



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

# **Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities**

---

TRAN • NUMBER 122 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

---

**EVIDENCE**

**Tuesday, November 27, 2018**

—  
**Chair**

**The Honourable Judy A. Sgro**



## Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities

Tuesday, November 27, 2018

● (0800)

[English]

**The Chair (Hon. Judy A. Sgro (Humber River—Black Creek, Lib.)):** I call the meeting to order.

Good morning, everyone. Thank you all very much for coming in for an eight o'clock start this morning. There are so many of you here, so we really appreciate it. I'm sure you didn't appreciate the call for eight o'clock, but thank you all very much for making it here this morning.

We gather here this morning to study a number of votes from the supplementary estimates (A), 2018-19: namely, votes 1a, 5a, 10a, 15a and 20a under Department of Transport; vote 1a under Canadian Air Transport Security Authority; and vote 1a under Canadian Transportation Agency.

I'm delighted to welcome the Honourable Marc Garneau, Minister of Transport, along with officials from Transport Canada. We have Michael Keenan, deputy minister, who has been here often to visit us, and André Lapointe, assistant deputy minister for corporate services and chief financial officer, as well as Lawrence Hanson, assistant deputy minister for policy.

From the Canadian Air Transport Security Authority, I would like to welcome Neil Parry, vice-president of service delivery, and Nancy Fitchett, acting vice-president of corporate affairs and chief financial officer.

From the Canadian Transportation Agency, I'd like to welcome Liz Barker, vice-chair, and Manon Fillion, chief corporate officer.

We also have representatives from three other departments.

From the Department of Western Economic Diversification, we have Barbara Motzney, assistant deputy minister, policy and strategic direction. From the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, we have Sheilagh Murphy, assistant deputy minister, lands and economic development. From the Department of Indigenous Services Canada, we have Scott Doidge, director general, non-insured health benefits directorate, first nations and Inuit health branch.

Welcome, everyone. Thank you very much for coming.

On vote 1a under the Department of Transport, Minister Garneau, you have five minutes, please.

**Hon. Marc Garneau (Minister of Transport):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

[Translation]

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for the invitation to meet with the committee. As you know, I am joined by several people today, as the chair mentioned.

I'm pleased to be here to talk about some of the important work being done in the federal transportation portfolio, which includes Transport Canada, Crown corporations, agencies and administrative tribunals. Funding for these federal organizations helps to make Canada's transportation system safer, more secure, more efficient and more environmentally responsible. I, and the organizations in the federal transportation portfolio, remain committed to sound fiscal management and solid stewardship of government resources, while delivering results for Canadian taxpayers.

Transport Canada's supplementary estimates (A) for 2018-19 total \$32 million. This figure includes funding for a variety of programs. There is \$10.5 million in new funding. Most of this new funding will be used to transition to the Government of Canada's holistic and transformative system for impact assessment and regulatory decision-making.

● (0805)

[English]

New and incremental resources will allow Transport Canada to meet its responsibilities, which have been expanded under the new impact assessment and regulatory review system. This includes a transformative approach to working with indigenous peoples to advance reconciliation, recognize and respect indigenous rights and jurisdiction, foster collaboration and ensure that indigenous knowledge is considered.

This system includes modifications that would create the Canadian navigable waters act, which is currently before Parliament as part of Bill C-69. The changes would ensure that the public right to navigate is protected in Canada's navigable waters and would restore lost protections and incorporate modern safeguards.

[Translation]

These supplementary estimates include a reprofiling of funds totalling \$21.6 million. This reprofiling includes funding for safety-related capital infrastructure at local and regional airports, for a variety of rail safety projects under our rail safety improvement program and for maintenance on ferries on the east coast.

Transfers from Transport Canada to other federal departments in the supplementary estimates total less than \$1 million, and there is \$840,000 listed for statutory employee benefit plan costs related to the aforementioned projects.

I am very proud of Transport Canada's ongoing work.

[English]

I'll take a few moments to highlight a specific priority, which is investment in our country's transportation corridors, particularly our trade corridors. "Trade Corridors to Global Markets" is one of the five themes of transportation 2030, our government's strategic plan for the future of transportation in Canada.

We can have the best products in the world, but if we can't get them to our customers quickly and reliably, we will lose business to other suppliers. We are working with stakeholders to address bottlenecks, vulnerabilities and congestion along our trade corridors, and the trade and transportation corridors initiative is a significant part of this effort.

We announced the trade and transportation corridors initiative in July 2017, including the national trade corridors fund, which is a cornerstone of this initiative. The national trade corridors fund is designed to help infrastructure owners and users invest in our roads, bridges, airports, rail lines, port facilities and trade corridors. Through this fund, our government is investing \$2 billion over a span of 11 years. We have already announced funding for projects, including railway corridors, airport runways, port facilities, bridges, highways and more. These are critical transportation assets that support the movement of goods and people in Canada. The national trade corridors fund has been accelerated, as you know, to enable more projects to address bottlenecks to trade diversification.

Our trade corridors are important for moving domestic trade to international markets and for helping Canadian businesses to complete, grow and create more jobs for the country's middle class. Canada is a trading nation, and one in six Canadian jobs depends on international commerce. For our economy to succeed, we have to ensure that our products, our services and our citizens have access to key global markets. This is an important reason why I am proud of the work Transport Canada is doing throughout the trade and transportation corridors initiative and the national trade corridors fund.

[Translation]

But Transport Canada is not the only organization in the federal transportation portfolio. The Canadian Air Transport Security Authority, or CATSA, is also an important part of the Canadian transportation landscape.

CATSA is seeking to reprofile \$36 million of capital funds in supplementary estimates (A) this year. The majority of this capital reprofiling—approximately \$29 million—is for postponed equipment purchase and integration work for the new hold baggage screening system. This is part of CATSA'S capital life-cycle management plan to align with revised airport project plans.

My mandate has not changed since being named Minister of Transport three years ago. I continue to ensure that Canada's transportation system supports economic growth and job creation. I

continue to work to ensure that our transportation system is safe and reliable, and facilitates trade and the movement of people and goods. I continue to work to ensure that our roads, ports and airports are integrated and sustainable, and allow Canadians and businesses to more easily engage globally.

The financial resources sought through these supplementary estimates would help the organizations in my portfolio as we continue to ensure that our transportation system serves Canadians' needs now and for years to come.

Thank you. If you have any questions, I would be happy to answer them.

• (0810)

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Minister Garneau.

We'll go to Mrs. Block, for six minutes.

**Mrs. Kelly Block (Carlton Trail—Eagle Creek, CPC):** Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

I want to thank you, Minister Garneau, for joining us today for 90 minutes. We're very pleased to be able to ask many questions. We look forward to your answers. I also want to welcome the departmental officials you've brought with you. There's quite a team here today. I do appreciate the fact that they've taken the time to join us this morning.

I know that we are studying the supplementary estimates and government spending, but I would like to ask some questions around a bill that we studied recently. It was referred to us by the finance committee. It was part of the budget implementation act, Bill C-86.

There were a couple of divisions in the budget implementation act that I think come directly from Transport Canada. They were buried within this budget implementation act between pages 589 and 649, in divisions 22 and 23. They contain substantial changes to the Canada Shipping Act and the Marine Liability Act.

One of the witnesses appearing before the committee for the Chamber of Shipping noted that clause 692 of this bill appears to be another mechanism with which to implement a moratorium on specific commodities through regulation and interim order, not legislation as the government has already done through Bill C-48. The witness noted that this contradicts what should be the government's objective in providing a predictable supply chain.

Quite honestly, Minister, there is no question in my mind that the inclusion of this clause in Bill C-86 will have a further chilling effect on Canada's oil and gas industry. My question for you this morning is, can you assure Canadians that this will not be yet another measure to undermine Canada's oil and gas sector?

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** I thank my colleague for the question.

Of course, the parts in Bill C-86 that she is referring to have to do with modifications that we will be making to the Canada Shipping Act of 2001 and the Marine Liability Act. These were referenced specifically in the budgets of 2017 and 2018 in the context of the oceans protection plan, which is a very important government initiative.

Canada relies on safe and clean coasts and waters for trade, economic growth and quality of life. We also recognize that our oceans hold a special place in the traditions and culture of Canadians, notably indigenous communities. We are taking decisive, concrete action to ensure that our oceans will continue to be enjoyed by all Canadians today and for generations to come.

To support safe and environmentally responsible shipping, divisions 22 and 23 of Bill C-86 propose legislative amendments to enhance marine environmental protection and strengthen marine safety. That is the purpose of those two.

**Mrs. Kelly Block:** Thank you very much. I appreciate your answer on that. I would like to follow up with you on another question, since you did raise the oceans protection plan. We had this question for your ADM, who appeared before our committee on Bill C-86.

We understood that the legislative consultations for the oceans protection plan concluded on Friday, October 26. Bill C-86 was tabled on Monday, October 29. Look, as good as the lawyers are within Transport Canada and at the justice department, no one really believes that they could actually get these clauses drafted and get them to the printer in two days. In fact, the shipping community was very surprised to see these clauses included in Bill C-86.

Minister, when did you decide to include these substantial changes in the BIA, and why did Transport Canada's website continue to suggest that these consultations were still ongoing?

• (0815)

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** I can tell you that we have been focusing on the oceans protection plan for a little over two years now. As you know, it was announced on November 7, 2016 by the Prime Minister in Vancouver. I was beside him at the time.

There are over 50 measures involved in the oceans protection plan. It is truly a world-leading initiative to ensure that our oceans are safer, that our marine environment is more protected and that our capability to respond is greater. One of the parts of this that we have always been planning to do is to make changes to these two acts that I mentioned to you before.

One of them is directly related to liability in case there is a spill. We've made some very important changes there with respect to that. The other one is to also have the capability within the government to make certain changes to protect marine species, such as the ability to order slowdowns, let's say in the Salish Sea, if we decide that it is important for the protection of endangered species.

We want to strengthen—

**Mrs. Kelly Block:** Thank you, Minister. I would like to just quickly follow up. I think I have 45 seconds left.

**The Chair:** You have about 20 seconds.

**Mrs. Kelly Block:** Witnesses who appeared before the committee did note that these were the most substantial changes to be made to the Canada Shipping Act and Marine Liability Act in 10 years, in one case, and in another case, 25 years, so they were very surprised and perhaps even disappointed to see that these were buried within a budget implementation act.

Thank you.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** You're welcome.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mrs. Block.

Mr. Hardie, go ahead, please, for six minutes.

**Mr. Ken Hardie (Fleetwood—Port Kells, Lib.):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

Good morning, everybody, and thanks for being here.

Minister Garneau, we've been spending a little time looking at a couple of very important trade corridors in Canada. My colleague Vance Badawey and I were fortunate to have studies done in our home areas.

In looking at the west coast, I wonder if you could comment on the role and mandate of the WESTAC group. I understand that they have a coordinating function with respect to planning and implementation of improvements in the trade corridor.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** I'd be pleased, Mr. Hardie, to comment on that. In fact, my deputy minister is involved with WESTAC as well, as a government representative.

As you hint, it is an organization that is strongly focused on the fluidity of transportation on the west coast. Of course, the port of Vancouver, as we all know, is by far the largest port in Canada. There is significant concern about bottlenecks in the Lower Mainland and all the way into the inland port of Ashcroft. To ensure that we are moving goods as efficiently as possible to this very strategic port, WESTAC fulfills an important function in that respect.

Certainly, the dialogue about where the bottlenecks are is crucial to our decision-making process when we award funding—through the national trade corridors fund—to particular projects, where the purpose, I might repeat, is to reduce bottlenecks or eliminate them. The input from WESTAC is an extremely important input.

**Mr. Ken Hardie:** One of the things we noticed in our conversations with the various component parts of metro Vancouver's trade corridor was that there's an option to spend an awful lot of money there to improve the corridor. You mentioned choke points. There are three that lead to the north shore, where a lot of the bulk and break bulk terminals are located in the inner harbour, as we call it. There's the bridge at New Westminster, which is over 100 years old now. There's a tunnel that goes underneath Burnaby Mountain. Then there's another bridge that crosses right next to the Second Narrows bridge.

Looking at the cost of potential improvements there, it would be quite substantial, but at the same time, the potential for growth in terms of the material-handling capabilities of the north shore of Burrard Inlet is somewhat limited. The concern arises that we need to have oversight that looks at the big picture, not just the component parts, to start to identify alternatives for development that might not necessarily be in the field of vision of the railways or the port of metro Vancouver, etc. Are you satisfied that we have that kind of line of thinking going?

• (0820)

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** I agree with what you've just expressed. We do need to not just zero in on specific projects.

There are a lot of specific projects that are recognized as bottlenecks, some of which we addressed in our first awarding of funding under the national trade corridors fund. We announced them during the course of the past few months.

