



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities

TRAN • NUMBER 057 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Tuesday, May 9, 2017

—
Chair

The Honourable Judy A. Sgro

Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities

Tuesday, May 9, 2017

• (1130)

[English]

The Chair (Hon. Judy A. Sgro (Humber River—Black Creek, Lib.)): I am calling to order the meeting of the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities for the 42nd Parliament, our first session. Today's meeting is pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), a study of aviation safety.

To the witnesses, my apologies that we had a vote. We don't want to take away too much time from your presentations, so would both of you at the table please introduce yourselves?

Mr. Farnworth, would you like to go first?

Mr. Stephen Farnworth (Vice-President, Aircraft Maintenance Engineers Association of Ontario, Canadian Federation of Aircraft Maintenance Engineers Associations): My name is Stephen Farnworth. I'm the vice-president of the Aircraft Maintenance Engineers Association of Ontario. I'm a licensed aircraft maintenance engineer, commonly known as an AME, and I hold Transport Canada M1 and M2 licenses.

Mr. David Clark (Regional Vice-President, Pacific, Union of Canadian Transportation Employees): I'm David Clark, the regional vice-president Pacific of the Union of Canadian Transportation Employees.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Farnworth, would you like to go first?

Mr. Stephen Farnworth: Yes, please.

Madam Chair, members of the committee, I represent the Canadian Federation of Aircraft Maintenance Engineers Associations, commonly known as CFAMEA. CFAMEA consists of six regional AME associations. We're all volunteer, grassroots, and membership-based. We represent members from across Canada.

The purpose of our associations is to maintain and enhance the standards of professionalism of the AME and the aircraft maintenance industry as a whole, and to promote the rights and privileges of the AME. We hold in high regard the safety of those persons affected by the aviation maintenance occupations. It is our aim to promote safe practices in the workplace and to recognize that safety is the cornerstone of the aviation industry.

Our regional associations run numerous workshops and conferences across the country to educate and update AMEs and others working in the aircraft maintenance profession. We also provide mentoring for aviation maintenance students and participate with the

various colleges as advisers on their aircraft maintenance program advisory committees.

We are on the front line to provide safe, dependable aircraft for the public. Here are some of our concerns and suggestions.

First, the level of service from Transport Canada is slow and delays decisions at the operational level. For example, there can be lengthy times to obtain a ferry permit, or prolonged times for amendment approvals of maintenance policy manuals and maintenance control manuals. These delays mainly originate from decreased staff levels at Transport Canada. Lack of timely responses may result in some operators ignoring established procedures, which, in turn, could affect safety. Transport Canada should shift some decision-making back to the industry but still maintain oversight at all times. There is a system in place for ministers' delegates. It works well. Maybe this model of delegation could be applied in other areas of concerns and bottlenecks.

Second, it's important to maintain an open door policy between Transport Canada and approved maintenance organizations and the AME associations. There are various conferences, symposia, and workshops. Interaction with maintenance communities are an important means of communication. The curtailment of funding for staff of Transport Canada regional offices to attend various aviation seminars and conferences has, and will continue to have, a detrimental effect on aviation safety implementations.

Third, updated curricula are required for approved training organizations to deal with changes in aircraft maintenance and to prepare students for obtaining their license. We recommend removing the detailed standard 566.12 Curriculum and the skills requirement from 566 Appendix B and moving them into an advisory circular or other document that would be easier to amend and update.

Fourth, consideration should be given to unshackling the standards from the regulations in order that they can be updated in a more expeditious manner. Currently, changes seem to be taking up to five years. This is unacceptable. Transport Canada has to maintain oversight and control at all times, but let the industry make minor changes to established maintenance procedures.

In order to maintain a high level of aviation safety, Canada has to be able to maintain a competitive playing field with other countries, and we have to synchronize our rules and regulations with those of the European EASA, American FAA, as well as those of other countries.

While the demand for air services in Canada has been growing at an annual rate of almost 5%, Transport Canada's aviation safety budget has been consistently cut. In the face of such cuts, Transport Canada needs to delegate administrative duties and concentrate on improving the level of service of key safety related oversight activities. We implore the House of Commons to support Transport Canada by increasing the funding for this crucial mandate.

Thank you for this opportunity to voice the opinions of the aircraft maintenance engineers. We look forward to future invitations and we request that you invite us back to make a presentation when you review recreational and personal aviation.

● (1135)

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

Mr. Clark.

Mr. David Clark: Thank you, Madam Chair and members of the committee, for the opportunity to present the views of our members on aviation safety.

The Union of Canadian Transportation Employees is the national union for most employees at Transport Canada, the Transportation Safety Board, the Canadian Transportation Agency, and many of Canada's airports. This includes all inspectors at Transport Canada, except for the pilot inspectors in the civil aviation mode.

Our members play an important role in all aspects of aviation safety, including the collection and storage of reports, monitoring and inspection, and prevention and emergency services. They are literally the eyes and ears of Transport Canada, local airport authorities, and the agencies charged with aviation safety in this country. They are proud of the work that they do in protecting the travelling public. However, they have also shared some concerns with us.

They are concerned that either some things are not being done, or done properly, and that more can and should be done to better secure the safety of Canadians who travel by air. I'm here today to share their voices and ideas with you.

First of all, I want to note the themes that the committee has established for this review. In order to make use of the limited time that was offered, I want to highlight three main areas of concern that our members across the country have raised. They are Transport Canada's safety management system, SMS; airport firefighting services; and the roles, responsibilities, and workings of the Transportation Safety Board.

With regard to the safety management system, SMS, in our view there continues to be far too much regulatory reliance on SMS, which has turned many of our inspectors into program auditors. It is important to note that the concept of SMS is predicated on the philosophy that companies are compliant with the regulations before they adopt SMS. This is simply not the case for a large percentage of the companies in civil aviation.

We would like to point out that, where SMS is concerned, the United States takes a very different approach in comparison to Canada. It is far less reliant on SMS for regulatory oversight. They actually make a virtue out of whistle-blower protections, and even provide significant financial incentives for whistle-blowers. There should be a similar approach in Canada, with the creation of an independent office of whistle-blower protections where air transportation workers, both within and outside of the government, can report incidents without fear of reprisals.

Reliance on corporate SMS plans is creating a situation where the role of the inspector is to check corporate paperwork. If they leave the office to do an SMS audit, also called an assessment by the department, air operators must be given notice. In some instances the minimum notice period is 10 weeks. This gives the operator more than enough time to correct whatever deficiencies might have been present at the time the SMS audit originated. SMS audits continue to replace direct and unplanned inspections, as opposed to being an additional layer of safety.

