments and responsible authorities to discuss how to collaborate. But I just want to make it clear to the committee that there is no formal buffer associated with this NMCA or provided for under the legislation.

What we are encouraged to do is to look at managing on an ecosystem basis and to collaborate with other authorities and stakeholders beyond the boundaries, but there is no statutory buffer.

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP): I'll just pick up from there, Chair, if that's all right. Thanks.

It's a rare moment, as a committee member, when I feel like sliding over to your side to defend and sing the praises of this project.

My only criticism is that there are some nice pictures in your presentation, but it does no real justice to this place. It's so extraordinarily beautiful, and you should be commended for the efforts. We all like to talk about our ridings; that's why we're here. This place is easy to talk about and to celebrate and enjoy. I'm glad we're at this point where it feels that this is finally moving forward after a couple of decades.

I may have missed this in earlier testimony, so forgive me if I have, but is there something unique about the governance model that the Haida use that has enabled us to get to this point? The Haida have been quite advanced in having a self-managed and co-management governance model in place on Haida Gwaii. Has that been a helpful element to Parks Canada's approach and the government's approach? If so, does it bode well in other parts of the country where you seek to do something similar?

Mr. Alan Latourelle: I must say, if the current partnership and cooperative management and co-management of Gwaii Haanas national park reserve through the archipelago management board, which has representatives from both Parks Canada and the Haida Nation, had not been as solid as it is, we would not be here today. I think I can say that.

The respect that both the Haida have shown to Parks Canada and Parks Canada has shown to the Haida is the fundamental reason we were successful in getting an agreement with the Haida Nation and with DFO. I think this brings the relationship to a new level, including the marine component, but also including our partners at DFO, who will be part of the archipelago management board.

As I mentioned earlier, it also allows us to look at western science but also seriously consider and be part of the process of traditional knowledge. I would say that this is one of the few places in the world internationally where, from the start of the process, aboriginal communities have been involved as true partners in the whole process.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: I suppose that was part of my point as to how we go about making parks and conservation areas.

I think there's a famous story of Chrétien when he was a minister of parks and also natural resources. He looked out a window as he was flying over the far north and said, "That looks like a good place for a park." He recounted this story at a meeting I was at, and everyone laughed and thought that was great, but there was a part of me that said there are people there too. I don't offer it as a criticism of the former prime minister, but the days of just getting out a map and circling areas that seem interesting to us hopefully are gone.

Mr. Alan Latourelle: Those days have been long gone. If you look at the Nahanni National Park Reserve expansion, it's a good example of Parks Canada, the Government of Canada, working with the aboriginal community—in this case, the Dehcho.

The recent announcement we've made in terms of the Mealy Mountains National Park Reserve proposal and the boundaries of that is really working with the Labrador Inuit and the Métis nations, again, through the whole establishment process.

● (1600)

Mr. Nathan Cullen: I don't want to speak on behalf of the Haida, but for committee members who haven't had the chance to come to a place like this, there's a standing invitation. If in your careers you get to see something like this and actually explore a place you may have had some participation in creating, this would be one of the ones you'd want to take up. I know Parks Canada does a great job in highlighting the beauty of the place and leaving it as it is, but it's something all members should consider, and the Haida are wonderful hosts. You'll eat well and you might see a dance or two as well.

Thank you to the officials.

Mr. Alan Latourelle: The one point I'd like to add, Mr. Chair, if I can, is that I'm extremely proud of—not since I've become CEO, but well before that with Tom Lee and my predecessors—the relationship with aboriginal peoples. We in Canada should celebrate that, because as a parks organization, we are international leaders in this field.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Warawa.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Thank you, Chair.

Just before I hand my time over to Mr. Trudeau, who I'm sure has some important questions, I want to acknowledge that Canada is an incredible country, a country of unparalleled beauty, and our government is of course committed to preserving and protecting our natural environment, but to achieve that is not possible without the support of yourself from Parks Canada, and a great thanks to the Haida Nation, as well as the different NGOs that were also part of this process. It's tough to say thank you to Mr. Nathan Cullen, but a thank you to him.

Anyway, what an incredible area for this generation and future generations.

I'm going to give my time to Mr. Trudeau.

Mr. Justin Trudeau (Papineau, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Warawa and Mr. Bezan.

First of all, I'd like to echo the sentiments around the table about how pleased I am, and we are, at the establishment of this national marine conservation area. I think it's a wonderful piece of news. It has been a long time coming.

On a personal note, I'm very fond of my riding of Papineau, but when I was a young child on a visit to Haida Gwaii with my father and family, I was made an honorary child of the eagle, I believe, on Haida Gwaii. For me to see this national marine conservation area and park come into existence is a wonderful thing.

My only concern around this is related to the tanker traffic moratorium that everyone has brought up, and I'll come to it in a moment.

I have a concern around the process whereby this happened. I would like to at least highlight this, because we had a rushed June, last year, in passing the Nahanni National Park Reserve expansion. This June we seem to be doing this again. I would hate to have to rush through another wonderful piece of good news and a new park being brought in next June without proper time to appreciate it. Therefore, I'm a little bit curious about the process.