But you're right. We should look at the bigger picture. I believe that when our department judges the different applications for funding for the different bottlenecks that are in the Lower Mainland, each time we do look at the big picture with the idea of optimizing, because that's the most important criterion: How much will this help to make the transportation more fluid?

As you know, the port of Vancouver and the railways—there are three class I railways that come into it, as well as a very large amount of trucking in a very busy area where there are a lot of people going about their lives and driving their cars—really have to be looked at in a way that we can optimize for the taxpayers' money, because there is more demand than there is money. I think that in itself forces us to try to optimize towards what will provide the best long-term solution in terms of that transport fluidity.

**Mr. Ken Hardie:** I think a lot of people were comforted by the move to a new class of railcars for shipping oil. We know that's the backup until such time as we get more pipeline capacity to the west coast.

In terms of the overall shipping regime, there are grains to move. There is obviously more oil to move. What is your sense of how the rail system is performing in the national interest or in the national strategy for getting the right things to market?

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** I think the changes made through Bill C-49 in the modernization of the Canada Transportation Act went in the right direction. That was to try to optimize the movement of commodities. We happen to be at a time when there is a very strong demand for moving goods in this country. You're right to point out that it is the movement of grain, but it is also the movement of many other commodities. I hear regularly from the mining community, from the forestry community, from the potash community. These are important commodities that are headed for our ports. Of course, right now there's an increased demand for shipping oil by rail as well.

The railways know that there is a strong demand, because they're receiving it. At the same time, we have to ensure that there is not a focus that advantages one commodity versus other commodities. That is essentially the situation you have to deal with when the economy is running strongly, as it is at the moment, and there is enormous demand for Canadian products.

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

Ms. Benson, we will go to you. Welcome to our committee this morning.

**Ms. Sheri Benson (Saskatoon West, NDP):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

Thank you to the minister and all the folks from the various departments for being here.

I am going to turn the conversation a little bit. I come from Saskatchewan; obviously, access to affordable transportation for rural and remote communities and people's ability to travel are concerns for me. I have raised these a number of times—in particular, the safe transportation for indigenous women and the support we provide for public transportation outside of large urban centres. People may not necessarily have heard what I've said, but I see the bus service in western Canada as our subway. I feel it deserves support and leadership from the federal government.

It's been almost two years since the Saskatchewan Transportation Company closed and 253 communities in Saskatchewan lost service. Folks listening today should understand that this means more than just having an inexpensive way to get to the city to do some shopping. We're talking about students' ability to go to post-secondary education, people's ability to be employed, the movement of medical supplies between urban centres and smaller centres, and of course people accessing health care. Then, of course, the other shoe dropped. We lost Greyhound service in northern Ontario and the rest of western Canada.

I have a couple of questions to get an update on what I feel is the federal government's role in this and the parameters around it. I understand jurisdiction, but it's also my feeling that any level of government can lead on an issue to bring people together and help provide a service to communities while co-operating with other levels of government. I just put that out there to encourage you to think about what role the federal government has.

Minister, concerning Greyhound, we have heard that anywhere between 87% and 90% of the routes have been covered. I'm wondering if you could let us know where the routes are that currently are not being covered and what the federal government's plan is to deal with that. In particular, I'd be interested in hearing where those routes are and if one province is really being left out in the cold, so to speak.

• (0825)

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** Thank you for your question.

Since July, when Greyhound announced that they were pulling out of the west and a little part of northern Ontario, our ministry did get together with the provinces. You're right that, even though transportation by coach has been on the decrease for a very long time, there are vulnerable populations that depend on it, such as people who have no other choice financially and people in remote regions. There has been a coordination between the federal and the provincial. When I say federal, we've also brought in Indigenous Services Canada and CIRNAC, as well as ISED, so that we could look at this challenge that is in front of us.

As you point out, there was a take-up on 87% of the routes that were dropped by Greyhound, and that's a good thing because they feel they can make a go of it. However, you're right that there are also some that haven't been. We can provide you with the details of the actual trajectories we're talking about that haven't, but we have a plan there as well. If you look at what's been lost by Greyhound leaving, mostly they're in Alberta and British Columbia. We have worked with those two provinces, so that if, at some point, they go out with a request for proposals to find a line through a competitive process, we would be there to assist them financially. That is the plan with respect to that.

On indigenous and remote communities, which is through ISC, we have put in place a plan to work with indigenous communities that want to also set up a commercial capability themselves, so we feel that process is under way as well.

That's only a short-term solution. We need a long-term solution, so part of what we announced a few weeks ago also includes, within two years, coming up with a more national...we're talking about all 10 provinces and three territories.

• (0830)

**The Chair:** You have 10 seconds left, Ms. Benson.

**Ms. Sheri Benson:** I'll underline the point that those who need to access services, particularly those with disabilities, should be included when we're starting to talk about a plan for Canada. I would suggest you start where there is no bus service or where we're really struggling.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Ms. Benson.

We'll move on to Mr. Graham.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. David de Burgh Graham (Laurentides—Labelle, Lib.):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

Minister, thank you for being here today.

The Laurentians are home to more than 10,000 lakes, so figuring out who has jurisdiction over what in the aquatic domain is extremely complicated. Who is responsible for bodies of water? Who is responsible for what is below the surface? That's one of the biggest concerns in my riding.

Transport Canada is responsible for the Vessel Operation Restriction Regulations. We know that consultations on the regulations were launched. Can you or a member of your team give us an update on the consultation process?

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** I believe you're referring to navigable water jurisdiction over lakes.

**Mr. David de Burgh Graham:** Yes.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** You're right in that, traditionally, the area falls under federal jurisdiction. However, we recognize the numerous challenges that creates given the local regulations that apply to lakes.

We are currently working on that. I have to admit, it's a long-term effort, and we are trying to find a way to delegate some of that responsibility to the most appropriate authorities, meaning the municipalities. We would like to give them greater flexibility. At the same time, though, they will still be required to protect navigation activities on lakes. We are not done yet, but that's the direction we are moving in. We know that it will be a more flexible mechanism that meets municipalities' needs.

**Mr. David de Burgh Graham:** Thank you for working on that. It's a major concern for my constituents. We have huge vessels using our small lakes and causing serious damage, so we certainly welcome any progress on the issue.

[*English*]

I want to go to another topic. I think it's a little lighter. I think we're all very happy to hear about the InSight landing on Mars yesterday. I think you might have some particular excitement for that as well.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** Did you want my comments on it?

**Voices:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. David de Burgh Graham:** I'd like your comments on it.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** Well, I thought it was extraordinary. Beyond even space flight with humans, I think the ability to land a rover or a vehicle on Mars is the most technically demanding challenge that any spacefaring nation faces. Only the United States has ever been able to land and have an operational rover or experiment on the surface of Mars.

Now, it's early days; they've landed, but they still have to check out all the systems. I think it is a testimony to the brilliance of NASA, particularly the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena, California, which runs all of these things. I'm very excited and will be watching very carefully what scientific results—they're going to look underground—come out of it.

I wish space were under Transport, but I haven't been successful yet with my colleague Minister Bains.

**Mr. David de Burgh Graham:** We'll work on that.

Back to Canada, on VIA Rail, you've announced a renewal for the fleet. Do you have an update on where we're at with that?

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** VIA Rail is a Crown corporation. The Government of Canada recognized that the passenger railcar and locomotive fleet was in need of replacement. Some parts of it were over 40 years old, so we announced some time ago that VIA would launch a competition. That competition is under way, and it is open to the world.

At this point, we're looking forward to fairly shortly hearing back officially from VIA Rail on which company will be awarded the contract to replace these old passenger cars, and I know they're old because I take them every week myself between Montreal and Ottawa. I think it's very exciting. This is in the corridor between Quebec and Windsor, where the greatest amount of traffic is taking place, with the objective of having the first new vehicles coming out in 2022.

● (0835)

**Mr. David de Burgh Graham:** Can we expect that this will significantly improve passenger service or at least the experience?

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** I know that VIA is always striving to improve its service and its on-time record. When you have new equipment, if you get the right equipment, you're going to be spending less time doing maintenance, which helps to improve the reliability.

**Mr. David de Burgh Graham:** That's fair.

Very quickly, you have the airports capital assistance program. Can you talk a bit about what this program is and why it's important? There are five airports in my riding, so it's always interesting to hear about possibilities.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** The airports capital assistance program has been in place for roughly 20 years, I think, and has awarded close to \$900 million to our airports. Every year, there's about \$38 million to \$40 million that's allocated. There are many airports across the country. There are the five you mentioned in your riding.

To be eligible, you have to have.... The actual funding is for safety improvements at the airport. That can be lighting; it can be snow-clearing equipment. It has to be safety-related. There are a lot of applicants every year, so we can't do it for everybody. There is a requirement that the airports in question have a regular service for flights of at least a thousand passengers per year and that they're non-federal airports. It's a federal program that is very hotly competed for. We announce every year those airports that receive funding.

**Mr. David de Burgh Graham:** Are PPR airports eligible?

**The Chair:** I'm sorry, Mr. Graham. Your time is up.

We're moving on to Mr. Badawey.

**Mr. Vance Badawey (Niagara Centre, Lib.):** Good morning.

Thank you for being here this morning.

I'll preface my question by stating that, as Mr. Hardie recognized, when we took a trip to Niagara as well as Vancouver, we learned a great deal about the changes happening within world trade, the transport of global trade and the products contained within. We learned that our trade corridors need to be updated.

Let's face it, at the end of the day, we found out quickly how content and complacent this nation has been for the past many generations. To some extent, we are now sitting on archaic transportation assets. There's a need to be very strategic and become more of an enabler, utilizing those assets. As you mentioned, Minister, this will strengthen our nation's overall global performance. I congratulate you. After decades of contentment and complacency, with the economy suffering as a result, the efforts and the direction

you're taking are much welcomed, especially in Niagara, which is one of the nation's strategic trade corridors.

With that, Minister, I have a question. Taking into consideration transport, infrastructure, labour, global affairs, environment, international trade, finance, economic development, fisheries and intergovernmental affairs and relations, how are you and Transport Canada utilizing a whole-of-government approach to invest, integrate, optimize, and update our fluidity when it comes to mobility and global trade?

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** Thank you, Mr. Badawey.

If I may, I will commend you for the work you're doing in the Niagara area with respect to trade corridors. That is an important entry point, particularly for trade between Canada and the United States.

I would answer your question by saying that the recent fall economic statement gives a strong hint of where we're looking at trade with respect to a whole-of-government approach. There were of course measures in our economic statement that were focused on trying to make our Canadian enterprises more competitive. The accelerated depreciation on capital investments was a good example that we believe will create jobs. Of course, if you create jobs and you make more products, you have to move those products. The significant part, although it may not have been mentioned too much, was the fact that the government took some of the funding for out-years on the national trade corridors fund and moved it forward so that we would have access to that funding.

As you know, we've had one competition. We awarded \$800 million to 39 projects. There is such a strong demand for this, because there's a recognition that it is crucial for the economy to move our goods efficiently, that we welcome the fact that money for later years has been moved forward so that we can continue going out and having more projects under the national trade corridors fund, which will improve the movement of goods and will be good for the economy.

I think the government has clearly recognized the crucial function of transportation in getting our goods to market. If we don't, our clients will go elsewhere.

● (0840)

**Mr. Vance Badawey:** I congratulate you for going to a whole-of-government approach. In my former life as a mayor, I was extremely frustrated when we had to communicate individually versus having a government that actually communicates effectively within itself.



Besides the 10 ministries I mentioned earlier, I'll add Innovation, Science and Economic Development. R and D is very important. We have encouraged universities and colleges to assist in bringing new products to market. How are you working with those different ministries to once again create the fluidity we need to expand GDP in the future? How are you working with those different ministries to ensure that we're all communicating to become more of an enabler for the transport of those goods internationally?

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** Transportation is a highly technical area. There are a lot of examples of where transportation is becoming increasingly sophisticated.

An example would be the fact that we're exploring truck platooning as a possible future method of transporting a great deal of merchandise by truck. Of course, truck platooning is where a platoon of several trucks are following each other, but there is a coordination between the trucks that's all done via technology so that they are all following each other. This is something that is being done throughout the world at the moment. Many western countries are developing this capability.

We rely on science and technology to implement this kind of system. Having been in a platoon of trucks in a demonstration at a Transport Canada facility, I must say that it is a very impressive capability. It's also fixed in such a way that the separation between trucks minimizes the aerodynamic drag on the trucks behind the first one, so you can get fuel economy as well.

Canada is working on that kind of development, not to mention autonomous vehicles, which is another area, or drones, which is also a very strongly emerging field.

In all of those cases, we need to make use of the best available technological capability, as well as the science that will help us deal with these new disruptive technologies.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Minister Garneau.

Mr. Liepert, you have six minutes.