Inspectors believe this is a grave mistake. Giving airlines primary responsibility for safety oversight is tantamount to putting the fox in charge of the henhouse. For a long time now, UCTE has gone on record stating that SMS must be an additional layer of safety, and that the audit or assessment function should be completely separate from the direct inspection.

Transport civil aviation inspectors are highly qualified industry specialists, many with aircraft maintenance, engineering, and other important credentials. Unfortunately, I'm not sure how much longer I will be able to assert these qualifications. To make matters worse, Transport Canada is mistakenly recruiting generalists for inspector positions, placing emphasis on soft skills such as interpersonal communications and being a team player, instead of industry qualifications, expertise, and knowledge. If the issue is safety, that has to change.

Now, I'll address airport firefighting services. Today, many airports across Canada are not prepared to effectively respond to an airport crash, where fire intervention is essential within the first few vital minutes after an airplane crashes and fire ignites. This is because Transport Canada regulations do not provide for firefighters to rescue passengers or extinguish fires inside an airplane. In the unfortunate event of aviation accidents at airports, the results are more devastating, and the loss of life would be far greater than necessary.

● (1140)

Transport Canada regulations also do not recognize many of the risk factors involved in the complex world of crash firefighting, including aircraft configuration, high numbers of passengers, fuel capacity, emergency medical needs, hazardous materials, and threats from terrorists.

The result of this policy is that hundreds of thousands of airline passengers and crew members face unnecessary dangers on the runways of many airports because emergency response capabilities fall below accepted worldwide standards.

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

I apologize for interrupting. It's just that we want the committee to get a chance to get their questions in as well.

Mr. Berthold, for six minutes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Berthold (Mégantic—L'Érable, CPC): Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

My thanks to the witnesses for their testimony.

We do not have a lot of time, but you provided the committee with some food for thought.

Mr. Clark, to go back to what you said about firefighters' response to airport emergencies, the picture you are describing is quite worrisome.

Could you tell us more specifically what your expectations are?

There are all sorts of airports, big and small, actually.

What are you criticizing exactly?

Personally, I have always believed that there are enough firefighters and response teams at large airports to respond to a fire.

Could you elaborate on that, please?

[*English*]

Mr. David Clark: In Canada, it's actually the amount of product to a spot on a runway, as opposed to actual firefighters. In the crash of Air France, I think it was, at Toronto airport, they were actually running at 17 firefighters, which was the American standard. In Canada that would have been three trucks. On average, that would have been four people. We have a difference—if you're under 150,000 aircraft movements at an airport in Canada, you have no need to have any firefighting capability. A perfect example is Prince Rupert Airport. Under Transport Canada, we had firefighting. Under an airport authority, it comes from the city. The fire truck comes from the town; it's emptied of all product; it's put on a ferry; it goes across; and it has to refill and get to the airport. That would be an average of about two hours before getting firefighting capability to an airport that has 737s coming to it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Berthold: Unfortunately, we will not have much time to talk about it, but this is a new aspect that has not yet been raised in our study. Thank you very much.

There is a third point you wanted to discuss, Mr. Clark. I can leave 30 seconds for you to give us some details.

[*English*]

Mr. David Clark: Thank you very much.

With regard to the Transportation Safety Board, we've noted our concerns about the operations of the TSB on a number of occasions,

but these bear repeating because if we do not learn from our accidents and mistakes, we are doomed to repeat them.

Our greatest concern remains the length of time it takes TSB recommendations to be implemented. Historically, Transport Canada has taken years to implement some TSB recommendations, while others have still not been implemented. The TSB needs to be given greater powers—and this was talked about in the Emerson report. This includes the power to direct and implement recommendations where other government bodies or private interests have failed to act or failed to act promptly. Having the power to direct versus recommend would make TSB investigations mandatory for compliance and allow TSB the authority to see recommendations for improvement to transportation safety and security within a reasonable time frame.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Berthold: Thank you very much, Mr. Clark. I'm pleased to have had the opportunity to hear your comments on this, which is also very important.

I'm going to give my remaining time to Ms. Block.

[*English*]

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

I'm very pleased to join my colleagues in welcoming the witnesses here today.

I'll go straight to the point of SMS and what you referred to as generalist inspectors. I've come to understand that our safety management systems were to be an additional layer by Transport Canada to ensure a safe and reliable transportation system. It seems there is deep concern with the fact that it's clear we have abandoned a number of other regulatory means of assuring compliance and have wholeheartedly gone to the SMS system. That is troubling, from what I hear from witnesses.

I also want to raise the issue of generalist inspectors. We heard from, I think, Transport Canada early on when we were doing our rail safety study that we now have multimodal inspectors. I'm assuming that's what you mean by a generalist.

I just want to give you a chance to follow up on that.

● (1145)

Mr. David Clark: If we look in the dangerous goods inspectors, that role has gone down from different modes of travel, be it rail or civil aviation, into one mode that will do everything.

As I specified, someone coming into Transport Canada before as an inspector would bring lots of years of experience in the sector from private industry. When I talk about generalists, they're realistically more able to do the paperwork and to follow a system, as opposed to being a technical expert on an issue—and, yes, going across many different modes.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Now Mr. Iacono.

[Translation]

Mr. Angelo Iacono (Alfred-Pellan, Lib.): Thank you, Madam Chair.

I also thank the witnesses for joining us this morning.

I would like to make a brief comment.

I understand you are concerned about the decrease in funding and oversight, but it started when the previous government was in power. Our government is in the process of increasing funding again for oversight.

Do you think Transport Canada's regulatory oversight and inspections are effective and sufficient right now?

[English]

The Chair: Who wants to take that question?

Mr. Stephen Farnworth: The frequency of Transport Canada audits and inspections has gone down considerably. The audits themselves, as my friend Mr. Clark points out, are more based on SMS procedures in the larger airlines.

When it comes to smaller maintenance outfits, audits don't happen as often as they used to. It could be that we expected an audit yearly or every two years. Now, five or six years goes by before there's an audit. They're better than they used to be when the audits are done, because it used to be that Transport Canada seemed to come in with a big—

Mr. Angelo Iacono: Mr. Farnworth, you say five or six years. The present government hasn't been in place for five or six years. So in the last two years what has happened?

Mr. Stephen Farnworth: I don't care which government's in power. For aviation safety it doesn't matter which government's in power. What's important is that Transport Canada continues to be funded and to act no matter who is in the big chair.

Mr. Angelo Iacono: You're referring to the last five years. I'm just trying to highlight that under the new government, which is reviewing this, if you're referring to five years then those audits weren't being done under the previous government. Is the problem still—how do I say it—going forward or has there been any change in the last three years?

