

Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development

Comité permanent de l'environnement et du développement durable

**EVIDENCE NUMBER 18,
TÉMOIGNAGES DU COMITÉ NUMÉRO 18**

UNEDITED COPY – COPIE NON ÉDITÉE

Thursday February 10, 2005 – Le jeudi 10 février 2005

🕒 (1105)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Alan Tonks (York South—Weston, Lib.)):

Excuse me, if our witnesses could take their places. We would like to commence with the proceedings.

Bonjour, and welcome this morning. To the members of the committee and to our witnesses, thank you for being here. Well, especially to our witnesses, thank you for being here. Members of the committee are here as of right and as of duty...and privilege, I'm reminded. That's very, very true.

This morning, pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), study on Canada's implementation of the Kyoto Protocol, Part I, Setting the Stage. We're talking about where we are with respect to the current situation. You've all had an opportunity as to have a copy of our research paper that has attempted to set a platform in place within which we are going through this analysis of the Kyoto regime. We appreciate your being here as witnesses to assist us in terms of that process of the evaluation, re-evaluation and so on. So thank you very much for being here.

This morning we have: Greenpeace Canada, Steven Guilbeaut, who is a campaigner with respect to climate and energy, welcome, Steven; the David Suzuki Foundation, Morag Carter, the Director of the Climate Change Program, Morag; from Équiterre, Sidney Ribaux, who is the General Coordinator and Co-founder, Sidney; and Friends of Science, Charles Simpson, President, and Tim Patterson, expert witness from Carleton University. Welcome to all of you.

I don't know whether you have arranged among yourselves to speak in a particular order. We don't flip coins or anything like that. Whatever the order is that you're comfortable, perhaps we could just start in the order you're on in the procedure sheet, here. That would have, Steven, you making the first presentation from Greenpeace Canada. Then we'll go to the rest of it. Is that okay? The committee's in agreement with that? Then we'll proceed in that order.

Okay, Steven, from—

Mr. Sidney Ribaux (General Coordinator and Co-founder, Équiterre): Sorry, what would the order be? Could you just repeat it? So, in this order, okay.

The Chair: Yes, we'll go in this order: Greenpeace, then the David Suzuki Foundation, Équiterre, and Friends of Science, sort of going from right to left.

Merci.

[Français]

M. Steven Guilbeault (responsable de la campagne, Climat et énergie, Greenpeace Canada): Merci beaucoup, monsieur le président, membres du Comité permanent de l'environnement et du développement durable.

Mon nom est Steven Guilbeault, je suis le responsable de la campagne Climat et énergie pour Greenpeace Canada. Je suis à Greenpeace depuis 1997, mais je suis le dossier des changements climatiques depuis 1994. J'étais à la première Conférence des partis à Berlin en 1995, j'étais à Kyoto en 1997 et j'ai fait plus d'une douzaine des réunions internationales de négociations sur les changements climatiques au cours des 10 dernières années.

Il y a trois éléments que je voudrais aborder avec vous ce matin concernant toute la question de la mise en oeuvre du protocole de Kyoto au Canada, soit, si vous me permettez l'image, la question de la carotte et du bâton, d'abord au niveau des mesures qui ont été mises en oeuvre jusqu'à maintenant, toute la question de mettre en place un élément qui est essentiel, à notre avis, la mise en place de mesures qui seront structurantes pour l'avenir parce que, évidemment, il y a le protocole de Kyoto, mais on commence déjà à parler au niveau international de l'après Kyoto, alors les ententes qui vont suivre ou l'entente et les ententes futures qui vont suivre le protocole de Kyoto et pour en venir finalement à cet élément qui est, à notre avis, très important, celui de la nécessité d'avoir un plan à long terme. J'élaborerai un peu là-dessus dans quelques minutes.

Sur la question précisément de la mise en oeuvre du protocole de Kyoto jusqu'à maintenant, il faut reconnaître que l'approche qui a été prise par le gouvernement canadien est essentiellement une approche que je qualifierais de la carotte. On a offert des incitatifs, on a mis en place des programmes, souvent volontaires, pour demander à différents secteurs de la communauté canadienne, comme le secteur de l'entreprise. On commence depuis tout récemment avec le Défi d'une tonne, à demander à la population canadienne de mettre l'épaule à la roue. On a donc mis en place toute une série de mesures de programmes incitatifs, mais qui sont souvent sans lien les uns avec les autres au niveau de leur effet structurant à long terme. On voyait récemment dans plusieurs des quotidiens canadiens que même les fonctionnaires à Ottawa, reconnaissent maintenant que l'approche volontaire ne nous permettra pas d'atteindre les objectifs nécessaires. Ce que nous, les écologistes, disons depuis très longtemps.

On se rappellera que lors de la Convention cadre sur les changements climatiques de Rio, nous avons également des engagements au niveau international, soit de stabiliser nos émissions de gaz à effets de

serre en 2000, au même niveau que 1990. Par contre, les seules mesures qui ont été mises de l'avant à l'époque pour atteindre ces objectifs ont été des mesures volontaires avec les résultats qu'on connaît aujourd'hui. Nos émissions de gaz à effets de serre en 2000 étaient d'à peu près 20 p. 100 plus élevées qu'elles ne l'étaient en 1990. De toute évidence, il peut y avoir des mesures volontaires. On doit mettre de l'avant des mesures incitatives, nous sommes tout à fait d'accord avec cela, mais la carotte sans le bâton ne fonctionnera pas. Alors on doit utiliser les mesures réglementaires. Nous devons mettre en place des lois pour forcer des réductions d'émissions au niveau canadien. Cela, on ne s'en sort pas.

Je pense que cela est vrai pour plusieurs des secteurs où les émissions de gaz à effets de serre sont très importantes. On pense au secteur des grands émetteurs finaux, qui représentent 50 p. 100 des émissions de gaz à effets de serre au Canada. On pense évidemment aussi à toute la question du transport qui représente une portion importante. C'est à peu près 30 p. 100 de nos émissions au Canada. Jusqu'à maintenant, il y a eu peu, pour ne pas dire pas, de mesures qui s'adressent au secteur des transports, ce qui m'apparaît comme une aberration qui doit être corrigée très rapidement.

On peut penser également à toute la question du secteur du bâtiment. Je pense que mon collègue, M. Ribault, d'Équiterre, va en parler un peu. Le Code du bâtiment date de plusieurs années. Dans certains cas, dépendamment des provinces, on a des codes--comme dans le cas du Québec, un code qui date de 1981--qui ont été très peu modernisés, malgré l'introduction de nouvelles techniques de construction, de nouveaux matériaux de construction, de nouvelles technologies comme la géothermie qui est de plus en plus utilisée, quoique de façon encore timide, au Canada pour atteindre finalement des réductions d'émissions. Ces mesures ont été jusqu'à maintenant, à toute fin pratique, ignorées ou mises de l'avant de façon très timide.

Il y a un projet très intéressant, puisque nous parlons de la géothermie, qui est celui dans la ville de Winnipeg, où on va construire 10 000 unités domiciliaires toutes au géothermique. C'est probablement un des exemples les plus intéressants.

Ce qui m'amène au deuxième point, donc celui de la nécessité de mettre sur pied des mesures qui sont structurantes, qui nous permettrons d'atteindre les objectifs de Kyoto, mais aussi évidemment d'aller au-delà de ceux-ci.

🕒 (1110)

On se souviendra que le groupe d'experts intergouvernemental sur l'évolution du climat, le GIEC, ou l'IPCC si vous préférez, en anglais

[English]

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

[Français]

nous rappelle que les réductions d'émissions nécessaires pour prévenir des bouleversements climatiques catastrophiques à l'échelle planétaire, sont de l'ordre, pour un pays comme le nôtre et pour

l'ensemble des pays industrialisés de 60 à 80 p. 100 au cours des prochaines décennies. On parle donc d'environ 2050. Encore la semaine passée, ces grandes conclusions ont été confirmées par une rencontre parrainée par le premier ministre Blair en Grande-Bretagne qui avait lieu à l'Université d'Exeter.

Nous pensons que les mesures structurantes viendront entre autres par l'introduction de mesures fiscales dans différents secteurs de l'activité canadienne. Il faut donc revoir de fond en comble le système fiscal canadien qui, encore aujourd'hui, a tendance à encourager beaucoup plus des activités qui vont avoir de grandes incidences sur nos émissions de gaz à effet de serre, et décourager des activités, des technologies et des investissements qui ont peu ou même qui nous permettent de réduire nos émissions de gaz à effet de serre, ce qui va à contresens de nos objectifs de Kyoto.

En terminant, je pense qu'une partie du problème dans lequel on se trouve est que, jusqu'à maintenant, nous n'avons jamais eu au Canada de vision globale dans ce dossier. Que ce soit à Rio en 1992, ou à Kyoto en 1997 où j'étais, on est arrivé là sans trop savoir. On avait une position de négociation mais sans trop savoir quel est le point final. On peut s'inspirer de ce qui s'est fait ailleurs. On peut penser à la Grande-Bretagne avec son livre blanc sur les réductions d'émissions. Le gouvernement britannique s'engage à réduire de 50 p. 100 d'ici 2050 les émissions de gaz à effet de serre, et qu'on prépare en fonction de cela des plans d'action pour les décennies à venir. Je parle de la Grande-Bretagne mais je pourrais parler d'un État tout près d'ici, l'État du Maine qui s'est engagé, dans le cadre d'un exercice semblable, à réduire d'ici 2050 les émissions de gaz à effet de serre de 70 p. 100. C'est un État américain sous George Bush qui s'engage malgré tout à mettre de l'avant des mesures très proactives pour réduire les émissions de gaz à effet de serre. Qui l'eut cru?

Je pense que ce qu'on doit également garder en tête, et qui a été complètement évacué du débat jusqu'à maintenant, c'est la question des écolimites. À quel point le climat atteint-il des niveaux de bouleversement catastrophiques pour l'ensemble de la planète? À cet égard, l'Union européenne est en train d'adopter, certains pays l'ont déjà fait, comme la Grande-Bretagne et d'autres, le concept qu'il faut, par tous les moyens possibles, éviter de dépasser deux degrés celsius d'augmentation de température à l'échelle planétaire. En fonction de cela, on établit des niveaux de concentration atmosphérique qui vont nous permettre de ne pas dépasser cet objectif. Cela fait déjà partie de la politique britannique de lutte aux changements climatiques. C'est en train de devenir le cas pour l'Union européenne. Je souhaite sincèrement que le Canada fasse ce genre d'exercice, qu'on définisse ce genre d'objectif à long terme. Cela va nous permettre de pouvoir évoluer dans le temps au cours des prochaines décennies de façon beaucoup plus organisée. Tout le monde va savoir à quoi s'attendre, ce qui n'a pas toujours été le cas, hélas jusqu'à maintenant. Je m'arrête là en vous remerciant beaucoup.

Le président: Merci, monsieur Guilbeault.

[English]

Thank you for that input.

I should have mentioned at the beginning that we allow 10 minutes, give or take. We try to be as reasonable as we can with that time. You were under that time, Mr. Guilbeault. Thank you for setting that standard.

Mr. Steven Guilbeault: Good.

The Chair: We'll now go to Ms. Morag Carter, director of the David Suzuki Foundation.

Mr. Morag Carter (Director, Climate Change Program, David Suzuki Foundation): Good morning everybody and thank you for inviting the David Suzuki Foundation to present before the committee. We're going to be sort of saying very similar things to my colleague at Greenpeace Canada.