**Mr. Ron Liepert (Calgary Signal Hill, CPC):** Thank you, Minister, for being here and for being here for 90 minutes.

However, I only get six, so I'd like to ask some quick questions and hopefully we can use committee-of-the-whole rules, where the answers don't exceed the length of the questions.

I want to ask you about transportation 2030. You stated, "We can have the best products in the world, but if we can't get them to our customers quickly and reliably, we will lose business to other suppliers."

When we were in Vancouver.... The port of Vancouver has something like two billion dollars' worth of construction under way today to help get products to customers. However, the CEO of the port of Vancouver said that if Bill C-69 had been law two years ago, not one dollar of that investment would be made today.

How can you make the statements that you made about transportation 2030 and still rationalize a bill like Bill C-69 being pushed through by the Liberal government?

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** All I can say to you is that I didn't make that statement. You referred to the CEO of the port of Vancouver. He can speak for himself on that.

Bill C-69, in our opinion, is absolutely necessary because the previous government, the government that you represented, gutted a lot of the protections for the environment, which were an important part of our commitment—

• (0845)

**Mr. Ron Liepert:** But you're the transportation minister. It's the environment minister's job to make those statements. You're the transportation minister. You're supposed to be fighting on behalf of Canadians, getting their supplies to world markets, and that's not happening with our oil and gas industry today.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** I'll be glad to tell you that we talk to each other in our government, the different ministers. We believe that we can juggle several balls at the same time.

**Mr. Ron Liepert:** Okay, so then you are obviously losing the argument within your own caucus. I'll leave it at that.

I also want to state—

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** I wouldn't put it that way, myself, but you can.

**Mr. Ron Liepert:** Well, I'd like to, and I will.

I'd like to stay on transportation 2030. It says right in the statement that one of the goals is to decrease the cost of air travel for Canadians. How do you rationalize that with the carbon tax that's been put on aircraft, where there is no other choice but to use jet fuel?

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** If you had looked in detail at the measures in Bill C-49, which we're very proud of, you would have seen that there were several measures to increase competition. Competition, I think you would agree, has the potential to lower costs. One of the significant measures that we took was to increase foreign ownership in Canadian airlines from the 25% limit that used to exist to 49%. This allows for more foreign investment, up to 49%, in Canadian airlines, and this can generate new, ultra-low-cost carriers, which can help competition, lower prices and offer new destinations.

That's one part of it that we announced in Bill C-49. We also had some other measures dealing with joint ventures.

We think that we're doing good things to increase competition.

**Mr. Ron Liepert:** So, because you didn't address the carbon tax issue, I can assume that this is another loss for the Minister of Transport on behalf of Canadian business to the Minister of Environment within this Liberal cabinet.

Let's move on, then. I want to ask whether or not you're satisfied with how our airports are being managed with the current structure that exists for airport authorities.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** Yes, I'll answer that.

As for the tail end of your comment, unlike your party unfortunately, we believe that pollution implies costs and that we can't ignore it. It's not free, as your party seems to believe.

Yes, on airports, better is always possible. There's no question. With the increase in the amount of travel by air in this country, there is more and more pressure on our airports. I was very glad to be at Toronto airport recently, which won the prize for the best large airport customer service in North America. However, with more and more passengers, there are more pressures on CATSA, the security organization responsible for ensuring that when you go to the airport

**Mr. Ron Liepert:** Yes, I know what CATSA is.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** Okay, good. So that is an area where we need to make improvements. I think our airports are coping with the expansion. There are always stories about people not being satisfied, but I think that, generally speaking, our airports do a very good job, especially if you compare them to the airports in other countries of the world.

**Mr. Ron Liepert:** I have one last question. I have only six minutes.

This committee is currently doing a study on aircraft noise at large urban centres. One of the things that seem to have come out of the testimony we've had is that it's very difficult to find out who is responsible, at the end of the day, for dealing with these concerns.

I am presuming that we, as a committee, will make several recommendations to you as a minister. Will you confirm today that after receiving a report from this committee and studying it, you will respond to it and it won't simply sit and collect dust?

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** I always take seriously all reports that come from this committee, so we will look at that, and I value the input that you will be providing on the very important issue of noise.

**Mr. Ron Liepert:** But will you respond publicly to the report?

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** I respond to every report that comes out of this committee.

**Mr. Ron Liepert:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** It will be one of the requests in our report, when we file it in the House, that they report back in a specified amount of time in the interests of all committee members.

We'll move on to Ms. Damoff. Welcome to the committee this morning.

• (0850)

**Ms. Pam Damoff (Oakville North—Burlington, Lib.):** Thank you, Chair.

How much time do I have?

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

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Minister, thank you for being here today.

You and I have had a number of questions around pedestrian and cycling safety, and I really appreciate your engagement on the issue. I know you announced an intergovernmental task force to improve the safety of vulnerable road users, in particular around heavy vehicles. In the spring of this year, you invited the public to take part in an online consultation.

Could you update us on your efforts on pedestrian and cycling safety?

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** I'll preface my answer by saying that many areas of transport are shared jurisdictions between provinces, in some cases municipalities, and the federal government. Now that more people are walking and biking and there are even bike paths in busy cities, the issue of vulnerable road users that you refer to, pedestrians and cyclists, has brought to light the fact that there have been fatalities and serious injuries, particularly, as you say, from heavy vehicles. In my riding, two people have lost their lives as a result of that.

About a year ago, I decided to work with the provinces to see if we could address this growing problem. As you said, there was consultation. There was a tour of several cities, as well as online input from Canadians, and that led to a report that was published in late summer. That report identified over 50 measures that could be implemented to improve the situation if different levels of government, including the federal, chose to implement them. Some would have a greater effect, and some would have perhaps a lesser effect, but the actual assessment of each measure was not done. It was mainly a listing of all the things that could be done at the three levels of government.

That's a very important document, and we will be following up when I meet with my provincial and territorial counterparts in January to take the next step and make decisions about which measures we should all consider putting in place to make roads safer for Canadians. I'm looking at some federal measures as well, and we will have more to say once we've had that meeting.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Thank you, Minister.

Coupled with what our infrastructure minister has done in funding for infrastructure around active transportation, cycling and walking, it's very much appreciated in my riding and across Canada. Thank you very much.

I'm going to turn it over to my colleague, who has a question for you as well.

**Mr. Gagan Sikand (Mississauga—Streetsville, Lib.):** Thank you.

Minister, I had the pleasure of spending the day with you in Mississauga, and I, as well the University of Toronto students, really enjoyed hearing first-hand about your experience of being launched into space.

Earlier in the day, you were speaking at the Mississauga Board of Trade. I am wondering if you could get on the record for the committee some of the numbers you were talking about in terms of transportation announcements in the Peel and GTA region.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** I'd have to dig that up. There were 39 projects. My speech is not at hand with me this morning, but there have been investments in the Peel and York regions. I could get back to you on that.

If memory serves me correctly, there were something like 58 or so projects. I can't remember the exact amount, but it is part of the different programs that Transport Canada regulates and coordinates. I know there were some significant ones, because I mentioned them in the speech. I wouldn't have mentioned them if they hadn't been significant, but I can't remember the numbers offhand. I'm sorry.

**Mr. Gagan Sikand:** Could we ask for the exact number to be provided to the committee?

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** We can provide those to Mr. Sikand.

**Mr. Gagan Sikand:** Okay, thank you very much.

**The Chair:** If you could supply them to the clerk, please, she will distribute them to all the members of the committee.

● (0855)

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** I think you're going to get back to me, as there's about a minute left.

Is that right, Chair?

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Minister, you've had conversations with Air Canada about the fix for the Airbus that would deal with a lot of the airplane noise, which my constituents contact me about fairly regularly.

I'm wondering if you could update us on your conversations with Air Canada on the Airbus noise issue.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** Yes. What we did specifically was to speak to Air Canada, which has an Airbus fleet. Some of these Airbus 320s have this device that protrudes below the left wing, the port wing, and it creates quite a bit of noise as the airplane is coming in. There is a fix for that where the wing can be made flush, and it is something that Air Canada has undertaken to do on all its fleet when it brings those airplanes in for regularly scheduled maintenance. That will be done over time. The process is under way. It affects mostly the GTA, but it does affect some other airports as well.

This is good news. In terms of the specific schedule on when the last one will be completed, I don't have that at the moment, but it is something that we can ask Air Canada.

I do have some statistics, Mr. Sikand, and I'll get back to you.

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

We're moving on to Mr. Jeneroux, for five minutes.

**Mr. Matt Jeneroux (Edmonton Riverbend, CPC):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

Thank you, Minister, for being here. It's great to see the minister show up for supplementary estimates, unlike the infrastructure minister. I feel we all collectively agree that was a bit of a disaster at the last meeting.

Minister, we have a premier from Alberta who's requesting increased rail capacity—up to 120,000 extra cars. She has requested support from the federal government and apparently hasn't received

it. There's nothing in the fiscal update; “crude by rail” isn't a line in there.

I'm curious as to whether that's something you're considering or not.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** Thank you for your question.

I have seen the letter from Premier Notley that was sent to the Prime Minister, and I recognize the situation Alberta is in. The request was for additional train capacity. As you know, oil by train is approaching 300,000 barrels a day, and there was demand for an additional capability of 120,000 barrels. We're looking at that, but the situation is the following.

It is something that can be worked out with the railways. Most of the tanker cars are owned either by the oil companies or by shippers; they are not primarily owned by the railways. The railways provide the locomotives to move things. It is something that is a possibility if a deal is done on a commercial basis with the railways.

At the same time, as I mentioned a little earlier, we want to make sure that we move our grain, and other products as well. It's a balancing act that needs to be accomplished. I am definitely aware of Alberta's need and desire to move more oil until we can have more pipeline capacity.

**Mr. Matt Jeneroux:** Speaking of pipeline capacity, just to pick up my colleague's line of questioning, you appear to be losing the argument on that one with Minister McKenna as well. We've heard from a number of stakeholders at this committee, through our travel across the country, that initiatives like the carbon tax are detrimental to their competitive nature.

Are these things that you're bringing up in cabinet—that you're hearing the same issues from the stakeholders you're meeting with?

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** You won't be surprised that I don't necessarily share your assessment of the situation. As I've said, and as my government has said many times before—

**Mr. Matt Jeneroux:** Be clear, Minister. Have you or have you not heard that the carbon tax is detrimental to competitiveness?

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** No, I have not.

**Mr. Matt Jeneroux:** You haven't heard that from people.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** No, I have not.

**Mr. Matt Jeneroux:** No stakeholder has told you that.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** No—except for the Conservative Party making allegations.

● (0900)

**Mr. Matt Jeneroux:** Well, that's fantastic.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** I think most Canadians are enlightened and realize that there is a cost associated with pollution. We in Canada believe it is possible to actually advance the economy and also be responsible.

**Mr. Matt Jeneroux:** But you're exempting the largest emitters. I believe the parliamentary secretary even admitted, in question period the other day, that it is chasing investments away. How can you sit here today and say that you haven't heard from anybody who's telling you that the carbon tax is making it uncompetitive to do business here in Canada?

I invite you to just look at the protest that happened in Alberta. A thousand people in the streets of Calgary were saying those exact same things. They're unemployed. These are families before Christmastime. They are directly blaming initiatives like the carbon tax and your tanker moratorium, initiatives that continue to drive business out of this country. Yet you're sitting here today and telling us that nobody has told you that the carbon tax is detrimental to business.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** Well, you weren't here three years ago—I was—when the previous government was in place.

**Mr. Matt Jeneroux:** I'm glad you follow my political career so closely, Minister.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** They didn't do anything. They had this fancy thing called a sectorial approach, which they never did anything with.

**Mr. Matt Jeneroux:** So Catherine McKenna—

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** Let me finish.

**Mr. Matt Jeneroux:** —is essentially giving you your talking points on this.

**The Chair:** Please allow the minister to complete.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** There were two provinces, British Columbia and Quebec, that did show some leadership with respect to putting a price on pollution. If you look at their economies today, you have to come to the realization that it didn't harm them. It actually made the situation better.

**Mr. Matt Jeneroux:** You're exempting the largest emitters, Minister.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** Your facts are not facts. They're erroneous assumptions on your part, because those economies that have embraced a responsible approach to both pollution and their economy—

**Mr. Matt Jeneroux:** You're exempting the largest emitters, Minister.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** —are actually doing much better.

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

Ms. Benson, you have three minutes.

**Ms. Sheri Benson:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

I would ask you, Minister, if you could, to table with this committee more information about the mandate of the working group that will look at transportation in western Canada. Greyhound has closed, which you referred to. I'm wondering what kind of representation there will be, and I would encourage you to have regional representation. I'm wondering about the timeline and about the intended outcome for that working group. I would like to encourage that working group to look at service and safety standards when it comes to bus transportation.