Mr. Stephen Farnworth: I've seen it stabilize. I haven't seen it change, but in the past two years we've had several instances where we used to have Transport Canada come to our workshops and association meetings, where they could speak to hundreds of aircraft maintenance engineers, but their money has been cut and they do not show up at our workshops anymore. And that's current. That has happened in the past couple of years.

I'll give you an example. Our past-president of the Atlantic AME Association sent a letter to Mr. Garneau on May 26, 2016. He was complaining that in the Atlantic region, where they had been operating these things for 35 years, there seems to be reduced spending and no one was available to come to the workshop held last year.

Mr. Garneau's response was on August 22, over three months later. This level of response, whether it be audits or with regard to maintenance policy manuals within our various companies, is just

taking too long. It's too hard for the businesses to keep reacting that way, and if you do keep taking so long to react, it means that we will find shortcuts to go around.

● (1150)

Mr. Angelo Iacono: Mr. Clark, what's your read on that?

Mr. David Clark: I'm sorry, can you just ask the question one more time?

[Translation]

Mr. Angelo Iacono: Do you think Transport Canada's regulatory oversight and inspections are effective and adequate?

[English]

Mr. David Clark: What we say to this is that the reliance on SMS is a portion of it. It's a portion of regulation, but it is not a stand-alone system. Many places in the federal sector that are using SMS are not actually compliant or need to be SMS compliant. The problem that Transport Canada has at the moment is that they are treating everything they're overseeing as SMS-compliant. We have zero problem with Air Canada and WestJet, who are larger and have experience, doing that. We have concerns that it's being used at other levels. We say that it needs to be maintained today and that there needs to be more than just that.

There is a change in the fact of...

I'm sorry. I lost that one.

Mr. Angelo Iacono: Thank you.

The Chair: Monsieur Aubin.

[Translation]

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

Welcome to our two guests.

Madam Chair, just before we start asking our guests questions, I have a request for you. When my colleague Mr. Iacono acts almost as a witness, by telling us about some major investments that have supposedly been made in aviation safety, could he table a document that shows us that? I think that would be useful for all members of the committee.

Personally, when I look at the budgets for 2016-17, I see some cuts to the tune of \$7 million, some of which, it is true, started when the Conservative government was in power. When someone makes statements almost as a witness, as he did, it would be useful to have a supporting document.

There. That's my request.

Mr. Clark, your presentation was, to say the least, alarming. When we undertook this study on aviation safety, I already had a very long list of problems that I wanted to address, and now you have added to that list.

I was particularly intrigued by the examples or problems related to fires at airports. I will try to connect two questions by asking if you can give me one answer. When the government agrees that an airline can move from one flight attendant per 40 passengers to one flight attendant per 50 passengers, does that make a difference in working with firefighters who have to intervene in the event of an accident?

[English]

Mr. David Clark: To understand the difference between Canada and the U.S., our emergency response is to get product to a location on a runway and to create an egress, or an escape route, and to protect the escape route. The responsibility in Canada for the removal of passengers, or any toxics or any fire in an aircraft, is the responsibility of the flight attendant. The flight attendant must be the one who removes people, bodies, anything in there. It is not a responsibility of the firefighter in Canada. We do not have the capabilities for it. We don't have the manpower. That is under CARs.

When you're talking about 50:1 and the changes there, the 50:1 alone is a ludicrous number when we have a system in which the flight attendant removes the flying public. To extend that is even more ludicrous. How in the world can there be the idea that the flight attendant, who is actually involved in the crash, who is also a victim, now has the responsibility of taking people out?

At the Toronto airport, when the aircraft went in the ditch, they were lucky they got the people off. Well, there have been lots of situations, including the Air Canada DC-9 in Cincinnati that burned up, where they weren't lucky. We have had many instances—not in Canada, fortunately—of flight attendants not being able to, and this is with firefighting capabilities that could enter the aircraft. In Canada our firefighters can't enter an aircraft.

• (1155)

[Translation]

Mr. Robert Aubin: Thank you.

I have another question about the fire department that came to mind when I was listening to you.

Does the same fire department intervene both in the case of a burning aircraft and in the case of a fire in an airport building? In other words, is there a possibility that the employees are working at one location and cannot go to another location, or are there two different fire departments?

[English]

Mr. David Clark: At an airport that has over 150,000 movements, they could have one truck. That would be one truck, one individual, for firefighting. They wouldn't have the training for structural firefighting. My understanding is that in Canada, we have that capability at the Edmonton airport and I think at Pearson also. We don't have that capability. Those are resources that are given.... While the travelling public is in the terminal, it's the same thing as a house. The municipalities would have to respond.

[Translation]

Mr. Robert Aubin: Thank you.

Madam Chair, do I have enough time to ask another question?

I have two minutes left? That's very good.

We have heard a lot about inspectors working less and less on the ground and more and more on paper. Could you tell us about the training of inspectors?

What is the actual frequency and nature of training received by inspectors?

[English]

Mr. David Clark: As I said, in the earlier time, we went out to the actual airports, to engineers and such, to get technical experience from the industry. Today, we are moving away from that. Funnily enough, with our inspectors today, we have gone through two or three versions of new inspection procedures and our inspectors are not trained on those new procedures—for the last three.... So we're working on the basis of about the three previous procedures. It's just just that someone has done the paperwork.

I'm sorry, was the other part of your question about what the new training is?

[Translation]

Mr. Robert Aubin: I was talking about the actual frequency and nature of the training that inspectors receive.

[English]

Mr. David Clark: It's really left to the inspectors to interpret the new changes without being trained in them. There is no standardization across Canada of training. Every region has its own way of doing it. The only standard training is delegation, which is roughly every five years. We have a word for it. Inspectors receive "drive-by training": an incident occurs and hits the public attention, and then suddenly Transport Canada requires all of the inspectors to receive that training.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Clark. My apologies. I've allowed you to run over significantly here.

Thank you very much to our witnesses. My apologies that our meeting was cut short, but that's politics and votes. Thank you very much. We appreciate that.

We will suspend momentarily while our ministers and their appropriate staff come to the table.

• _____ (Pause) _____

•

• (1200)

The Chair: I call the meeting of the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities back to order.

We will now continue with the main estimates, along with the investing in Canada plan.

A number of votes were referred to the committee on Thursday, February 23, 2017, namely vote 1 under Canadian Air Transport Security Authority; vote 1 under Canadian Transportation Agency; votes 1, 5, 10, 15, and 20 under Department of Transport; vote 1 under Marine Atlantic Inc.; vote 1 under The Federal Bridge Corporation Limited; vote 1 under VIA Rail Canada Inc.; votes 1, 5, and 10 under Office of Infrastructure of Canada; vote 1 under The Jacques-Cartier and Champlain Bridges Inc.; vote 1 under Windsor-Detroit Bridge Authority; and votes 1 and 5 under PPP Canada Inc.

