

Climate Change Policy in Canada: Domestic Influences on Foreign Policy Formulation

by

Matthew Bengier

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of

The University of Manitoba

in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Political Studies

University of Manitoba

Winnipeg

Copyright © 2016 by Matthew Bengier

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	4
1.1: INTRODUCTION	4
1.2: METHODOLOGY	7
1.3: OUTLINE OF THESIS	12
1.4: HISTORY OF CANADIAN CLIMATE CHANGE	16
1.5: BACKGROUND	18
THEORY AND LITERATURE REVIEW	22
2.1: INTRODUCTION	22
2.2: THEORETICAL APPROACHES	23
2.3: POLITICS AND CLIMATE CHANGE	34
2.4: NATIONAL INTEREST	38
2.5: CANADA’S CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY	40
2.6: THE KYOTO PROTOCOL	47
2.7: CONCLUSION	52
ANALYSIS	53
3.1: INTRODUCTION	53
3.2: RATIONAL ACTOR MODEL.....	54
3.3: ORGANIZATIONAL MODEL.....	65
3.4: GOVERNMENTAL POLITICS MODEL	81
3.5: LEVELS OF ANALYSIS	88
3.6: CONCLUSION	97
CONCLUSIONS	100
4.1: INTRODUCTION	100
4.2: FINDINGS	101
4.3: THEORETICAL AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS	104
4.4: RECOMMENDATION FOR FURTHER RESEARCH.....	106
4.5: CONCLUSION	107
WORKS CITED.....	109

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Introduction

Climate change is a contentious and politicized issue. The increase and buildup in greenhouse gas emissions are causing changes to the global climate and environment, mainly, by increasing the average global temperature. Climate change refers to the consequences of this buildup of greenhouse gases and the resulting “atmospheric changes connected directly or indirectly to human activities.”¹ These changes caused by unsustainable industries, global pollution, and increasing population have massive political implications. Not only will climate change impact the environment, it will also impact the economic wellbeing of nations, the economic wellbeing of their citizens, people’s health and many more facets of everyday life. Geographic location and poverty can further compound the issue creating severe repercussions on the global population. International agreements are negotiated with the intention of mitigating the effects of the changing environment.

For Canada, the changing climate means a need to formulate a policy approach that meets both the international agreements and be acceptable to various domestic groups. Canada has pursued a number of diverse approaches to climate change and environmental policy. The current Trudeau government is pushing for an international climate change agreement by signing the Paris Agreement, and meeting with the premiers of the provinces to discuss climate change. The Paris Agreement is a legally binding international agreement set to address climate change

¹ Harris, Paul G. “Introduction: the global politics of climate change” in *The Politics of Climate Change: Environmental Dynamics in International Affairs* ed. Paul G. Harris (New York, NY: Routledge, 2009) 2

and limit greenhouse gas emissions. Trudeau has stated that the intention of Canada is to take a leadership role internationally on addressing climate change.² The stated/ostensible goal of the Trudeau government is to mitigate climate change by becoming an international leader and by implementing policies at the domestic level.

The Trudeau government differs from its predecessors in climate/foreign policy. The Chrétien government saw Canada in terms of its role in the international community, while the Harper government took a more domestic approach. As this thesis will show, the Chrétien government sought to sign the Kyoto Protocol to maintain international influence. The Harper government withdrew from the Kyoto Protocol to pursue domestic environmental policies, rather than international. There is a relationship between the international and domestic politics. The Chrétien and Harper governments still considered Canada's international role. The Chrétien government wanted to remain an important actor in the international community. The Harper government wanted to show that Canada could mitigate climate change without the Kyoto Protocol, with a domestic approach. The Chrétien and Harper governments had different ideological positions on climate change but these differing positions are not sufficient enough to explain their differing approaches to climate change policy. Despite their ideological differences, both the Chrétien and Harper governments pursued environmental policy. Therefore, it is necessary to look at other influences that impacted the direction that they took. Each one of these governments' approaches was influenced by domestic politics. The goals, pursuits, and objectives of a state as determined by the government make up the national interest. The national interest, as the Chrétien government viewed it, was in coordinating an international response to

² Trudeau, Justin. "Canada's National Statement at COP21" Speech. Nov. 30, 2015.
<http://pm.gc.ca/eng/news/2015/11/30/canadas-national-statement-cop21> (accessed April 12, 2016)

climate change. Therefore, the Chrétien government focused on the international approach that included negotiating the Kyoto Protocol. The Harper government viewed the environmental policy and the national interest as the need to pursue a domestic approach. This domestic approach to policy would mean that Canada could create and control its own policies and create a voluntary implementation program and could protect the economy from the burden of mandatory environmental measures. There is a gap between the environmental policies pursued, both international and domestic policies, and their implementation.³ The Chrétien government pursued international agreements but failed to meet the requirements of the agreements and produce an implementation strategy. The key variable in the negotiation, ratification and implementation of climate change and environmental policies by the Chrétien and Harper governments is domestic politics.

This thesis will argue that, despite differences in policy and approach, the Chrétien and Harper governments have implemented climate change policy based on the pressures of domestic organization, institutions and individuals. These domestic constituents shape how the government views the national interest and therefore, the formulation and implementation of policy. The policy directions that the government takes are influenced by its view of the national interest. The thesis will do so by examining governments of different political parties that, while approaching climate change for diverse perspectives, nonetheless established their strategies on the basis of various political interests. The thesis will show how climate change policy in Canada

³ See. Eugene Lee and Anthony Perl., eds., *The Integrity Gap: Canada's Environmental Policy and Institutions*, Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2003.

demonstrates the key variable of domestic politics as a determinant in the formulation of an environmental policy position.

1.2 Methodology

The research presented will examine mainly primary and secondary sources. The primary sources will provide a comparative analysis based on government documents, speeches, policies, and party platforms. These documents are indicative of how the government publically views the national interest and the priorities of that government. They indicate a disconnect between government discourse and the actual policy implementation. It will also examine various political institutions through which the government is influenced. These institutions consist of governmental departments, parliament, cabinet, and provincial governments. It will also look at other influences such as interest groups, business coalitions, and public opinion. Through these sources, one can understand the differences between the Chrétien and Harper governments. These sources will indicate how the Chrétien and Harper governments made decisions based on domestic constraints, and how these constraints translated into different environmental policies.

The secondary sources, such as newspaper articles and journal articles, will provide background information on the politics of climate change, environmental policies in Canada, government decision-making, and the levels of analysis theory. These sources provide the basis for the comparative analysis. They situate the analysis within the greater discussion on environmental policy and government decision-making. For example, how climate change affects Canada, and the importance of natural resources on the Canadian economy. Allison and Zelikow models of government decision-making and Putnam's levels of analysis provide the fundamental substance to which the comparative case study is examined.

This thesis applies Graham Allison and Philip Zelikow's rational actor model, organizational model and governmental politics model.⁴ Allison and Zelikow's *Essence of Decision* provides an analysis of the decision-making behind the Cuban missile crisis of October 1962. They look at the foreign policy decisions made by the United States government by President Kennedy and the USSR government. Allison and Zelikow state that in understanding foreign policy decisions, one must understand the domestic political actors.

Treating national governments as if they were centrally coordinated, purposive individuals provides a useful short-hand for understanding policy choices and actions. But this simplification – like all simplifications – obscures as well as reveals. In particular, it obscures the persistently neglected fact of government: the “decisionmaker” of national policy is obviously not one calculating individual but is rather a conglomerate of large organizations and political actors.⁵

. There is a difference between the state, as the singular political actor, and government. As Allison and Zelikow explain, the government is made up of many domestic constituents, such as organizations, institutions, interest groups and individuals. The same approach made here in analyzing the decisions made during the Cuban missile crisis can be applied to governments' positions on climate change. In *Essence of Decision*, Allison and Zelikow seek to answer a number of questions on how states acted during the Cold War and Cuban missile crisis. The decisions made by the United States government during the Cuban Missile Crisis can be applied to the Canadian governments' decisions on climate change. The United States government faced a number of international and domestic pressures on the appropriate response to the missile crisis. Similarly, the Canadian government faced pressures to formulate and implement appropriate responses to climate change. While these situations are vastly different, the analysis

⁴ Allison, Graham and Philip Zelikow. *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*, 2nd ed. (New York, NY: Longman, 1999).

⁵ Ibid, 3.

that Allison and Zelikow take to uncover the decision making process can be applied to climate change. This thesis will take the theory applied to the Cuban Missile Crisis to illustrate how the Canadian government makes decisions based on domestic influences. The important thing to note is that the theoretical approach that was applied to the Cuban Missile Crisis by Allison and Zelikow can be applied to almost any situation in which the government must make a decision. The different contexts in which these theories are applied shows how versatile these theories are. As stated, for a better understanding on government decision making Allison and Zelikow's theories break down an expansive and complicated topic. Both the Cuban Missile Crisis and the implementation of environmental policies involve a number of interested political actors and involve a complex issue.

Allison and Zelikow argue that analysis using the rational actor model explains behaviour of national governments and to show "how the nation of government could have chosen to act as it did, given the strategic problems it faced."⁶ The organizational and governmental politics models "provide a base for improved explanations."⁷ Applying the same models to climate change policy in Canada, we can illustrate how differing Canadian government approached the problem of climate change. It is these "strategic problems" that this thesis seeks to highlight and analyze as potential influences in the formulation and implementation of climate change policy. The public is often made aware of the policies pursued by the government but rarely the determining factors that influence the direction the government takes. We usually see the result, rather than

⁶ Ibid, 4.

⁷ Ibid, 5.

the process. Applying Allison and Zelikow's three models of government will help examine the decision-making process in climate change policy.

The rational actor model will outline how government makes decisions based on their interpretation of the national interest. The organizational model paradigms will outline how sub-state actors compete to influence how the government views the national interest and therefore determines the approach to environmental policy. The governmental politics paradigm illustrates how individual bargaining within the government and organizations influence the formulation of policy. In the case of environmental policy, particularly the Kyoto Protocol, the government makes policy decisions based on the influences of domestic politics. Furthermore, the analysis will apply Robert Putnam's levels of analysis theory to Canada's policies.⁸ The levels of analysis theory is based on the idea that the state "must be concerned simultaneously with domestic and international pressures."⁹ Political pressures from both the international and domestic sphere can influence the policy approach of a state. Putnam asserts that each state bargaining at the international level seeks to maximize its position to satisfy the national interest. At the domestic level, sub-state actors and constituents seek to influence the policies adopted by the government.¹⁰ As a theory, it allows an examination of the interplay between domestic pressures that are brought to bear on international issues such as climate change. This theory will provide an understanding of how bargaining among interest groups, organizations and other sub-state actors influence the negotiation, ratification and implementation of international agreements. Allison and Zelikow's models will outline how governments make decisions based on domestic

⁸ Putnam, Robert D. "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games" in *International Organization*. Vol. 42 No. 3 (1988).

⁹ Ibid, 431.

¹⁰ Ibid, 434.

politics. Putnam's levels of analysis theory will analyze how government decisions, based on domestic bargaining affect international agreements. Through this analysis, it will be shown that the formulation of policy approaches is largely influenced by ideological interpretations of the national interest. A number of key assumptions on government decision-making will be addressed. The first assumption is that governments vary in their approach to policy formulation both in the international and domestic political spheres. To highlight this issue, a comparative analysis of the Chrétien and Harper governments will be undertaken. The next assumption is that the variation in approaches is largely influenced by domestic politics. Applying the theoretical framework to the Chrétien and Harper governments allows for the understanding of domestic determinants. More specifically, the theories will illustrate how bargaining between domestic constituents (organizations, interest groups, and individuals) influence the governments' international policy approach.

International influences can also be a factor in influencing government policy approach. As this thesis illustrates, domestic influences cannot be isolated from international influences. The United States, for example, can influence the government's decision-making through the economic relationship they have with Canada. While this thesis primarily examines the domestic influences, there are also international influences that can be present. The argument here is that by examining the domestic influences, we can see how it translates into international action. The levels of analysis theory indicates the interconnectedness of domestic and international negotiations in formulating policy.

1.3 Outline of Thesis

Chapter Two consists of a literature review and analysis, and will discuss three main bodies of literature. The first section outlines the literature involving theoretical approaches to government decision-making, including Allison and Zelikow's rational actor model, organizational model, and the governmental politics paradigm, as well as Putnam's levels of analysis theory. Allison and Zelikow's models involve an analysis of government decision-making, more specifically, how domestic politics determine the choices the state makes.