I would like to raise with you, Minister, the fact that I have heard from people in my province about some of the bus services that are up and operating in western Canada dropping people on the side of a highway. That is not safe. I know you would agree with that.

I'm wondering as well if you could let us know what indigenous communities have come forward with proposals to offer bus service to their communities or surrounding communities.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** You asked a lot of questions there. I don't know if we'll be able to do all of them.

My deputy minister will talk about the working group. I can talk about safety. With respect to any dialogue with indigenous groups, we can get back to you on the information there. That's being led by ISED and Indigenous Services Canada. We can get back to you on that.

Deputy Minister, go ahead.

**Mr. Michael Keenan (Deputy Minister, Department of Transport):** Thank you, Minister.

As the minister indicated, he tasked me to work with our provincial transportation colleagues in developing the immediate measures that were put in place on the day Greyhound closed down in terms of the transition of bus services.

We were also tasked by our ministers to begin work on the future of transportation in the long term. At this point, the overriding focus of the work has been on the immediate challenge in that transition. That has consumed most of the working group's effort. Now that we've done that, we are transitioning. We're beginning a conversation on how we will work together in developing the long-term agenda and how we will engage the key communities in those issues. You will see that coming out in the coming months.

**Ms. Sheri Benson:** Would the working group be working with the fact that... If you're moving on to the next step, what about communities that don't have any bus service?

**Mr. Michael Keenan:** I think that is exactly the kind of question that we'll be working through. We'll be looking at the challenges that communities are facing and looking at the challenges that different members in the communities are facing, particularly those who have barriers to transportation because they don't drive or because they have mobility issues, etc.

I'll be frank. We have just begun that conversation about how to move that work ahead, because we have been really focused on the short-term challenge and addressing that.

• (0905)

**Ms. Sheri Benson:** Would it be possible to table that with the committee, what work you've done and who is on that committee? I've had a really hard time getting any information to find out what exactly is going on since the announcement in July.

**Mr. Michael Keenan:** At this point, that committee is really the deputy ministers. There's a committee of the deputy ministers of transportation, and there's a subcommittee of working officials under that. The membership is me and my colleagues in provincial transport ministries from across Canada; essentially, that is the membership right now. We are building a work program that will include engagement, and the development of that work plan is under way.

With respect to engagement with indigenous communities, we have colleagues here from Indigenous Services Canada and CIRNAC. They may wish to comment on the discussion and the engagement with indigenous communities in terms of supporting them in developing transportation services.

**Ms. Sheilagh Murphy (Assistant Deputy Minister, Lands and Economic Development, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development):** I'd be happy to do that.

We have been engaging and reaching out to national and regional indigenous organizations' leadership over the last number of months. They're interested in the idea of indigenous-led business solutions. We have not had active interest in pursuing that in terms of proposals at this point in time.

We are striking a working group with the Canadian Council of Aboriginal Business, the National Aboriginal Capital Corporations Association, NWAC, and others to work with regional and national indigenous organizations to try to scope out where there might be interest. It's early days, but we intend to do that work over the next couple of months. If businesses come forward—and there are probably tourism companies that are already in the business of transportation that might be interested—then we will work with those indigenous businesses or communities to look at solutions.

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

We'll go to Mrs. Block for five minutes.

**Mrs. Kelly Block:** Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

Transport Canada is requesting close to \$10.4 million in funding in these estimates. That's a combination of votes 1a, 5a and 15a, and it includes “[c]ontributions to support the participation of Indigenous groups in the navigation protection system and to establish Indigenous advisory groups”.

Minister, your government is already facing a lawsuit from the Lax Kw'alaams Indian Band as a result of a lack of consultation prior to the introduction of Bill C-48. As is widely known, but swept under the carpet, we heard again in committee last Tuesday from witnesses that American environmental groups funnel money to Canadian organizations to oppose resource development and the expansion of pipeline capacity in Canada. These same groups probably had much to do with your government's decision to introduce Bill C-48 in the first place, as there are no economic or environmental reasons to do so.

In the estimates, as I've said, your department is asking for the amount of \$10.4 million, and I'm wondering if you can tell us what measures will be taken to ensure that these advisory groups will not be populated or influenced by American-funded special interests.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** Thank you for your question.

I can tell you that these consultations are consultations with Canadian organizations and with Canadian indigenous groups. As you know, and as you mentioned in the context of Bill C-48, there are certain coastal first nations that don't agree with the government's decision on the moratorium, but you also know that there are coastal nations in British Columbia who agree 100% with the decision that has been taken. Recently, in fact, they've been providing testimony to the Senate committee that is looking at Bill C-48, where this bill currently resides.

It's an enormously complex situation, but we feel that the input from indigenous groups is extremely important. Does it mean that it is unanimous? No. It's very difficult when we're talking about a very large number of different coastal nations or indigenous groups in any project, including the TMX, to get unanimous consent, but we are committed to continuing to consult in a meaningful way with first nations and, where we can, to try to address their concerns.

• (0910)

**Mrs. Kelly Block:** Thank you very much.

I want to pick up on what you've just said in terms of continuing to consult. During our study of Bill C-48, we did in fact hear from a number of indigenous communities, and absolutely, there are some that support Bill C-48 and a number that do not. However, I think what was unanimous from those individuals who provided testimony was that they had not been consulted prior to the introduction of Bill C-48. I would just leave that with you.

I want to pick up on the line of questioning of my colleague in regard to the carbon tax. We know that there's been an exemption provided to the air industry in the north, so obviously that's in recognition of perhaps the detrimental effects that the carbon tax will have on that industry and on the costs of operating in the north. I'm wondering if you or your government are contemplating providing an exemption to the rest of the industry across Canada.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** No, that's not in our plans at the moment. We do recognize the particular circumstances of small regional and northern airlines or air transport companies, because they work on extremely small margins in very difficult situations where, as we know, costs in the north are higher in a number of areas. We recognize that.

Let me put it to you. I am really looking forward to hearing from your party on what your plan is, with respect, because you have said that you are going to reach the climate targets of the Paris Agreement, but you have yet to tell us how you will do it. You have some magical painless solution in mind, which we are dying to hear about.

**Mrs. Kelly Block:** I'm sure you will, after 2019.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** Well, why can't we hear about it now?

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Minister Garneau.

Mr. Hardie, please go ahead, for five minutes.

**Mr. Ken Hardie:** Well, it has to do with this magic well.... No, we'll just move on.

I have a couple of issues: trucking and VIA Rail.

Truck drivers, the training, the fitness for operating and the oversight of trucking companies, especially the long-haul ones, would fall into your realm of interest. Obviously, concerns have been raised after a number of high-profile incidents, but on a day-to-day basis, with the growth in trade, truck movements, just-in-time delivery and a lot of other things, what are the trends? What are you seeing? What are we doing about it?

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** Thank you.

We're doing a lot about it. We announced the implementation of electronic stability control, which is extremely important. It has to be put into trucks because it helps to minimize the possibility of a rollover. That is an important piece of technology.

We've also implemented regulations that will force the implementation of electronic logging devices. This is to ensure that we accurately log how many hours a driver has actually driven, because there have been proven allegations in the past that drivers suffer from fatigue when they exceed the limit on how many hours they can drive. This leads to the possibility of accidents. That's another area where we are making changes.

Another one that recently came up, unfortunately in the tragic context of Humboldt—and this was in a story on CBC—was that only one province in Canada actually has minimum entry-level training requirements before a trucker takes their test. That is Ontario. You have to have 100 hours of training before you take your test. We think that this is something we need to implement in all of the provinces. It is a provincial jurisdiction, but it is an item that I have signalled to the provinces we need to look at. We will be discussing this in January. Those are the initiatives there.

On the trade side, we also recognize that when a truck leaves from Halifax to go to Vancouver, there are a host of different regulations as it moves through the different provinces, which have to do with dead weight on the roads themselves, with the potential use of wide-base tires. These are irritants or impediments in terms of maximizing our trade. That is something that we want to work on with the provinces to improve the internal trade within our country.

• (0915)

**Mr. Ken Hardie:** I had a constituent drop into the office showing me his VIA Rail ticket. He was actually successful in getting at least half of that ticket reimbursed. He took a trip from Vancouver to the Yorkton—Melville region. There were extensive delays, in one case for seven hours, as freight train after freight train headed west with all of that trade that we value so much. On his way back, he decided to forget the train and take Greyhound. He got as far as Edmonton, and they said, “That's the end of our line. I don't know about yours,” so he had a hard time.

In terms of VIA Rail travel time reliability, especially in the western provinces, in competition with freight movement, is there a strategy under development to maybe improve VIA Rail's performance?

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** As you point out, VIA Rail mostly travels on the rail of class I railways, like CN and CP. The arrangements that exist between VIA and those companies are such that they have to yield to those freight trains. On the one hand, we're delighted that there are more freight trains moving all those important goods to our ports, but there's no question that it has an impact on VIA.

VIA is rightfully concerned and is looking at that situation at the moment to see if there's a better arrangement that can come up to minimize these very long delays, which are compounded in the winter, when there are difficult conditions. It is something that is of concern, and VIA rail is looking at it. At this point, I don't have anything further to say.

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

We'll move on to Mr. Aubin.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Robert Aubin (Trois-Rivières, NDP):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

Thank you for joining us this morning, Minister.

The last time I saw you was in my riding of Trois-Rivières. You were there for a forum organized by the Union des municipalités du Québec, or UMQ, to speak to experts on rail transport development. No offence, but I must say I was a bit disappointed by your speech. You focused entirely on rail safety, which is an important issue, to be sure, but we would've liked to hear your vision for developing the rail system. For instance, we would've liked to hear more about the expansion of passenger rail services and possible accommodations involving the Quebec government and its transportation electrification efforts. You made no mention of that.

If you don't mind, then, I'm going to ask you about a wish the UMQ representatives expressed at the very end of your speech. Is your government going to follow through on the VIA Rail high-frequency train project soon, or does it plan to make it an election issue in the upcoming campaign?

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** Thank you for your question.

I know it's an issue you pay close attention to. That's not surprising, since you're from Trois-Rivières.

One of the options we are considering right now is a high-frequency train for the Quebec City-Montreal corridor, via Trois-Rivières. What I conveyed on that wonderful day I spent in Trois-Rivières, speaking to a number of groups, was that we were very far along in our study.

**Mr. Robert Aubin:** Are you far enough along, Minister, to at least tell us when you'll make an announcement? In a week, in a month, before Christmas, before the election?

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** I know you are eager to find out, Mr. Aubin. You're constantly saying that you want an answer by tomorrow. As a government, however, we have responsibilities we have to fulfill. We are talking about a considerable commitment involving taxpayer money. I know taxpayer money is something you worry about, as well.

• (0920)

**Mr. Robert Aubin:** Absolutely.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** Naturally, we have to examine the viability of such a service, passenger volume and other such important considerations.

**Mr. Robert Aubin:** It is clear to me that I won't get an answer this morning, Minister.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** No, but it should also be clear that our government has to do its homework, and that's exactly what we are doing.

**Mr. Robert Aubin:** I see.

You mentioned taxpayer money, the perfect segue for my next question. An increasingly persistent rumour is going around that the contract for renewing VIA Rail's fleet was awarded to a German company, which would do the engineering work in Germany but build the trains in the U.S. That would mean a contract committing nearly a billion dollars in taxpayer money would generate no economic spinoff for Canada and would not safeguard or create any jobs in Canada. I have a huge problem with that.

Don't you think you would be justified in following the lead of many other countries and incorporating a national content requirement into all procurement contracts involving public funds, such as the VIA Rail fleet renewal contract?

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** You should understand that I can't comment on rumours.

That said, VIA Rail is a Crown corporation, as you know. A year ago, I announced that VIA would be replacing its fleet and putting out the contract to tender to find the best possible supplier. At that time, I again made clear that performance and price mattered most to make sure taxpayer money was spent wisely. It's a project that—

**Mr. Robert Aubin:** You're telling me the request for proposals doesn't require Canadian content?

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** I'm getting to that. Please let me finish.

The process is independently conducted by VIA Rail. Although we do ensure a certain degree of transparency, the VIA Rail people are the ones who make the decision. They are the experts, after all.

I know your party isn't in favour of free trade agreements, but we have an obligation to open up federal procurement contracts to all bidders. It doesn't work the same at the provincial level. For projects like these, we can't include contractual clauses favouring Canadian companies. If we did, we wouldn't be living up to our commitments. For your information, it's a two-way street. Our trading partners are under the same obligation. As a country that believes in free trade and seeks to do business with the rest of the world, we have to respect our commitments. In situations like this, we can't impose a Canadian content requirement.

**Mr. Robert Aubin:** It's rather strange, though, that other countries we have treaties with do it.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** We hope there will be Canadian content, but we can't require it.