We are delighted to welcome the Honourable Marc Garneau, Minister of Transport, along with his officials: Mr. Michael Keenan, deputy minister, and Mr. André Lapointe, chief financial officer. Welcome. It's nice to have you back with us.

We also have the pleasure of having the Honourable Amarjeet Sohi, Minister of Infrastructure and Communities, along with his officials: Mr. Tremblay, deputy minister; Mr. Fortin; Ms. Boileau; and the others who are joining us today.

Welcome, everyone. Thank you very much for coming. As you are aware, we have only an hour, and then, no doubt, many questions.

I shall start the discussion by calling vote 1 under Canadian Air Transport Security Authority.

Mr. Garneau, it's over to you for five minutes.

• (1205)

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

Madam Chair and honourable members, I am pleased to meet with the committee today to talk about the main estimates.

[*Translation*]

Joining me today is Michael Keenan, Deputy Minister of Transport, and André Lapointe, Assistant Deputy Minister and Chief Financial Officer of Corporate Services.

I would like to take a moment to talk about some of the key initiatives that Transport Canada is going to implement this year.

[*English*]

In addition to the funds included in the main estimates, budget 2017 proposed investments for transportation-related initiatives that would provide additional funds for the department in future estimates. These initiatives would help the department improve marine safety, enhance and develop new regulations, and support investments in transportation infrastructure.

For example, the \$1.5 billion investment announced for the oceans protection plan represents the most significant investment ever made to protect our oceans and coastlines. It is a robust national plan that will protect our oceans and coastlines from the potential impacts of marine shipping and ensure the health of our oceans for generations to come.

Transport Canada will work closely with Fisheries and Oceans Canada and Environment and Climate Change Canada to deliver the various initiatives of the plan. We will also continue to develop stronger relationships and partnerships with indigenous and coastal communities.

The budget also proposes funding to enable Transport Canada to develop regulations for the safe deployment and integration of emerging technology such as unmanned air vehicles and connected and autonomous vehicles.

In addition, Transport Canada would be provided funding for a trade and transportation information system, initiatives to support clean technology and greenhouse gas reductions in the transportation

sector, and a national trade corridors fund to support investment in trade-related transportation.

Funds for these initiatives would be added to our departmental budget in due course. These initiatives are all critical elements for delivering on our transportation 2030 strategic plan, which represents a major renewal of transportation policy in support of trade and economic growth, a cleaner environment, and the well-being of Canadians.

The plan is focused on five themes. First is the traveller, in order to provide them with greater choice, better service, lower costs, and new consumer rights, Second is safer transportation, in order to build a more secure transportation system. Third is green and innovative transportation to reduce air pollution and embrace new technologies. Fourth is waterways, coasts, and the north to build world-leading marine corridors and enhance northern transportation infrastructure; and finally trade corridors to global markets to improve our transportation system to get products to market and grow Canada's economy.

Over the coming weeks and months, I will be bringing forward other key elements of the transportation 2030 plan. I hope I've circulated a placemat for your reference to help situate the various initiatives under the respective themes. I look forward to future discussions on how we are progressing in delivering the plan.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Minister Garneau.

Now we move over to Minister Sohi, for five minutes.

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi (Minister of Infrastructure and Communities): Thank you so much, Madam Chair.

I have a bit of a sore throat, so I hope you can understand me.

I've been asked to appear today to speak about Infrastructure Canada's main estimates and what my department is doing to deliver on the government's commitment to invest in Canadian communities through its long-term infrastructure plan, called "investing in Canada".

Madam Chair, you introduced some of my staff members. I'm also joined by Glenn Campbell, executive director of the Canada infrastructure bank transition office, as well as my parliamentary secretary, Marc Miller.

Colleagues, the Government of Canada has an ambitious plan and vision for infrastructure funding in Canada.

We have been making great progress in delivering projects. Since November 2015, we have approved over 2,200 projects across the country, with a total value of \$20 billion. These projects are now rolling out in communities large and small.

These investments are making real, tangible impacts in Canadian communities. This means that 864 public transit projects have been approved to date, including over 200 projects that will make public transit more accessible for people with disabilities. The investments made will expand 132 transit systems across the country and help communities acquire more than 1,000 new buses, among other improvements. Together, these investments will deliver faster, more reliable service, and will help reduce traffic congestion and pollution.

To date, 908 projects under the clean water and wastewater fund have been approved. These investments will give more Canadians access to clean drinking water and will reduce pollution in our lakes and rivers.

Over 2,000 projects to retrofit or renovate social housing have been approved to date, helping improve energy and water efficiency in almost 90,000 existing social housing units.

There are 182 arts and heritage facilities in 109 communities that are being improved.

Nearly 6,000 housing units on reserve have been built, renovated, or planned, along with 125 projects aimed at building and improving schools.

There are 251 projects under the post-secondary institutions investment fund that are under way to enhance and modernize research and commercialization facilities on Canadian campuses.

With budget 2017, we have formalized the commitment we made through the fall economic statement. The budget showed how we will invest more than \$180 billion in federal funding over 12 years. It showed how these investments will create long-term economic growth; build inclusive, sustainable communities; and support a low-carbon, green economy.

Our plan focuses on five key areas: public transit; green infrastructure; social infrastructure; trade and transportation infrastructure; and rural and northern communities infrastructure. It also features two new initiatives, the smart cities challenge and the Canada infrastructure bank.

The Canada infrastructure bank will be responsible for investing at least \$35 billion over 11 years, using loans, loan guarantees, and equity investments, and attracting private capital for public infrastructure. The bank's funds will be over and above the commitment we made to double infrastructure funding. Most importantly, it will offer our funding partners a new way to help meet their pressing infrastructure needs.

The second initiative I mentioned is the smart cities challenge.

It is vital that our communities are at their best, that they be responsive to the needs of citizens and be nimble in adapting to the increasingly complex challenges they face. Smart cities will do this by being better connected to their citizens, by using data to make decisions that impact quality of life, by helping to drive and attract innovation, and by fostering positive change in our communities through social inclusion.

Budget 2017 announced \$300 million for the smart cities challenge to “encourage cities to adopt new and innovative

approaches to city-building” by focusing on innovative, measurable, and outcomes-based solutions. And most importantly, it will be delivered in full partnership with all sectors of Canadian society while drawing on similar experiences in the United States, India, and other countries. We will be sharing more detailed information about the smart cities challenge in the coming weeks and months.