Putnam's levels of analysis theory outlines how the bargaining among domestic constituents translates into the national interest and therefore, international policies. These approaches will be the focus of the analysis. This section will also address other theories based on the interaction of domestic and international politics. For example, Susanne Lohmann and James Rosenau both describe the levels of analysis in terms of linkage politics.¹¹ Lohmann explains that to properly understand international agreements, one must look at the underlying domestic politics.¹² Rosenau also argues that domestic politics plays an important role in understanding international agreements. He states that the negotiations in one political sphere influence the negotiations in another; that both the domestic and international spheres are linked and react to the other.¹³ Another theory that illustrates the relationship between the domestic and international is what George Tsebelis describes as nested games.¹⁴ The state as a political actor is involved with a

¹¹ See Lohmann, Susanne. "Linkage Politics" in *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*. Vol. 41 No.1 (1997) and Rosenau, James N. "Toward the Study of National – International Linkages" in *Linkage Politics: Essays on the Convergence of National and International Systems*. ed. James Rosenau. (New York, NY: The Free Press, 1969).

¹² Lohmann, *Linkage Politics*, 41, 59-60.

¹³ Rosenau, *Toward the Study of National-International Linkages*, 45

¹⁴ Tsebelis, George. *Nested Games: Rational Choice in Comparative Politics*. (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1990).

number of coinciding agreements and negotiations at both the domestic and international level. These negotiations, or games, are all connected. All these approaches indicate that both the domestic and international political spheres are closely linked and it is important to look at the domestic influences in order to understand how the Chrétien and Harper governments took different approaches to climate change policy.

The next section will examine the literature outlining the politics of climate change. Finally, the third section will look provide a background on Canada's climate change policies and the issues that Canada faces in addressing climate change. It will focus mainly on the Kyoto Protocol as much of the literature addressing climate change policy focuses on this agreement. Examining the Kyoto Protocol will also set the foundation for the following analysis as a large part will address this agreement.

Chapter Three consists of the comparative case study. This thesis will examine the climate change policies of both the Chrétien and Harper governments. The analysis will apply the rational actor model, organizational model, governmental politics model and levels of analysis theory to the Chrétien and Harper governments' approach to climate change policy. Allison and Zelikow's rational actor model will look at government decision-making based on cost-benefit analysis. Applying this to the Chrétien and Harper governments will show that both made decisions that increased the benefits for the state, in what they viewed as the national interest, while decreasing the costs. There are various policy approaches that the government has to pursue in contradiction to the national interest. Despite this, the government still weighs the costs and benefits, and considers the national interest in the decision making process. This will primarily be analysed through an economic framework. There are other frameworks to approach the question of climate change policy and government decision making. For example, looking at

the different ideological difference between the Chrétien and Harper governments. An institutional framework can help analyse how Canadian institutions influence the government's decision making ability. There are many frameworks that can be applied to the analysis of the influences of government decision making. The economic framework provides a much more thorough explanation for the formulation of climate change policy as it is often discussed in opposition to the environment. Economics also take up a large portion of the government's agenda and therefore the national interest. As stated, there are other frameworks to analyse the process of government decision making and the formulation of climate change policy. However, economics is so central to the environment that the two cannot be separated. Any sort of environmental policy needs to have economic provisions. The organizational model will outline how the state is not a unitary actor and that domestic organizations influence the governments' decisions. Each organization, institution, and interest group has its own view of what is in the national interest and the interest of its organization. By determining what their interests are, in pursuant of their goals, these domestic constituents can influence government decisions in order to maximize their benefits, while minimizing the costs. As in the case of public interest groups, the cost and benefit analysis does not always take an economic stance. These "citizen-based non-governmental organizations" in some cases do not just consider the economic costs and benefits, but also the costs and benefits to society as a whole.¹⁵ This may be based on morals, altruism, or tradition. Allison and Zelikow's governmental politics model looks at bargaining among these domestic organizations. Both the Chrétien and Harper governments were constrained by the

¹⁵ Phillips, Susan D. "Policy Analysis and the Voluntary Sector: Evolving Policy Styles" in *Policy Analysis in Canada: The State of the Art*. Ed. Michael Howlett, David H. Laycock, and Laurent Dobuzinskis. Toronto, Ont: University of Toronto Press, 2007

number of seats won in parliament, the constitutional powers of the provinces, and their own individual leadership roles. Finally, this chapter will apply Putnam's levels of analysis theory to the climate change policies. This theory will show how domestic pressures determine the acceptable parameters of international agreements. In the case of the Chrétien government's ratification of Kyoto Protocol, the parameters of the agreement fell within acceptable limits and the protocol was accepted. The Harper government concluded that the Kyoto Protocol was unacceptable and that the costs of pursuing the agreement were too great. Therefore, the government withdrew from the protocol.

Chapter Four will provide an overview of the findings and the different themes discussed throughout the thesis. In addition, this section will outline some theoretical implications this study has for the broader understanding of foreign policy and climate change agreements. The research in this thesis can explain the difference in government approaches. Furthermore, the conclusion will address some possibilities for further research and some limitations. Further research can be done in other policy areas, such as security, trade, and economic development, to determine if domestic politics plays an equal role in influencing policy as it does with environmental agreements. The limitations of this study include the fact that it focuses on Canadian governments. Other states might have different pressures that influence their decisions and the course of action that they take may be different.

The following section will outline the three main bodies of literature to explain the foundation on which the analysis is based. It will discuss the wider body of literature on climate change and climate change politics. It will then outline Canada's various positions on climate change policy and the implications these policies have on Canada. Finally, it will examine the theoretical foundation. These three bodies of literature will serve as the foundation for applying

both the Chrétien and Harper governments' position on climate change policy and how domestic politics influenced their decisions.

1.4 History of Canadian Climate Change

Unmitigated climate change will have profound impact on Canada. These effects may include more frequent and severe forest fires, a decrease in glaciers and permafrost, warmer oceans, increase drought, poor soil conditions, flooding, heat waves, and health risks including allergies, and respiratory illnesses.¹⁶ This thesis does not provide an in-depth description of such impact of climate change on Canada. It focuses entirely on how the governments investigated and formulated climate change and environmental policy based on domestic politics and the national interest.

The Mulroney government was among the first to address the issue of climate change with the "Green Plan" in 1990. Shortly after Mulroney's retirement, in 1993, Jean Chrétien defeated Kim Campbell and was elected prime minister.¹⁷ The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) was ratified by Canada in 1994, and would provide the foundation for the Kyoto Protocol. Progress on meeting the environmental reductions set by the convention was slow. Therefore negotiations to create a legally binding agreement were started in Kyoto, Japan in 1997.¹⁸ The Chrétien government was among those negotiating the Kyoto Protocol, which was

¹⁶ Bjorn, Andrew et al. *Ratification of the Kyoto Protocol: A Citizen's Guide to the Canadian Climate Change Policy Process*. (Toronto, Ont.: Sustainable Toronto, 2002) 17-18.

¹⁷ MacDonald, Douglas and Heather A. Smith. "Promises Made, Promises Broken: Questioning Canada's Commitments to Climate Change" in *Readings in Canadian Foreign Policy: Classic Debates and New Ideas*. ed. Duane Bratt and Christopher J. Kukucha. (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2007) 358-360.

¹⁸ Smith, Heather A. "Political Parties and Canadian Climate Change Policy" in *International Journal*. Vol. 64, No.1 (2009) 49-50.

ratified by the House of Commons on 10 December 2002. The Martin government followed but largely continued on the same policy path as the Chrétien government. Canada continued its image as an international leader of climate change policy. The Martin government produced a “Project Green” plan, the intent of which was to educate the public on climate change and voluntarily reduce emissions.¹⁹ It was not until 2006 when Stephen Harper was elected that there was a shift in environmental policy. The Harper government would follow a “made-in-Canada” approach rather than an international one. Harper was very outspoken against the Kyoto Protocol and withdrew Canada from the agreement in 2011. The theory section will focus on the environmental policy and domestic influences of the Chrétien and Harper governments because they held office long enough to establish their position on climate change and to pursue and implement some form of policy. Kim Campbell was Prime Minister for less than a year, arguably not a sufficient time to negotiate and implement any environmental policy. Paul Martin, as Prime Minister, faced a difficult situation. He became Prime Minister after Chrétien retired. In 2004, Martin won the federal election with a minority government, but in 2006, a motion of no confidence was passed in parliament and another federal election was called. In 2006, Martin and the Liberal Party was defeated by Harper and the Conservatives. The Martin government was not in power long and faced numerous challenges by the Conservative Party of Canada, the Bloc Québécois and the New Democratic Party. Therefore, this thesis will not discuss the Martin government. Although the domestic influences of environmental policy would benefit from research into the Martin government, this thesis will focus solely on the Chrétien and Harper governments. These governments formed government for an extended period of time and were

¹⁹ Ibid, 56.

also in power at a time when climate change and environmental policy came to the attention of the public and therefore, required government response.

This thesis provides a better understanding of why the environmental policies of different Canadian governments vary by looking at two examples. Domestic constituents, organizations, interest groups, and individuals, influence how the government interprets the national interest and in turn, this influences their approach to policy formulation and implementation. Knowledge of this influence will help people understand the impact behind the policy process and the decisions made by governments. The study will contribute to a broader understanding of the relationship between domestic and international politics. The governments' approach to environmental policy is determined by the interpretation of the national interest. The national interest is largely determined by domestic politics, such as interest groups, businesses, provincial and civil governments, and individuals. How the government views the national interest is influenced by political bargaining and negotiation which happens at both the international and domestic levels. Bargaining involves numerous influences such as governmental departments and institutions, ideology, relationships with various interest groups, and public opinion. The research provided indicates that bargaining within the domestic sphere determines the policy approach.

1.5 Background

The determining factors of environmental and climate change policies are important to look at for a number of reasons. One reason is that climate change, as will be shown later in the thesis, requires a collective response from the international community. Ronald Mitchell argues that two factors make the environment international. The first is that environmental problems can occur

within a single country but are brought to the attention of citizens in the global community and they become concerned. The issue might not represent a problem within that state, for example the environmental problem might be a matter of culture or tradition such as the hunting of endangered animals. However, the global community and other states might not agree with it, and therefore, it becomes an international concern. The second factor is that some environmental problems that occur within local and domestic areas require international cooperation such as bilateral and international agreements.²⁰ It is largely through these two factors that domestic environmental issues become international. There are, of course, some environmental concerns that do not need international cooperation in order to be addressed. While these issues are purely domestic, this thesis is concerned with the mitigation of global climate change, and how domestic politics influence the government's decision-making ability. The problem of climate change is not one that can be addressed through domestic politics alone. Addressing the issue of climate change requires consensus among states, on a wide range of economic, social and environmental issues.

The domestic politics of individual states can have an impact on the international approach to mitigating climate change. Boardman states that “operating effectively outside national boundaries requires a solid and visible base of domestic activity.”²¹ This means that in order for an international issue like climate change to be addressed, there needs to be a stable domestic constituency. These individuals, organizations and businesses such as, governmental

²⁰ Mitchell, Ronald B. *International Politics and the Environment*. (London, UK: Sage Publishing, 2010) 24-25.

²¹ Boardman, Robert. “The Multilateral Dimension: Canada and the United States” in *Canadian Environmental Policy: Ecosystems, Politics, and Process*, ed. Robert Boardman (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1992) 227.

departments, ministers, interest groups, business and citizen coalitions, as well as the wider public provide the foundation on which foreign policy is adopted and implemented. These groups and individuals, influence the approach by limiting the choices the government has. By applying the rational actor, organizational, and governmental politics models, as well as the levels of analysis, we can see how these domestic constituents influence government decision-making. The implementation of environmental policies is, largely, the responsibility of domestic groups. Domestic groups that make up the state, influence the ability to bargain and implement international agreements. What is in the interest of domestic groups and constituents is translated as in the interest of the nation. This is why they play an important role in the formation of foreign policy.

Allison and Zelikow mention the importance state structures and domestic politics hold in influencing the behaviour of governments. They argue that “state structures matter: the structure of their domestic governments and the values and views of their citizens affect their behavior in international affairs.”²²

The research on the domestic determinants will also highlight the fact that government is not a unitary actor. Although the state stands as a unitary actor in international negotiations, the federal government is responsible for negotiating international agreements, there are a number of domestic constituents that affect the negotiation. Sub-state actors can participate indirectly by lobbying governments and providing information needed during the negotiations, but ultimately the Canadian government is responsible for negotiation of international agreements. This thesis will outline the involvement of a number of domestic constituents in the influencing of

²² Allison and Zelikow, *Essence of Decision*, 39.

government decisions. It will look at how organizations, interest groups, provinces, and government departments all determine the government's approach to climate change policy.