[English]

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

We'll go on to Mr. Badawey, for two minutes.

**Mr. Vance Badawey:** Thank you, Chair.

I want to state that we look forward to seeing the infrastructure minister come here on December 6. I am sure that discussion can be continued then with Monsieur Champagne.

Second, I want to take this opportunity to thank the committee, especially our Liberal colleagues, as well as Mr. Jeneroux, Mr. Liepert and Mr. Aubin of the Conservative Party and NDP, for coming down to Niagara and recognizing the Niagara-Hamilton trade corridor and the assets that are attached to the same. We are within a day's drive of over 44% of North America's annual income—New York, Baltimore, Washington, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh; and, in the Ohio area, Cleveland and Toledo; as well as Detroit, Chicago, Indiana, and of course back into Ontario with the GTA, and Montreal.

With that, and with how robust it has been, continues to be, and will be, especially with the investments we're looking at making within that trade corridor, I want to ask the minister, with all the work that's being done with all the partners throughout Niagara-Hamilton, and some of the investments that are being made, including the one he announced the other day in Hamilton, what his expectations for us are as we work within that team down in Niagara-Hamilton with respect to strengthening our Niagara-Hamilton trade corridor.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** Thank you for your question, Mr. Badawey.

I think there is strong potential in the Niagara Peninsula. We're talking about a very large population density in that area in Canada. There is a great deal of trade done, not only by trucks crossing the border, but also using the St. Lawrence Seaway, which is something we feel is under-exploited at the moment. There's tremendous potential in that area. I think there is growth potential with respect to port activity, seaway activity and trade corridors on land.

I hope we can continue to work, with your implication and those of your colleagues, to identify where we can spend money wisely to grow that capability. At the same time, we're always taking into account that we have to look at all the other factors, like the environment.

There is potential there that has not been exploited. We were delighted to make that announcement at the port of Hamilton, which I think is good news for the port of Hamilton. I congratulate them on their forward-looking vision, in terms of growth.

• (0925)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Graham, do you have a very short question?

**Mr. David de Burgh Graham:** If you want me to, I can.

There's one topic I would like to bring up. It's a good way to finish the meeting.

There are a number of companies working on flying cars around the world. Are we doing anything at Transport Canada to think about the regulations required to allow that to actually happen?

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** It's a very good question. In fact, I was visited a while back by a company that makes a flying car. It sounds like a glib expression—a flying car—but I actually saw—

**Mr. David de Burgh Graham:** I want one.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** Yes. I saw a video demonstration of it, and it was very impressive. It was electrical, too.

This is something that has to be looked at from a regulatory point of view and not only from a safety point of view. We're looking into the future here, but if people in Orleans suddenly decide they want to come in to work here in downtown Ottawa and you have all of these flying cars coming in—as we see in science fiction movies all the time—then there's an important safety component to it. It would not only be federal, but there would also be provincial and municipal enforcement of the rules of the road—traditionally provincially. In this case, the rules of the air would play a significant role.

It is not just science fiction. It is something that is coming through.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** Madam Chair, I will just finish by saying that there are 67 projects in Mississauga for over \$97 million.

**The Chair:** We would appreciate if that could be submitted to the committee.

We have one minute left, and Mr. Liepert has a question before the minister has to go to a cabinet meeting. You have one minute before he has to leave.

**Mr. Ron Liepert:** I wanted to conclude by tying a bow around this Liberal environmental plan.

In your words, we exempt the small airlines from a carbon tax because their profit margins are slim. We will put a carbon tax on the large airlines. We will also put a carbon tax on small businesses, even though their profits are slim, but we will exempt 90% of large emitters because, in the words of the parliamentary secretary, they would leave Canada if we put a carbon tax on because it would be a job killer. Then we use Stephen Harper's emissions targets.

That's the Liberal environmental plan as I can see it. That doesn't scare me very much. What does scare me is this: I would like to know if you or your department did an impact assessment on what a carbon tax would do to the transportation, and the business community relying on transportation, as part of the discussion leading up to the carbon tax.

If you did, would you table it with this committee? If you did not, will you admit that you just rolled over and played dead to the environment minister, who's running energy, who's running transportation and who's running this government today?

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

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** Mr. Liepert, I know you're trying to make a point here, but I also have to say that the only thing Mr. Harper had was some numbers. He actually didn't have a plan—

**Mr. Ron Liepert:** It was his targets—

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** He didn't have a plan—

**Mr. Ron Liepert:** You're using his emission targets, Minister—

**The Chair:** Give the minister the opportunity to answer, please.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** He didn't have a plan behind it. I would urge you again to provide that plan.

Secondly, there are two components on airlines. One is internal, where we're talking about a price on pollution. There is also the international component, which is done through ICAO. Canada has taken a significant lead there, because international travel is not under the Canadian budget for greenhouse gases.

Canada has taken the lead there because 2% of greenhouse gases on the planet come from international air travel. I'm very proud of the role Canada has taken there, with sign-on by other nations to take a responsibility for the production of greenhouse gases.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Minister Garneau, especially for giving us 90 minutes of your time, along with your officials. I know you have to go to a cabinet meeting, so please feel free to leave at this point.

**Hon. Marc Garneau:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Pursuant to Standing Order 81(5), the committee will now dispose of the supplementary estimates (A) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2019 under Transport Canada. These are vote 1a under Canadian Air Transport Security Authority, vote 1a under Canadian Transportation Agency, and votes 1a, 5a, 10a, 15a, and 20a under Department of Transport.

Do I have unanimous consent to deal with all the votes in one motion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

CANADIAN AIR TRANSPORT SECURITY AUTHORITY

Vote 1a—Payments to the Authority for operating and capital expenditures.....  
\$36,038,397

(Vote 1a agreed to on division)

CANADIAN TRANSPORTATION AGENCY

Vote 1a—Program expenditures.....\$1,671,892

(Vote 1a agreed to on division)

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT

Vote 1a—Operating expenditures.....\$10,927,693

Vote 5a—Capital expenditures.....\$1,438,265

Vote 10a—Grants and contributions—Efficient transportation system.....  
\$6,049,065

Vote 15a—Grants and contributions—Green and innovative transportation system.....\$3,131,670

Vote 20a—Grants and contributions—Safe and secure transportation system.....\$10,549,935

(Votes 1a, 5a, 10a, 15a and 20a agreed to on division)

**The Chair:** Shall I report these votes to the House?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

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



Thank you to the departmental officials for being here.

We will now suspend for a few minutes so we can have our other witnesses come to the table.

● (0930) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

● (0940)

**The Chair:** I'll call the meeting back to order.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), we are doing a study on assessing the impact of aircraft noise in the vicinity of major Canadian airports.

Welcome to the witnesses. Thank you for being here. At least the weather co-operated enough to get you here. Whether you'll get home or not, who knows, but at least you got here.

From Halton region, we have Jeff Knoll, councillor from the town of Oakville and the regional municipality of Halton.

From the Greater Toronto Airports Authority, we have Hillary Marshall, vice-president of stakeholder relations and communications; Michael Belanger, director of aviation programs and compliance; and Robyn Connelly, director of community relations.

From the Toronto Aviation Noise Group, we have Renee Jacoby, the founding chair, and Sandra Best, the current chair.

Mr. Knoll, we'll start with you. Please limit your comments to five minutes, because the committee always has lots of questions. Thank you.

**Mr. Jeff Knoll (Town and Regional Councillor, Town of Oakville and Regional Municipality of Halton, Halton Region):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

Ladies and gentlemen, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you at this standing committee today. My name is Jeff Knoll, and I appear as a long-standing member of the town of Oakville and regional councils, representing the people of ward 5. I also serve as the Halton appointee on the GTAA's Community Environment and Noise Advisory Committee, known as CENAC.

Through my work on that committee, I am highly engaged on the issue of aircraft noise and the resulting impacts on the residents of Halton. As you may know, Halton region comprises the city of Burlington and the towns of Halton Hills, Oakville and Milton. We are a growing community with a population of over 548,000 people, located a mere 15 kilometres to the west of Toronto Pearson Airport.

We acknowledge Pearson's role as an economic engine and the international gateway that links Canadians to the world stage. Each day, thousands of Halton residents travel to Pearson to go to work and to travel for business and pleasure.

However, as an elected municipal official whose constituency is deeply affected by aircraft noise, I am here before you to contend that we have not achieved the proper balance between the ongoing operations of Pearson, its future growth plans and the resulting impacts on Halton residents.

I further contend that aircraft noise is highly detrimental to the well-being of Halton residents. I hear this consistently from residents in my ward and throughout the region.

Recently, as I knocked on doors and spoke to my constituents during this fall's municipal election, we often had to pause our conversations as aircraft shrieked overhead. No other words were necessary at that point, because one of the key issues in my ward was flying right above us.

Some might say that these residents should have considered this when choosing to live in a community under a flight path. In the case of north Oakville, it was not on a flight path until merely six years ago. The changes to the downwind leg, the incessant low and slow overflights, and the resulting noise and nuisance were imposed on these established neighbourhoods as a result of Nav Canada's 2012 flight path changes—changes, I might add, that were made with no consultation and virtually no notice.

I should note that the noise complaints that elected officials are receiving are coming from all across the Halton community. Recently, I was invited to speak at an aircraft noise meeting in Milton. We watched incredulously as one aircraft after another flew over and shook the little community centre to make a final noisy descent into the airport, as if to punctuate the very purpose of the gathering.

Aircraft noise in Halton is disrupting the ability of our residents to go outside and use their backyards, to enjoy our parks and our hiking trails, to talk with their neighbours, to get a full night's sleep. In short, aircraft noise is compromising our residents' quality of life.

I must acknowledge that there have been some positive engagements on this issue over the past few years, including three major studies by the GTAA and Nav Canada. However, while appreciative of this engagement, residents are not satisfied with the pace of implementation of the proposed mitigating measures coming out of these studies. Residents want and need relief today, especially as the airport looks to become a super hub to serve a projected 85 million passengers in 2037, up from 47 million today.

My time today is very limited, so I will submit additional written comments and suggestions to your committee, but I want to raise one last issue before I conclude.

The GTAA is engaged with regional airports in southern Ontario with the objective of solidifying Pearson's role as the main international hub, with regional airports providing complementary passenger and cargo services. While a potentially positive goal, it does raise the question of whether the proper jurisdictional partners, accountability structure, and incentives are in place to ensure that the GTAA adequately brings aircraft noise into the equation along with Pearson's economic interests.

We need the engagement of all levels of government, potentially with Transport Canada playing the lead role, to help in the long-term planning and routing among airports in southern Ontario, a process that needs to focus on a triple bottom line of social responsibility, economic value and environmental impact.

Furthermore, I would like to suggest that it is time for the government to consider a second major airport in the GTA, potentially making use of the Pickering lands that were assembled for this very purpose over 50 years ago. Such an initiative would spread the aircraft and vehicular traffic, as well as the economic development benefits, to the eastern GTA.

Madam Chair, as elected officials we are constantly challenged to find the proper balance between sometimes inherently opposite interests. In the case of Toronto Pearson, Canada's largest airport and the surrounding communities, we're in a situation where we're not achieving the balance between the economic imperatives at Pearson and the impacts of aircraft noise on our community. If we can't achieve that balance, we're at a real risk of seeing the continued and permanent erosion of the quality of life in Halton and across Canada, a prospect that does not serve the interests of governments at any level.

Thank you for your time.

• (0945)

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mr. Knoll.

Ms. Marshall, you have five minutes, please.

**Ms. Hillary Marshall (Vice-President, Stakeholder Relations and Communications, Greater Toronto Airports Authority):** Madam Chair and committee members, good morning.

I'm Hillary Marshall, vice-president of stakeholder relations and communications for the GTAA. With me is Robyn Connelly, the director of community relations—her office manages noise programs—and Mike Belanger, director of aviation programs and compliance.

Thanks for the opportunity to present today and for the work the committee is undertaking to understand the impact of noise. The GTAA shares this goal.

Toronto Pearson is working towards a bold vision: to be the best airport in the world. Today, we're the fifth most connected airport in the world, and we play a vital role in connecting Canadian cities to each other and the world. One in five Canadians uses Toronto Pearson for air travel today. Because of our connectivity, we believe that being the best airport in the world starts closer to home, working hand in hand with our community and in lockstep with our aviation partners and industry experts.

Today, I'd like to tell you about a few of the initiatives that we've developed in collaboration with our community and industry partners.

Every five years, we develop a noise management action plan, which lays out how we will address noise over a five-year cycle. In our previous noise management action plan, we accomplished the following. We removed the 10-nautical-mile boundary that limited where we would accept noise complaints from; this initiative in particular was pushed forward by Councillor Knoll of Oakville, whom you just heard from, and he also pushed to expand the committee membership to include the regions of York, Durham and Halton. We also undertook a review of the locations of our system of noise monitoring terminals and added eight more for a total of 25.