• (1210)

I would now like to address the department's main estimates and speak briefly about how our funding flows to our partners.

Infrastructure Canada's total authorities for the new fiscal year are \$7 billion, which is up \$3.1 billion dollars from what was requested last year. On that note, the authorities in the main estimates do not include funding for the new phase of our program, but they do include nearly \$2.7 billion in contribution funding for the public transit infrastructure fund and the clean water and wastewater fund. It is through these two programs that we have announced over 1,760 projects to date.

At my previous appearance, some of you raised concerns about funds flowing to projects across the country. It is important to note, however, that Infrastructure Canada's funding matches the pace at which our partners submit claims for reimbursements. Most partners submit claims throughout the life of the project, although some wait until the project has been completed. When projects are approved, funding is available for reimbursement even if projects are delayed or funds are not spent as forecast.

Through budget 2017, the Government of Canada is showing how it will support Canadian communities in the years to come. Infrastructure has a great many challenge ahead of us. We are ready to meet them and to support other communities to build the infrastructure they need.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

• (1215)

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

Mr. Rayes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Thank you, Madam Chair.

Minister Sohi, my questions are for you, and I am particularly interested in the Canada infrastructure bank. You know how interested I am in this matter, because I am constantly asking you questions about it in the House.

In 2015, Infrastructure Canada published a document stating that no provincial or territorial government had requested the creation of such an institution. Has that changed since 2015?

[English]

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi: Thank you so much for that question.

Madam Chair, we consulted with a wide range of stakeholders, including big city mayors and municipalities, the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, the Canadian Urban Transit Association, and other stakeholders who build infrastructure.

As we have identified, regardless of the historic investments we are making in infrastructure, there will still remain an infrastructure deficit, particularly for very large, transformative projects, or projects for which traditional funding models aren't working effectively.

[Translation]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Let me stop you there, Mr. Minister. My question was whether or not any provincial, municipal or territorial government had asked you to set up an infrastructure bank, yes or no. Have you received such a request? If so, can you name a Canadian province or a Canadian municipality that told you that such a bank was needed?

[English]

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi: The proposed Canada infrastructure bank is a mandate commitment that we made during the campaign. We consulted with other partners, and they are very supportive of our proposed Canada infrastructure bank to deliver more infrastructure.

[Translation]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Great. Thank you.

I have yet to receive the name of a province or territory, but that's fine.

In your mandate letter, you are asked to establish an infrastructure bank so that the federal government can use its strong credit to more easily provide loans to municipalities to finance their many infrastructure projects. By the way, municipalities borrow at a maximum of 2% right now. We know that this infrastructure bank must be of financial interest to private investors. Even Mr. Sabia said that projects should be funded at a rate of about 7% so that it is profitable for the Caisse de dépôt et placement du Québec to invest in this bank.

Can you tell me what the minimum amount of a project will be for this infrastructure bank to accept it? According to the data that we were given in the various discussions and the figures that you have quoted to the House, if I'm not mistaken, the projects should be at least \$100 million or \$500 million to make it attractive for investors.

[English]

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi: Through you, Madam Chair, first of all there is no limit on the size of the project. It could be a small project. It could be a large project. On your first question about the rate of return, it will vary from project to project. It depends on the nature of the project, the risk that the public sector and private sector are willing to absorb and share. The goal of the bank is to look at each project on its own merit and then determine whether that project should be funded through the bank, whether it serves a public interest, or whether the project is needed to promote growth in the economy or serve the needs of our community, so the rate of return will vary based on the nature of the project.

I also want to make it absolutely clear to everyone in this room that the vast majority of the infrastructure funding will still be delivered through the grants that we provide to other municipal and provincial sectors. Less than 10% of the total commitments we make will be delivered through the bank.

• (1220)

[Translation]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Very well, but I want to come back to that. I am really talking about the Canada infrastructure bank. You say that all municipalities could have access to it, whether for small, medium-sized or large projects. I'm not worried about big projects. The governments of large cities will indeed be able to resort to this bank if they see a financial interest.

Having said that, the last time you appeared before the committee, I asked you the following question. I even challenged Mr. Tremblay.

Can you name a project for which a small or medium-sized municipality outside the major centres would benefit from requesting funding from the Canada infrastructure bank and that investors might be interested in funding?

I am referring to funding other than that normally provided by municipalities, which is under 2%.

Can you name a concrete project through which the Canada infrastructure bank could help communities outside major centres across Canada?

[English]

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi: Through you, Madam Chair, different projects have different benefits for different communities. There could be a project that may not be located in a small community but that benefits a small community. For example, the transmission infrastructure. If you want to build your electrical transmission to reduce your dependence on coal-fired generation and you want to connect to the existing hydro system, those benefits are reaped by communities throughout the region. We feel that regardless of the location or who owns the infrastructure, whether a small community or a province or a region or a big city, it's about the benefit. We feel that every community will be able to reap some benefits from the investments that we are making through our overall infrastructure plan, and particularly through the bank.

[Translation]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Very well.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Rayes. We're over time.

Mr. Sikand.

Mr. Gagan Sikand (Mississauga—Streetsville, Lib.): Thank you, Ministers, for being here.

My question is also for Minister Sohi.

Could you please give us an update on the progress made for setting up the infrastructure bank before the end of the year?

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi: Yesterday we launched the search for the leadership team of the bank. We will be recruiting the CEO for the bank, and the board chair, as well as board members. That information is out. We encourage all Canadians to apply. The legislation has been introduced as part of the budget implementation act. If that is passed by Parliament, the bank will be legally established and our goal will be to have it running by the end of 2017.

Mr. Gagan Sikand: Thank you.

Minister, I've met with the GTTA that is responsible for Pearson airport, and they've shown me a project of theirs to turn Pearson into a multi-modal hub. Is that the type of project that could potentially access the infrastructure bank?

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi: Our goal is to look outside the box and not be confined to saying that this project doesn't fit and another project does fit. We will look at various options to support those kinds of transformative projects, whether it's in the GTA or other smaller areas. The bank could potentially play a role, because if there's revenue attached to the project which could pay off the cost of capital as well as provide a rate of return for the private sector, we will definitely be looking at those kinds of projects that are transformative for communities—and there's a very exciting project linking the airport to all parts of the GTA.

Minister Garneau is more familiar with the overall airport plans. Maybe he can further elaborate on them, but those are the kinds of projects the bank will definitely look at.

• (1225)

Mr. Gagan Sikand: Thank you for your answers.

I'll be splitting my time with my colleague, Mr. Badawey.

Mr. Vance Badawey (Niagara Centre, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Sikand, and Madam Chair.