Chapter 2

Theory and Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This chapter of the thesis will provide an overview of three main bodies of literature. The first body of literature will focus on various theoretical approaches that demonstrate government decision-making and how domestic politics plays an influential role in determining the course of action a government can take. The literature will focus on Allison and Zelikow's models, as well as Putnam's levels of analysis. These theoretical approaches will be used in the comparative analysis of the case study. This section will also examine a number of other theories that contribute to an understanding of the formulation of policy.²³ The international and domestic levels of policy formulation often have competing interests. What may be in the interest of one level, may not be in the best interest of the other. Both the domestic and international levels have organizations that have goals and interests that are pursued. These goals and interests may coincide or compete for attention in the national agenda. In this theoretical approach, the domestic level of politics is influential in the formulation and implementation of Canada's climate change policy. The second body of literature will outline the politics of climate change and how climate change is problem that requires international efforts to mitigate. The section will describe how governments respond to climate change policy and the difficulty they face in mitigating a collective problem both individually and collectively. Finally, the section will look at how domestic politics and public opinion can shape the national interest and in turn, shape

²³ For a discussion on level of analysis theory and its various components see Putnam's "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games" (1988) Rosenau's "Toward the Study of National – International Linkages" (1969) Tsebelis' *Nested Games: Rational Choice in Comparative Politics* (1990) and Allison and Zelikow's *Essence of Decision* (1999).

how the government forms and implements environmental policies. The final body of literature will look specifically at Canada's response to climate change and the various approaches Canadian governments have taken, including climate change policies and international agreements. The Kyoto Protocol was among the most important international agreement that Canada was party to. It will also highlight the important position Canada holds as an international leader and developed country, with vast natural resources. These vast natural resources available to Canadians means that climate change can have a profound impact as much of the economy is based on the usage of natural resources. Canada's vast wilderness and diverse environments also means that climate change is perceptible and has the potential to impact the lives of Canadians. Many organizations, interest groups and individuals have an interest in the outcome of environmental policy formulated by the government. Therefore, they seek to influence the government's approaches and thereby placing constraints on acceptable parameters of policy.

2.2 Theoretical Approaches

In *Essence of Decision*, Allison and Zelikow provide three different models. The first model is the rational actor model. This model is based on a number of assumptions. It assumes that the state is the primary actor and that the national government is strategic in calculating the choices and outcomes.²⁴ Allison and Zelikow list the core concepts of the rational choice model as follows: goals and objectives, alternatives, consequences and choices. Goals and objectives are ranked in order of preferences. Then the actor chooses one of the alternatives from a particular situation while considering the side effects of each choice. Each alternative has a set of

²⁴ Allison and Zelikow. *Essence of Decision*, 15.

consequences which must be considered. Choice is a result “simply of selecting that alternative whose consequences rank highest in the decision-maker’s payoff function.”²⁵ The rational actor model is based not only on the actors’ cost-benefit analysis or their choices, but also what interests the actors wish to pursue and their readiness to take risks.²⁶ This model views the government and nation as a unitary actor, therefore underplaying the roles of sub-state actors. The rational actor model is important in analysing the outcomes of policy formulation. It can enlighten the public on the direction the state wants to go, what the state deems as important and necessary to put on its agenda, and why the state chose to adopt a specific policy. It does not however provide insight into the negotiation process and the process of formulating the policy. The rational actor model is focused on the outcome, rather than the process leading up to that outcome. That outcome is what is most beneficial to the state and therefore in the national interest.

The organizational model and governmental politics paradigm illustrate how domestic constituents and sub-state actors try to influence the government in order to achieve their goals and influence policy formulation. These groups try to influence how the government weighs the costs and benefits, thereby influencing the direction the government will go. For the purposes of this thesis, the rational actor model is important to look at as a consequence of bargaining among domestic political groups.

The second model Allison and Zelikow discuss is organizational behaviour. According to the organizational model, the state is not a unitary actor (as presumed by the rational actor

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Ibid, 49.

model) and there are a number of smaller organizations that make up the state and whose goals and actions may differ. The idea of the state as a unitary actor assumes that there is a level of cohesion within the state and that the costs and benefits of decisions are calculated and then acted upon the choice that maximizes the benefit and minimizes the cost.²⁷ Allison and Zelikow state that “[e]ach organization attends to a set of problems and acts in a quasi-independence on these problems. But few important issues fall exclusively within the domain of a single organization.”²⁸ They further note that the organizational model does not mean that organizations lack central purposes but “rather that organizations participate meaningfully in a process in which several purposes are possible and preferred by nominal masters in the executive, legislative, or judicial branches of government.”²⁹ Each branch of government will serve its own individual purpose. They will have their own goals, direction, and incentives. This is what is meant by several purposes. These branches all work within the larger governmental organization. There is still a hierarchy of influence and the executive, legislative, and judicial branches still determine the goals and purposes of the wider organization.

The third model is defined as governmental politics. In this model, like the organizational model, the state is not a unitary actor but consists of a number of political players, who “act in terms of no consistent set of strategic objectives but rather according to various conceptions of national, organizational, and personal goals; players who make government decisions not by a single, rational choice but by the pulling and hauling that is politics.”³⁰ The governmental

²⁷ Ibid, 32.

²⁸ Ibid, 143.

²⁹ Ibid, 151.

³⁰ Ibid, 255.

politics model goes beyond the state as a single rational actor and also the organizational politics model. It examines the government not only as a single actor that makes decisions as a cohesive unit but as number of individuals. These individuals within government all have their own goals and interests and belong to organizations and departments that also have their own goals and interests. Not only does the governmental politics model take account of the different organizations within the government but also the competing and bargaining between these organizations and individual actors to achieve their desired outcome.

Allison and Zelikow's models are based on Robert Putnam's levels of analysis theory (which he termed the "Logic of two Level Games") in which the assumption is made that the international and domestic levels of politics are interconnected. He states "at the national level, domestic groups pursue their interests by pressuring the government to adopt favorable foreign policies, and politicians seek power by constructing coalitions among these groups."³¹ He adds that "at the international level, national governments seek to maximize their own ability to satisfy domestic pressures."³² This means that any international negotiation or agreement, such as the Kyoto Protocol, is determined by domestic politics. Domestic politics and constituents apply pressure on the federal government to appease their demands. The government in the negotiations must consider the national interest while considering prestige and leverage at the international level. Therefore, there are two levels (or "games") to the negotiations; the international level and the domestic level. The first level in negotiations is international bargaining which can lead to a potential agreement. The potential agreement is then discussed at

³¹ Putnam, *Diplomacy and Domestic Politics*, 434.

³² Ibid

the second level; the domestic. At this level domestic politics determines whether or not the agreement suits the national interest and is ratified.³³

The range of potential agreements that satisfy both the international negotiators and domestic politics is called a win-set. At the domestic level there are parameters of negotiation that are acceptable to the parties involved. The same can be said for negotiations at the international level. The common parameters between the domestic and international negotiations are the win-set. An agreement within this common range will satisfy both international and domestic parties involved. It is essentially an agreement with the most benefit and an acceptable amount of cost. Putnam explains that the win-set depends on a number of factors. One of the factors that the win-set depends on is the “distribution of power, preferences, and possible coalitions” among domestic constituents.³⁴ Not all domestic constituents have equal power and ability to determine the international negotiators. In the case of climate change, corporations and the business elite might have more power and resources to influence international negotiations than environmental organizations. Dahl and Lindblom argue that “income inequality, however, threatens equality in political power.”³⁵ Those individuals, corporations, and organizations that greater income, not only have greater access to the political decision-makers but also have ability to communicate with citizens.³⁶ This means that those with greater income hold a greater influence on government decision-makers. In addition, they can influence the public, which in

³³ Ibid, 436.

³⁴ Ibid, 442.

³⁵ Dahl, Robert A. and Charles E. Lindblom. *Politics Economics and Welfare: Planning and Politico-Economic Systems Resolved into Basic Social Processes*. (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1976) 139.

³⁶ Ibid, 140.

turn, holds influence over the government through elections. Dahl and Lindblom also argue that in addition to income, organization also has a direct influence on the policy process. The more organized domestic constituents have a greater influence on government decision-making. They have the negotiable rewards and deprivations that influence government.³⁷ The idea of income and organization can be applied to climate change policy in Canada. The organizations, interest groups and individuals that have greater income and organization can lead the negotiation of an agreement in their favour. Domestic constituents that have an interest in Canadian climate change policy consist of, but are not limited to; government agencies and departments, nongovernmental organizations, business organizations and coalitions, and interest groups. These domestic groups enact their influence by lobbying the government in order for their interests to appear on the government's agenda. The various groups and organizations try to convince the government to adopt the same interests and goals as their group. How these groups influence the climate change policies of the government will be discussed in the analysis chapter.

The size or parameters of the win-set³⁸ also depend on the domestic institutions.³⁹ For example, the number needed to ratify the international agreement within parliament can affect the win-size. On one hand, with a minority government, the governing party needs to convince the opposition to vote in favour of the policy. This can create a small win-set as the government will need to bargain with the other parties in order to ratify the agreement. On the other hand, a majority government has more seats in parliament and therefore requires less bargaining.

³⁷ Ibid, 340.

³⁸ The win-set is the acceptable parameters of international negotiation that will satisfy domestic constituents. The overlap between what is acceptable internationally and domestically is the win-set. See Putnam, *Diplomacy and Domestic Politics*, 1988.

³⁹ Putnam, *Diplomacy and Domestic Politics*, 448.

Another example of a domestic institution that can influence the win-set is regionalism. The provinces have wide jurisdiction on a number of issues. The federal government and parliament negotiate and ratify the agreement, but it is largely up to provincial and municipal governments to implement. This is illustrated in the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol in Canada despite objections from a number of provinces. Many provinces argued that they could not implement the Kyoto Protocol and reach the required reduction in emissions. The jurisdictional power that the provinces hold over the implementation of environmental policies provides a barrier to the federal government. The provinces can hold this power over the federal government, thereby influencing how the federal government makes environmental policy decisions. Finally, the win-set is determined by the international negotiators themselves. Domestic popularity, influence of the negotiator, and side payments would help ratify the agreements. The more popular the government is, the more power it has in ratification. Side-payments are concessions that can be made to influence domestic implementation and acceptance of policy.⁴⁰ Side payments are secondary agreements that are made in order for the main agreements to benefit all actors. An example of this can be seen in the voluntary nature of many environmental policies. The government adopts a voluntary policy where corporations and individuals can choose to reduce greenhouse gas emissions or other environmentally friendly actions. This concession may appease environmental groups, while allowing business organizations to continue operating without strict environmental regulation. Without these side-payments in the negotiations process, adopting and implementing any policy would be difficult. Of course the government ultimately

⁴⁰ Ibid, 450-452.

has final decision making ability, and while considering domestic influences, can employ more coercive negotiation tactics to achieve a wanted policy outcome.

In addition to Putnam, there are many other scholars who have contributed to the literature on the relationship between domestic and international politics. For example, Frederick Mayer describes how “domestic factional interests manifest themselves in international bargains is determined both by their interests and by the rules of the domestic political game.”⁴¹ The national interest plays an important part in international negotiations. Keisuke Iida notes that most governments pursue their national interests even at the expense of other governments. To determine the national interest domestic constituents and political actors come to a consensus on the most important objective of the negotiations.⁴² Conflict arises when there is disagreement between political actors that do not share the same interests or goals. Both Rosenau and Tseblis build on the idea of interconnected levels of negotiation. Rosenau’s examines how the domestic and international levels influence each other. This thesis will look more closely at how the domestic level influences the international. Tseblis also acknowledges the relationship between the domestic and international by showing how policy outcomes are the effort of many different interest groups bargaining. Through these theories, we can see how the domestic and international political levels are closely linked.

Rosenau describes the two level games as linkage politics. Rosenau defines linkage as “any recurrent sequence of behavior that originates in one system and is reacted to in another.”⁴³ His

⁴¹ Mayer, Frederick W. “Managing Domestic Differences in International Negotiations: The Strategic Use of Internal Side-Payments” in *International Organization*. Vol. 46 No. 4 (1992) 796.

⁴² Iida, Keisuke. “When and How Do Domestic Constraints Matter? Two-Level Games with Uncertainty” in *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*. Vol. 37 No. 3 (1993) 406.

⁴³ Rosenau, *Toward the Study of National-International Linkages*, 45.

analysis is mainly focused on the relationship between states at the international level. However, his theory of linkage politics can be used to create a better understanding of the relationship between the international level and domestic level. Linkage politics looks at the different boundaries between policy areas and how the environments in which they operate can impact the outcome of policies. Rosenau argues that the distinctions of boundaries between different political spheres are not clearly defined but he states that both the linkages and boundaries between the two levels of politics are central to their functioning.⁴⁴ This means that each political arena is dependent on the other. Rosenau warns that a more interconnected world does not necessarily mean that the two levels of politics are becoming more connected. There are still policy areas that “occur solely within the boundaries of a single polity and cannot be understood without reference to the existence and character of the boundaries.”⁴⁵

Rosenau supports the approach taken in this thesis by analysing the linkages between the domestic and international levels. As the boundaries between the international and domestic level are not clearly defined, the domestic level can influence the international level and vice versa, the international can influence the domestic. This thesis looks at how the domestic level influences the international. As stated, climate change is a good example of a policy area that spans both the domestic and international levels. He describes the relationships of these linkages as penetrative, reactive and emulative. The penetrative process occurs when political actors in one level serve as actors in another. An example of this is in the negotiations of international agreements. The negotiators are actors within the international level but also represent the

⁴⁴ Ibid, 45.