Canada now has an unenviable reputation for being one of the least energy efficient countries in the OECD and Canada's greenhouse gas emissions are approximately, as you know, as your background paper said, 20% above 1990 levels and more than 25% above our Kyoto Protocol commitments.

Minister Dion has repeatedly referred to the Canadian target for meeting Kyoto as the most onerous in the world. This is true. But it's true because we have been so negligent in meeting our Kyoto commitments to date. It's clear from our emission trends and the growing gap that Canada requires a credible, workable plan to meet our Kyoto targets and obligations. Canada's plan must also set us on the path toward the steep emission reductions that Steven mentioned, that will be required to prevent dangerous climate change.

What is also apparent, as Steven said, is that we need this mixture of carrot and stick obligations. We need a mixture of regulatory, fiscal and incentive measures if we are to be successful in meeting our Kyoto obligations. The right mix of measures will also have the added benefit of ensuring that Canada is on track to developing the architecture that we think is required for the long term and steep reductions that science is showing us we need to achieve in order to avoid catastrophic climate change.

The David Suzuki Foundation would like to share with the Committee our analysis of two key programs that are central to the government of Canada's strategy to address climate change, and then to give a very brief overview of the findings of key scientific publications.

In 2004, the Suzuki Foundation received access to information documents that dealt with a large final emitter program as well as the internal mid-program review of Environment Canada's climate action plan 2000, usually referred to as the AP2000. The LFE sector is of particular concern since the emissions from this sector are projected to produce half of Canada's total greenhouse gas emissions by 2010. In addition, this program is also a clear example of the need for a regulatory backstop to ensure that greenhouse gas reduction targets are met.

As part of Canada's Kyoto commitment, the LFEs—made up of Canada's oil and gas, electricity, manufacturing and mining sectors—initially had a target to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions by 55 megatonnes. This emission reduction for LFEs was a 15% decline from 2010 business as usual projections but an increase of 14% from 1990 emission levels.

The target was based on emissions intensity, or emissions per unit of production, not on absolute reductions, so if production went up, the LFEs would be allowed to emit more greenhouse gas than their original target. These access to information documents say that it has become apparent that output in a number of high-intensity industries, most notably the aluminum and oil sands, will be significantly higher

than projected. The net result is that greenhouse gas emissions from LFEs, even if they comply with their targets, will be somewhere between 27% and 55% above their 1990 levels.

With Canada needing to reduce its overall emissions by 6% from 1990 levels, who is going to be responsible for the emissions reduction shortfall caused by increased industrial pollution? The documents are very clear, and this is actually a quote.

The taxpayer, not industry, bears the risk if output turns out to be higher than forecast.

As well, recent developments reported in the press have suggested to us that the government maybe considering revising the LFE target down to 37 megatonnes. This is a very significant concern to us.

The other program that the Suzuki Foundation was interested in evaluating was the Pilot Emissions, Removals, Reductions and Learnings program. That is the PERRL program. Our interest in this program has been heightened, again by suggestions in press and from a variety of sources, that a PERRL type program may be a central feature of a new climate change plan for Canada.

In the package that we received, a memo to the Prime Minister from the Clerk of the Privy Council explained:

While the review found that the majority of AP2000 measures are meeting their milestones as planned, it also found that some measures may have difficulty in fully achieving their 2010 GHG emission reduction targets.

Of particular concern in this process is the Pilot Emission Removals, Reductions and Learnings program, which is among the initiatives expected to yield emission reductions before the Kyoto commitment period of 2008-12). ATIP information indicates that PERRL is among the measures from the mid-term review that require course correction.

🕒 (1115)

The PERRL program was expected by the government to yield results sooner than other measures than AP2000, and its expected emission reductions were significant, a total of about 17.7 megatonnes. It represents several measures and approaches expected to affect and influence a variety of sectors.

The documents contain a detailed description of the challenges currently being faced by PERRL. The program was originally expected to reduce emissions by 17.7 megatonnes, but that figure has now been revised to a total reduction of about 3 megatonnes.

The reasons for this drastic revision include the fact that expected provincial-territorial participation in PERRL did not materialize. Also, AP2000's fixed end date and reduced budget limits the amount of reductions that can be attained over the remaining life of the project.

PERRL shows at least two important outcomes. One, that their program demonstrates reducing emissions is not only good for the environment but it can also be good for business, and that achieving strong federal, provincial, territorial collaboration is essential to achieve greenhouse gas reductions.

The fact that the emissions gap faced by Canada keeps growing is an unequivocal signal that all levels of government and industry need to collaborate with creativity and resolution to implement a variety of strong additional initiatives to achieve our global responsibilities on time.

A different policy approach is also required, one that includes strong regulatory and fiscal measures. This last point has been reinforced by the OECD, Canada's Commission for the Environment, and officials at Environment Canada.

Important lessons can be drawn from these documents. One, using an intensity-based system for the LFE program is the wrong approach because it allows absolute emissions from industry to rise and places responsibility on Canadian taxpayers to make up the difference. Two, the petroleum industry in particular is being allowed by the federal government to shirk its responsibilities with respect to greenhouse gas emission reductions.

Three, through access to information documents state that most of the measures in the government's Action Plan 2000 are meeting their greenhouse gas emission reduction milestones, Canada's emissions have nevertheless grown by more than 20% since 1990. There seems to be a bit of a gap here.

Four, if the PERRL program is to play a significant role in future greenhouse gas emission reductions, it needs to be significantly revamped by eliminating constraints on its effectiveness, i.e. with fixed end dates and lack of funds.

The provinces and territories need to work together, much better collaboration, and the Canadian government needs to take on their fair share of Kyoto-related responsibilities.

Six, that all Kyoto-related programs, including AP2000, require strong reinforcement and more open and frequent evaluations to assure that they remain on target. They're clearly not.

Seven, not only can Canada's target still be met, but reaching them can also be good for Canadian business.

I just want to turn very quickly to one of the other things that Steven touched on, which is the state of the current science. Very few scientists around the world now debate that climate change is a reality. Furthermore, a growing body of evidence points to more potentially catastrophic changes than had previously been thought. As each major scientific assessment is published, the evidence of increasing temperatures, melting ice, changing weather patterns, species loss and adverse human health impacts get stronger.

Each publication comes with a warning that scenarios previously thought as unlikely or even far-fetched may in fact be more likely unless we act as a global community to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

The IPCC Third Assessment Report found that there is new and stronger evidence that most of the warming observed over the last 50 years is attributable to human activities, and that global average temperatures and sea level are predicted to rise under all IPCC scenarios.

IPCC modelling further predicts global average surface temperatures is projected to increase by 1.4 degrees to 5.8 degrees Celsius over the period 1992-2100. The conference that Steven talked about earlier this month at Dexter University, researchers reported that the potential for the collapse of the western Antarctic ice sheet was not as unlikely as previously thought. This is something that the IPCC Third Assessment Report has concluded was very unlikely before 2100.

However, one of the most compelling scientific assessments to be published recently is the *Arctic Climate Impact Assessment*. In November 2004, the ACIA was released in Reykjavik. The report was authored by more than 300 scientists from 15 countries and reviewed by a further 160. The ACIA took on a multidisciplinary approach to evaluating the impacts of climate change in the Arctic, and included indigenous knowledge as a component of the scientific findings.

The 10 key scientific findings from the ACIA are these. Arctic climate is warming rapidly and much larger changes are predicted. Arctic warming and its consequences will have worldwide implications. Arctic vegetation zones are likely to shift, causing wide-ranging impacts. Animal species' diversity ranges and distribution will change.

🕒 (1120)

Animal species, diversity ranges and distribution will change. Many coastal communities and facilities face increasing exposure to storms. Reduced sea ice is very likely to increase marine transport and access to resources. Thawing ground will disrupt transportation, buildings and other infrastructure. Indigenous communities are facing major economic and cultural impacts. Elevated Ultraviolet radiation levels will affect people, plants and animals and, finally, the multiple influences, including that of chemical contamination in the Arctic will interact to cause impacts to people and ecosystems.

These findings and others point not only to an urgent need for Canada to comply with our obligations under the Kyoto Protocol, but to start creating an architecture that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions by at least 50%, and as Steven said, more likely 60% to 80% within the next 25 years. Clearly, the current science tells us action to reduce the emissions that cause climate change is warranted and urgent. Kyoto is an important first step on the path, and while Canada has committed to meet reductions under the Kyoto Protocol, our actions and policies so far have had very little effect. Therefore, we are making the following recommendations.

The first and the most important is to establish a central bureau in the Privy Council Office with the authority and knowledge to engage departments on Kyoto implementation in an integrated manner and foster the development of an innovative low carbon economy.

The second is that we really need to design a transparent, fair and effective large fine emitter system with the dual objectives of protecting environmental integrity and promoting a low carbon future. The cornerstone of this plan could fail if Natural Resources Canada fails to include key design elements

including reporting transparency for industry, provisions beyond emissions intensity to ensure targets are achieved, safeguards against double counting, commitment to help the shifting of responsibility from industry to taxpayers.

The need to phase out the subsidies from the oil and gas industries is a very tough one, but we need to redirect these subsidies to key Kyoto solutions programs including a significant investment in the renewables industry.

We need to design measures to support deep emission reductions and also achieve the Kyoto target.

We need to take advantage of smart regulations that encourage technical innovation. Voluntary measures in spending, on their own, as we know, have proven economically and environmentally ineffective.

We need to renew the principle of equitable burden sharing that threatens to be fundamentally violated by the rapid growth of emissions in key sectors, particularly the oil and gas, electricity and transportation sectors shifting the burden unfairly onto other regions, sectors or from industry to taxpayers. Provincial, territorial and federal governments agreed to this principle in the wake of the signing of the Kyoto Protocol.

We need to contain Canada's major drivers of climate change, particularly the electricity, oil and gas production and construction and transportation.

Last, but certainly not least, we all need to take leadership. This is the single most important consideration in developing and implementing the climate protection and sustainable energy agenda in Canada.

🕒 (1125)

[*Français*]

Le président: C'est bon. Merci, madame Carter.

[*English*]

We appreciate that.

We'll now go to Mr. Ribaux. We look forward to your presentation.

[*Français*]

M. Sidney Ribaux: Chers membres du Comité sur l'environnement, je vais faire ma présentation en français. Par contre, si jamais il y a des questions, je peux aussi répondre en anglais, par la suite.

Premièrement, merci de l'invitation pour vous parler du point de vue des critères sur le plan d'action que devrait adopter le Canada sur l'accord de Kyoto. En partant, je vais vous dire que la présentation que je vais vous faire sera beaucoup plus près du terrain des vaches que ce que Greenpeace et la Fondation Suzuki vous ont fait. Je crois que ce sera très complémentaire. En fait, je crois qu'on soutient les grandes recommandations que vous font ces organismes. Équiterre est un organisme beaucoup plus terrain. Donc, c'est un organisme qui existe depuis 1993 et j'aimerais vous en parler un peu.

On a notre siège social à Montréal et on intervient auprès du grand public à travers le Québec, dans toutes les régions du Québec et parfois à l'extérieur, mais c'est principalement au Québec qu'on intervient. Notre leitmotiv est de faire passer les gens à l'action. On est dans le secteur d'intervention qui s'appelle changement de comportement. Donc, on n'est pas seulement dans la sensibilisation, mais on essaie de faire en sorte que les gens posent des gestes, les gens et les collectivités aussi. On rejoint plus de 300 000 personnes par année. Donc, ce sont des gens à qui on parle, ce sont des gens qui participent à des conférences et on se rend chez ces gens. Ce sont des gens qui lisent notre documentation et qui visitent notre site web et, de plus en plus, on sent qu'il y a une grande réceptivité pour le genre de message que communique Équiterre.