I have a question for Minister Garneau on his statement that there will be “a national trade corridors fund to support investments in trade-related transportation” infrastructure.

For the existing crown or private assets that are expected to enhance the existing trade corridors and the possibility of nationally designated trade corridors—thereby adding to the overall economic positioning and performance of that particular area—is it safe to say that funds can be brought forward or attached to those assets to enhance their performance?

Hon. Marc Garneau: I will say that with respect to a national trade corridors fund and the overall trade and transportation corridors initiative, our focus is really driven by how we make our trade corridors—which are vital for our economy—as efficient as possible.

There are a number of bottlenecks across the country, too numerous to mention but large in number. As you know, under the previous government, there were some initiatives that were undertaken in that same direction. They have yielded some good results, but there's still more work to be done.

If it represents an opportunity to make our trade corridors more efficient, if it represents an opportunity to remove a bottleneck, we will be looking at all of those cases and making decisions based on where we get the best bang for our buck and where we get the best improvement in terms of the fluidity and efficiency of our trade corridors. We're not limiting ourselves overly. We're looking at the efficiency of our trade corridors.

Mr. Vance Badawey: Minister Sohi, smart cities and investments and community growth planning sort of align with where Minister Garneau is going with trade corridors.

If in fact a municipality, region, or jurisdiction—an economic cluster—sees itself as a trade corridor...and your initiative with smart cities, and of course getting returns on infrastructure investments and improvements to infrastructure assets, trade corridor assets, and others....

Is it the intent to align a lot of your funding and the direction you're taking with respect to funding allocations with those various strategies?

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi: Through you, Madam Chair, absolutely. We feel that we can tap into the technology and innovation that is fostered in our communities by launching this challenge, whether it's dealing with, as Minister Garneau was saying, the pinch points that we feel on a take-away [*Inaudible—Editor*]. Technology can be used for that. Technology can also be used to improve services. Columbus, U.S.A. won the challenge from the U.S. transportation department and ended up reducing infant mortality rates in some of its underserved communities by using autonomous vehicles and improving transportation through the use of technology. We see a lot of potential, through the smart cities challenge, to support our municipal sectors, provincial sectors, and community sectors, and to look at cross-collaboration between departments.

Mr. Vance Badawey: Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Monsieur Aubin.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Robert Aubin: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Minister Garneau, the timing could not make me happier to see you.

You probably know that I cannot avoid asking the following question. Many of the flood victims in my area are also potentially victims of vessels navigating at too high a speed on the St. Lawrence River.

Can you shed some light on this? Is the department still analyzing the various elements or have you actually launched an investigation into the events in Yamachiche?

• (1230)

Hon. Marc Garneau: I thank my colleague for his questions.

For everyone's benefit, the role of Transport Canada, when the water levels are high, is to issue a notice to shipping through—

Mr. Robert Aubin: I'm going to interrupt you, Mr. Minister. I have received excellent service from your department.

Hon. Marc Garneau: If that's all you want to know, yes, we are indeed doing an investigation. As for navigation, I am coming to that.

I want to inform everyone that, through the Coast Guard, we have imposed speed limits. Indeed, we do not want speed to worsen the effects of flooding. We are investigating the speeding that has been reported to us.

Mr. Robert Aubin: Thank you very much.

I also thank you for the chart you provided this morning. For a visual person like me, this summary is very much appreciated.

With respect to VIA Rail's high-frequency train project, which we have discussed a number of times, it seems to me that it would definitely have a place in the section entitled "Green and Innovative Transportation". Unfortunately, neither in the wording nor in the measures, let alone in the budgets, I cannot find where a project like that is.

It seems to me that, in this case, we have to act quickly enough to ensure that the REM project in Montreal and the VIA Rail high-frequency train project are able to develop jointly. You are aware of the problem with the Mount Royal Tunnel.

Can I expect to see this project in this or any other section?

Furthermore, would you be able to forward to the clerk of the committee the studies that are helping you make a decision on the VIA Rail project?

Hon. Marc Garneau: Thank you for those two questions.

I understand your impatience, but we must, of course, take the appropriate steps. This is a huge project. As you know, that is why we have been studying the project. To do so, we have even put money aside. It's complex. Given that we are talking about the Quebec City-Windsor corridor, there are many factors to consider. This is especially true since we are talking about a possible investment of taxpayers' money. We have to look at it closely.

As for the connection between the REM and the high-frequency train, I know that the Caisse de dépôt et placement du Québec and VIA Rail are discussing the tunnel. I can assure you that discussions are ongoing, and so is the study on the viability of this project. When we get the results, it goes without saying that we will make them public, because we will have to make a decision.

Mr. Robert Aubin: In terms of the tabling of studies, would it be possible for the committee to take note of that?

Hon. Marc Garneau: When we decide to make it public, it goes without saying that the committee will be able to see what our report and our recommendations contain.

Mr. Robert Aubin: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

We are in the process of completing a study on aviation safety. Extensive testimony has caused us concern, at the very least. We cannot stand idly by. To your knowledge, does Transport Canada follow all of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) guidelines, practices and standards?

Hon. Marc Garneau: We take the safety of air travel seriously and we are constantly vigilant. In addition, we receive reports from the Transportation Safety Board with the ensuing recommendations. This is another important part of our decision-making process. Other agencies, such as the Office of the Auditor General, also make recommendations from time to time.

Whether it's through our involvement in ICAO or the aviation safety administration here in Canada, we are committed to aviation safety and we are vigilant in that regard.

Mr. Robert Aubin: When a witness before this committee tells us that eight of the 13 ICAO standards are not being met, does an alarm bell go off at Transport Canada offices?

● (1235)

Hon. Marc Garneau: We are always prepared to look at what could be improved or the criticism we receive. I would certainly like to see the details of that individual's testimony about non-compliance. If there is a compliance issue on our side, we are always ready to make improvements. I must say, however, that what you are telling me here surprises me. I am certainly prepared to look at that, but in terms of our relations with the ICAO, I think Canada is doing well.

[*English*]

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

I'm sorry, but you're over time.

Mr. Iacono.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Angelo Iacono: Thank you, Madam Chair.

My question is for Minister Garneau.

I am a VIA Rail service user. I know that its aging fleet is an important issue for the company.

Does the amount allocated to VIA Rail in the main estimates reflect this need to update the trains?

Hon. Marc Garneau: Thank you for your question.

For now, the answer is no. The budget reflects the money required to operate VIA Rail, operating costs and an amount for capital costs. Transport Canada is currently addressing the renewal of railway cars and locomotives. As you know, VIA Rail must be partly funded because its operating costs are not fully covered by ticket sales.