⁴⁵ Ibid, 47.

domestic level. Here, there is a link between the domestic and international spheres. The reactive process is when there is a distinct boundary between the two levels. The connectedness between levels is only a reactionary one when what happens in one policy level elicits a reaction in another. As opposed to the penetrative process, there is only a reactionary connection. One political sphere (whether domestic or international) must react and adapt to what is agreed upon in the other sphere. The final process is emulative in which “political activities in one country are perceived and emulated in another.”⁴⁶ For example, there is a strong connection between Canada and the United States. Canada’s climate change policy, in particular the negotiation of the Kyoto Protocol, was largely reflective on the policies implemented by the United States because their economies are so connected. The penetrative, reactive and emulative processes explain the relationship between states in the international system. How closely the domestic and international levels are linked also impacts the negotiation process. Domestic politics can influence the negotiation process at the international level, and vice versa.

George Tsebelis makes an important distinction between the outside observer and the political actor in the negotiation process. He argues that the observer focuses on only one game and the outcome of that game or choice. The political actor is a participant in more than one game, since they are all interconnected. These interconnected games are what Tsebelis calls “nested games”.⁴⁷ The outside actor only sees the outcome of the choice. For example, in climate change policy, the outside actors and observers only see whether or not climate change policy is adopted and implemented. They often fail to see the constraints placed upon the political actor such as: public opinion and the constituents needed for re-election, the influence of different

⁴⁶ Ibid, 46.

⁴⁷ Tsebelis, *Nested Games*, 7.

institutes and governmental departments, and the international community. This view is essential in understanding the influences of domestic politics on climate change policy. The policy formulation is determined by the connected games and interactions between all these actors. Tsebelis builds his argument on the foundation of the rational actor model. He argues that negotiations between political actors are complex and the rational choices they make are based on a number of connected and nested games.

Tsebelis states that there are two reasons why observers might disagree with the outcome of the actor's choice. The first is what he calls games in multiple arenas. Here the observer focuses on a 'principal arena' and "disagrees with the actor's choice because the former sees the implications of the latter's choices only for the principle arena."⁴⁸ When the observer considers all possible arenas or determinants of choice, the outcome becomes more acceptable. The second case is what he calls institutional design. This means that the actor "takes steps to increase the number of available options so that some new option is now better than [the original]."⁴⁹ The misperception, again, is the result of the observer focusing only on the primary arena with the original rules. The actor is essentially "in a game about the *rules* of the game."⁵⁰ Tsebelis' nested games are about the perceived irrationality behind some actors' choices. In contrast to many other theories of rational choice, Tsebelis looks beyond the single actor in a single game and recognizes that actors can be participants in a number of games with a number of rules and influences. Tsebelis' nested games highlight how, while domestic negotiations between different constituents influences the ability of government, and that these games are interconnected. This

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Ibid, 8.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

illustrates the idea that when making a decision on policy approach and implementation, the government needs to consider many different interests. The rational choice model illustrates the policy outcome of the nested games and interconnected negotiation. This thesis posits that the Chrétien and Harper governments' environmental policy approaches were largely influenced by these domestic nested games. That the domestic interests served to limited their decision making ability, and in turn influences how they perceived the role of Canada in approaching environmental policy.

The rational actor model, organizational model, government politics model and levels of analysis theory all describe the link between the domestic and international. These approaches all illustrate that domestic politics have influence on the approach the federal government takes in foreign policy development. These approaches will be used for the comparison between the Chrétien and Harper Governments' approach to climate change policy. They will underscore the idea that Canada's climate change policy is influenced by the domestic level. It will also serve to explain how the domestic level determines what position the government takes. As the state is not a unified actor, but a collection of individuals and organizations all acting rationally to achieve their goal, we can see how domestic politics have determined the federal government's position on climate change.

2.3 Politics and Climate Change

Climate change is a highly polarizing and contentious issue. There are a number of reasons for this. One reason is that as climate change became a more pressing issue, it gained public attention and therefore the attention of the media. News media, especially in the United States, polarizes viewership to the right and left so that people can attain news that confirms their

beliefs.⁵¹ This polarization had an effect on the wider public, as now the public had two differing views on climate change; those that denied or were critical of the influence that humans had in changing the earth's climate and those that supported this idea. The public now did not know who to trust.⁵² The polarization of climate change shaped how different political parties addressed the issues, therefore making it a highly contentious and political problem.

Another issue is that, as stated, climate change is closely linked to the economy. Therefore, ideological positions can influence stance of climate change and climate change policy. Furthermore, the link with the economy can make it seem as though climate change policy is opening the door to government interference.⁵³ In order to address climate change the government needs to have some ability to influence the economy. An important part in mitigating climate change comes from a sustainable or green economy. Governments have different ideological differences that dictate the role the government should have in the economy. This further makes climate change a political issue.

A further issue is how individual states can address and mitigate a global issue. As stated earlier, two factors make the environment and climate change an international issue. First, problems can occur within a country which can create direct and indirect problems within other countries. Other states then turn their attention to the domestic problems within a state in order to mitigate the potential for the issues to spread worldwide. Second, local and domestic problems

⁵¹ McCright, Aaron M. and Ryan E. Dunlap. "The Politicization of Climate Change and Polarization in the American Public's View of Global Warming, 2001-2010" in *The Sociological Quarterly* Vol. 52 (2011) 157

⁵² See Boykoff, Maxwell T. "Public Enemy No. 1? Understanding Media Representations of Outlier Views on Climate Change" in *American Behavioural Scientist* Vol. 57 No.6 (2013) 796-817

⁵³ Hoffman, Andrew J. *How Culture Shapes the Climate Change Debate*. (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2015) NP

often require international cooperation to understand and address the issue.⁵⁴ The distinction between these two factors is where the problem is felt. The environmental problems associated with the first factor cross borders and create problems with other states. For example, one state polluting the ocean can create environmental problems for almost every state, thereby creating an international issue. Within the second factor, the problem is localized, but in order to address this local issue it requires international cooperation. For example, a nation's demand for fish can create a problem where the fish are exported but not with the demand. In order to address the localized issue of overfishing, cooperation between the supply and demand are needed. The internationalization of the global economy as well as the interdependence of states has affected the environment and climate change responses.

In order to get governments to address climate change and put climate change on the agenda, public opinion and pressure play an important role. Many political parties turn to polls to judge what the public views as an important issue and “what ‘sells’ politically”, and thereby shaping their agenda.⁵⁵ Within the domestic sphere, interest groups and institutions apply pressure on their governments that might conflict with international pressure or the government's own self-interest. Morgan states that “a few participants are working seriously to address and solve climate problems. Many more, both governments and interest groups are pursuing their own agendas. Many are primarily involved with using the process to appear concerned, to appear to take action, and political cover, while avoiding or delaying as long as possible, any real

⁵⁴ Mitchell, Ronald B. *International Politics and the Environment*, 24-25.

⁵⁵ Savoie, Donald J. *Breaking the Bargain: Public Servants, Ministers, and Parliament*. (Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 2003) 207.

action.”⁵⁶ Often a government’s promises and actions do not coincide. Eugene Lee and Anthony Perl discuss the gap between promises made internationally and the implementation of those promises domestically. This makes governments *appear* to address the issue of climate change while not implementing or taking any kind of action. In the context of Canada, they argue that “Canadian policies often fail to deliver solutions or even launch efforts to attain those solutions.”⁵⁷ An example of this is the failure of the Chrétien government to implement the Kyoto Protocol. The Chrétien government could negotiate and ratify the Kyoto Protocol, but implementation was largely up to the provinces, because of their jurisdiction over natural resources. Therefore, federal government, had difficulty in implementing the protocol.

Harrison states that governments respond to an issue following a “peak in issue salience as measured by public opinion polls.”⁵⁸ She argues further that there have been two peaks in which the North American public turned its attention to environmental issues. The first peak was in the 1970s and the second in the 1990s. The 1970’s saw a peak in environmental interest with the creation of the US Environmental Protection Agency and the foundation of Greenpeace. The United Nations Conference on the Human Environment in 1972 provided acknowledgement that there is evidence of human-made harm and that “man’s environment, the natural and the man-made, are essential to his well-being and to the enjoyment of basic human rights.”⁵⁹ The

⁵⁶ Morgan, M. Granger. “Policy Analysis for Decision making About Climate Change” in *Economic and Policy Issues in Climate Change*. ed. William D. Nordhaus. (Washington, DC: Resources for the Future, 1998) 31.

⁵⁷ Lee, Eugene and Anthony Perl. “Introduction: Institutions and the Integrity Gap in Canadian Environmental Policy” in *The Integrity Gap: Canada’s Environmental Policy and Institutions*. ed. Eugene Lee and Anthony Perl. (Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2003) 3.

⁵⁸ Harrison, Kathryn. *Passing the Buck: Federalism and Canadian Environmental Policy*. (Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 1996) 17.

⁵⁹ United Nations. *Report of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment*. (Stockholm, Sweden, 1972) 3.

conference also acknowledged that “the natural resources of the earth ... must be safeguarded for the benefit of present and future generations.”⁶⁰ The 1970’s was also a turbulent time for oil and gas. Oil prices rose in 1973 and 1979 due to global shortages which also turned public attention to natural resource extraction and environmental issues. The 1990’s also saw a peak in interest as the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) tried to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. In 1988, the Mulroney government implemented a “Green Plan” to reduce emissions. It is argued that the plan “had more to do with spending than institutional change”⁶¹ and that the green plan might not be an environmental policy at all. Despite this, the Mulroney government was still among the first governments, worldwide, to address climate change and turned public interest to the issue.⁶² When public interest is high, in order to placate the public, governments often will enact policies.⁶³ This is how public opinion and issue saliency influences the governments approach to policy and how the government views the national interest.

2.4 National Interest

Any agreement made internationally is constrained by the national interest. As the national interest is a vague concept, there are many definitions. Robert Burchill describes the national interest as a common will among the citizens. He states that the very basis of national interest is

⁶⁰ Ibid, 4.

⁶¹ Gale, Robert J.P. “Canada’s Green Plan” in *Nationale Umweltpläne in Ausgewählten Industrieländern [a study of the development of a national environmental plan with expert submissions to the Enquete Commission "Protection of People and the Environment" for the Bundestag (German Parliament)]* (1997) 97.

⁶² Simpson, Jeffery, Mark Jaccard and Nic Rivers. *Hot Air: Meeting Canada’s Climate Change Challenge*. (Toronto, Ont: McClelland & Stewart, 2007) 47-50.

⁶³ Harrison, *Passing the Buck*, 17.

that a “political community can speak with a common vision.”⁶⁴ This definition is similar to the description of the general will presented by Rousseau who states that “only the general will can direct the forces of the state according to the purposes for which it was instituted, which is the common good.”⁶⁵ The national interest is any goal that the state deems necessary to pursue to further the well-being of its citizens, security, and economy. The government has the responsibility to interpret general will or common vision among citizens and translate that into policy.

The national interest is fundamental in creating foreign policy. Joseph S. Nye Jr. states that national interests are the fundamental basis on which foreign policy is discussed.⁶⁶ He goes on to say that “the national interest is simply the set of shared priorities regarding relations with the rest of the world.”⁶⁷ National interest is used to describe how the state will act within the international system. It provides the agenda for what is important to the state. The concept of national interest can be used to describe, justify or oppose foreign policy initiatives. Within Canada, “the federal government, more specifically prime minister and cabinet, decide the position Canada will take in international negotiations.”⁶⁸ Such international agreements are implemented by the provinces and private firms, therefore the federal government must ensure

⁶⁴ Burchill, Robert. *The National Interest in International Relations Theory*. (New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005) 13

⁶⁵ Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. “On the Social Contract” *The Basic Political Writings*. 2nd Edition. ed. Donald A. Cress. (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing, 2011) 170.

⁶⁶ Nye, Joseph S. Jr. “Redefining National Interest” in *Foreign Affairs*. Vol. 78 No. 4 (1999) 23

⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁶⁸ Bjorn, Andrew et al. *Ratification of the Kyoto Protocol*, NP.

its international position is not at odds with the national position. Agreements being negotiated at the international level are influenced by the national interests of the member states. Therefore, the national interest can be used as a term to explain the behavior of states in relation to each other.⁶⁹

2.5 Canada's Climate Change Policy

There is a vast literature on Canada's climate change policies that examines the impact Canada has on climate change and the effects of the issue that are being felt by Canada, such as droughts, a decline in fisheries, and melting polar ice. The literature also discusses Canada's role in mitigating climate change by taking part in international agreements and implementing domestic policies. This section will go beyond the general literature on international negotiations and look at Canada's role in implementing policies. Canada is responsible for producing approximately 2 percent of global greenhouse gas emissions responsible for climate change.⁷⁰ Reducing the 2 percent emission rates would have an impact on the global climate change issue. Jeffery Simpson, Mark Jaccard and Nic Rivers state that "Canada is an advanced industrial country with an enviable standard of living based in part on development and use of energy resources."⁷¹ The development and use of energy resources is an important part of the Canadian economy, and therefore, the implementation of climate change policy is closely related to Canada's economy. Simpson, Jaccard and Rivers also note that Canada is a large northern country and will be among the first states to experience the consequences of climate change.