On a quatre programmes éducatifs sur lesquels on travaille: le transport écologique, l'efficacité énergétique, l'agriculture écologique et un volet international qui est le commerce équitable. On a aussi une campagne sur la consommation responsable et on se préoccupe de changements climatiques depuis notre création en 1993. Donc, on est très actifs sur les solutions et la plupart de nos solutions touchent, d'une façon ou d'une autre, la question des changements climatiques.

Je vous soulignerais qu'on est évidemment présent au Québec et dans toutes les régions du Québec. Je siège au conseil d'administration d'une organisation qui s'appelle la Green Communities Canada, qui regroupe des organismes qui réalisent des projets semblables à travers le Canada. Donc, ce dont je vais vous parler, dans la plupart des cas, s'applique, à un niveau ou à un autre, dans à peu près toutes les régions et comtés fédéraux à travers le pays.

J'aimerais vous donner quelques exemples de ce qu'on fait pour que vous ayez une idée à quel point on est terrain. D'une part, on a lancé, depuis quelques années, des projets qu'on appellerait des projets de paniers de légumes biologiques. Ces projets permettent à des citoyens d'acheter directement d'un fermier un panier de légumes. En fait, le consommateur ou le citoyen achète, au début de la saison de récolte, s'engage auprès du fermier à acheter un certain nombre de paniers de légumes, donc achète une part de la récolte et, pendant toute la saison de récolte, il reçoit un panier de légumes et fruits certifiés biologiques. Il y a aussi toutes sortes d'autres produits.

Équiterre joue un rôle essentiellement de communicateur dans ce projet. Donc, on facilite et on aide les fermiers à monter ces projets-là et on aide et on fait la communication auprès des consommateurs. Ces projets-là permettent d'une part de conserver les petites fermes familiales qui ont une vocation écologique, d'une part, en leur garantissant un marché essentiellement, parce que les gens s'engagent à l'avance, et en garantissant aussi une plus grande biodiversité de leurs fermes. Donc, on parle de fermes qui ont entre 20 et 30 variétés versus, pour la plupart, une variété. Du côté des consommateurs, cela leur permet d'avoir accès à des produits locaux, biologiques et frais à peu près au même prix qu'ils paieraient

pour des produits conventionnels qu'on trouve dans les épiceries ou à 50 p. 100 moins cher que ce qu'on paierait pour les produits biologiques dans des épiceries.

Donc, ce sont des projets qui fonctionnent extrêmement bien. On a commencé avec, et ceci est intéressant d'un point de vue de où sont rendus les Canadiens et Canadiennes à travers le pays, on est partis avec un projet, une ferme et 50 partenaires en 1995 et, cette année, il va y avoir 100 fermes à travers le Québec qui participent à ces projets-là et qui vont approvisionner plus de 20 000 personnes. Vous me direz que 20 000, ce n'est pas beaucoup de citoyens, mais la courbe d'augmentation de ces projets-là est phénoménale et, en fait, le problème qu'on a, ce n'est pas le nombre de personnes qui souhaitent participer, c'est le nombre de fermes qui ne suivent pas pour toutes sortes de raisons, entre autres, un manque de soutien de l'État.

Vous me direz: Qu'est-ce que cela a à voir avec les changements climatiques? En moyenne, les aliments que vous mangez ont voyagé 2 400 kilomètres avant de se rendre dans votre assiette au Québec. J'ai les chiffres pour le Québec, et cela doit être semblable à travers le Canada, 50 p. 100 environ des aliments qu'on consomme au Québec proviennent de l'extérieur de la province ou du pays. Donc, il y a un lien évident en termes, d'une part, de sécurité alimentaire et de développement écologique de l'agriculture, mais aussi carrément de transport des marchandises et donc émissions de gaz à effet de serre.

🕒 (1130)

Également, à Équiterre, nous offrons des services d'efficacité énergétique. Donc, nous nous rendons chez les gens pour leur offrir nos services. Nous avons un programme qui s'adresse spécifiquement à des personnes à faible revenu. Nous offrons une visite gratuite d'environ deux heures où nous offrons une série de services-conseils. Nous visitons annuellement 1 000 ménages par année. Ce programme qui vise des personnes à faible revenu est soutenu par le gouvernement du Québec. Malheureusement, il n'est pas soutenu par le gouvernement fédéral. Il permet donc des économies entre 5 et 20 p. 100 de la facture énergétique. Donc, pour des personnes à faible revenu qui ont de la difficulté à se loger. Il s'agit donc d'un impact considérable.

Nous offrons un deuxième service réalisé en collaboration avec les gouvernements du Québec et du Canada, concernant les analyses énergétiques pour les maisons, autrement appelé Énerguidé. Il s'agit d'une analyse énergétique de la maison qui permet aux propriétaires de réaliser des travaux de rénovation écoénergétique, pouvant contribuer à des économies allant jusqu'à 20 p. 100 de sa facture. Ce sont des programmes qui sont extrêmement populaires qui nous permettent d'intervenir en termes d'éducation de très haute qualité et d'apporter ainsi des changements concrets.

En ce qui concerne le transport, nous menons des campagnes d'éducation auprès du grand public, en collaboration avec toute sorte de partenaires, incluant les gens du milieu de la santé et des municipalités. En fait, le gros du travail d'Équiterre depuis une dizaine d'années, sur cette question, a été d'amener les décideurs aux niveaux municipal et provincial, à poser des gestes pour notamment améliorer le transport en commun ainsi que les autres modes de transport en milieu urbain.

Donc, nous avons été très actifs pour faire en sorte qu'on investisse davantage, entre autres, dans le transport en commun et le transport actif. D'ailleurs, plus tard dans ma présentation, je vais vous entretenir de cette question plus en détails. À mon avis, le transport en commun est l'un des enjeux les plus importants, à long terme, dans le dossier des changements climatiques.

Par exemple, à Montréal, on discute présentement de la construction d'un nouveau pont entre Montréal et Laval, sur la rive-nord, c'est le pont de l'autoroute 25. Or, il y a un débat de société qui est en train de se dessiner autour de ce pont-là. Pour l'instant, il s'agit d'un pont qui ne nécessiterait pas l'intervention du fédéral mais qui pourrait être un exemple intéressant étant donné que cela s'applique à n'importe quelle infrastructure autoroutière. Donc, dans le passé, le gouvernement fédéral a investi et continue à investir dans les infrastructures autoroutières, notamment en milieu urbain.

Alors, le pont en question ferait en sorte qu'il y aurait 150 000 voitures additionnelles qui entreraient à Montréal. Un tel pont à Montréal et la banlieue, où circuleraient 150 000 voitures pendant toute la journée, cela voudrait dire 20 000 voitures uniquement à l'heure de pointe pendant la matinée. Le coût de construction de ce pont est de 350 millions de dollars. Or, il existe des voies réservées autour de Montréal, notamment sur le pont Champlain, qui ont une capacité de déplacer environ, en autobus, 25 000 personnes, en période de pointe.

À notre avis, toute la question du débat sur cette infrastructure autoroutière est la suivante: Du point de vue des finances publiques uniquement--oublions pour quelques instants la question de l'environnement--est-ce qu'on dépense 350 millions de dollars pour construire un nouveau pont? Ou est-ce qu'on place des cônes jaune-orange le long d'une voie existante pour la réserver aux autobus? Le débat se résume essentiellement à cela.

À mon avis, d'un point de vue des investissements que fait et que va faire le gouvernement fédéral en matière d'infrastructures, il sera extrêmement important qu'on examine cela puisque si le fédéral envoie un message que les investissements dans les infrastructures routières sont souhaitables, nous risquons, non seulement d'aggraver le problème au niveau environnemental, mais aussi au niveau de la congestion routière et au niveau des enjeux comme la santé en milieu urbain.

Au niveau de Kyoto, le gouvernement canadien a envoyé un message extrêmement positif à toutes les instances et à plusieurs citoyens lorsqu'il a signé l'Accord de Kyoto, en 1997 et lorsqu'il l'a ratifié par la suite en 2002.

🕒 (1135)

Je vous donne quelques exemples. Au Québec, on a travaillé fort pour que la Communauté métropolitaine de Montréal qui regroupe l'ensemble du RMR de Montréal appui la ratification du Protocole de Kyoto. Des villes comme Québec et Montréal ont carrément adopté des plans d'actions pour réduire leurs émissions de gaz à effet de serre. Plus récemment, les citoyens du Québec se sont positionnés très clairement contre la construction d'une centrale au gaz naturel, dont à peu près le seul enjeu environnemental était celui des gaz à effet de serre. Dans ce sens, la signature et la ratification de l'accord a envoyé des messages intéressants.

Sur le terrain, quand on travaille avec les villes et différentes instances, le problème maintenant est que les actes n'ont pas suivi les paroles du gouvernement fédéral. Je vous donne un exemple. On siège au comité de direction du plan de développement durable. Pour la ville de Montréal qui veut poser des gestes pour l'environnement, il n'y a aucun moyen concret d'appuyer ce que voudrait faire la ville de Montréal. Les programmes sont peu ou inexistantes et les moyens mis à la disposition des villes ou même des provinces ne sont pas cohérents avec le message qu'on leur envoie en termes de réduction des gaz à effet de serre.

Je vous parle de cela parce qu'à mon avis c'est important. Le gouvernement a lancé une campagne d'éducation sur les changements climatiques qui s'appelle «Le défi d'une tonne». Récemment, Équiterre a fondé, avec d'autres organismes, le Centre d'action québécois sur les changements climatiques. Nous sommes partenaires de cette campagne. Nous essayons de l'adapter au contexte québécois tout comme des groupes semblables, qui se nomment «Climat change Hobs» dans toutes les provinces et territoires, tentent de le faire. C'est une campagne nécessaire.

Il est essentiel qu'on communique aux Canadiens ce que les gouvernements essaient de faire en matière de changements climatiques. Cependant, un moment donné cela va devenir difficile, et pour le gouvernement et pour nous, qui sommes sur le terrain et qui parlons à ces gens tous les jours, de leur dire de laisser leur voiture, si on subventionne les entreprises qui fabriquent des voitures sans leur imposer des conditions en ce qui concerne le type de voiture qu'ils font. Cela va devenir très difficile de dire aux gens, «utilisez le transport en commun», alors qu'à Montréal il y a dix ans les autobus passaient, au pire des cas, aux 15 minutes. C'est maintenant rendu aux 30 minutes. Quand on attend un autobus à moins 30 au mois de janvier, ce n'est pas évident, si on n'a pas de signal clair des différences instances incluant le gouvernement canadien, qu'on va investir dans le transport en commun et non pas dans les systèmes autoroutiers.

Je passe rapidement sur la question du portrait du transport puisqu'il me reste peu de temps. Je veux simplement vous dire que du point de vue du nombre de voitures et de kilomètres parcourus, nous sommes en constante augmentation depuis plusieurs années au Québec. Mis à part les États-Unis, parmi les pays du G-7 nous sommes le pays qui se déplace le moins avec les transports urbains. Cela n'a rien à voir avec l'étendue du pays. On parle du transport urbain. On est en perte constante, que ce soit à Montréal, à Toronto ou dans d'autres villes. Il faut redresser cette situation, notamment en envoyant des signaux clairs.