Mr. Angelo Iacono: Mr. Garneau, I have another question for you, and I would like your response to be very short.

Has the aviation safety budget increased since 2016, yes or no?

Hon. Marc Garneau: I will ask one of my colleagues to respond.

[*English*]

Mr. Michael Keenan (Deputy Minister, Department of Transport): In respect to the budget for aviation security, was the question from 2016-17 to 2017-18, or—

Mr. Angelo Iacono: I would say 2015. I would say before 2016; 2016 and forward.

Mr. Michael Keenan: From 2015-16 to 2016-17, I'm going to turn it to.... I apologize, for one second.

Mr. Angelo Iacono: It's airline safety. That's what I'm talking about.

Hon. Marc Garneau: Are we talking about safety or security?

Mr. Angelo Iacono: Safety.

Mr. Michael Keenan: I was actually looking up.... I thought the question was for the Canadian Air Transport Security Authority. Was it for CATSA or the department?

Mr. Angelo Iacono: The department.

Mr. Michael Keenan: For the department, the level is about the same. From 2016-17 to 2017-18, the level in terms of aviation safety and security is about the same, I believe. It's actually a bit higher. It went from \$179 million in the 2016-17 main estimates to \$185 million in the 2017-18 main estimates. That's a slight increase.

Mr. Angelo Iacono: Thank you.

Minister Sohi, I have a question for you.

[*Translation*]

I met with representatives from the Société de transport de Laval. Like many people, they are worried about how long it takes to approve projects in Quebec.

Do you expect to be able to soon announce the list of infrastructure projects selected in Quebec under phase 1?

[*English*]

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi: Thank you for the question and through you, Madam Chair, I want to let the committee know that since taking office we have approved more than 200 projects for the Province of Quebec, with a combined investment of close to \$2.5 billion.

On public transit, we have received the applications and are reviewing them. We have been working very closely with the province to get them to give us the information, and we received that information very recently. Assuming that these projects meet the criteria, they will be approved very soon.

Mr. Angelo Iacono: Thank you.

Mr. Sean Fraser (Central Nova, Lib.): Minister Sohi, I'm going to jump in here with a quick question. We only have two minutes remaining, so if I could ask you to be concise, that would be very helpful.

My question pertains to investments in small communities. You noted that one of the priorities in your infrastructure plan is rural and northern communities. Specifically, I'd like you to confirm whether there will be dedicated funds for small towns and rural communities, and whether things like recreational infrastructure and community transit would be eligible for those funds?

• (1240)

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi: We have done very extensive consultations with small and mid-size communities throughout the country. That is the reason we have introduced \$2 billion in dedicated funding

focused solely on small, rural, and isolated communities, so they will have that access. They will also qualify for other funding. They're not excluded from applying for other funding.

As for the eligibility criteria—which projects and which areas of investment—we will engage with the provinces to determine where they want those investments to go, along with the mayors from the smaller communities. We want to have a more collaborative approach to determine where the needs are, because each province is unique, and the needs will differ from province to province. We want to engage with them.

Mr. Sean Fraser: Excellent. This will make a very big difference for the people I represent in rural Nova Scotia.

Very quickly, with respect to the infrastructure bank, I think it's a great idea to take advantage of about \$13 trillion in global capital and negative-yield bonds. Is the ability to tap into these global investors' funds for transformational projects going to free up capital from traditional envelopes so we can invest it in smaller communities?

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi: Absolutely: that is the goal. In areas where there's a role for the private sector to play to build that necessary infrastructure, that will free up resources that we can invest both in social housing and in building shelters for women fleeing domestic violence, or in investing in rural and northern communities for their much-needed infrastructure demands.

Mr. Sean Fraser: Excellent. Thank you, Minister.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Hardie.

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

This is a question for both ministers. We're looking at two sources of funding specifically for transportation improvements. When it comes to trade corridors, we had the excellent example of the Roberts Bank rail corridor project in Metro Vancouver where, although it wasn't necessarily by design, there was a lot of complementarity between what was done for the trade corridor and what was also done for the region itself to improve the transportation system in Metro Vancouver. They worked together. One complemented the other.

I'm wondering as you go forward and you're assessing project from municipalities, particularly in trade-sensitive areas, whether or not you two are going to be talking to each other to make sure the investments do complement each other, so that we're not necessarily boosting one thing while the whole program collapses because the other part isn't working very well. I hope that's more or less clear enough for a good long answer.

Hon. Marc Garneau: Thank you very much.

The minister and I talk to each other continuously.

The classic example is something like a grade crossing where, unfortunately, because of long trains going by, there are several important consequences for local traffic and what have you. In some cases, the solution is to provide vertical separation. That has happened in the Vancouver area in particularly sensitive parts of the corridor.

When we are going to be focused on trying to make the corridors more fluid, we obviously don't want to make life worse for the local municipalities. It's very much part of our considerations that we're not working in silos in that respect, because the solutions we want to bring from my point of view in terms of making those corridors more efficient are not meant to make life more difficult for local municipalities. We are certainly talking not only with each other, but also with the municipalities and all of the players involved wherever there's a bottleneck.

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi: To further supplement that, through you, Madam Chair, we are providing some support to the Federation of Canadian Municipalities to encourage and support the municipalities to do more long-term asset management planning and coordination of their plans. That coordination happens at a local level, and then we work with them. Mr. Garneau and I, and other ministers who are linked to infrastructure investments, work very closely with each other on the reporting and on delivering the results for Canadians.

• (1245)

Mr. Ken Hardie: Particularly in metro areas where there's a lot of movement to and from a seaport, say, with a lot of container traffic going to warehouses, etc., one can see that it isn't necessarily even the corridor itself but the whole road system, sometimes complemented by a good public transit system, that alleviates enough pressure so that you can get those goods moving properly in a metro area.

Hon. Amarjeet Sohi: Just quickly, one practice that we're encouraging municipalities to undertake is to look at mobility as a whole, not just as transit segregated from rural infrastructure and trade and transportation infrastructure. How do goods and services move in our urban centres or in other areas? We want to encourage that kind of holistic approach to transportation planning.

Mr. Ken Hardie: This is where, you know, in smart cities—

The Chair: I'm sorry, Mr. Hardie, this is a four-minute round here. I'm trying to make sure that Mr. Berthold gets an opportunity as well.

Four minutes, Mr. Berthold.

Mr. Luc Berthold: No, it's Ms. Block.

The Chair: Oh, Ms. Block, I'm sorry. I had the wrong name down here.

Go ahead, Ms. Block.

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

I want to thank you for being at our meeting here today.