⁶⁹ Burchill, *National Interest in International Relations Theory*. 26.

⁷⁰ Williston, Byron. "Moral Progress and Canada's Climate Failure" in *Journal of Global Ethics*. Vol.7, No.2 (2011) 156.

⁷¹ Simpson, Jaccard and Rivers, *Hot Air*, 18.

Canada's economy is dependent on many aspects of natural resources, for example forestry, fishing, agriculture and more. Oil is also a big part of the Canadian economy and its extraction is a large contributor to greenhouse gas emissions.⁷²

Canadian climate change policy focuses on a number of areas. One area of policy focus examines the economic impact of climate change policy weighed against the environmental benefits.⁷³ Since Canada has a large amount of natural resources, the economy is susceptible to the implementation of environmental regulations. The costs and benefits of implementation have to be considered. Another area of research focuses on Canada's relationship with the United States.⁷⁴ The United States is Canada's largest trading partner and Canada is dependent on the US economy. The relationship between the United States and Canada needs to be considered when examining the costs and benefits of climate change policy. The trading links between the United States and Canada have had a profound effect on the negotiation and ratification of the Kyoto Protocol. During the Kyoto negotiations, Canada had to remain close to the targets set by the United States as the Canadian economy largely relies on the United States. Initially, Canada suggested a 3 percent reduction in emissions from the 1990 levels. The United States responded

⁷² Ibid, 3-4.

⁷³ For discussions on Canadian climate change policy and economics see Bernstein, Steven. "International Institutions and the Framing of Canada's Climate Change Policy: Mitigating or Masking the Integrity Gap?" in *The Integrity Gap: Canada's Environmental Policy and Institutions*, ed. Eugene Lee and Anthony Perl. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2003. Harrison, Kathryn. "The Struggle of Ideas and Self-Interest in Canadian Climate Policy" in *Global Commons, Domestic Decisions: The Comparative Politics of Climate Change*. ed. Kathryn Harrison and Lisa McIntosh Sundstrom Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press, 2010. Lee, Eugene and Anthony Perl. "Introduction: Institutions and the Integrity Gap in Canadian Environmental Policy" in *The Integrity Gap: Canada's Environmental Policy and Institutions*. ed. Eugene Lee and Anthony Perl. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2003. And MacDonald, Douglas. *Business and Environmental Politics in Canada*. Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Press, 2007.

⁷⁴ For discussions on Canada's environmental relationship with the United States see. Boardman, Robert. "The Multilateral Dimension: Canada and the United States" in *Canadian Environmental Policy: Ecosystems, Politics, and Process*, ed. Robert Boardman New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1992 and Simpson, Jeffery, Marks Jaccard and Nic Rivers. *Hot Air: Meeting Canada's Climate Change Challenge*. Toronto, Ont: McClelland & Stewart, 2007

with a 7 percent reduction.⁷⁵ There was apprehension about how the United States would respond with this gap in reductions between the two countries, and how Canada's economy would be affected. Ultimately, Canada settled on a 6 percent reduction.⁷⁶ In many cases, Canada does look towards the United States for climate change policy, and therefore sometimes follows closely the policies that are implemented south of the border.

According to Harrison, politicians are faced with a number of competing views that determine their position on climate change policy issues. One such position on climate change involves the business and corporate sector, particularly fossil fuel and oil companies, which push for more relaxed environmental regulations. The other competing view is from environmental groups.⁷⁷ The climate change issue is not limited to only two differing views and competing interest groups. These two groups are a generalization of two competing interests with business on one hand and the environment on the other. There are many interest groups that fall outside of these two viewpoints. For example, there are certain companies that create technologies that help the economy as well as mitigate climate change. There are also environmental groups that push for fewer environmental regulations.⁷⁸ These interest groups do not fall squarely into either the business or environmental side of the climate change debate. Rather, business and environmental interests provide a continuum, involving many different interest and views of the climate change debate. Although some environmental interest groups, such as Sierra Club Canada, Greenpeace

⁷⁵ Simpson, Jaccard and Rivers, *Hot Air*, 38-41.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

⁷⁷ Harrison, *Ideas and Self-Interest*, 171.

⁷⁸ See Klein, Naomi. *This Changes Everything: Capitalism vs. The Climate*. Toronto Ont.: Alfred A. Knopf Canada, 2014

Canada, Canadian Environmental Network, and many others, play an important part in Canada's economy, their influence on the federal government is smaller as the oil and gas industries are much larger and influential. Generally, the Canadian economy relies much more on these industries for stable economic growth. According to Phillips and Laforest, the role of interest groups is to "articulate and aggregate" citizen's interests, thereby giving them an organizational base to influence government policy.⁷⁹

The policy process usually comes from the bottom, that is, consultation with various interest groups, organizations, institution, individuals and other domestic constituents. Through this consultation, the policy process can consider many types of domestic influence. There are, however, problems with this consultation process. Savoie mentions that consulted departments need to feel that they have some sort of input into the policy process, and non-governmental interest groups need to see their influence.⁸⁰ If these groups do not feel like they are sufficiently consulted, they feel like their influence over the government is diminishing.⁸¹ The flip side to this is issue is that the decision-makers can also become fatigued with the policy process. The result of this is a top-down announcement. The prime minister "simply delivers a major speech to unveil a new policy...and then lets the policy process pick up the pieces,"⁸²

Another view mentioned by Harrison, is the pressure that the federal government receives from the provinces. The division of powers between the federal government and the provinces creates issues when addressing climate change because the environmental effects are not limited

⁷⁹ Laforest, Rachel and Susan Phillips. "Citizen Engagement: Rewiring the Policy Process" in *Critical Policy Studies*. Ed. Michael Orsini and Miriam Smith. (Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2007) 69.

⁸⁰ Savoie, *Breaking the Bargain: Public Servants, Ministers, and Parliament*, 202.

⁸¹ Phillips, *Policy Analysis and the Voluntary Sector: Evolving Policy Styles*, 516.

⁸² Savoie, *Breaking the Bargain: Public Servants, Ministers, and Parliament*, 201.

to one jurisdiction. Many consequences of climate change such as flooding and pollution cross national and provincial borders. Therefore, it is important that the provinces and federal government work together to create effective climate change policy. Often, the provinces need the financial backing of the federal government to properly implement environmental policy. Since 2006, the federal government has invested \$10 billion in green infrastructure, energy efficiency, clean technology and clean production of fuels. A good portion of the invested money goes to the provinces to aid in implementing the programs.⁸³ The federal government relies on the provinces to implement policies, but the provincial governments rely on the federal government to negotiate reasonable policies and help with the cost of implementation. Implementation of environmental policies is the responsibility of the provinces because they are in control of natural resources such as oil, gas, and coal.⁸⁴ Steven Bernstein states that the relationship between the federal government and the provinces is one of the primary institutional constraints on policy implementation.⁸⁵ The division of jurisdiction impacts how Canada can respond to climate change and implement policies.⁸⁶ The federal government can make promises internationally, but it is up to the provinces to achieve these agreements domestically. The following chapter will discuss how groups such as Environment and Climate Change Canada, Natural Resources Canada, business and environmental organizations, and political institutions

⁸³ Environment Canada. *Canada's tional Report on Climate Change*. (2014) 59.

⁸⁴ Harrison, *Ideas and Self-Interest*, 174.

⁸⁵ Bernstein, Steven. "International Institutions and the Framing of Canada's Climate Change Policy: Mitigating or Masking the Integrity Gap?" in *The Integrity Gap: Canada's Environmental Policy and Institutions*, ed. Eugene Lee and Anthony Perl. (Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2003) 81.

⁸⁶ See Harrison, *Passing the Buck*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 1996.

influence government decision-making and translate the national interest into environmental policy initiatives.

Another area of federalism that impacts Canada's approach to climate change policy is the regional diversity of Canada's economy. Manufacturing is concentrated in Ontario and Quebec; oil is concentrated in Alberta (with growing sectors in Saskatchewan, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland and Labrador, and Manitoba). Manitoba and Quebec's economies are based in part on hydroelectricity, and British Columbia focuses on the forestry sector.⁸⁷ The diversity within the Canadian economy means that it is very difficult to reach a national consensus on emission reduction as levels of emissions vary across provinces.

The other institutional constraint is conflict within the federal cabinet.⁸⁸ The federal cabinet can influence the negotiation of climate change policy and the choices made by political decision-makers. The cabinet, led by the Prime Minister, sets the government agenda and priorities.⁸⁹ The cabinet ministers debate issues and present the government's agenda in parliament. The ministers are therefore accountable to parliament for the governments' priorities and decisions. The conflict within the cabinet can strain the decision making process of the government. Although there is disagreement within cabinet, the idea of cabinet solidarity ensures that once a consensus is reached behind closed doors all cabinet ministers will publicly support the initiative.⁹⁰ If cabinet ministers disagree of a policy proposal, the Prime Minister can ask that

⁸⁷ Harrison, *Ideas and Self-Interest*, 174-175.

⁸⁸ Ibid, 176.

⁸⁹ Privy Council Office, *About Cabinet*. <http://www.pco-bcp.gc.ca> (Accessed April 2, 2016)

⁹⁰ Vogt, Paul. "The Manitoba Cabinet" in *Manitoba Politics and Government: Issues, Institutions, and Traditions*. Ed. Curtis Brown and Paul G. Thomas. (Winnipeg MB: University of Manitoba Press, 2010) 183-190.

the minister who introduced the item work with those that oppose it to reach a consensus.⁹¹ Because disagreements happen behind closed doors, it is rare that the public can view these disagreements.

Among the most discussed topics in the literature on Canadian climate change policy is the Kyoto Protocol. It provides an intriguing case to examine the various domestic constraints on foreign policy positions. Douglas MacDonald and Heather Smith, in their outline of the formation and negotiation of the Kyoto Protocol argue that, as the Cold War drew to an end, the public's attention shifted to climate and environmental issues.⁹² Kim Richard Nossal describes this "domestication" of Canadian foreign policy as a shift in political focus from the international sphere to the domestic sphere. He states that the domestication process stemmed from the federal government's shift from 'high' politics to 'low' policy issues.⁹³ The federal government's agenda was no "longer dominated by war and peace, military or security but of "low" policy issues,"⁹⁴ including capital, debt, tariffs, trade and investment. He states that these low policy issues are more domestic than high politics. They impact the Canadian citizen much more than the 'high' politics of military and security.⁹⁵ This supports the framework used here to analyze domestic influences on the formulation of foreign policy agreements.

⁹¹ Ibid, 182.

⁹² MacDonald and Smith. *Promises Made, Promises Broken*, 358-360.

⁹³ Nossal, Kim Richard. "Analyzing Domestic Sources of Canadian Foreign Policy" in *Readings in Canadian Foreign Policy: Classic Debates and New Ideas*. ed. Duane Bratt and Christopher J. Kukucha. (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2007) 167.

⁹⁴ Ibid.

⁹⁵ Ibid.

Smith argues that climate change is rarely about the environment but more about economic competition. She also doubts that Canadians will voluntarily take the action to reduce emission.⁹⁶ If Canadians have to endure any kind of financial obligation or any economic impact, the likelihood of supporting the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions is low. The connection between the economy and climate change agreements can be seen in the negotiation of the Kyoto Protocol.

2.6 The Kyoto Protocol

The Kyoto Protocol was negotiated in 1997. The negotiation process consisted of more than 170 states and several hundred nongovernmental and intergovernmental organizations.⁹⁷ The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) provided the legal basis for the Kyoto Protocol in 1992.⁹⁸ Canada had been an active member in the international negotiations, but its policy was driven by the “concerns for potential negative economic impacts.”⁹⁹ As a result, Canada sought to reduce emissions at the lowest cost to domestic stakeholders. The Liberals under Prime Minister Jean Chrétien argued that the Kyoto Protocol would not impede economic growth and in fact there would be a 17.5 percent increase in economic growth over 8 years compared to the 18 percent if nothing was done.¹⁰⁰ The Chrétien

⁹⁶ Smith, *Political Parties and Canadian Climate Change Policy*, 60.

⁹⁷ Oberthür, Sebastian and Hermann E. Ott. *The Kyoto Protocol: International Climate Policy for the 21st Century* (New York, NY: Springer- Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 1999) 13.