Je vous laisse avec les recommandations d'Équiterre. Ce sont des recommandations assez larges qui sont inspirées d'organismes qui ont déjà fait des recommandations semblables, comme la Table ronde nationale sur l'environnement. Même si ce dont les villes auraient besoin à court terme, ce sont de nouveaux moyens fiscaux de lever des fonds, puisque le gouvernement fédéral n'a pas cette capacité de donner des nouveaux légaux aux municipalités, c'est important qu'il y ait de l'argent. On parle de 3 milliards de dollars annuellement qui seraient dédiés uniquement au transport en commun et aux sources de transport actif comme le vélo mais qui pourraient aussi dédiés à des infrastructures visant la diminution de l'utilisation de la voiture, par exemple des stratégies de mise en place de péage dans de grandes villes. Parallèlement à cette recommandation, il sera important de s'assurer qu'on n'investit pas dans des infrastructures autoroutières ce qui viendrait annuler les gains qu'on pourrait faire avec des investissements en transport en commun.

Le gouvernement fédéral devrait mettre en place des politiques de localisation de ses immeubles et de déplacement de ses fonctionnaires. C'est une mesure très facile mais qui pourrait avoir un important impact compte tenu des 367 000 fonctionnaires de la fonction publique fédérale.

🕒 (1140)

Il faut se diriger vers une déduction fiscale pour les employeurs que fournissent des passes de transport en commun à leurs employés.

D'un point de vue de l'éducation du public, il faut examiner des façons de décentraliser les stratégies de l'éducation du public sur cette question, car les solutions en Alberta et au Québec pour l'individu, ne sont pas les mêmes. Il faut éventuellement aller vers une augmentation de la taxe sur l'essence. C'est un des leviers qu'a le gouvernement fédéral à ce niveau-là.

[English]

The Chair: Could I ask you just to conclude now, please?

Mr. Sidney Ribaux: I'm concluding.

[Français]

Il faut augmenter le financement que vous accordez à l'efficacité énergétique et plus particulièrement, il faut examiner la possibilité pour le fédéral de financer un programme d'efficacité énergétique visant les personnes à faible revenu.

Je concluerai là-dessus.

Merci beaucoup.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Ribaux.

Just to remind the members and witnesses that if you have additional points to bring out, you can bring them out in the question and answer period also. Okay? We're just a little bit over time on that one, but we do appreciate that input.

Mr. Simpson and Mr. Patterson from the Friends of Science, please.

🕒 (1145)

Mr. Charles Simpson (President, Friends of Science Society): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members. Thank you for the opportunity to be with you today and impart our thoughts on the implementation of the Kyoto protocol.

I'm with Friends of Science Society, which comprises engineers, geologists, geophysicists, and atmospheric and environmental scientists. The society was formed just three years ago to examine the science underlying Kyoto, as our members felt that this science was at best uncertain, and certainly leans towards being obsolete. We have consulted many client experts, and now have a scientific advisory board consisting of a number of leading international experts in the field. One of them, Dr. Tim Patterson of Carleton University, is with me today to speak to the science.

Today is unique in that it is the first time, to my knowledge, that an independent climate scientist has addressed a committee such as this as a dissenting voice. We and others who contest the science of Kyoto have previously been prevented from attending the stakeholders meetings. For allowing us to present today, I give my sincere thank-you.

The summary notes from your October 21 meeting make no mention of the science of climate change. From this omission, I presume that the committee has concluded that the science has been resolved. To the contrary, it has been swept under the rug and it has been ignored. As a consequence of this serious oversight, Canada is about to commit to spending billions of dollars towards the implementation of a climate change plan which is not justified scientifically.

We are here today to give you just a snippet of the science, and further, to encourage you to recommend to your government that an open national debate on the science of Kyoto be held, something that has never happened in Canada.

While this committee session is focused on implementation, please seriously consider what Professor Patterson has to say about the science before going forward. Future actions should clearly be focused on dealing with real pollutants, not carbon dioxide, which is most assuredly not a pollutant. Kyoto is flawed in its science, failed as a policy, and could be financially disastrous. I am hesitant to say, but personally I feel that Kyoto is only politically motivated.

The Canadian government has refused to listen to our country's leading experts in the fields and so we have brought one with us today to impart some science to you. It now gives me a great deal of pleasure to introduce my friend and associate, Professor Tim Patterson.

Dr. Tim Patterson (Expert Witness, Carleton University, Friends of Science Society): Mr. Chairman and committee members, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to testify today and I hope that my presentation here will result in many more non-governmental scientists being invited to make testimony.

Any government policy concerning climate change must be based on the most up to date and best in today's climate science, otherwise we risk wasting taxpayer dollars on plans that may have no foundation in reality.

Besides advising friends of science and working at Carleton University as a Professor of Geology, I am what is known as paleoclimatologist. That is to say I examine evidence that is contained in ocean and lake sediments, fossils and isotopes to attempt to decipher how climate has varied naturally over the past two million years.

My research is funded by the Canada's Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council as well as the Canadian Foundation for Climate and Atmospheric Sciences. I am also the Canadian leader of UNESCO International Geologic Correlation Program designed to examine sea level change.

During the past half million years there have been more than 33 major glacial advances and retreats. The next ice age is expected to start some time within the next two millennia.

Even in recent times we have seen disastrous cold periods such as the little ice age when the Thames River in London froze over and famine and pestilence killed millions of people throughout the world.

There have also been periods warmer than today such as the medieval warm period when Vikings farmed in Greenland and sailed waters now covered with sea ice.

Generally speaking warmer is better and colder is worse for human societies. Based on the period of climatic data that I and others have collected it is obvious that climate is and always has been variable. In fact the only constant about climate is change. It changes continually. We certainly have no chance of stopping this natural phenomena.

The field of climate science is vast and I should emphasize rapidly evolving. Many things we thought we knew about the climate system just a few years ago are now proving to be highly uncertain or quite mistaken.

It is no exaggeration to say that in the eight years since the Kyoto protocol was introduced there has been a revolution in climate science. This is not surprising given that the industrialized world has spent around \$30 billion on climate research over that period.

If back in the mid-1990s we knew what we know about climate change today there would be no Kyoto protocol because it would have been considered unnecessary.

Today I'll highlight some of the recent Canadian developments that illustrate this point. Analyst Steven McIntyre and Guelph University Professor Ross Mcitrick have found devastating mathematical mistakes in an important 1998 study which claimed to prove that the most recent warming of the earth is unusual.

The intergovernmental panel for climate change, the IPCC, used this study as a major prop. Now that prop is gone. Yet Environment Canada and others continue to use this graph as if it were still valid. It is not.

Figure No. 1 in your handout illustrates this point very well. The blue line is one of the primary pieces of evidences that is used by the IPCC to promote the idea that the 20th century warming was unprecedented in the past millennia. This line has become known as the hockey stick. The shaft of the stick is the supposedly relatively lower temperatures for the first 900 years of the period and the blade of the stick is the reputed sudden temperature rise of the past century. The red line in Figure No. 1 is the result you get when the data and the methodology used to produce the hockey stick are applied correctly.

As you can see there is an enormous difference between the two curves prior to about 1500 A.D.

While neither McItrick nor McIntyre of anyone else who properly understands climate history would assert that the 1400s did have such high temperatures, their exposure of the serious flaws in the hockey stick was a crucially important development our government has simply ignored.

Similarly the research findings of extreme weather experts such as Dr. Maha Kandahar have been disregarded and this is in the published literature. Dr. Kandahar has shown that extreme events are not on the rise in Canada and the likelihood that such occurrences will rise or increase in the next 25 years is very low.

Events such as droughts, floods and hurricanes are important threats and we can do a lot to prepare for them, but humans do not cause such occurrences and Kyoto will do nothing to prevent them.

Canada is fortunate to have one of the world's leading paleoclimate researchers at the University of Ottawa and that is geology professor, Dr. Jan Visser.

🕒 (1150)

Over the past several years he has conducted truly groundbreaking research looking into the long term climate trends. Professor Visser has shown the changes in atmospheric carbon dioxide, the gas most restricted by Kyoto in Canada, have had little effect on earth's long term temperature variation in comparison with natural causes.

I direct you to figure 2 in your handout. The thick blue line at the top shows the changes in atmospheric carbon dioxide, CO₂, and the thin black line at the bottom of the graph is a plot of temperatures found by Professor Visser looking back through the geologic time. As you can see, through deep time there is no meaningful correlation between carbon dioxide levels and earth's temperature. In fact, when CO₂ levels were over 10 times higher than they were at the present time, about 450 million years ago our planet was in the depths of the absolute coldest period in the last half billion years.

On the basis of this evidence, how could anyone still believe that the recent relatively small increases in CO₂ levels that you see in figure 3 of your handout would be the major cause of the past century's modest warming?

What causes climate change? My own research and that of many others in the field show that in all times scales there is a very good correlation between earth's temperature and natural celestial phenomena such as changes in the brightness of the sun. This should surprise no one because, after all, the sun and the stars are the source of virtually all the energy that's received by our planet. The fact that the sun is now brighter than it has been at any time in the past 8,000 years should have a major impact upon climate.

In our research, we are showing the excellent correlation between the regular fluctuations in the brightness of the sun and earthly temperatures and hundreds of other studies have shown similar trends. In the legal system, there's a mechanism to reopen cases when new evidence comes to light. In science,

this is the norm as well: questioning, re-examining, changing ideas and rejecting old ones when reputable new information surfaces.

If Canada's government is to base climate policy on real science, then it must accept that its policy decisions should be changeable as climate science advances. Otherwise, policy becomes disconnected from science and we may waste billions of dollars going in entirely the wrong direction.

Until we have a far better understanding of the underlying science, the government should cancel funding allocated to stopping climate change, which is ridiculous. The only constant about climate is change. Instead, we should be preparing for whatever nature throws at us next, as well as continuing to fund research that will help us to eventually understand our planet's complex climate system.

I would like to thank you, Mr. Chair and committee members, and I look forward to answering any questions that you may have.

🕒 (1155)

The Chair: Merci beaucoup, Monsieur Patterson et Monsieur Simpson.

Let me say that you certainly have given us something to, I shouldn't say cross-examine but certainly to examine further, and we appreciate that point of view. It will be interesting with respect to the balance of the committee's deliberations to inquire further into the perspectives that all of the witnesses have put forward.

Without any further ado, I will go to the first questioner, Mr. Mills.

We have a pre-prescribed format. We have 10 minutes of questioning from each of the parties and then we go to a back and forth for 5 minutes. I will try to keep this part within the 10 minutes each for the parties.

Mr. Mills, please.

Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you witnesses for attending.

I understand your frustration Mr. Simpson and Dr. Patterson. I went through exactly the same thing. I tried to attend 14 of the public consultation meetings and of course was excluded because I was an opponent of Kyoto. So the public consultation process has been one sided up 'til this point. It's amazing what a minority government does for a country and its democracy.

Having said that, I would ask you to keep your answers fairly short if you might because I have an awful lot of questions.

First of all, from the very beginning, the Kyoto target being 6% below 1990 levels seems to not consider the fact that we have a very large country, a very huge amount of space, no transportation

infrastructure, not a lot of people. All of those are considerations if you were going to try to achieve a target which makes that target totally impossible to achieve as a resource-based economy and so on.

I really question the fact that a poor country can't take care of its environment, so I'm always amazed when environmental groups seem to think that most Canadians would like to live in a cave instead of having the modern economy that we have with an ability to take care of our environment.

So I wonder about the reality of even these targets or even attempting to achieve them because to me, Kyoto is basically a Eurocentric, bureaucratic nightmare. And having attended those meetings, I believe I can say that with some fact basis.