There's a saying, "Culture eats strategy for breakfast." I'm not sure if you're familiar with it. This seems to be especially true, given the current government's commitments and its ability to execute them; I guess there is still a lot to learn about deliverology. I'm imagining that our many cabinet ministers are thinking it's a good thing there is a two-year contract in place, with the ability to extend it for another year, with the deliverology guru you have lined up to help you.

I want to refer to the plan that's in front of me. I think it's a very ambitious plan. I see that it's going out to 2030. You know, all things being equal, I think that sometimes rank, order, and priorities provide a bit more clarity.

This committee has undertaken a number of studies when it comes to rail safety, the Navigation Protection Act. We're currently undertaking a study on aviation safety. I'm thinking that a safe and reliable transportation system is probably something that would be one of the top priorities of Transport Canada.

After making those observations, I would like to hear from you, Minister Garneau.

Do you believe that the significantly lower budget you have today compared to 2015-16 gives you the resources you need to not only fulfill the obligations that you have, but also this vision that you have introduced?

Hon. Marc Garneau: Thank you very much.

I agree with you that rail safety is extremely important. In fact, I'm on record as saying it's my number one priority.

In 2016, as you recall, more funding was identified for rail safety, because we still had work to do. It was \$143 million in fact, and \$55 million of that I announced last November with respect to the issue of addressing safety issues at grade crossings.

I announced \$20 million just a little while ago, of that \$55 million, for about 130 projects which are aimed at improving rail safety at grade crossings. Last year, there were some 65 deaths at grade crossings, or people trespassing on railways.

Mrs. Kelly Block: If I may interrupt for a moment, rail safety is absolutely important. My observation was on a safe and reliable transportation system on the whole—

• (1250)

Hon. Marc Garneau: Sure.

Mrs. Kelly Block: —including aviation safety, marine safety.

I'm really wanting to know if you believe that the budget you have today, which is significantly lower than in the previous years, is enough to fulfill the obligations that you have across all modes of transportation.

Hon. Marc Garneau: Yes, I believe it is.

The Chair: Thank you, all.

Thank you to the Ministers and your staff for appearing before us today.

Mr. Luc Berthold: On a point of order, Madam Chair, I don't know why you are stopping the meeting right now. We have 10 minutes left. I know we have to vote on the main estimates, but usually it takes just five minutes to do that.

The Chair: You never know if there are going to be any concerns raised, and it's important for us to try to pass these main estimates today. I did not want to leave it to the very last minute, and there were only 35 seconds left of the four-minute rounds that we shifted down to.

Mr. Luc Berthold: On the same point of order, Madam Chair, I want to know why you decided to change the time allowed for each person to speak.

We have a motion on the table prescribing each round that we have. If we did it as we were supposed to, they had six minutes, we had six minutes, and we had time to ask all of our questions. Now we don't have time because we didn't plan it.

You didn't say to us—

The Chair: No, let me put it straight. Everybody had six minutes exactly in the first round—the four turns being exactly 6:16, 6:20, 6:20, 6:17 minutes long.

The next round was started with Mr. Hardie. I shifted from six minutes to five minutes, and then looking at the clock, I moved it to four minutes. And it was the same for Ms. Block, at four minutes.

We're talking about two minutes here, and we still have work to do.

Mr. Luc Berthold: Yes, but it's important when we have only 10 minutes to ask questions of two ministers in the same meeting. It's really important. Those two minutes could have made a difference. I could have had a chance to ask the minister and to thank him for his support for Lac-Mégantic.

The Chair: Well, you can use that. Now you've done that, and I appreciate your comments. We will move forward.

Thank you all again. I appreciate your being here.

Pursuant to Standing Order 81(4), the committee will now dispose of the main estimates for the fiscal year ending March 31, 2018, minus the interim supply the House agreed to on March 21, 2017.

For the Ministry of Transport, it is vote 1 under Canadian Air Transport Security Authority; vote 1 under Canadian Transportation Agency; votes 1, 5, 10, 15, and 20 under Department of Transport; vote 1 under Marine Atlantic Inc.; vote 1 under the Federal Bridge Corporation Limited; and vote 1 under VIA Rail Canada Inc.

For the Ministry of Infrastructure, it is votes 1, 5, and 10 under Office of Infrastructure of Canada; votes 1 and 5 under PPP Canada Inc.; vote 1 under the Jacques-Cartier and Champlain Bridges Inc.; and vote 1 under the Windsor-Detroit Bridge Authority.

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: I will deal with all votes in one motion.

CANADIAN AIR TRANSPORT SECURITY AUTHORITY

Vote 1—Payments to the Authority for operating and capital expenditures.....
\$584,584,214

(Vote 1 agreed to on division)

CANADIAN TRANSPORTATION AGENCY
Vote 1—Program expenditures.....\$27,714,765

(Vote 1 agreed to on division)

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT
Vote 1—Operating expenditures.....\$596,606,256
Vote 5—Capital expenditures.....\$138,591,900
Vote 10—Grants and contributions—Gateways and corridors.....\$113,975,543
Vote 15—Grants and contributions—Transportation infrastructure.....
\$185,061,604
Vote 20—Grants and contributions—Other.....\$37,739,369

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

MARINE ATLANTIC INC.
Vote 1—Payments to the corporation.....\$76,545,000

(Vote 1 agreed to on division)

OFFICE OF INFRASTRUCTURE OF CANADA
Vote 1—Operating expenditures.....\$126,917,348
Vote 5—Capital expenditures.....\$523,659,656
Vote 10—Contributions.....\$4,282,963,173

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

PPP CANADA INC.
Vote 1—Payments to the corporation for operating expenditures.....
\$11,800,000
Vote 5—Payments to the corporation for P3 Canada Fund.....\$267,700,000

(Votes 1 and 5 agreed to on division)

THE FEDERAL BRIDGE CORPORATION LIMITED
Vote 1—Payments to the corporation.....\$22,885,386

(Vote 1 agreed to on division)

THE JACQUES-CARTIER AND CHAMPLAIN BRIDGES INC.
Vote 1—Payments to the corporation.....\$331,777,000

(Vote 1 agreed to on division)

VIA RAIL CANADA INC.
Vote 1—Payments to the corporation.....\$221,004,897

(Vote 1 agreed to on division)

WINDSOR-DETROIT BRIDGE AUTHORITY
Vote 1—Payments to the Authority.....\$258,916,050

(Vote 1 agreed to on division)

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: We're done, and no one has objected and we've managed to get through it.

Sir, I had to allow sufficient time in case you were going to object and we had to go through all the votes individually.

Thank you all very much. The next meeting is on Thursday.

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

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

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

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

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

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

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

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

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

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

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

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