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ Smith, Heather A. “Dollar Discourse: The Devaluation of Canada’s Natural Capital in Canadian Climate Change Policy” in *Canadian Environmental Policy: Context and Cases*, 2nd ed. ed. Debora L. VanNijnatten and Robert Boardman. (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2002) 286.

¹⁰⁰ Smith, *Political Parties and Canadian Climate Change Policy*, 54.

Government pushed the idea that Canada had a responsibility as a developed state to act first and address the climate change issue.¹⁰¹ Public opinion was largely in favour of reaching an agreement in Kyoto. The media provided significant coverage on the negotiations and environmental groups staged campaigns to gather support.¹⁰²

Throughout the debate on the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol in 2002, federal government daily tracking polls indicated a high level of public support for the Kyoto Protocol when asked close-ended questions.¹⁰³ Most people are in favour of protecting the environment, reducing emissions, and addressing climate change. Although there is support for environmental policy change, it remains a low priority, usually behind the economy.¹⁰⁴ With the economy as the major focus of government priorities, greenhouse gas emissions kept rising steadily. As of 2005, emissions were 24 percent above 1990 levels, or 30 percent above the Kyoto target.¹⁰⁵

The Kyoto Protocol was a contentious agreement that served to outline the difficulties in implementing climate change policy domestically. The movement in opposition to the Kyoto Protocol was largely based on the demand for a made-in-Canada approach that would be consistent with federalism. Most industrial associations criticised Kyoto for being rushed through ratification without proper consultation and without attempting to create a made-in-Canada approach.¹⁰⁶ Business coalitions and organizations that opposed the Kyoto Protocol included:

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ Harrison, *Ideas and Self-Interest*, 173.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵ Williston, *Moral Progress*, 155.

¹⁰⁶ Bjorn, Andrew et al. *Ratification of the Kyoto Protocol*, 96.

Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers, Canadian Energy Pipeline Association, Automotive Parts Manufacturers Association, Canadian Chemical Producers Association, Canadian Electricity Association, Canadian Steel Producers Association and many others.¹⁰⁷

These business associations had economic interests that would be impacted with the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol. It was believed that the only way that Canada could meet its commitment to the Kyoto Protocol was by cutting industries, and implementing regulation which could impede business. Business and economic interests competed with environmental interests to influence government decision-making.

A made-in-Canada approach would consider the international implications but would be designed, implemented and regulated by the provinces.¹⁰⁸ Smith states that several opponents to the Kyoto Protocol, including the province of Alberta and Stephen Harper, claimed that the economic impacts would outweigh the benefit done to the environment. The Alberta government claimed that trying to implement the Kyoto Protocol and reach the emission reduction requirements would cost the province 5.5 billion dollars in yearly GDP and approximately 70,000 jobs.¹⁰⁹ Nationwide, opponents to the Kyoto Protocol alleged that implementing the protocol and meeting the reduction requirements would cost between 23 and 40 billion dollars a year.¹¹⁰ As Canada's economy is in some respects aligned with the United States, the Kyoto Protocol was contingent on what the United States did.

¹⁰⁷ MacDonald, Douglas. *Business and Environmental Politics in Canada*. (Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Press, 2007) 1.

¹⁰⁸ Smith, *Political Parties and Canadian Climate Change Policy*, 53.

¹⁰⁹ Bjorn et al. *Ratification of the Kyoto Protocol*, 64.

¹¹⁰ Smith, *Political Parties and Canadian Climate Change Policy*, 53

Nossal states that “the Canadian government is assumed to have little autonomy vis-à-vis the international system: its decisions therefore are made within parameters set by external actors, notably the United States.”¹¹¹ When US President George W. Bush withdrew from Kyoto, it was widely assumed that Canada would follow.¹¹² There is much speculation as to why Canada remained in the Kyoto negotiations even after the United States withdrew. Canada had to remain competitive in the international system and had to maintain a strong economic relationship with the United States. Despite this, Canada remained party to the Kyoto Protocol after the United States withdrew. This allowed Canada to maintain its reputation as an international leader in environmental negotiations and ensure that they were committed to addressing climate change.¹¹³ Remaining in Kyoto would allow Canada to make sure the rules that were negotiated were in its favour. With the United States already out, even the threat of withdrawal from Canada could have allowed for some leverage in negotiations.¹¹⁴ The United States had already left the negotiations, and Canada, by threat of leaving, had some leverage in negotiations as well.

Simpson, Jaccard and Rivers claim that Canada’s continued role in the Kyoto Protocol was an attempt to show the world its moral superiority to the United States. Throughout the negotiations Canada promised slightly higher emissions reductions than that of the United States. The promises were only slightly ahead of the United States as Canada’s economy is so

¹¹¹ Nossal, *Domestic Sources*, 168.

¹¹² Harrison, *Ideas and Self-Interest*, 179.

¹¹³ Ibid.

¹¹⁴ Smith, *Political Parties and Canadian Climate Change Policy*, 51-52.

dependent on the United States. Harrison mentions that the United States accounts for approximately 80 percent of Canada's exports and about 70 percent of its imports.¹¹⁵

Despite the promise of a 6 percent reduction below 1990 levels by 2008 to 2012, the financial crisis in 2008 meant that climate change and the environment were no longer a primary focus in the government's agenda. As the public was more affected by the economic downturn, its focus remained on issues of taxation and employment.¹¹⁶

Williston mentions that Canada's policy towards climate change "requires re-evaluation of our character,"¹¹⁷ meaning that Canada is an international leader in many negotiations and Canadians view themselves as "humanitarian, internationalist, and socially progressive."¹¹⁸ Canada's climate change approach has shown strong international commitment consistent with its own self-image and national interest but lacks domestic implementation and does not meet its international promises. This contradiction in practice outlines the theory that will be applied to the analysis of both the Chrétien and Harper Governments. The level of analysis theory looks at how politics in the international sphere are connected to domestic politics. Andrew Baldwin and Simon Dalby state that:

assuming that environmental matters, specifically climate change, will continue to dominate international relations over the coming century alongside energy security, to rethink Canada's middle-power statue must also factor in some of the very basic environmental contradictions that undergird Canadian political

¹¹⁵ Harrison, *Ideas and Self-Interest*, 172.

¹¹⁶ Harrison, *Ideas and Self-Interest*, 173.

¹¹⁷ Williston, *Moral Progress*, 155.

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

economy ... in environmental matters, what Canada does at home is effectively international policy.¹¹⁹

2.7 Conclusion

The literature on climate change, Canada's climate change policy and level of analysis theory provide a foundation to analyse Canadian governments' approaches to climate change.

As discussed, there is a large body of work on international climate change negotiation but very little focuses on the domestic aspects of these agreements and the implementation. The literature largely views the state as a unitary actor working within the anarchical international system. The anarchic nature of international relations as well as the international aspect of climate change makes for difficult implementation domestically. The following chapter will provide a comparative analysis of the formulation of climate change policy by the Chrétien and Harper governments. The chapter will use the organizational model, governmental politics paradigm and levels of analysis theory to illustrate the domestic influence behind government decision-making, and will ask how this influence determines how the government weighs the costs and benefits of a policy within the national interest. It will show how different domestic politics influenced both the Chrétien and Harper government's environmental policy and how they interpreted the national interest.

¹¹⁹ Baldwin, Andrew and Simon Dalby. "Canadian Middle-Power Identity, Environmental Biopolitics, and Human Insecurity" in *Canada's Foreign and Security Policy: Soft and Hard Strategies of a Middle Power*, ed. Nik Hynek and David Bosold. (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2010) 123.

Chapter 3

Analysis

3.1 Introduction

This chapter will compare and contrast the Chrétien and Harper governments using Allison and Zelikow's rational actor model, organizational model, governmental politics model, and Putnam's levels of analysis theory. Robert Putnam's levels of analysis theory will be used to explain how bargaining among domestic constituents influence the states' ability to negotiate policies. Allison and Zelikow's rational actor model will be used to analyze how domestic politics determine the foreign policy options available, how governments weigh the costs and benefits of each option and ultimately arrive at a choice. The organizational model will make it possible to describe influences of domestic organizations on the formulation of foreign policy. The governmental politics model will illustrate how the policy output of a state is not only determined by cost-benefit analysis or by the organizations that make up the state but also by the bargaining between political players and their personal goals. The organizational and governmental politics models illustrate what influences a government decision. The rational actor model helps to illustrate the outcome of that influence.

The chapter will conclude with a discussion of Putnam's levels of analysis theory, which will further illustrate how domestic politics determine foreign policy by influencing the government's international bargaining position. Analyzing these approaches to policy development in the context of climate change will show that the various Canadian governments all developed their approach on the basis of domestic politics.

3.2 Rational Actor Model

The rational actor model is built upon and shows the outcome of the organizational model and the governmental politics model. Domestic constituents, organizations, individuals, provinces, and other political institutions create pressure on the government and therefore influence what choices the government has, how it defines national interest and how it weighs the costs and benefits of its decisions. Based on the organizational and governmental politics models, domestic politics seek to influence the government's policy approach and decisions but ultimately the government (as a rational actor) has the agency to make decisions based on the national interest. Applying the core concepts of the rational actor model to Canadian climate change policy creates a better understanding of both the Chrétien and Harper governments' differing approaches and how the governments came to make the decisions that they did. The Kyoto Protocol is a good example for analysis as it involves negotiation at both the international and domestic levels. It also illustrates the debate between environmental protection and economic security as the elements of the national interest.

The first core aspect involves goals and objectives. These goals are what the state views as being in the national interest and what strategic interests the state wants to achieve. The Kyoto Protocol illustrates the Chrétien and Harper governments' differing views of the national interest. We can see the intended national interest by examining the throne speeches under the Chrétien and Harper governments. In its throne speeches, the Chrétien government made a number of references to the environment as a source of national pride and suggested that Canada needed to play a leadership role internationally. The throne speeches do not directly translate to policy action but are indicative of the discourse on climate change policy.

The throne speech delivered in 1996 under the Chrétien government stated that “the quality of Canada’s natural environment is a matter of national pride. Security for Canadians means sustaining our environment.”¹²⁰ The speech went on to state that “the solution to many environmental problems lie outside our borders. The Government will continue to play an environmental leadership role both at home and in the international arena.”¹²¹ This reveals the position of environmental discourse that the Chrétien government. It pursued the Kyoto Protocol as a means to continue Canada’s leadership role on environmental issues. Further, in the midst of the Kyoto negotiations, the 1997 speech from the throne mentioned that “the government is committed to working in the international community to promote sustainable development and to achieve practical solutions to global environmental problems.”¹²² In the 1999 throne speech, the government identified that its priority would be to “work with other governments and citizens to meet our country’s commitment under the Kyoto Protocol.”¹²³ With the negotiations of the Kyoto Protocol over and the ratification impending, the Chrétien government affirmed the importance of the Kyoto Protocol and the need for Canada to meet its greenhouse gas emissions commitment. Further, the 2001 throne speech set out three environmental priorities; clean air, clean water and conservation of natural spaces. The Chrétien government stated in the speech that “Canada is blessed by the beauty of its vast landscape and the wealth of its natural resources. But with this blessing comes the responsibility to ensure its preservation. A healthy environment is an essential part of a sustainable economy and our quality of life.”¹²⁴ Clearly, the Chrétien

¹²⁰ Chrétien, Jean. *Speech from the Throne*. 35th Parl., 2nd Sess., 1996.

¹²¹ Ibid.

¹²² Chrétien, Jean. *Speech from the Throne*. 36th Parl., 1st Sess., 1997.

¹²³ Chrétien, Jean. *Speech from the Throne*. 36th Parl., 2nd Sess., 1999.

¹²⁴ Chrétien, Jean. *Speech from the Throne*. 37th Parl., 1st Sess., 2001.

government viewed Canada's national interest as protecting the environment and maintaining a strong leadership role in international negotiations.

The Harper government viewed the national interest in terms of economic stability and growth. As can be seen in the Harper government's throne speeches, the government tied environmental protection in with sustainable resource development. The 2007 speech from the throne acknowledged that the environment is essential to the quality of life but warned that "it is not widely understood that, because of inaction on greenhouse gases over the past decade, Canada's emissions cannot be brought to the level required under the Kyoto Protocol."¹²⁵ The Harper government intended to pursue a different approach and to move away from the Kyoto Protocol commitment. In the 2008 speech, the government stated that it understood that "Canada's economic prosperity cannot be sustained without a healthy environment, just as environmental progress cannot be achieved without a healthy economy." The speech went on to argue that "energy is vitally important to our country. Our geography and climate mean that Canadians depend on affordable and reliable energy."¹²⁶ The throne speeches from 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2013 made no mention of the environment or climate change. The focus of these speeches was on the economy. The government was focused on fiscal responsibility, balancing budgets, eliminating deficits, and national security, rather than environmental concerns. These speeches show that in the aftermath of the 2008 recession, the economy was a priority. The 2013 speech from the throne made no mention of climate change, but did mention responsible

¹²⁵ Harper, Stephen. *Speech from the Throne*. 39th Parl., 2nd Sess., 2007

¹²⁶ Harper, Stephen. *Speech from the Throne*. 40th Parl., 1st Sess., 2008.

resource development and extraction.¹²⁷ The indication here is that the Harper government was focused on the economic aspect of the environment, rather than the mitigation of climate change. The Harper government viewed the goals and objectives of Canada to be economic stability and sustainable domestic resource development, in contrast to the Chrétien government's internationalist view.