Our 2018-22 noise management action plan is even more ambitious. It has 10 commitments that will make Toronto Pearson a leader in aviation noise management. We created this plan following an international best practices study of 26 comparator airports around the world. The study was conducted for us by Helios, whom you will hear from at a later date, I understand. Additionally, we engaged more than 3,000 residents to help shape the plan by giving us their input through workshops, and we assembled a resident-led reference panel specifically to provide input on noise and airport growth. This plan has been well received by the community and resident groups, and we're now taking action to implement the plan. As part of our implementation, we're continuing to update our community and resident partners, as well as our elected officials.

A key initiative of our plan is the quieter fleet incentive program, which targets noise from aircraft. The A320 family of aircraft has a high-pitched whine related to air intake. This can be eliminated with a simple retrofit. Airlines around the world, such as Lufthansa, Air France, British Airways and easyJet, have already made this change. We've written and engaged with our carriers to ask for their support and to advise them that we are moving ahead with an incentive program in 2020. We continue to work with our airline partners to make this happen as soon as possible.

In 2015, we started working with NavCan to develop what has become known as the "Six Ideas", specifically designed to reduce noise in our adjacent communities. A description of these six ideas has been provided to you, but I'd like to take a moment to highlight a few of them.

Ideas 1 and 2 were implemented on November 8 by Nav Canada. These are new nighttime flight paths for approaching and departing aircraft. Idea 5 involves alternating east and west runway use on weekends to provide some predictable respite for communities on the final approach or initial departure. This program was tested this past summer. We're examining the results, and we look forward to making those results public shortly.

Following the guidelines of the airspace change communications and consultation protocol, our community partners were involved at every stage of this three-year study. In the last year alone, we reached out to 2.9 million residents via print ads, had 250,000 online views and connected with 160,000 people by phone. About 1,000 people participated directly in surveys. We also met with elected officials throughout the process to ensure that they had information in order to respond to community questions and concerns.

We're seeing positive impacts and also a positive response from the community. In addition to working with our community and industry partners, we have also engaged with experts in the field of noise management and annoyance to guide our work. We're working with the University of Windsor to understand noise annoyance. The committee heard earlier from Professor Novak and Ph.D. student Julia Jovanovic. We are supporting their research to better understand how the community experiences noise effects and how we can work better to mitigate that. We also engaged Helios to be our technical consultant on the delivery of our five-year noise management action plan. Its role is to help us ensure that we're finding responsible and innovative solutions based on international best practices.

In closing, Toronto Pearson is continually looking for ways to manage its noise and annoyance. We do this by balancing our commitment to our neighbours with the pursuit of our vision of making Toronto Pearson the best airport in the world. In 2017, we served more than 47 million passengers and directly employed nearly 50,000 people at our airport. We have the second-largest employment zone in the country, and the airport facilitates more than 6% of Ontario's GDP.

Toronto Pearson's growth is important to future jobs and economic development. We know that it cannot be done without the help of our neighbours and partners. We're working hard to find a way that we can all grow and prosper together.

Thanks again for the opportunity to represent the airport. I look forward to your questions.

• (0955)

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

We'll go on to Ms. Best for five minutes.

**Ms. Sandra Best (Chair, Toronto Aviation Noise Group):** Thank you for the opportunity to appear before your committee.

I'm Sandra Best. I'm chair of the Toronto Aviation Noise Group, TANG, established in 2012 in response to Nav Canada's airspace redesign implemented at Toronto Pearson in February of that year.

I am joined today by my colleague, founding co-chair Renee Jacoby.

We are a facts-based, multi-community residents group committed to finding fair, safe and equitable solutions.

I live in High Park, Toronto, and my colleague lives in midtown Toronto, so you're probably asking yourselves why we are addressing your committee.

Well, we are here to dispel the myth that aviation noise is limited to the communities in the vicinity of airports. Imagine, if you will, that you wake up one morning in your relatively quiet neighbourhood, as far as 20 kilometres from the airport, to the torturous sound of low-altitude airplanes deploying their flaps and screeching their brakes directly overhead—it's not "annoyance".

You call the airport and learn from the noise management office that you now live under what we at TANG affectionately term a "super highway in the sky", and you can't register a noise complaint because you live outside the radius for reporting. Even with

improvements made to date, residents are fatigued, and many have simply given up on using the process.

Imagine the shock you feel when you find out that there was little or no consultation and your elected representatives knew nothing about it: from no aircraft one day to more than 88,000 flights per year in 2017 on our runway alone, which does not include either arrivals crossing en route to other runways or departures. The data in our briefing materials speak for themselves: high flight volumes, high noise monitor readings and disproportionate runway utilization.

You are further shocked when you become aware of the deregulation in 1996 of our air navigation services to Nav Canada, a private company. There was no legislated protocol to challenge the decision made in 2012, and being asked to attend ineffective meetings of the Community Engagement and Noise Advisory Committee, or CENAC, to solve problems at the local level yielded no meaningful change.

What has been achieved to date?

There was the voluntary communications and consultation protocol in June 2015, which we believe must be amended and legislated.

There was the Helios report, the independent Toronto air space review. We commend Nav Canada for commissioning it, as it has built bridges with stakeholders and created dialogue and discussion. We support much of the work carried out by Helios, and we collaborated with them throughout the process. However, we were disappointed that the GTAA, in an attempt to appear more consultative, formed a widely panned reference review panel and deferred better runway utilization to them, among other things.

Also recommended was the restructuring of CENAC, and we understand that the GTAA is about to unveil their new look next month. We haven't been privy to the deliberations involved, but we are cautiously optimistic about the results.

When TANG first engaged with both the GTAA and Nav Canada, public relations were atrocious. Concerns were summarily dismissed and information difficult to obtain. It was very clear that airlines were the customers and that citizens living under aviation routes were an afterthought. We have seen positive changes within Nav Canada in the last two years and more willingness to work with community groups. In particular, we commend Blake Cushnie for his commitment to the process.

However, these changes did not come about voluntarily but as a result of years of hard work and lobbying by members of the general public. Therefore, we continue to believe that consistent, active and objective government oversight of Nav Canada is critical.

There is still much to be done. Pearson projections estimate total movements in excess of 600,000 by 2037, which means that arrivals on our runway alone would increase to a staggering 120,000 per year. Clearly, this is untenable.

Our recommendations are in your briefing materials. We ask that you take these into consideration. In particular, we ask for acceleration of the retrofit of the Airbus A320s and the adoption of the Helios recommendations with regard to night flights.

We believe that Toronto is one of the great livable cities of the world, and we support its economic development. However, as Canadians, we pride ourselves on our belief in justice and fairness, and it is neither just nor fair to ask some communities to bear the burden of concentrated aviation noise while absolving others. Solutions simply must be found.

We invite your questions, and we look forward to the results and recommendations of the study and the minister's response.

Thank you again for this opportunity. It's deeply appreciated.

• (1000)

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

We'll go to Mrs. Block for five minutes.

**Mrs. Kelly Block:** Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

My first question will be for TANG.

Could you tell me if your organization has developed a proposal for how airport authorities should balance the concerns of communities surrounding night flights with the economic benefits offered by these flights?

**Ms. Renee Jacoby (Founding Chair, Toronto Aviation Noise Group):** I'd be happy to answer that question.

I'd like for the committee to know that we have been involved in the aviation noise issue for the last seven years. It is a temptation at the beginning of the process to chase headlines that invite solutions that we think might be beneficial to us. I can use as an example the Frankfurt Airport, which is often referred to with regard to its curfew at night. You'll hear many positive things about the night curfew; you'll hear equally negative things about it.

**Mrs. Kelly Block:** I'm just wondering if you've put together a proposal.

**Ms. Renee Jacoby:** Our proposal is to support what Helios has recommended in its report, "Best Practices in Noise Management". That would be to extend the night flight restricted hours and to form a new formula for the night flight cap.

**Mrs. Kelly Block:** Thank you very much.

In the spirit of Tuesday giving, and with the number of colleagues on the other side of the table, I would like to give the rest of my time to one of those members, if they have any questions.

**The Chair:** That's why I love this committee. Everybody is so kind to each other.

All right, we have almost four minutes here.

Borys, go ahead.

**Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskij (Etobicoke Centre, Lib.):** Thank you so much, Mrs. Block. Merry Christmas to you, as well.

Ms. Marshall, in June 2013, Transport Canada increased the GTAA's budget for night flights, with a formula that would continue increasing the number of night flights in future years. Did the GTAA lobby government officials for this change?

**Ms. Hillary Marshall:** Thanks for your question.

We undertook extensive consultation and engaged with government officials in the process.

**Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskij:** Could you provide us with a list—I'm asking for an undertaking—of who was lobbied and by whom, which department officials and which elected officials?

**Ms. Hillary Marshall:** The consultation documents are posted on our website, and we'd be happy to provide a link to that website. It's fully recorded.

**Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskij:** On that same topic, was the minister lobbied on this particular night flight request?

**Ms. Hillary Marshall:** I'd have to go back through the documents, but Transport Canada approved the change, so—

**Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskij:** So you would undertake to provide us all the information that you have.

**Ms. Hillary Marshall:** Yes, I'd be happy to.

**Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskij:** Thank you.

I was glad to hear you state that you work—and this is your quote—"hand in hand" with our communities. Unfortunately, that wasn't reflected in the opening statement that we heard from one community group. I know that's not the feeling in our community.

Let me zero in on CENAC. There's great community dissatisfaction with CENAC. It's seen as a vehicle to manage and deal with complaints and not actually address the issues.

After going through all these processes, would you support an arm's-length noise committee beyond the control and perceived manipulations of the GTAA?

**Ms. Hillary Marshall:** I think what you'll find is that in the coming months we'll be coming forward with a new proposal for CENAC. We've looked at other airports internationally, as I indicated, to understand how they've approached it, and found some great initiatives in terms of industry partnerships. We'll be coming back with those.

•(1005)

**Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj:** Okay. My question is, do you support an arm's-length noise committee that would deal with these issues so that the perceived control and manipulations that the GTAA has over this process would no longer be the reality that communities live with?

Do you support an arm's-length noise committee?

**Ms. Hillary Marshall:** The new CENAC, the new approach that we're going to be coming forward with, has industry partnerships. It has more direct community outreach, government outreach.

We think that's a good first step. That's the step we're going to be moving forward with.

**Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj:** So you're not comfortable with a fully arm's-length noise committee to oversee noise complaints?

**Ms. Hillary Marshall:** We think that this approach is a good first step, and we look forward to bringing it forward to discuss with members of the community.

**Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj:** Members of the community—

**The Chair:** Sorry, Mr. Wrzesnewskyj—

**Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** Ms. Damoff, go ahead.

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Thank you, Chair.

Thank you to all the witnesses for being here. In particular, I want to thank my former colleague, Jeff Knoll. We served together on council.

I know you've been engaged in this issue for many, many years—well, since 2012, when the flight paths were changed—and have seen some positive steps over the last few years.

There have been multiple studies and technical reviews done by Nav Canada, the GTAA, Helios consulting. I had arranged for them to do one of the consultations in Oakville North—Burlington. Community members have been engaged, in particular David Inch and Richard Slatter, from my riding—your ward.

I'm wondering, in all of that, what role the federal government should be playing. We're talking about arm's-length agencies here. How do you see us becoming engaged to ensure that some of the...? There are pilot studies that are being done right now.

I'm wondering if you could comment a little further on that.

**Mr. Jeff Knoll:** I'd be happy to. Thank you for the question, Ms. Damoff. I appreciate my member of Parliament asking me a question.

There are a couple of things here. First of all, I acknowledged in my presentation that there have been these studies. There has been some good work and great recommendations coming out of them. As my friends from TANG indicated earlier, there are a number of initiatives left on the cutting room floor—to use a film term—that need to be embraced, specifically the night flight restrictions and the restructuring of the noise advisory committee, which, of course, is apparently in process, and I understand that it's about to be announced.

To get directly to your question of what the government could be directly involved in, I think it would be in potentially taking back some of the responsibility from Nav Canada in terms of addressing these issues. Nav Canada is an independent agency. I understand the formation of an independent organization to deal with difficult issues and decisions. Certainly the issues around safety are paramount and need to be kept at arm's length. Safety should never be a political or neighbourhood decision. Certainly, issues around quality of life and the impact of the operations of any federally regulated service or organization need to be taken into account in decision-making. I would urge your committee to consider changing the terms of reference for Nav Canada so that there can be more direct involvement by the government and the people's representative in some of those decisions.

While we have some terrific ideas on the back burner and things that are working, they're not moving fast enough. There are not enough teeth to make them happen quickly enough. GTAA is certainly doing their level best, but there needs to be more involvement by both Nav Canada and Transport Canada.