My next question, is CO₂ really a poisonous, a hazardous waste? We seem to talk about CO₂ being hazardous. I have, with my biology background, basically always thought of CO₂ as being a basis of photosynthesis and necessary for all life on earth and very valuable.

I wonder do you consider CO₂ a hazardous material in our environment? I guess I'm addressing more to the unscientific people in terms of that basis.

My third question would be, would it not be better to develop technologies in Canada? Let our companies here develop the technologies that would allow us to really make a difference to the environment where we would transfer this to developing countries, to the Indias, the Chinas, and really make a big difference. Again, Canada is a pretty small player when it comes to global change.

My question for our scientists would be it's very difficult to get Canadians to focus on science. It's much easier to look at the sky is falling and the Chicken Little phenomena where you run across the country and say, "people are drowning, polar bears are dying". I wonder how we can get that science on a level that Canadians can understand. How can we do that?

And as well, I guess that comes into what do Canadians think Kyoto is? If you asked them in Toronto, they'll say it's about the smog days. We can reduce smog days by signing Kyoto. We can have no boil water warnings across the country. We can have a clean environment if we in fact go along with Kyoto.

So there's a lot of questions there. I wonder if you might, whoever wants to tackle sort of that general gist. I think you see where I'm coming from, and again the purpose of this committee is to establish some solid evidence about Kyoto in a balanced approach because I, like you, am very afraid we're going to spend billions of dollars on programs that really will make little or no difference to Canada or to the world.

🕒 (1200)

The Chair: Well, you've got a full spectrum of questions. Who would like to lead off with answers to some of Mr. Mills' questions?

All right. Professor Patterson.

Dr. Tim Patterson: I am not prepared to speak about Kyoto per se. That's not my expertise. I'm a paleoclimatologist but what I can speak to are the two science portions, one talking about carbon dioxide as a poisonous gas. That's ridiculous. It's a plant food and natural part of the atmosphere.

Probably the major contributions that humanity makes every year is a net increase of about 3 gigatonnes to an overall flux of about 740 gigatonnes. There is a sort of increase so that's our anthropogenic or human induced influence but if you look over geologic time we find when CO₂ concentrations are going up it's generally trailing on after a temperature increase because just as you mentioned, this is a plant food and you're reflecting biological activity. That's the basic answer about CO₂. You cannot equate this with some kind of a poisonous gas. We are breathing it out ever time we sit here. That's the first answer.

The second that I would discuss is science education. As an educator myself, I find that really difficult. I teach a climate change course every year at Carleton University. I have one going now with about 350 students and these are university students and I'm amazed at the understanding of some of the even most basic concepts of climate.

I feel good by the end of the semester when basically I think I've brought them up to a certain level they can understand basically some of the questions because they don't understand Kyoto, what's behind it and particularly they don't understand the science of climate change. That's why I make an effort when I can to go into the community to give general climate lectures and so on to try to bring people up to speed so they can form an educated opinion and not be overtly influenced by certain organizations that have a stated agenda. That's about all I can say on the science at this point.

Mr. Steven Guilbeault: On the issue of science, a study was leaked from the Pentagon saying that climate change was in its eyes a threat far worse than terrorism for the U.S. global security and to say that the Hadley Centre, that Environment Canada and that the 122 countries that have ratified Kyoto are simply suffering from some form of mass illusion is a bit of a stretch.

In terms of living in a cave, I'm not particularly fond of it myself. You may be familiar with Scandinavian countries which have a standard of living very similar to our own. They live in a cold climate. They have heavy industries like we do. Norway, and countries as such, basically consume a third of the energy we do so it's not about living in caves, it's about being efficient. Frankly, being efficient would not only also be good for the economy but it would be good for the environment at the same time.

You will probably be reassured to know that I am a social scientist. I have published a number of articles in peer reviewed magazines on the issue of climate change and as Morag pointed out earlier, the international scientific consensus around climate change is there. Some people still dispute it but the overall majority of scientists who are working on the issue are saying that it's happening.

The IPCC, the intergovernmental panel on climate change, does its work by basically doing an international scientific review of the literature that looks at climate change. I don't have the numbers for the 2001 assessment report but the 1995 assessment report basically reviewed 20,000 scientific papers dealing with climate change and that's how they were able to come to the conclusions that they did in 1995, and in 2001.

I think none of us has argued that CO₂ is a poisonous gas although a number of legislatures around the world, including Quebec, are saying that CO₂ should be considered a pollutant. If you look at the classical definition of what a pollutant does to the environment, then from that perspective, yes it can be described as a pollutant. No one is saying that it's a poisonous gas, obviously.

I would agree with you that I think that the Kyoto implementation plan should focus on developing technologies and implementing them in Canada rather than buying credits abroad. That being said, I think it has to be recognized that because of the time we've wasted over the past few years we will have to buy some credits internationally and I think what needs to happen is that we need to make sure these are for valid projects in which we can invest. Canadian companies are investing abroad every day of the year and we should make sure that the investments that are being done are being done for very valid projects.

🕒 (1205)

The Chair:

Thank you.

Mr. Ribaux, we have one minute left in this interchange.

Mr. Sidney Ribaux: Okay. Well, very, very quickly just to say the objective of Kyoto, we can dispute it, we can talk about it for a long time, but I think reducing CO₂ in most of the measures that certainly we're proposing would have huge co-benefits that in and of themselves are worth it in terms of air pollution in cities, in terms of congestion, which is costing cities like Montreal and Toronto hundreds of millions of dollars a year, and so on.

In terms of the technology, I sort of agree with you. We should use Kyoto to develop technologies that are promising for the future, like wind power, like geothermal. We should be investing in these new forms of energy rather than investing in existing technologies that have proven to be very pollutant for all sorts of reasons, including climate change, like the oil industry and nuclear power, for example.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Ribaux.

We'll now go to the next questioner. Might I remind, once again, if there is something that is outside the time limit which you wish to add, you possibly can complement that in the answers that you give with respect to other members in their questions.

We go to Mr. Bigras.

[*Français*]

M. Bernard Bigras (Rosemont—La Petite-Patrie, BQ): Merci beaucoup, monsieur le président.

J'aimerais aborder la question de la carotte et du bâton. Je discuterai moins de la carotte, parce que cela m'apparaît trop évident, mais j'aimerais qu'on discute du bâton. Et lorsqu'on parle du bâton,

naturellement on est obligé à mon avis d'en discuter, parce que l'approche volontaire développée jusqu'à maintenant a été un véritable échec. À mon avis, nous devons donc déplacer le débat du côté de la réglementation. Encore faut-il savoir le type de réglementation qu'on veut adopter au Canada, particulièrement en regard des grands émetteurs industriels et des 55 mégatonnes.

Jusqu'à présent, l'approche développée par le gouvernement fédéral aborde la question de l'intensité des émissions de gaz à effet de serre pour les grands émetteurs industriels—donc émissions sur production, plutôt que la valeur absolue et la quantité absolue d'émissions par secteur industriel.

Deuxième élément: on tient compte de la période de 2010. On dit: nous allons évaluer les émissions par secteur industriel, projetées jusqu'en 2010, et nous réduirons de 15 p. 100 par secteur industriel les émissions de gaz à effet de serre. Ma question est la suivante: Dans la mesure où l'on peut s'entendre sur la réglementation comme voie éventuelle à privilégier, que pensez-vous de ces deux notions: l'intensité des émissions de gaz à effet de serre comme calcul d'une répartition sectorielle et la période de 2010? N'est-ce pas simplement un encouragement à polluer, entraînant la pénalisation possible d'entreprises comme celles du secteur manufacturier québécois, qui a réduit de 7 p. 100 ses émissions de gaz à effet de serre depuis 1990?

ⓘ (1210)

Le président: Suivant.

M. Steven Guilbeault: Merci, monsieur Bigras.

Sur la question de l'intensité versus les réductions absolues, les réductions d'émission absolues, nous sommes tout à fait d'accord avec vous. C'est une très mauvaise approche qui a été introduite dans le programme des grands émetteurs que celle de fonctionner en partant de l'intensité des émissions, vu l'absence de garantie que nous atteindrons les réductions d'émissions totales, et c'est l'objectif de Kyoto, de toute évidence.

Il faut bien comprendre qu'on nous fait miroiter la catastrophe économique, comme on l'a fait d'ailleurs à l'époque du débat sur la ratification concernant la mise en oeuvre du Protocole de Kyoto au Canada, notamment dans le secteur du pétrole et du gaz. Cependant, si ma mémoire est bonne, c'est M. George Anderson, sous-ministre aux Ressources naturelles, qui a avoué devant ce même comité que l'impact des mesures prévues finalement sur le secteur du pétrole représenterait une augmentation de 23 à 25 cents le baril de pétrole. Pas le litre! Alors qu'il y a des variations sur les marchés internationaux de plusieurs dollars par semaine, parfois même plus. Et cela ne semble pas embêter l'industrie, mais une augmentation de 23 à 25 cents par baril serait la catastrophe économique. J'ai un peu de misère à croire cela.

L'autre élément, sur la période de référence, est très important aussi. Il faut bien comprendre que si on décide d'adopter 2010 plutôt que 1990 par exemple, on invite essentiellement les gens à polluer beaucoup d'ici à 2010, de façon à avoir un plafond d'émissions maximal, et alors les réductions seront beaucoup plus faciles. Par rapport à utiliser 1990 comme année de base, c'est de toute façon celle qu'on utilise déjà dans le Protocole de Kyoto, elle permettrait de reconnaître les efforts déjà faits dans plusieurs

secteurs de l'industrie canadienne, dont l'Ontario—on parlait du secteur manufacturier québécois, mais ce qui est vrai au Québec le demeure dans plusieurs secteurs manufacturiers canadiens. Songeons aux pâtes et papiers, qui ont beaucoup réduit, à l'échelle du Canada, la consommation d'énergie. Pour la production, on songe au secteur de l'aluminium.

Si on choisit 2010 plutôt que 1990, tous les efforts déjà déployés par ces industries seront pratiquement effacés et non reconnus par le plan fédéral.

M. Christian Simard (Beauport—Limoilou, BQ): Il n'en demeure pas moins que nous avons raté des objectifs, je crois qu'il faut le redire. Nous avons engagé 3,7 milliards de dollars, je crois, et nous sommes en retard sur les objectifs de 28 p. 100. Je crois que l'heure est assez grave, parce que pour le plan d'action cela veut dire des choses assez radicales. Ce que nous aurions pu faire de façon plus phasée, nous serons obligés de le faire de façon plus directe.

Le ministre des Finances est venu nous dire que les Canadiens veulent un développement économique et une protection de l'environnement très rapides, et que le gouvernement allait leur donner les deux.

Maintenant, il y a des choix difficiles, nous sommes à la veille d'un budget. Pouvez-vous nous résumer quelles mesures fiscales seraient importantes dans ce budget et nous dire aussi pourquoi, selon vous, la fiscalité, qui n'est pas coûteuse pour un gouvernement, n'est pas utilisée actuellement dans une urgence d'appliquer le protocole de Kyoto? Quelle est votre interprétation de cette non-utilisation?

M. Steven Guilbeault: Merci, monsieur Simard.

Présentement, le système fiscal canadien a tendance à encourager les activités qui génèrent beaucoup de gaz à effets de serre et décourager celles qui en produisent peu ou pas. On peut penser à l'éolien, par exemple, et là c'est vrai que le gouvernement fédéral a mis en place un crédit à la production d'énergie éolienne qui est, soit dit en passant, à peu près le tiers du crédit à la production d'énergie éolienne qui est offert aux États-Unis sous l'administration de M. Bush. George W. Bush offre un crédit à la production d'énergie éolienne trois fois plus généreux que celui qui existe au Canada. Pourtant, c'est supposé être rétrograde en matière d'environnement. Il l'est, mais je pense que cela illustre qu'on a beaucoup de retard à ce niveau au Canada.