Domestic organizations and government departments can use polling and public interest to persuade the government to create a respective policy. Public opinion can play a major role in determining the national interest and influencing the decisions made by government. A party is only chosen to lead through a democratic vote, therefore the government needs to always consider the interests of public opinion. If the government does not consider public opinion, or implements policy initiatives that contradict what the public wants, it may translate into a loss in the next election. Therefore, public opinion is closely linked to national interest

Often public saliency, how important the public views an issue, and climate change initiatives are linked to economic interests. What the public views as important is often reflected in the government agenda. When the economy is strong, the public can focus on other areas of interest such as the environment. If the economy weakens, this becomes the focus of public attention and therefore the focus of the government. States are wary of agreements that could possibly have an impact on their domestic economic and global competition. Stuart Soroka states that since “only a finite number of issues can top the agenda at one time, environmental matters seem particularly prone to decline as economic issues (re)surface.”¹²⁸ Environment and climate

¹²⁷ Harper, Stephen. *Speech from the Throne*. 41th Parl., 2nd Sess., 2013

¹²⁸ Soroka, Stuart N. “Agenda-Setting and Issue Definition” in *Critical Policy Studies*. ed. Michael Orsini and Miriam Smith. (Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2007) 201.

change policy are often in conflict with economic development. When the focus is on the economy, matters of the environment and climate change become a lower priority. Harrison describes this relationship between the environment and the economy by outlining Canadian polls between 2006 and 2008. The environment was identified as the most important issue facing Canada by 26 percent of respondents in 2007. This number fell to 5 percent in December 2008, coinciding with the global economic crisis and rising gas prices.¹²⁹ In an IPSOS poll conducted in March, 2009, 71 percent of respondents stated that it is more important for government to focus on jobs than climate change.¹³⁰ The indication here is that, during a recession, the government should make the economy a priority, rather than focus on the environment. A similar poll conducted in 2010, after the economic crises had settled a little, showed that “Canadians want more action on the environment”¹³¹ and that 66 percent of respondents think that the government is paying too little attention to climate change.¹³² Naomi Klein argues that during economic recessions, there is a decrease in public “willingness...to bear the financial burden of responding to climate change.”¹³³ Although, the support for action in addressing climate change remains relatively high, and many individuals view climate change as an issue, the problem comes with asking the “least responsible for current conditions to bear the burden.”¹³⁴ As Klein asks after “paying for the crises of bankers with cuts to education, health care, and social service

¹²⁹ Harrison, *Ideas and Self-Interest in Canadian Climate Policy*, 173.

¹³⁰ Ipsos. *New Survey on Canadians' Views on Climate Change and the Economic Crisis*. <http://www.ipsos-na.com/news-polls/pressrelease.aspx?id=4302> (accessed Sept. 19, 2014)

¹³¹ Angus Reid Institute. *Canadians Want More Action on the Environment*. http://angusreid.org/canadians_want_more_action_on_the_environment/ (accessed Sept. 19, 2014)

¹³² Ibid.

¹³³ Klein, Naomi. *This Changes Everything*, 117-118.

¹³⁴ Ibid, 118.

safety nets, is it any wonder that a beleaguered public is in no mood to bail out the fossil fuel companies from the crisis that the not only created but continue to actively worsen?”¹³⁵

The next core aspects of the rational actor model are options and alternatives. Given the national interest, the rational actor determines the options available to him or her in order to achieve the goal. The goal that the government is pursuing must be in line with the national interest. With a number of policy options available to them, the government chooses the ones that enable it to directly achieve its goals. For example, the Chrétien government sought to achieve its goals in the national interest by continuing to negotiate and eventually ratify the Kyoto Protocol, despite not knowing how Canada could achieve the required reduction in emissions.¹³⁶

One of the Harper government’s options was to continue the internationalist approach put forward by the Chrétien government, despite arguing that achieving the reduction commitments would put pressure on the economy.¹³⁷ This would involve the continuation of the Kyoto Protocol and attempts at implementation. Another option was to take a more domestic approach and pursue a “made-in-Canada” policy. Rather than the international approach of the Kyoto Protocol, the domestic approach would have no international requirements and would focus solely on reducing greenhouse gas emission within Canadian borders. In their campaign platform “Stand Up for Canada,” the Harper Conservatives outlined their “made-in-Canada” approach to environmental policy. The platform provides a brief idea of what the approach involved,

¹³⁵ Ibid.

¹³⁶ Simpson, Jaccard and Rivers, *Hot Air*, 40, 60-61.

¹³⁷ See, Harrison, *Ideas and Self-Interest*, 184, Ormaechea, *Turning the Corner*, 332, and Simpson, Jaccard and Rivers, *Hot Air*, 92-93.

including: reducing pollutants in the air, addressing the issue of greenhouse gas emission, ensuring water quality by addressing environmental issues, cleaning up federal contaminated sites and requirements for cleaner fuel.¹³⁸

According to Allison and Zelikow's rational actor model, given the goals, objectives and options on a policy issue, the rational actor weighs the consequences of all the options.¹³⁹ The process of analyzing the consequences of each choice rests in weighing the costs and benefits.¹⁴⁰ The Chrétien government perceived there to be a number of benefits from remaining in the Kyoto Protocol, even though it likely had no intention of meeting the necessary reductions. Smith speculates why Canada remained in Kyoto negotiations even after the United States withdrew and Canada knew it would not meet the reduction requirements.¹⁴¹ Simpson, Jaccard and Rivers state that ratifying Kyoto would provide a number of benefits to Chrétien. He would differentiate Canada from the United States, the decision would be popular in Québec, and would be an essential part of his legacy.¹⁴² At this time, Chrétien popularity in Québec was at its peak. This combined with the "legalization of same-sex marriage, proposals to decriminalize marijuana, campaign finance reform, and keeping Canada out of the Iraq invasion" would silence his critics and cement his legacy. The costs associated with implementing the Kyoto Protocol

¹³⁸Conservative Party of Canada, *Stand Up for Canada*, Conservative Party of Canada Federal Election Platform. 2006.

¹³⁹ As the rational actor model indicates, there are a number of challenges to weighing the costs and benefits. For example, not all costs and benefits are known to the decision-maker. The rational actor model relies on perceived costs and benefits. Furthermore, the weight given to each cost and benefit relies heavily on the individual or group making the decision. No all perspectives are weighed equally.

¹⁴⁰ Allison and Zelikow, *Essence of Decision*, 24.

¹⁴¹ Smith, "Political Parties and Canadian Climate Change Policy" 51-52.

¹⁴² Simpson, Jaccard and Rivers, *Hot Air*, 71.

were lower, in the view of the Chrétien government, compared to the benefit of ratification. The costs included economic penalties in trying to implement the Kyoto Protocol and well as the international stigma of not meeting the agreed-upon reduction requirements. As discussed in the organizational model of government decision-making, the national interest is determined by bargaining between organizations, interest groups, and individuals. The domestic politics determined how the Chrétien government viewed the national interest and, in turn, what approach was taken.

In contrast, the Harper government came to a different conclusion which was a more domestic, Canadian approach to environmental policy and withdrew from the Kyoto Protocol. A 2002 poll found that the majority of Canadians supported the Kyoto Protocol, but when faced with a ‘made-in-Canada’ alternative, 49% supported a more domestic approach, rather than ratifying the Kyoto Protocol (43%).¹⁴³ The Chrétien government focused on the international aspect of the Kyoto Protocol, and the domestic pressures faced by the Chrétien government, and thus saw the benefits of ratifying the Kyoto Protocol outweighed the costs of that decision. The Harper government chose not to continue with the implementation process. Remaining in the Kyoto Protocol had the potential to be too much of an economic burden and, in the view of the Harper government, the costs outweighed the benefits. The “made-in-Canada” approach meant that Canada could control the economic impact of environmental policies, rather than align with international pressures. Canada could create and implement an environmental policy that would be specific to the needs of the country and its citizens, while not burdening economic growth. In

¹⁴³ Ipsos. *Support (74%) Remains High For Kyoto Protocol*. <http://www.ipsos-na.com/news-polls/pressrelease.aspx?id=1667> November 8, 2002. (accessed March 20, 2016)

a 2007 speech given in Berlin, Germany, Harper outlined the stance his government took on climate change and the role Canada would play. The speech argued that economics should be placed first in considering climate change policy. He stated that “indeed, it is no exaggeration to call Canada an ‘emerging energy superpower’ and a ‘global mining giant.’” Since Canada was an “emerging energy superpower,” Harper said that the government could do more to address climate change in constructing a plan that was “practical, achievable and affordable ... balanced and market-driven. A plan that deals with our growing economy and population.”¹⁴⁴ In this speech, Harper argued that meeting the required emission reduction of the Kyoto Protocol was impossible without “crippling the economy.”¹⁴⁵ This approach highlights the neoliberal approach to climate change policy. If any climate change policy were to be implemented, it would have to be consistent with economic growth and the market.

The final core aspect of the rational actor model is choice. Given the costs and benefits of each option, a choice is made to maximize the ability to achieve an original goal. Allison and Zelikow describe rational choice as “value-maximizing” in which “the rational agent selects the alternative whose consequences rank highest in terms of his goals and objectives.”¹⁴⁶ In the cases of Chrétien and Harper, the outcome of governments’ choices for implementation of climate change policy was voluntary. The voluntary approach had no legally binding requirement to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and corporations could choose to reduce their emissions on a voluntary basis. The Chrétien government ratified Kyoto but did little by way of implementation.

¹⁴⁴ Harper, *Prime Minister Stephen Harper Calls for International Consensus on Climate Change*. Speech. Berlin, Germany. 4 June 2007.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid.

¹⁴⁶ Allison and Zelikow, *Essence of Decision*, 24.

The Harper government withdrew from the protocol in favour of a voluntary “made-in-Canada” approach. This illustrates that the government has agency to choose its policy approaches despite the domestic pressures. Harper waited for the American response to climate change based on the idea that the North American economy is integrated. The Harper government’s domestic approach considered the direction that the United States took on environmental policy as well as an approach that would protect Canada’s economic interests. Ultimately, the Harper government had the ability to choose the policy approach within the parameters of domestic politics.

The Harper government was often criticized by the opposition parties and the media for waiting on the United States to respond and implement climate change policies.¹⁴⁷ Environment and Climate Change Canada argued that “the North American economy is integrated to the point where it makes absolutely no sense to proceed without harmonizing with the United States and aligning a range of principles, policies, regulations and standards.”¹⁴⁸ The United States government, as of 2010, has invested 8 times more per person than Canada towards renewable energy, energy efficiency and public transportation.¹⁴⁹ The problem is that both Canada and the United States need different climate change and environmental policies. Much of the United States’ energy is derived through coal, which is declining as a viable energy source. In contrast, Canada’s energy is largely from oil and gas, which is still continuing to rise.¹⁵⁰ Therefore,

¹⁴⁷ Partington, P.J. and Matthew Bramley. *Evaluation of the Government of Canada’s Greenhouse Gas Reduction Policies, Prepared for the Climate Change Performance Index 2012*. (The Pembina Institute. 2011) 12

¹⁴⁸ Environment Canada, *Climate Change: Canada’s Action on Climate Change*. 2009, NP.

¹⁴⁹ Greenpeace, *Energy [R]evolution: A Sustainable Energy Outlook for Canada*. 3rd Ed (2010) 22

¹⁵⁰ Ibid.

different energy policies are needed to address the different paths energy consumption is taking. This illustrates the importance of a “made-in-Canada” approach to climate change policy. Stuck between the influences of domestic politics and the United States economy, the Harper government had to consider all the options for policy implementation and the national interest.