I understand you asked a question earlier today about Air Canada, and that's a great example. There was a big flurry about the announcement and press release, and everybody was very happy, but the implementation of the retrofit with the noise-reducing vortex generators is happening at a molasses-like rate. Getting involved and basically having Nav Canada take a more direct role in considering community impacts needs to happen.

The last thing, of course—I mentioned it in my comments and I want to re-emphasize it, because I don't want to see this ignored—is thinking beyond. Those of us who are elected sometimes have to think in terms of what we can accomplish in our term. We need to think of a multi-term solution to this, which is potentially a second airport. Most major jurisdictions around the world have multiple airports in their jurisdictions. The federal government, in its wisdom of the day, 50 years ago, assembled lands for that purpose. It's time to dust them off and start moving in that direction.

•(1010)

**Ms. Pam Damoff:** Thank you, Councillor Knoll.

The growth of Pearson is something that I know Oakville council and the region of Halton have been quite engaged in, and you've had delegations to both councils.

Do you see a role for the minister and the Department of Transport in that growth? Should there be some engagement by the minister in the growth of the airport?

**Mr. Jeff Knoll:** Once again, I'll go back to my previous responses.

First of all, I think the answer to that is absolutely yes. I agree, and I said this in my statement. I fully acknowledge, respect and appreciate the economic contributions made by Pearson and the GTAA organization; however, there is a disconnect between the ambitions and the desires of the board of the GTAA to serve more customers and the impacts on the ground.

I do believe that the federal government, as the people's representatives with this in their jurisdiction, needs to be taking a direct role in this. As I stated, it is having a deleterious impact on the quality of life of surrounding communities. Once upon a time, the airport was built in an area where there was nobody around it. It was built in the middle of a farmer's field, essentially, in Malton. Those times have changed.

The impacts of what takes place at the airport need to be considered in the context of the people who live there in an adjacent community or, like my friends from TANG, in midtown Toronto.

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

We are going to Mr. Aubin for five minutes.

[Translation]

**Mr. Robert Aubin:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

Thank you to each of the witnesses for being here this morning.

My first question is for Ms. Best and Ms. Jacoby, as well as Mr. Knoll.

Since beginning our study, we have heard from witnesses who suffer the consequences of aircraft noise, and I have absolutely no doubt as to how disruptive it is for them. However, no one has been able to show me a noise level airports and citizens' groups could agree on. The only standard I have found thus far is an average noise limit of 55 decibels, as recognized by the World Health Organization and the International Civil Aviation Organization. We all know, though, that aircraft noise is well in excess of 55 decibels.

Do airport authorities and citizens' groups at least agree on the instruments used to measure the noise so that the data gathered by each side is even accepted for discussion? Again, wouldn't it be up to Transport Canada to be more transparent and provide access to all the data that would allow for a conversation based on the same information?

[English]

**Ms. Sandra Best:** I think that's a very valid question. Thank you.

I think the issue we all face at the moment is that because GTAA and NavCan are private companies, there is no freedom of information involved, and therefore we cannot see how decisions are made, so we cannot understand how they're trying to do things. In terms of the decibel levels, there has to be some clarity around that. There has to be some agreement among everyone on what that looks like.

More importantly, when we speak with pilots and when we do our research, we find there are two kinds of aircraft noise. There is the noise when you're coming down to land. There's not much you can do about that. You're coming in to land as an aircraft. But, there is a lot you can do about the downwind, which is the initial descent before you turn. I think within that, discussions about decibel levels

can be had. Agreements can be made. Planes can fly more quietly and they can fly higher.

Some of that has been undertaken already, but the decibel issue itself is a massive problem worldwide, and I don't think you're going to find agreements anywhere in airports. Those are not happening.

[Translation]

**Mr. Robert Aubin:** Thank you.

Would you like to add anything, Mr. Knoll?

[English]

**Mr. Jeff Knoll:** Sure. I'd be happy to jump in.

I think that strictly measuring impacts on a scientific metric like noise compression rates or decibel rates is not the only consideration. The accepted standards do not necessarily take into account concentration, for example. Having 55 decibels once every 20 minutes may be an acceptable standard, but 55 decibels or 45 decibels or any metric on a consistent, concentrated basis leads to a level of frustration and annoyance that is very hard to measure by science.

As I said in my opening statement, it's an issue of quality of life. When you are constantly bombarded with sound, whether it meets a certain standard or not, it's going to have an impact on your ability to conduct your daily activities, your sleep and your well-being.

•(1015)

[Translation]

**Mr. Robert Aubin:** Thank you.

My next question is for you, Ms. Marshall.

The final report put out by Helios, an independent firm, contains 18 short-term recommendations that take into account best practices for reducing aviation noise. In your opening statement, you said that Pearson airport would be following through on 10 commitments. Do they overlap with the recommendations? Are your 10 commitments among the 18 Helios recommendations? If not, where do you stand on the Helios report?

[English]

**Ms. Hillary Marshall:** Is there any relationship among the 10 recommendations?

We believe that the recommendations, taken together—whether they're for insulation, a quieter fleet incentive program, changes in reporting or changes in the noise committee—should help us move forward toward international best practices in airport noise management.

Did I understand your question properly?

[Translation]

**Mr. Robert Aubin:** Yes, thank you.

Will the airport's 10 recommendations be available soon? Will we be able to see them?

[English]

**Ms. Hillary Marshall:** They are available. They're posted on our website, as well as the short-, medium- and long-term actions that we're undertaking toward each of them.

**The Chair:** Ms. Marshall, can we ensure that the committee gets a copy of that report, please?

**Ms. Hillary Marshall:** Yes.

**The Chair:** We'll go on to Mr. Sikand and then Ms. Ratansi.

**Mr. Gagan Sikand:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

My question will be for the GTAA. I'll start by saying that I really appreciate the engagement I've had with you. I've had two people from my constituency actually participate in public consultation, and I've also enjoyed speaking to you about potentially making Pearson and Mississauga a transit hub.

Having said that, there have been estimates of Pearson expanding to 80 million or 90 million people by 2030, I believe. What is 100% capacity for Pearson?

**Ms. Hillary Marshall:** I'll just take a step back and try to explain. We have a certain number of runways at Toronto Pearson. We have five runways, and we are able to operate them in such a way that, as planes get larger and they're carrying more passengers, the number of passengers coming through the airport increases significantly, but the number of movements themselves—

**Mr. Gagan Sikand:** I'm sorry; I have limited time. There must be a number, though. You can't continue to have planes coming in indefinitely.

**Ms. Hillary Marshall:** Right now, our master plan calls for us to reach about 85 million passengers by 2037. That is with quite a mix of aircraft operating out of Toronto Pearson, but on average, as the planes start to have more seats, we'll be able to manage 85 million passengers with the terminals that we envision, the infrastructure that we have.

**Mr. Gagan Sikand:** Thank you.

Could you speak to the impact of potentially reducing the night flights?

**Ms. Hillary Marshall:** I'll go back and point out that we have communicated to our CENAC committee and members of the public that we are undertaking a study of our night flight operations. Night flights, for a city like Toronto and other cities, are flights that are coming from different parts of the country—Vancouver, Calgary, different time zones—and we're also operating both arrivals and departures from Asian airports. We're a global city, and we're trying our best to serve the demand and the need for tourism, trade and cargo, while respecting and managing within the restrictions.

**Mr. Gagan Sikand:** I'm going to ask you to speak to a hypothetical situation. Could you speak to the GTAA being in the care and control of another airport, if we were to have one built within proximity of Pearson?

**Ms. Hillary Marshall:** There are examples of airports that operate as systems around the world. Today, Toronto Pearson operates within a voluntary network of airports. There are 11 airports in southern Ontario that work together. That is not a mandate; it's not regulated in any fashion, but it is a collaborative, co-operative

network of airports that are looking forward to a day when there will be a demand of about 110 million passengers in southern Ontario and looking at how collectively we can service them.

• (1020)

**Mr. Gagan Sikand:** Thank you.

I do have to share my time, but I have a quick question for Sandra.

Please answer yes or no.

**Ms. Sandra Best:** Okay.

**Mr. Gagan Sikand:** If Billy Bishop Airport was to be expanded, would your community be affected?

**Ms. Sandra Best:** I honestly do not know, sorry.

**Mr. Gagan Sikand:** Okay, thank you.

**Ms. Yasmin Ratansi (Don Valley East, Lib.):** I'll make it quick.

Thank you all for being here.

Our role as MPs is to facilitate when there is a problem. Listening to TANG, I understood that there has been no consultation, so I think all these MPs are here because their constituents have been complaining. When they complain, we send them to your information sessions, etc. The concern I've heard from DMRI has been that whenever they come up with solutions, they've been disregarded. I think it is important for GTAA to actually listen to the concerns.

Sandra Best, I heard you say that the Helios recommendation is what you would like to go with.

My question to GTAA is this. What is the problem in meeting the Helios recommendation? That was commissioned by the minister and by you guys, and it's a consultative process. It took a lot of people to come to the table, to listen to you guys and to listen to the constituents, and yet you have not come up with a solution. What is preventing you from bringing that solution? I am very comfortable if you could say you're balancing the needs of the constituents with safety and with environment issues, but you need to talk to people. You need to listen to them. You need to give them the credence they are due. I think TANG also commissioned a pilot project and you have the report.

Could you give me some answers that we can take back to our constituents?

**Ms. Robyn Connelly (Director, Community Relations, Greater Toronto Airports Authority):** Sure.

Airport operations are very complex, and making changes to our operations takes time. Our friends at TANG, as well as Councillor Knoll, mentioned that changes are slowly happening. I think that is a reflection of the complexity of the issue.

You asked a question about a series of different studies. There was one study, a Nav Canada independent airspace review, that was undertaken by Helios. That was released in September 2017. Nav Canada responded with an action plan about how they would enact the recommendations of that report. They are doing that on an ongoing basis and do updates about that at each of our CENAC public meetings. That does happen regularly.

As part of our own practice, we also commissioned Helios to do a noise management best practices benchmarking study for us, which we undertook, and which forms the cornerstone of the noise management action plan we are currently pursuing. We are very much taking the recommendations that came out of that study and exploring how to implement them. It's also important to know that we also conducted consultations around what it would look like and what our guiding principles need to be for consideration. We did that through a randomly selected residents' reference panel, which TANG also mentioned, but we also did that through a series of workshops throughout the summer of 2017 to gather that feedback and guidance.

Finally, you asked about the report from David Inch. His recommendations, as part of the report that went to Nav Canada, fundamentally form the six ideas that Hillary referenced in her remarks. Those six ideas are currently being implemented. It is frustrating that things are happening at a slow pace, but good projects are going forward.

**The Chair:** Mr. Virani, go ahead.

**Mr. Arif Virani (Parkdale—High Park, Lib.):** Thank you.

I'm going to build on what Yasmin and Pam were saying, but I'll also ask a question directly from my constituents.

Ms. Best, thank you for being here and for illustrating the fact that concerns about airport noise are not germane only to those people who live near an airport; they're germane to people who live under a flight path. That flight path has increased dramatically over the last six years or so. Thank you for your advocacy.

I want to give you a chance to comment on a few things, because I'm sharing my time with Mr. Hardie.

The first point is about the accountability piece. We're hearing about CENAC. We have concerns about CENAC, and it's about the fact that, from your perspective, it's ineffective, as I understood from your submissions. You're not seeing meaningful change. Can you elaborate on that a little, in particular on what we've just heard about industry partnership as we move forward with CENAC? What does that mean to you?

Also, from what was just mentioned about the randomly selected citizens' reference panel, I understand there were concerns about it that were expressed by TANG at the time.

• (1025)

**Ms. Sandra Best:** Yes, it's a big subject and there isn't enough time today to cover all the issues around CENAC, but I will talk about the reference panel that's been mentioned.

Imagine, if you will, that you've been working on these noise issues for seven years. There are many constituents right across the GTA who have spent time and effort to work on this. We work day

and night. For some of us, it became a full-time job. When we start to see some kind of political action, we thank our representatives for it, because, frankly, that's what it took. Before political action, there was no movement.

We find out, however, that recommendations from the Helios report, the GTAA part of it, are going to be referred to a new panel that's going to be set up with 36 members who are going to be randomly selected across Toronto. They're going to be given four days of training and orientation. Now, they are fine people, I'm sure, with the very best of intentions, but they don't have any background information. We are asked to go and present to them for half an hour or an hour, and I think three or four other groups are asked to go as well.

Well, you sit back and you think to yourself that if they really wanted a reference panel that was going to have good recommendations and a real understanding of the issues they were tasked with commenting on, they would go to groups that have been involved in this for many years, groups that have educated themselves on the separate language, what you might call "aviation language", and on issues of concern in airports worldwide. They would at least put members from those committees on the panel, and then they might do some random selection of other people...but four days? One of those days, I believe, involved orienting them with the airport, visiting the towers. This is not real consultation.