J'en ai parlé plus tôt, mais le problème est que, dans les années 1990, nos émissions ont beaucoup augmenté. Si elles avaient été stabilisées dans la décennie des années 1990, notre objectif de Kyoto serait seulement de - 6 p. 100. On parle maintenant de 28 p. 100, peut-être même plus. Il y a donc un coup de barre à donner, et celui-ci doit se faire. On doit cesser de financer à l'aide des deniers de l'État les activités polluantes et on doit encourager massivement les activités non polluantes d'un point de vue d'émissions de gaz à effets de serre. Comme Sydney l'a dit, je crois qu'il est très important de le mentionner. Quand on s'attaque à la question des émissions de gaz à effets de serre, on s'attaque aussi à la source de plusieurs autres polluants, les oxydes d'azote, les oxydes de soufre.

Je suis d'accord avec mes collègues sur le fait qu'il faut réduire progressivement et même éliminer les subventions du gouvernement fédéral envers les combustibles fossiles--qui n'en ont de toute évidence

pas besoin, au prix où se vend le baril présentement--et encourager massivement l'introduction des énergies renouvelables, mais aussi toute la question du transport en commun. Parmi les pays de l'OCDE, le gouvernement canadien est celui qui investit le moins pour le transport en commun. Il y a également un coup de barre à donner à ce sujet. C'est très clair pour nous qu'on doit cesser de financer des activités qui polluent et financer le contraire.

🕒 (1215)

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Bigras, we have one minute and a half.

[Français]

M. Bernard Bigras: Une autre question. On a appris qu'on vise à réduire les objectifs pour les grands émetteurs industriels de 55 à 35 mégatonnes environ. Inévitablement, si on veut atteindre l'objectif de Kyoto, il faudra aller les chercher ailleurs. Il semble que le gouvernement fédéral veuille aller chercher ces émissions ailleurs à l'étranger.

Je regardais dans le plan original de novembre 2002, on parlait de 12 mégatonnes qu'on souhaitait aller chercher en émissions internationales par le gouvernement canadien. N'y a-t-il pas une limite à tenter d'aller chercher des mégatonnes à l'étranger alors que nous avons un potentiel évident de pouvoir réduire à la source les émissions de gaz à effets de serre sur notre territoire? Y a-t-il une limite à tenter d'augmenter l'objectif d'aller chercher les crédits d'émissions à l'étranger?

Le président: Monsieur Guilbeault, une courte réponse, s'il vous plaît.

M. Steven Guilbeault: Il n'y a pas de limite prévue dans le cadre du protocole de Kyoto, donc, théoriquement *the sky is the limit*. Évidemment, là où cela devient problématique c'est que cela pourrait être perçu comme une fuite de capitaux. Je suis d'accord avec votre collègue du Parti conservateur, ce qu'on ferait c'est qu'on financerait ailleurs des réductions d'émissions, du développement technologique, alors que nous restons pris avec nos vieilles affaires polluantes. Je ne pense pas que ce soit une stratégie de développement économique qui fasse beaucoup de sens.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you.

We now go over to Mr. McGuinty, please, questions.

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

Thanks very much for joining us, witnesses.

Mr. Chairman, the panel is reminiscent of a forum that I raised here once before with the members of the committee where the national round table on the environment and the economy of the Prime Minister's advisory council conducted a national climate change forum. Through that process it invited 29 experts from the economic perspective and the scientific perspective and the public policy and international legal perspectives and on and on it went. One of the things that we asked each and every one of the witnesses who appeared before that forum was to speak to the limitations of their discipline and, at the same time, to share what they did not know as well as what they knew.

It seems either this is a natural condition of disciplinary differences or it's a question of scientific method or some epistemological problem. I'm not sure what it is, but once again, we have a series of presentations which do not speak to the limitations of their disciplines and it's very frustrating, as a member of the committee, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to pick on something that was mentioned by Mr. Simpson with respect to the uniqueness of hearing dissenting views. I would beg to differ. The government has been hearing different and dissenting views and voices on this subject for over a decade. This is not the first time. It may be the first time that such views are heard in this committee. I don't know, Mr. Chairman. You're a longer serving member. I don't think that that this committee or this government is into censorship. I don't think it ever has been. That doesn't mean to say that the climate change debate isn't rife with censorship on all sides, Mr. Chairman. I think it is continuing, and I think that's a very unfortunate fallout effect of the difficulty we're having with wrestling this climate change elephant to the ground.

I want to also pick up on some of the remarks in the Friends of Science Society document, which I thought was carefully crafted and the choice of words was good. The thing that struck me the most was the sixth paragraph on the first page. You talk about "no political decision should be taken on the basis of the present incomplete scientific knowledge." I really appreciate the fact that the word incomplete and not certainty because the Kyoto Protocol speaks specifically to the fact that the science is not complete, and, for that matter, I would put to the panel: When is science ever complete?

It is not complete and when we put this question of completeness or incompleteness to the 35 or 30 Order of Canada members who sat around our national forum at the national round table, who knew precisely nothing about climate change—in fact they were chosen on the basis of their ignorance of climate change; they weren't environmentalists, they weren't anti-environmentalists and all former politicians were excluded. When they were given this privilege of sitting down and hearing from all these experts, at the end of the day when they could not reach a consensus on the science, what they in fact said to Canadians in their declaration was that we need to take out a measure of insurance. We need to follow the science, invest in the science heavily. We need to take mid-course corrections when we find out new things, so it is important for us to hear new discoveries, but at the same time this proxy sampling of Canadian society said no, it would like the government to move forward under Kyoto and it would like to see a measure of insurance taken out while benefiting from ancillary benefits like better air quality and higher eco-efficiency, the kinds of things that people would naturally tend toward anyway.

I want to table that first with the panellists for some comments.

The other thing that struck me was in the presentation from the David Suzuki Foundation, when it refers and bases one of its recommendations on the work done by Pembina Institute. I haven't seen the Pembina study yet, unfortunately. We could perhaps get a copy, Mr. Chairman, but there is, of course, an ongoing debate as to who science is more robust, whose analysis is more robust than the others. This is a very frustrating thing for Canadians and for MPs and members of the committee are trying to get to the truth of the matter. I'm not so sure what this study says. I'd like to hear more about it and I'd like to find out what other actors in Canadian society have to say about the study, and whether, in fact, we are, as a government, subsidizing the fossil fuel industry. I don't know that to be the case, Mr. Chair.

I'd like to turn that over to the committee and get some responses.

Thank you.

🕒 (1220)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. McGuinty.

We will have the Pembina Institute in next week, I believe, Mr. McGuinty.

You have those questions. Perhaps Mr. Simpson, you would like to lead off.

Mr. Charles Simpson: I would, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, thank you very much for your complimentary remarks on our scientific presentation.

We contend that environmental issues need to be addressed, pollution needs to be addressed, but we can show inconclusively that CO₂ is not a pollutant, and by addressing the reduction of CO₂ emissions, we are forgoing the chance of addressing the real pollutants: NO_x and SO_x, as I referred to, and particulates.

Insofar as this being the first chance to present the science, we can show that we have been precluded from first of all attending groups that are speaking supposedly to the stakeholders, and secondly, when we do obtain entrance to the forums, we are precluded from speaking.

If I could ask a question, I would like to know how buying credits from Russia will help pollution in Canada.

🕒 (1225)

The Chair: Well, Mr. Simpson, you introduce a different perspective and procedure. Could we just let that sit out there for the moment?

Mr. Charles Simpson: Sure.

The Chair: Because Mr. McGuinty had asked question equally with the rest of the panel, and I wonder if we could expand that and allow the witnesses perhaps to respond to Mr. McGuinty.

Ms. Carter.

Mr. Morag Carter: Thank you.

Speaking to the limits of discipline, I, like Steven, am a social scientist, and I work in an environment with a robust and very interesting scientific diversity on the staff and beyond.

I think one of the things that's really interesting about climate change is actually one of the things that Mr. Patterson and Mr. Simpson spoke to this morning, that there is room for a very wide range of perspectives, differences and disciplines in evaluating the climate science, and if we left it all to perhaps just atmospheric scientists, I think it would be incomprehensible. It's very important to have a really interesting range of perspectives.

When is science enough? When is enough science enough? I think that when you have a body of evidence that is beginning to show you that without action we are facing very serious consequences: economic, financial, environmental, social consequences, we have an absolute duty and obligation to act, but that does not mean that we should treat every new paper as absolute proof one way or the other. I think we all have, you and us, have a duty to weigh the body of evidence, the burden of evidence, and act with prudence and caution.

The Chair: Mr. McGuinty, we're out of time on that block but I'll come to Mr. Cullen when we come into the next round in the order, Mr. Cullen, because I do have you down on the list.

We're now back to Mr. Cullen, questions please.

Mr. Nathan Cullen (Skeena—Bulkley Valley, NDP):

Thank you, chair. Also, thanks to the witnesses for being here today.

First off, just with a comment, extraordinarily underlying the comments from Friends of Science today, there was some sort of notion, almost conspiratorial in nature in terms of what's happening with the way that this federal government has gone through things in the last decade, but also internationally.

I'm extraordinarily hesitant to rely too much on the conspiracy theories as to why there hasn't been a balanced look at climate change. Reading through even such populist publications as the *National Geographic* that devoted a recent edition entirely to this, and took a number of years to do this, and a broad range of fields, and came to the conclusive evidence that we're in a whole lot of trouble.

I'm not going to spend time seeking any questions or answers to your presentation. Although I do have curiosities as to how this has managed to manifest itself in such a way that the exclusion of such important science has happened both here nationally and internationally to such a great extent that so

many scientists, who by their nature tend to disagree on things, have found agreement, many, many, many published and well-researched scientists.

My questions are going to be around this concept of this stick, Mr. Guilbeault. It seems to be so reluctant from this Liberal government with respect to industry, that depending on the sector, the government seems very, very cautious about bringing in regulations. Many things are left to the realm of voluntary adjustments to business.

I'm wondering, and we saw this before years ago with asbestos or leaded gas, the resistance and the foretelling of great doom and despair. If you could comment on the importance of moving toward forest regulations and enforced regulatory environments.

Let's take a specific example around auto emissions. How important is this with whatever plan this government plans to move forward?

The Chair: Mr. Guilbeault.

Mr. Steven Guilbeault: Thank you, Mr. Cullen.

I think it is fundamental, as part of not just our Kyoto implementation strategy, but an overall, national clean air strategy that we force car manufacturers in Canada to produce more efficient, less-polluting vehicles.

The argument by the Canadian auto maker is that we'll be the only ones on the planet to do it, and they can't manufacture vehicles for us. Well, great, they won't have to. Oregon has adopted the California standards. California has obviously adopted the California standards. A number of other U.S. states are moving in that direction, New York being one of them as well.

On average, because people travel more and more, because every year there's a greater number of vehicles on the road, basically, the average fuel efficiency of the fleet hasn't moved since the end of the seventies. I mean, considering the tremendous technological development that we've seen in the auto sector, it's quite staggering to look at that statistic. We could very efficiently have....

Yes, it would be more expensive to buy those efficient vehicles. There's a bit of a debate in California. The range is between \$1,000 to \$3,000 to get those efficient vehicles. For an average Canadian who travels roughly 16,000 km a year, the payback is so quick that it becomes a non-issue.