Monsieur Latourelle, as I look at the document before me, the *entrée en vigueur* of the agreement, it was signed on January 16 of this year—so almost six months ago. That was a public signing, I'm assuming. Were the media present?

Mr. Alan Latourelle: It was a public signing.

Do you mean the Canada–Haida agreement?

Mr. Justin Trudeau: Yes, the agreement I'm seeing here, the Canada–Haida agreement.

Mr. Alan Latourelle: Yes, it was.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Justin Trudeau: The Gwaii Haanas Marine Agreement.

[*English*]

What processes were required following the signing of that agreement to get it to a position where it could be brought forward to Parliament?

Mr. Alan Latourelle: The process, part of it, is called for in our legislation, the Canada National Marine Conservation Areas Act, in terms of the consultation reports, for example, that you have before you. That is one element.

Since that time, we've had to complete that. Although we've had a lot of consultation over the last several years, we needed to put it into a readable format, one that could be communicated.

It's the same for all the other parts of this information. It's the same for the interim management plan. After that, in terms of the process, we actually have to go to Treasury Board first, and that generates the order in council that is before you. Then it's brought to the House.

If I can just comment, I want to make it very clear that I am a public servant. The last two years, it has been Parks Canada and the steps in our process that got us to that timeframe. In the future, in terms of bringing issues forward to our minister, to Treasury Board, and to these committees, we will try to avoid that if we can. We understand.

• (1605)

Mr. Justin Trudeau: Thank you.

I also notice that this report to Parliament is dated May 2010 and it was brought forward only in June 2010. There are issues around that. I just hope I'm getting it on the record that for next time we would love to be able to have a little more time and not have to do what we're about to do and waive the 30 days of study and reflection on it before it can be moved forward.

The other issue, and I guess this is more legal, possibly, is this tanker traffic moratorium that we were all talking about. Is there a moratorium on tanker traffic right now?

Mrs. Lucie Bourbonnière: I can't answer that question. I'm not aware.

Mr. Justin Trudeau: As I look at the handout, it says:

The review of petroleum resource potential found that most of the proposed Gwaii Haanas Marine Area had very low to moderate potential. ... Additional field work was not recommended, nor could it have been undertaken in view of the existing moratorium on west coast offshore oil and gas exploration and development.

So it looks as though there is in fact a moratorium right now.

Mr. Alan Latourelle: Sorry, there is a moratorium on exploration on the west coast. That I can tell you.

Mr. Justin Trudeau: Thank you. So it's a moratorium on exploration, but not necessarily on tanker traffic.

Mr. Alan Latourelle: That I would have to check. I'm not sure.

Mr. Justin Trudeau: You referred to Nahanni National Park. I know the issue of, for example, the abandoned Prairie Creek mine site, which stored barrels of cyanide in a place that could potentially leak and flow down to the river. There was an area of concern and responsibility by Parks Canada toward that site because things outside of park boundaries can affect in an extremely negative way the things within.

Now, I understand that not a lot of work has been done yet because it's not officially a national park reserve site yet. Even in the handout booklet there is a comment that there is a development and implementation of environmental emergency response plans. And when I think of environmental emergencies and the responses that are necessary, obviously right now we think of oil spills in the gulf, and the potential there.

Has there been any study of currents, winds, tides? I believe that the currents in that part of the world flow north, so the tanker traffic passing south and potential problems there could be extremely devastating. Once this is a national park, what kind of power will Parks Canada have to protect this extraordinarily beautiful and delicate piece of nature from potential spills?

Mr. Alan Latourelle: First, in terms of the dates of the report, May versus June, part of it is because we have to go to Treasury Board. I just want to make that clear. That's why there's a difference between May and June.

In terms of the future impacts of activities occurring outside of the national marine conservation area that may affect the national marine conservation area, our approach is going to be consistent with the approach we've taken on all of our programs. When there are activities outside parks or national historic sites that may affect the integrity of these places, we do provide science information and also participate in the appropriate processes. That is our intent, clearly.

At this point, as there have been major studies now, once we have the national marine conservation area established, we will create a team and establish the Parks Canada team with the Haida Nation. As part of their roles, and through the management plan, we will define the priorities for that.

Mr. Justin Trudeau: Okay. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Trudeau.

I want to thank our witnesses.

We have done our first round, which meets the demands of the motion that Ms. Duncan brought forward. So I want to thank you for coming in.

We are going to suspend and talk about our report, and of course these deliberations are done in camera.

Mr. Warawa.

•(1610)

Mr. Mark Warawa: Chair, the motion—

The Chair: Yes, we'll deal with it in camera.

Mr. Mark Warawa: Okay.

The Chair: Okay?

With that, I'm going to suspend, and ask everyone who is not associated with a member of Parliament to clear the room, and we'll come back into session.

[Proceedings continue in camera]

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

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

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

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

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

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

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

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

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

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

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

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

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

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

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

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

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