When the word "consultation" is thrown around, what we've found over the years is that it's not real consultation. It's consultation with predetermined answers. We've all been there. We've all been to organizations that do this. They know what they want. They consult about that particular subject matter, and then they staff the tables—as I understand they actually did—with industry experts. What are these good-hearted people going to come up with in terms of recommendations?

They send out a survey across Toronto. Again, I spoke with the group hired to facilitate and they told me directly—I have this on record—that the GTAA designed this survey themselves and this consultative group was only there to carry out and facilitate. Those questions were all moving towards predetermined answers. This was theoretically a massive consultation and a group of people who were used to come up with recommendations on runway utilization, for instance. Well, runway utilization is a complicated thing. It's not as simple as it might sound. Where are the crossover points? How will this affect other people? When you talk about "predictable noise respite", what does that look like? That's how we ended up with alternating east and west runways on alternate weekends, and deluging people, who were already deluged, with additional traffic on those weekends.

Therefore, when we talk about consultation, we have to be clear that it's meaningful consultation, and meaningful consultation, in our estimation, has been excessively hard to come by, other than the Helios report.



**Mr. Arif Virani:** I have two more questions. With respect to the Helios recommendations, there are recommendations about night flights and there are recommendations about the retrofit. Can you talk about what you would like to see in terms of the night flights, the pace of the changes, and the retrofits to the planes? Ms. Marshall mentioned the speed of the retrofitting of the planes.

**The Chair:** Give us a brief answer, if you possibly can, to Mr. Virani's question.

**Ms. Renee Jacoby:** Our last official retrofit number was five retrofitted planes in June. I think that was up to seven at the September CENAC meeting. Michael Belanger would be in a better position to know how big the fleet is, but I think it's around 40 planes to be retrofitted, the A320s. That's supposed to be completed by 2019. They say they'll get it done, either replace or retrofit.

I think we'd all feel more comfortable having more immediate information and better updates, and an inquiry into why it seems to be taking so long, or perhaps even a schedule as to when those planes are going to be retrofitted. I understand that this is supposed to be done during their regular maintenance. Could we see that? Could we see how many are going to be retrofitted? We'd feel more comfortable with that, rather than being disappointed, with only five done after one year.

• (1030)

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

We will go on to Mrs. Block for five minutes.

**Mrs. Kelly Block:** Thanks very much, Madam Chair.

I want to welcome all of our witnesses here this morning. I should have done that in my first intervention.

I'm going to direct my questions to you, Ms. Marshall and Ms. Connelly.

Perhaps you've touched on this, but I just want to confirm. Other witnesses who have testified before this committee as part of our study have suggested imposing a total ban on night flights, as has been done at Frankfurt Airport, or imposing a steep surcharge for night flights.

What impact would such a policy have on your airport, and how would a ban or surcharge on night flights affect your ability to compete with other large international airports nearby, such as Buffalo?

**Ms. Hillary Marshall:** I guess I'd start by saying that there are many types of traffic that comes in during the night. There are about 50 to 53 flights that come in at present during the nighttime hours. A small number of them are cargo flights. About 1% of the night movements would be related to cargo. There are some sun destinations, some Asian and international destinations, as well as domestic routes.

Within each of those movements, there are travellers and cargo vital to the local economy, and we need to understand the consequences of potentially removing those flights or limiting them in some way.

If you look at some of the big international hubs, Frankfurt would be one extreme, but there are many other international airports that

have restricted hours, as we do—restricted movements within those hours.

We think that while we can look at the formula, at who is being served by those flights and what the economic opportunity and impact are, the greater Toronto area and the country will continue to need night flights to serve our economy. Whether those flights are coming into Toronto Pearson or another airport in the greater Toronto area, there is still going to be an impact. We're potentially just talking about moving an issue from one airport to another.

**Mrs. Kelly Block:** Thank you very much for that.

There has been much discussion here this morning around public consultation and meaningful consultation. I understand that you recently developed a new noise management action plan. Based on your experience developing this strategy, what would you say are the most significant steps that airports can take to mitigate the impact of aircraft noise for surrounding communities? Can you tell us what role public consultations have played in creating your noise management program at the GTAA?

**Ms. Robyn Connelly:** Sure. There are couple of questions there, I think.

One is how we consulted to develop our noise management action plan, and then a piece of the best practices study and the noise management action plan is to improve how we work with the surrounding community.

To produce the noise management action plan, as we mentioned, the foundational document that guided us was the Helios best practices study. As Hillary mentioned, it looked at 26 airports worldwide and came forward with a series of recommendations. From that came a series of 10 commitments, which are like vision statements, and under those vision statements are a series of actions we need to take. Some things are about doing what we already do, but doing it better, and some are to stop doing things that aren't making any impact. Of course, we will also be introducing nine new programs as part of this over the next five years.

Part of the best practices research did look at what other airports do—how they conduct their noise committees and their consultations. We certainly came up short. That was a very fair recommendation. Challenges with our committee were the representation and the process through which committee members are appointed.

One of the biggest pieces of feedback, as part of that research, was that our noise committee didn't have a meaningful action plan or work program. Now that we do have this noise management action plan, which is much more ambitious than the ones we've had in the past, we certainly do have a really solid work plan going forward.

We will be making recommendations to make sure that we have the proper elected officials and residents support and infrastructure in place to advise and guide us on how we move forward on these programs—revolutionary things like Canada's first voluntary insulation program, for example. There are big initiatives ahead.

●(1035)

**Mrs. Kelly Block:** Thank you.

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

We'll go to Mr. Graham and Mr. Oliphant.

You're sharing some time.

**Mr. David de Burgh Graham:** Yes, if you can warn me when I have about two minutes left so that he can get his question in, that would be helpful.

To start, I have a very quick question for Ms. Marshall.

You mentioned in your opening comments that you're aiming to make Pearson the best airport in the world. At the moment, it is the most expensive airport in the world outside of Japan. I wonder on what measure you would consider it the best airport.

**Ms. Hillary Marshall:** Actually, in regard to Toronto Pearson, I don't know what information you're going on at this point—

**Mr. David de Burgh Graham:** It's expensive to land there. It has the highest landing fees.

**Ms. Hillary Marshall:** We've done more recent studies, where we've brought our landing fees down over the last seven years by about 30% and have held them steady.

We fall in the mid-range on airport improvement fees among Canadian airports, so we're certainly heading in the right direction. We have long-term agreements with our carriers to control the costs.

In terms of being a financially sustainable airport, we're working very hard to continue to head along that track.

**Mr. David de Burgh Graham:** By what measure are you hoping to become the best airport in the world? It's a very subjective thing to call yourself.

**Ms. Hillary Marshall:** There would probably be a number of factors on which we'd like to call ourselves the best airport in the world.

For example, in terms of passenger service, just this year we were recognized as the best large airport in North America for passenger service, as voted on by passengers. On behalf of the 300-plus employers and the 50,000 workers at Toronto Pearson, who all come together every day to get planes moving and serve passengers, I know that has been an important point of recognition.

We're making sure that we are environmentally sustainable, that we manage our stormwater, and that we introduce sustainability programs, as well as managing our operations safely.

**Mr. David de Burgh Graham:** My time is quite short. This is a very quick question, also following up on a previous comment.

You mentioned that Pearson is part of a network of 11 airports that work together, but we've also heard testimony here that Pearson has effectively poached cargo traffic from Hamilton. Therefore, is it competition or co-operation?

**Ms. Hillary Marshall:** I'd say it's co-operation. We haven't poached cargo traffic from Hamilton. I'm not sure what that refers to.

However, we do have a market that many carriers want to be as close to as possible. Understandably, they make a choice. We can't

force the carriers to go and operate at any airport. That's not under the terms of our ground lease. We're not allowed to do that.

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

Mr. Oliphant, go ahead.

**Mr. Robert Oliphant (Don Valley West, Lib.):** Thank you all for being here.

Thank you particularly to TANG for their long-time engagement on this issue. Also, thanks for helping us as MPs understand this issue quite at depth and with a really fact-based approach that has helped me a lot.

There must be some amusement on the opposition side to see all the government folks here attempting to solve a problem. I've been on that side during this issue and I've been on this side during this issue, and I recognize that the reality is that we have a system of oversight that is completely out of the hands of what we're trying to do as elected officials. It was there when I was in opposition and I was attempting to get to the government, and the government is now on this side. It must be amusing for them.

I'm looking at TANG particularly. Is there a model of oversight you have envisioned that could make this more responsive so that consultation is real, elected officials have insight and impact in it, and citizens' groups actually have a say, without treading upon safety and issues that I know you care about?

**Ms. Sandra Best:** There are a number of things, and I'll certainly defer to Renee on this one.

From my perspective, because these are two private companies, they are not subject to freedom of information, so we do not know in fact how decisions are made. If the government makes a decision, we know. If NavCan tells us they can't do this for safety reasons and they can't fly this way, but then two or three years later it's doable, if we had known in the beginning how that decision was made and we had insight into that...

However, they're private companies, so our level of oversight would involve some access to freedom of information that would allow our elected MPs, especially, to understand how NavCan and GTAA makes those decisions behind closed doors. That is the key.

When we find out after decisions are made, there may be consultation, but it's a *fait accompli*.

●(1040)

**Mr. Robert Oliphant:** The example of that for me would be runway usage.

**Ms. Sandra Best:** Exactly.

**Mr. Robert Oliphant:** If you have some ideas on runway usage that you could get to us, then we could look at how we can actually make that happen, because I think you have some good ideas there.

**Ms. Renee Jacoby:** I'd be happy to answer that.

We actually brought a few slides if you'd like to refer to them. I can point those out so that they bring up the examples you were speaking about.

The first slide was our background information. I'm going to go on to the second slide.... I can't, and I don't know why.

**The Chair:** I'm sorry. Your report will be distributed to the committee.

**Ms. Renee Jacoby:** Okay.

**The Chair:** We're looking at a new system here, but I think that doesn't really work so well.

**Ms. Renee Jacoby:** Okay.

MP Oliphant mentioned that we were fact-based, and that is important to us. We know that aviation issues are emotional and very personal, and at some point we have to remove the emotion from that and somehow come to a solution.

I have heard in the previous hearing—and I thank MP Block—that we are of the opinion that beyond the emotion we have to have good data to find a solution. As a fact-based group, we have done that. We have our material showing you our noise terminal readings and how incredibly high they are at 20 kilometres away from the airport. The highest reading that was taken was at Spadina Road and St. Clair, for those of you who know the Toronto area. It was 81 decibels, far higher than many in the Mississauga and Oakville areas or areas close to the airport. In addition, we've done runway utilization.

I would like to point out that what we brought today is only part of a very large PowerPoint presentation that was presented on May 25 at MP Oliphant's invitation.

Just to follow up on the lack of response, that presentation was done on May 25 and we have yet to have a response from CENAC.

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

The bells are ringing for a vote.

Mr. Liepert, you had a comment.

**Mr. Ron Liepert:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Can we continue for a couple more minutes?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** Mr. Liepert, go ahead.

**Mr. Ron Liepert:** Madam Chair, I think it's important that I make a comment following Mr. Oliphant's comments. I am not sure if we're still televised, but I do not want anyone, in any way, to misinterpret what was said, that this side of the table is not taking this issue seriously.

I know Mr. Oliphant is not a regular member of this committee, but we did have a number of witnesses—Calgary Airport Authority and others—whom we spent plenty of time questioning.

We recognize that our panel this morning is very localized to the GTA, and there are six GTA area MPs at the table, so our intent here this morning was to allow plenty of time for GTA area MPs to question the panel, which is all localized. I want to put that on record.

I am not suggesting Mr. Oliphant said that. I just don't want an interpretation to be made that somehow we aren't taking this issue very seriously.

Mr. Oliphant, just for your information, I represent a riding in Calgary that is a 30-minute drive from the airport. Because of a new runway, Nav Canada has changed the flight path, and in fact, on our week break two weeks ago, I held a town hall meeting with Nav Canada, airport authority folks and residents. So it's a big issue in Calgary as well, in a riding that never believed the MP would ever have issues with aircraft noise.

I just want to put that on the record, Madam Chair.

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

It is 10:44, so I am going to have to end the meeting, unless anyone wants to continue for another 10 minutes or so. I think everybody has had enough, since we started at eight o'clock this morning.

I thank all our witnesses so very much for coming. Thank you to our airport authorities for working very hard to try to find solutions together with the community.

Thank you to the members for their great co-operation.

The meeting is adjourned.

---





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

---

### SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

---

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

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

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

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

---

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: <http://www.ourcommons.ca>

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

---

### PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

---

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

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

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

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

---

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante : <http://www.noscommunes.ca>