Frankly, our approach to this, like other sectors, has been to try to negotiate a voluntary approach with the auto manufacturers. Guess what? It's not working. We're not going anywhere. I don't think we will ever get anywhere unless the government says to the Canadian auto manufacturers we can sit down and negotiate, but be certain that if we do not come to an agreement, then the federal government will legislate. If we don't do that, we'll never get out of it.

The Chair: Is there anybody else?

Ms. Carter.

Mr. Morag Carter: Thank you.

One other really important thing to remember is there was legislation that was approved by the House in 1982. It's never been proclaimed. The reason that it was never proclaimed was because there was a significant push back from the auto industry who wanted to negotiate voluntary agreements to comply with the intent of the legislation.

Well, more than 20 years later, we're in exactly the same predicament. The tragedy is, that perhaps if something had been done in 1982 when there was an auto pact that was in place, when there was a really, sort of robust national infrastructure that supported the auto industry, then we wouldn't be perhaps being held hostage to the kind of push back from the auto industry that we are now facing.

The Chair: Mr. Cullen.

Mr. Nathan Cullen:

I have a further question. As has often been talked about, Kyoto is being described more and more with respect to an energy question, the way that energy is produced and used and how people are moved around this country. I am wondering if any of you have taken a look at the impacts of this level playing field that has been called for.

I have heard the term subsidies and I have heard doomsday predictions within the oil and gas and coal sectors, in particular, about what the effects would be if subsidies were removed on what is a significant portion of the western economy, which is the extraction of those fuels.

Has anyone taken a look at what it would be to bring forward a level playing field and say, "We're going to treat wind the same as we treat oil and gas", and how that would manifest out in the Canadian economy? This is a huge concern for many of our western MPs.

The Chair: Ms. Carter.

Mr. Morag Carter:

I don't think anyone has looked at that question specifically, although the compendium of the report was released just last week, which is perhaps why the members of the committee haven't yet had a look at it. It shows that--I'm sorry, I had it earlier on--something around \$8.3 billion has been spent on subsidizing the oil and gas industry.

I understand the political difficulties of eliminating subsidies to the oil and gas industry on both the west and the east coasts, but one of the things that could be very important, as Steven mentioned earlier on, is a significant investment in renewable technologies.

The wind power producer incentive is not as well supported in Canada as it is in the U.S., but there are also a number of other technologies that are beginning to come on stream that do not enjoy the kind of federal support that wind does. For that we can look at, for example, geothermal, solar and so on. It would be absolutely fantastic if we were looking, for example, at a renewable energy production incentive in the same way that we have one for wind.

🕒 (1235)

The Chair: Mr. Guilbeault wishes to answer and then Mr. Ribaux.

Mr. Steven Guilbeault: Perhaps briefly, I think there are two things we should be looking at. We want a phased-in approach. No one is talking about massive disruption of any economic sector in Canada. That's not what we're arguing for. I think that we can look to concepts like the one developed by CEP around fair transition. If people will be losing employment in certain sectors, let's train them so that they can be employed in other sectors.

I recall in 2002 at the time we were debating whether or not Canada should ratify Kyoto, Industry Canada produced a study which showed that, depending on the different Kyoto implementation scenarios, the renewable energy industry in Canada could generate annual revenues in the order of \$7 billion to \$8 billion a year if Kyoto was implemented properly.

Obviously, the potential to create jobs is there. The potential to generate wealth is there as well. We just have to do it right.

The Chair: Mr. Ribaux. We have one minute.

Mr. Sidney Ribaux: Again we are proposing a gradual shift of the use of the government money that we are using. As a few examples, we produce trains in Canada and we produce buses. We actually produce 50% of the urban buses used in all of North America, so we have half the market. There are 40,000 jobs that exist in urban transit.

The idea is to shift toward these types of jobs in this type of economy rather than to keep going on what we've actually been going on.

The Chair: One last short question.

It will have to be short, Mr. Cullen.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: Yes.

Oftentimes pollution is equated with an inefficiency within a system, whether it's a machine or it's an entire economy. Canada's productivity has always lamented. I now lament that George Bush didn't get to address our Parliament and be able to highlight how much better they are doing on wind than we are, which would have been quite striking for Canadians.

I have been approached by the Canadian Mining Association and other groups that have done a great deal toward reducing the emissions they are putting into the air right now and have realized good economics out of it. This has actually been very good for our business. Yet they are not going to be getting any credit as it stands right now for the work that has already been done. It's going to be more expensive for a number of these mining outfits to make further increases.

Have your groups looked at or considered the concept of grandfathering in if the government were to grandfather in and say, "You've done a number of improvements, we applaud you for that, and this will go toward the reductions that we're now asking for the large final emitters", which is generally the place that we're talking about. I think parts of the mining sector are a good place to look.

The Chair: We'll have to have a short response, Mr. Guilbeault.

Mr. Steven Guilbeault: I think they're trying to have their cake and eat it too. Is that the English expression? It refers back to what Mr. Bigras was saying earlier. If we were to use 1990 as a baseline, then these efforts that they've done would be recognized, but these same companies or sectors are arguing for a 2010 baseline to start the intensity of emission reduction, and therefore basically nullifying all the efforts that they've done.

If they were to choose the approach that we were talking about earlier, then these efforts would be recognized, but because they're arguing for a 2010 baseline, then all of it is basically forgotten.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Guilbeault and Mr. Cullen.

We'll now go to five minute questions and responses, and we go back up to the top of the batting order with Mr. Richardson.

Mr. Lee Richardson (Calgary Centre, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you all for coming today.

As we get into these hearings, it's fascinating to look for patterns and similarities. Our interest, that is mine particularly as a layperson, is to better understand the basic premises that we work under. I noted, for example, today three of our four presenters reiterated the basic premise of Kyoto, and that is that man-made emissions are contributing to global warming and that it's occurring at a rapid and threatening rate. Mr. Cullen--I'm sorry he's not with us at the moment--even suggested that to think differently might be some kind of a conspiracy theory or whatever.

I think it's important to follow up the line of questioning on what Mr. McGuinty was saying a minute ago about his panel of experts, because that's what we're kind of looking for here. We'd like to get some expert opinion and solid data, and not just sort of a reiteration of other people's views, because I think as Ronald Bailey said, once a particular notion becomes conventional wisdom, evidence and stories confirming that conventional wisdom are easily accepted, and published in the media as well, and those that contradict the prevailing views have a much harder time getting a hearing.

We want to hear not just prevailing views, it's important to us, and also the basis of those views, where they come from, and what they're founded on. Without questioning the sincerity of people's views or their concerns, I think it's incumbent upon the committee as well to get an understanding of where those views are coming from and what the credentials are of the people who are making those presentations.

We've heard today questioning of the basic science at the premise of this. I'm talking about the physical science, not the social science. The credentials seemed pretty clear. Could I ask our first presenters your credentials for presenting the information you did today?

🕒 (1240)

The Chair: Mr. Simpson.

Mr. Lee Richardson: No, I'd like to ask the first presenters.

The Chair: Oh, I see. I'm sorry. All right, we'll go to Mr. Guilbeault.

Mr. Steven Guilbeault: As I said earlier, I am a social scientist, but I referred to NASA, you may have heard of them, Environment Canada, the intergovernmental panel on climate change, the Pentagon, the British Meteorological Centre, the Chinese Meteorological Centre, the Japanese Meteorological Centre, the European Meteorological Centre, the German Meteorological Centre. There are a tremendous number of organizations around this planet, the World Meteorological Organization, that all agree that climate change is real, it's happening, and it's largely due to human activity, so you might as well question their credibility, their credentials, if you want to question mine.

Mr. Lee Richardson: I didn't mean to suggest that I was questioning them. I just wanted to know what they were, but as you've raised this point, I think those were all views that came out early. We had this premise that was established, that it was CO₂ emissions that were the cause of climate change. It's only been recently, and particularly very recently, that those views are questioned.

I'm aware that it's difficult for people, once bought into a line of thinking, to defend their position, to save face or whatever, but I think it's only reasonable that we question these, and that's all I'm asking, is that you are then convinced that we don't need to go back over that ground, that there is no doubt in your mind that from your background that there's any reason to question that basic premise of the original basis of Kyoto?

Mr. Steven Guilbeault: That is not what I'm saying. What I'm saying is that there is an ongoing scientific debate around climate change. Right now the overwhelming consensus is that it is real, it is happening and it is because of us.

Therefore on that basis we should develop policies to address that question which as others have pointed out will help us address other environmental issues.

I am not saying we should stop or we should prevent people who have different views on the issue from being heard. What I'm saying is that the international overwhelming consensus on this issue is what I've said already.

I am not saying we should stop. Those who have different views shouldn't be prevented from saying them. In fact I've read many articles from Professor Patterson in various Canadian publications but mainly in newspapers. His voice is obviously being heard just like my voice is being heard and that is where the debate is at.

Dr. Tim Patterson: I think I would like to speak a little bit to this consensus. The idea of consensus is if you look at the scientific literature it is not like reading a newspaper. There is no the consensus there that you refer to and you should look at the different sorts of researchers.

Mr. Guilbeault is referring to himself as a social scientist. He is probably looking at basically observing what is going on with climate today. He is not looking at what natural variability is in deep time.

So you've got to think about the different sorts of research that goes on, whether you're looking at people who can look at the long term trends in climate or people who are just observing climate.

These are the sorts of things, but if you do look at the scientific literature it's much more of a debate than it would appear by sitting around a committee such as this.

The Chair: Thank you Professor. We'll now go to Mr. Cullen on this side.

🕒 (1245)

Hon. Roy Cullen (Etobicoke North): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I am Roy Cullen from Etobicoke North. We have two Cullens now in Parliament.

I am sorry I missed your presentations but I would like to start with Mr. Simpson.

I missed your presentation but I went through your brief. I think you make an interesting point with respect to which gases we're chasing. I for one think that greenhouse gases are a problem and I think we should be doing something about it.

However you raise an interesting point. I know that the Ontario government some time ago introduced some measures that caused the trucking companies for example to increase the energy efficiencies of their engines.

I am told by the truckers that what that means is that they're actually going to be polluting more in terms of some of the noxious emissions.

When I look at Toronto where I live one of the issues for me is the air quality.

It seems to me we have to work on all fronts. However sometimes we might have competing policy objectives or at least we need to understand that when we go after one gas there might be some unintended consequences that we need to think about.

The one gas that I am very interested in is methane. I don't think we talk enough about methane. I don't think we do as much as we should about methane.

As I understand it methane in terms of greenhouse gases is about 20 times more dangerous than CO₂. I can think of a perfect way that we create so much methane. That is through landfills. All this garbage that is sitting there in landfills, unless you have a collection system underneath which some do, that methane is rising into the atmosphere. It is 20 times a more difficult problem than CO₂.

I wonder if you could comment on why we haven't been able to deal with municipal solid waste more effectively and what we should be doing about it.

Secondly, the idea of tax shifting in terms of the non-renewable sector to the renewable sector. I am hoping in fact that there will be something in our budget . We do not know what we're going to see but I'm hoping to see something on that.

If you look at the energy companies in Canada, the oil and gas companies, they are all changing their theme. They're now energy companies. The reason they're energy companies instead of oil and gas companies is because they're trying to develop renewable energy sources.

I think that is what you were asking for. It is a shifting of some of the tax incentives from the non-renewable to the renewable sector. It seems to me for the energy companies one of the constraints I think is the development of the oil sands.

You would probably argue that we shouldn't be doing that but in a short to medium run we probably do. Therefore to get the economics right we might have to have some tax policies that support that or at least make it more economical in the short to medium run.

I would like to see some tax shifting to the renewable sector as well. I will just throw those comments out for whoever wants to answer.

The Chair: Mr. Simpson, would you like to lead off and we'll have to stay within two minutes now?

Mr. Charles Simpson: I would, thank you. I won't take two minutes.

The oil and gas industry, the energy industry in Alberta is probably the cleanest jurisdiction in the world insofar as emission controls and so on. I think that the Alberta government should be given a lot of credit for its initiative in addressing the real pollutants.

Our consensus is that, as I said, we need to address the real pollutants and not CO₂. In case I don't get another opportunity to say anything, I would like to extend an offer to have us appear before the committee again and present a more detailed scientific exposition on our reasoning.

The Chair: Thank you. We have time for one response. We've had the municipal waste and methane and the tax shifting.

Mr. Guilbeault. And it'll have to be one minute now.

Mr. Steven Guilbeault: I think Albert Einstein would be of very great use right now. He said that the significant problems we face cannot be solved by the same level of thinking that created them. And climate change is exactly that. Why aren't we capturing all the methane that's being emitted in our landfills? I don't know.

It's economical in most cases or very close to being cost effective in most cases. Toronto will reduce its greenhouse gas emissions by some 20% because it's doing that. I think Kyoto should force us to look at everything we're doing and to find creative ways of improving our wealth, improving our standard of living while not creating havoc on the planet. I think that's what it's about.

The federal government can play a very important role in providing leadership, in showing the direction where we should be going and unfortunately, that hasn't been the case so far. We say we ratified Kyoto but at the same time we don't want to put any measures that would force any sector of the economy to reduce their emissions, so we're sending out a very mixed signal and that's a problem.

🕒 (1250)

The Chair: Okay. Thank you Mr. Guilbeault.

We'll go now to Mr. Simard.

[Français]

M. Christian Simard: Monsieur Guilbeault, et je m'adresse aussi à la Fondation David Suzuki, on s'aperçoit que parfois ceux qui veulent l'application de Kyoto ne sont pas regroupés. On dirait qu'au niveau stratégie, ils demandent beaucoup de choses différentes, ils vont dans plusieurs voies et c'est qui m'apparaît pour un politicien à ce moment-là facile de s'en tirer. On a eu le ministre Goodale qui est venu nous dire que son ministère n'était pas responsable du tout, ou à la limite à la marge qu'il a admis finalement, du ratage de l'objectif de Kyoto et jusqu'à maintenant il ne se sentait aucunement responsable. C'est quand même assez grave qu'un ministre des Finances disent cela.

Maintenant, comment pensez-vous faire pour forcer le ministre des Finances? Quelle est la stratégie pour faire en sorte qu'on obtienne des changements au niveau de la fiscalité au Québec et au Canada, particulièrement au Canada? On a vu la coalition pour le budget vert qui nous a dit: « On aurait pu recommander une taxe sur le carbone, mais on ne l'a pas fait. » C'est un peu curieux, parce qu'à un moment donné on est découragé et on croit que cela ne passera jamais. On dirait qu'il y a défaitisme. Avec ce gouvernement on s'habitue à ce qui est immoral ou à ne pas avoir de résultat et finalement, on devient complaisant avec ce gouvernement. J'ai cette impression-là.

Comment allez-vous faire stratégiquement pour obtenir du ministre des Finances pour qu'il voit à ses responsabilités et de ce gouvernement et qu'il utilise le budget véritablement pour rencontrer Kyoto?

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Guilbeault.

[Français]

M. Steven Guilbeault: Merci, monsieur Simard.

Même au sein du gouvernement fédéral, il y a une reconnaissance que l'approche, qui a été adoptée dans ce dossier depuis 1992, ne fonctionne pas. On le voyait récemment, les fonctionnaires fédéraux admettent maintenant que les approches que nous prônons, celles de la carotte et celle du bâton, mais aussi toute la question de la fiscalité. Il y a une prise de conscience de la part du gouvernement fédéral. On va devoir mettre en oeuvre ce genre de choses. Nous, concrètement, ce qu'on va faire, on va continuer à mettre beaucoup de pression sur le gouvernement fédéral. Les Canadiens et les Canadiennes sont préoccupés par la question des changements climatiques et on a à coeur la mise en oeuvre du protocole de Kyoto. Un sondage, Léger Marketing rendu public dans *La Presse* lundi, le démontre. C'est plus de 80 p. 100, si ma mémoire est bonne, au Canada. Et là, on va au-delà des vœux pieux. Le sondage Léger Marketing dit aux gens qu'il fallait bien prendre conscience qu'en répondant à ces questions qui allaient être mis à contribution. Ils vont devoir réduire leurs émissions, et vont devoir aller leurs affaires. Il y a 80 p. 100 des gens au Canada qui disent oui. Ils disent qu'il faut mettre en place des mesures plus contraignantes. Il faut aller de l'avant et même que dans certaines provinces, comme le Québec, l'appui à ce type de proposition va à 92 p. 100. Ce n'est pas l'unanimité, mais on s'en approche drôlement.

Je crois que le gouvernement fédéral n'a plus d'autres choix que celui-là.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you Mr. Simard.

Members of the committee, I'm going to seek, and I'm seeking it most humbly. We are out of time almost and we come down to the point where the member that has been sitting here has not had an opportunity to ask a question that has been on the list.

Can I have your indulgence to have Mr. Watson ask the last series of questions? Anybody opposed to that?

Okay.

🕒 (1255)

Mr. Nathan Cullen: I'd like more time.

The Chair: Well, if you could do that, then we'll end with Mr. Watson.

Thank you very much committee members.

Mr. Cullen and then Mr. Watson.

Mr. Nathan Cullen: A real quick question. Just to establish credibility of all the groups here. I know that it was being questioned earlier, for you folks to submit any sort of--I don't have enough background about your organization to know, in terms of credibility where money comes from or where your members come from. Just to establish that you're--everyone's got a bias. I want to know what your's is. If you could submit that to the committee as to where you do get your funding and also who tends to be on your membership lists?

Thank you.

The Chair: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Watson.

Mr. Jeff Watson (Essex, CPC): Thank you for the committee giving me the indulgence of some time here. The auto industry's taking a real kicking here in testimony today and as an auto worker by trade before I was elected as a member of Parliament I would like to put a little meat on the bones for what the auto industry is actually like and take the concept of a specific regulatory measure applied in other jurisdiction and trying to be applied to Ontario, for example, as a jurisdiction and how that doesn't really work. And I'm talking about the café standard. We've talked about fuel efficiency standards in California, in Oregon and perhaps places in the northeast United States, but the reality is they don't have a manufacturing concentration for the auto industry that we have here in Ontario. So the cost to them is negligible to put this kind of a standard into place.

The reality is and this standard proposes to increase fuel efficiency 25% across the fleet. The reality in Canada is that we manufacture for export to the United States, not for local consumption by and large. There's a few model exceptions with Honda and Toyota and others but the reality is we build large SUVs, we build these trucks, and in order to continue building them with the café standard imported here, we'd have to build hundreds of thousands more units on the small end. Well, that's nice, but where do we sell them? We can't sell them to Canadian consumers because they already drive small cars. That's sort of the reality of the situation here.

So it's nice to talk regulatory without having a proper appreciation of what it means in real time here. Now these are \$30 an hour manufacturing jobs. The tens of thousands in the supply chain that depend on that to pay \$17 or \$18, up to \$28 an hour. There's a cost here. Now these jobs also, the United Ways in our region raise millions of dollars to support battered women's shelters. They raise millions of dollars to support persons with intellectual disabilities. I can go down the list.

What I'm trying to establish in this committee is an understanding that an idea that sounds nice in the abstract applied improperly to a jurisdiction like ours with respect to meeting a timeline of seven years

when product is already locked in for in many cases six to eight years in the auto industry so it can't be adapted to current situations here, how that can prove really disastrous. There's a huge cost.

Have you guys assessed that type of cost and do regulatory measures like this make sense to you, to continue going ahead?

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Watson.

Mr. Guilbeault.

Mr. Steven Guilbeault: Thank you, Mr. Watson.

The Canadian Auto Workers Union would disagree with you since it has endorsed the NDP's green car platform which does specify a very stringent standard for fuel efficiency for vehicles in Canada. This was launched, if I'm correct, about a year and a half ago.

A voice: It's more.

Mr. Steven Guilbeault: Two years ago. But we would be happy to provide the committee with a copy of that platform which has been supported by the Canadian Auto Workers Union.

Mr. Jeff Watson: I'd appreciate seeing that. I kind of understand it. I worked at the truck road assembly plant and through three collective bargaining agreements spanning eight years, we couldn't get product for that plant. The reality was products were already developed but gone to other plants. They couldn't get product developed in time, into the chute in an eight year window to save a particular plant in my community so that I could keep my job there, or families around me could keep jobs. In fact we still have 650 people on a city wide layoff because two and a half years later who still don't have a job.

So I'm curious about the timelines here. If we're going to keep to 20:10, we're going to lose a lot of manufacturing jobs in the auto sector because of a regulatory thing like this, like the café standard, it's going to cause enormous amounts of jobs.

My question, I guess my follow-up, is should the government be compensating auto industries for billions of dollars that they've already put into existing vehicle products that are either emerging now or soon to emerge because we're going to ask them now to adapt different technology and have to go back to the R and D drawing board? Or should we have some sort of compensation as well? Or should we abrogate timelines with respect to preserving jobs in the transition?

The Chair: Does anybody wish to--Mr. Ribaux.

Mr. Sidney Ribaux: Quickly on that, I think we often spontaneously turn to industry for innovation. In terms of fuel efficiency, the car industry has failed miserably. Fuel efficiency of cars now is lower than it was with the Model T Ford.

Kyoto was signed in 1997. I think the auto industry needs to have a level playing field, and I think that the federal government needs to intervene to create an incentive for all companies, including companies that are not based in North America, to provide consumers with efficient vehicles. Now, what are the transitional--

🕒 (1300)

Mr. Jeff Watson: That would be consumers in the United States with those vehicles, because we already buy small vehicles over here that are much more fuel efficient. How do you do that?

Mr. Sidney Ribaux: There needs to be transition measures put in place in terms of jobs, but I think eventually we need to look at this as a country and we need to think about where the jobs are going to go, and are we going to go towards producing more efficient cars, producing wind energy. Whether people are working at producing cars, buses or trains, they're still having very high paying jobs. There needs to be transition for those communities, but the long-term objective needs to still be there.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Just for members of the committee, we have reached the end of the agenda in terms of the time, and I'm going to have to bring closure.

I do have a point of order from Mr. Jean. Mr. Jean, on a point of order?

Mr. Brian Jean (Fort McMurray—Athabasca, CPC): Yes, I wonder if we would let our guests go first. It's more of a process in the meeting.

The Chair: Sure. Thank you very much for being here. I think you can see from the questions that have been asked that there's huge interest and capacity on this committee, and we appreciate your input in order for us to understand better how we can meet our Kyoto commitments and get on with the agenda.

Thank you so much for being here.

Mr. Brian Jean: I don't get a chance--I represent 20% of the gross domestic product of this country.

The Chair: Why don't we talk at the steering committee on that, because I'd already (unclear).

Mr. Brian Jean: Well I'm not on the steering committee.

The Chair: Well you can come.

Mr. Brian Jean: I think Mr. Cullen would want to be there as well because he's got the natural advantage on this stage. My difficulty is that I don't get any questions.

The Chair: Motion to adjourn. All in favour? Opposed? Carried. Thank you very much.