Both the Chrétien and Harper governments faced different domestic pressures and public opinion. The Chrétien government enjoyed a relatively stable economy and therefore, public opinion on environmental issues and concerns increased. As seen in the polls stated earlier, public support for climate change mitigation is contingent on a strong economy. If the economy is weak, public support shifts to fixing that over climate change policy. Since the Harper government faced an economic recession, public interest was focused on maintaining the strength of the economy, rather than protecting the environment. In October 2009, employment was down 400,000 jobs across Canada compared to October 2008.¹⁵¹ The unemployment rate also rose from 6.3% to 8.6%.¹⁵² With the Canadian economy closely tied to the United States, the economic downturn in the U.S. had an impact on the economic strength of Canada. With job losses, mounting debt, and increased unemployment, Canadian citizens were focused on economic recovery rather than climate change. The Chrétien government faced a relatively stable economy and therefore could focus their attention on other matters such as environmental protection and the Kyoto Protocol. Leslie Pal discusses this post-materialist idea. He states that as citizens shift “away from concern with material gain, [and] economic issues” they become

¹⁵¹ LaRochelle-Côté, Sébastien and Jason Gilmore. “Canada’s Employment Downturn” in Statistics Canada *Perspectives on Labour and Income*. Vol. 10 No. 12. (2009) 5

¹⁵² Ibid.

more concerned with aspects such as individual potential, esteem, and belonging.¹⁵³ With economic security, people can shift their attention to post-materialistic aspects. The post-materialism shift can lead to an increase in discussion on rights. This can be seen in literature framing environmental protection as a human right.¹⁵⁴

As will be shown through levels of analysis, the choices the government makes in the formulation of policy are largely constrained by domestic politics and win-sets. The government faces a range of possible actions in climate change policy. This range is in the national interest, as a state would not implement a policy that is not in their best interest. It is also accepted by all domestic constituents and political actors, including government departments, stakeholders and interested organizations. Therefore, domestic politics does not force the government to take a particular path in policy formulation and implementation but limits their choices. Instead, as can be seen in the example of the different responses to the Kyoto Protocol, the government ultimately has the choice of policy within the parameters set by domestic politics.

3.3 Organizational Model

The organizational model recognizes that the state is a collection of different organizations and institutions each with their own separate goals. Allison and Zelikow describe organizational behaviour as “government behavior relevant to any important problem [that] reflects the

¹⁵³ Pal, Leslie A. *Beyond Policy Analysis: Public Issue Management in Turbulent Times*. 3rd ed. (Toronto, Ont.: Nelson, 2006) 64.

¹⁵⁴ See Thorne, Melissa. “Establishing Environment as a Human Right” in *Denver Journal of International Law and Policy*. Vol. 19, No. 2 (1991) 304-342 and Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. *Human Rights and the Environment*. <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Environment/HREnvironment/Pages/HRandEnvironmentIndex.aspx>

independent output of several organizations, partially coordinated by government leaders.”¹⁵⁵

There are a number of organizational concepts that Allison and Zelikow list: actors, factored problems, organizational missions, operational objectives, organizational output, central coordination and control, and decisions of government leaders.¹⁵⁶ Organizational missions, mandates and goals determine the influence that an organization has within government. These organizational concepts can determine the outcome of collective policy initiatives and approaches.

As with climate change policy, within the state there are a number of organizations and political actors that influence the national interest and ultimately the goals of the state. There are a number of groups that are involved in climate change policy. The prime minister, parliament, and government departments such as the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (now Global Affairs Canada) influence negotiations, while the provinces are responsible for the implementation of the agreements, and Natural Resources Canada for its research and advice. Section 92a of the Constitution Act, 1867 outlines the responsibility of the provincial governments to develop, conserve, and manage non-renewable resources.¹⁵⁷ The Constitution Act divides jurisdictional powers between the provincial and federal governments. The constitution limits the ability of the federal government to implement environmental policy domestically.

¹⁵⁵ LaRochelle-Côté, and Gilmore. *Canada's Employment Downturn*, 143.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibid*, 166-174.

¹⁵⁷ Constitution Act, 1867. Ss. 91-92, *VI – Distribution of Legislative Powers*.

Additionally, climate change policies affect forestry, transportation, agriculture, trade, and many other departments within the federal and provincial governments.¹⁵⁸ For example, the negotiation of the Kyoto Protocol included many federal departments such as: Environment and Climate Change Canada, Natural Resources Canada, Agriculture and Agri-food Canada, Department of Finance, Global Affairs Canada, Department of Justice, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Health Canada, Industry and Northern Affairs Canada, Innovation, Science and Economic Development Canada, National Defence, Public Works and Government Services Canada and Transport Canada.¹⁵⁹ These organizations each have specific terms that need to be met in order to accomplish its regulatory goals. Allison and Zelikow state that “each organization perceives problems, processes information, and performs a range of actions with considerable autonomy (within broad guidelines of national policy and numerous constraints).”¹⁶⁰ Therefore, this section will outline the numerous constraints placed upon various organizations that determine which goals are pursued. It will focus on organizations within the government, such as Environment and Climate Change Canada, and Natural Resource Canada, as well as organizations outside of the federal government. These outside organizations include those with business interests and various environmental organizations. Looking at these organizations will provide the best overview of how different goals and interests conflict within the state and how these conflicts influence the direction of foreign policy.

The hierarchical structure and bureaucratic nature of government departments influence the constraints placed upon government decision-making. At the head of the government department

¹⁵⁸ Bernstein, Steven. *International Institutions and the Framing of Canada's Climate Change Policy*, 81.

¹⁵⁹ Bjorn, Andrew et al. *Ratification of the Kyoto Protocol*, 53-54.

¹⁶⁰ Allison and Zelikow, *Essence of Decision*. 166.

is the deputy minister, who reports in turn to the minister. The ministers are all selected by the prime minister. The cabinet ministers, along with the prime minister, set the government agenda. They are then, in turn, held responsible by parliament for the government's decisions. While government departments do have some autonomy, they ultimately must conform to the governing party's platform and agenda. It is also important to note the difference between institutions and organizations. Institutions have more influence over government decision making than some organizations. Organizations operate within "the larger institutional framework in which institutions set the rules for political action."¹⁶¹ Institutional conventions provide the framework in which organizations operate, therefore there can be a difference in the power that institutions hold vis-à-vis organizations.

Environment and Climate Change Canada and Natural Resources Canada are good examples of organizations within the federal government that have distinct mandates and goals that often come into conflict with each other. These organizations play an important role in determining the implementation of climate change policy. Environment Canada (Now Environment and Climate Change Canada) was created in 1971 and has a number of responsibilities. Among these are the responsibility to preserve and enhance the quality of the natural environment, the conservation of renewable resources and water resources, and forecasting weather conditions and providing meteorological information.¹⁶² Environment and Climate Change Canada is also responsible for the coordination of environmental policies and programs for the federal government. They keep track of environmental indicators, create reports

¹⁶¹ Levasseur, Karine. "In the name of charity: Institutional support for and resistance to redefining the meaning of charity in Canada" in *Canadian Public Administration*. Vol. 55 No. 2 (2012) 199.

¹⁶² Environment Canada. *About Environment Canada: Mandate*.

through the Federal Sustainable Development Act, and provide research on climate change to help create policies for adaptation and mitigation.¹⁶³ Within Environment and Climate Change Canada, there are a number of departments that deal with climate change research and policy. The Climate Change Bureau has the responsibility of developing climate change policies for Environment and Climate Change Canada.¹⁶⁴ The International Relations Directorate ensures that international and domestic policies are consistent. This is important when the negotiation and implementation of environmental policies is the responsibility of different departments. The directorate also supports Environment and Climate Change Canada within the United Nations and other international organizations, and manages bilateral relations on the environment working closely with the Global Affairs Canada.¹⁶⁵ Environment and Climate Change Canada also has an Economic Issues Branch that provides analysis of the economic effects of environmental issues.¹⁶⁶ While conserving and protecting Canada's natural resources, Environment and Climate Change Canada "continues to balance the need to protect the environment while growing the economy."¹⁶⁷ This illustrates the struggle between environmental protection and economic growth and how governmental departments can influence this balance.

Natural Resources Canada was established in 1994, under the Chretien Liberals, when its mandate was shifted out from the Geological Survey of Canada. The department's main goal is to help ensure the sustainable development of natural resources in Canada. It does this by

¹⁶³ Ibid.

¹⁶⁴ Bjorn, Andrew et al. *Ratification of the Kyoto Protocol*, 54.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid, 55.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid, 56

¹⁶⁷ Environment Canada. *About Environment Canada: Mandate*.

conducting research in the areas of energy, forestry, minerals and metals. The department focuses on land development, sustainability, and energy efficiency.¹⁶⁸ Again, the balance between the economy and environmental protection is important. The sustainable development of natural resources must consider the economy and the jobs associated with the extraction of natural resources as well as the long-term impact on the environment.

Smith uses these two departments as an example of how organizations within the federal government are often at odds and therefore a consensus within the government on the approach to take to address climate change is difficult to achieve.¹⁶⁹ She argues that there is an inherent difference between the mandates of Environment and Climate Change Canada and Natural Resources Canada that create conflict: Environment and Climate Change Canada is responsible for the preservation and conservation of natural resources, while Natural Resources Canada is responsible for the use and development of natural resources. The difference between preservation/conservation and use/development often causes tension that comes from disparate goals.

Bernstein also describes the relationship Environment and Climate Change Canada and Natural Resources Canada have with regard to climate change policy. He argues that Environment and Climate Change Canada has taken the lead on climate change initiatives and is often considered the global advocate for climate change action. In contrast, Natural Resources Canada leads on domestic implementation and is focused on the economic aspects and the

¹⁶⁸ Natural Resources Canada. *About us*. <https://www.nrcan.gc.ca/department> (accessed Feb. 24, 2014)

¹⁶⁹ Smith, Heather A. "Stopped Cold: Action by Canada on climate change has been blocked by opposition both inside and outside government" in *Policy Alternatives*. Vol. 24 No.4 (Fall 1998) NP.

extraction of energy and resources.¹⁷⁰ In other words, the mandate for Environment and Climate Change Canada is to “preserve and enhance the quality of the natural environment ... conserve Canada’s renewable resources ... coordinate environmental policies and programs for the federal government.”¹⁷¹ In comparison, Natural Resources Canada outlines its goals as to “enhance responsible development and use of Canada’s natural resources and the competitiveness of Canada’s natural resources products.”¹⁷² The debate between conservation and economic development is the key in the implementation of climate change policy.

The tensions between these two departments are sometimes made explicit by the ministers involved in creating policies. For example, on October 29, 2002 Conservative MP John Reynolds illustrated the conflict between departments. He brought to attention the fact that the Natural Resource Minister, Herb Dhaliwal, stated that nuclear generated electricity can seriously fight climate change. In contrast, the Environment Minister, David Anderson, said nuclear energy will not be considered.¹⁷³ While still members of the same party and working towards mitigating climate change, these two ministers had conflicting ideas as to how it was to be achieved and differing ideas of the direction that the government should take. One viewed nuclear electricity as important in mitigating the effects of climate change, while the other would not even consider nuclear energy as an option. The drawbacks and benefits of nuclear energy on the environment is a contested issue that highlighted the strategic and operational tensions between Environment and Climate Change Canada and Natural Resources Canada. As stated earlier, the conflict within

¹⁷⁰ Bernstein, *International Institutions and the Framing of Canada’s Climate Change Policy*, 81.

¹⁷¹ Environment Canada, *Mandate*.

¹⁷² Natural Resources Canada. *About Us*.

¹⁷³ Canada. Parliament. House of Commons. *Debate*, 37th Parliament. 2nd Session. October 29, 200 2.

cabinet remains behind closed doors and rarely becomes public. The cabinet must uphold consensus on policy issues to maintain the confidence of parliament and remain in power.¹⁷⁴

While this disagreement became public, it is just an example of the type of disagreement that can happen within cabinet until a consensus is reached by all minister.

In addition to the conflict within federal departments, there is also conflict between organizations outside of the government that frame government actions. In particular, there is conflict between business interests and various environmental organizations. Often policies that promote the economy and the environment are viewed as mutually exclusive.¹⁷⁵ There is a wide continuum of organizations that view the economy as more important than the environment and the environment as more important than the economy, but the goals and interests of the various business and environmental groups compete to get their interests on the government agenda. Harrison explains the perceived “job-versus-environment” trade-off in which protection of the environment means cuts in profit and employment opportunities. In order to achieve the commitments agreed to in the Kyoto Protocol, there needed to be cuts made by the resource extraction business community. Continued “business-as-usual” would only increase greenhouse gas emissions as the population and economy continues to grow.¹⁷⁶ Environmental groups

¹⁷⁴ See Vogt, Paul. “The Manitoba Cabinet” in *Manitoba Politics and Government: Issues, Institutions, and Traditions*. Ed. Curtis Brown and Paul G. Thomas. Winnipeg MB: University of Manitoba Press, 2010

¹⁷⁵ See Harrison, Kathryn “The Struggle of Ideas and Self-Interest in Canadian Climate Policy” in *Global Commons, Domestic Decisions: The Comparative Politics of Climate Change*. ed. Kathryn Harrison and Lisa McIntosh Sundstrom Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press, 2010

¹⁷⁶ Harrison, *Struggle of Ideas and Self-Interest in Canadian Climate Change Policy*. 171

asserted that “mitigation measures were not only necessary but politically popular and economically feasible.”¹⁷⁷

A significant example of this can be demonstrated by looking at the effects of the oil and gas industry in Canada. When a large portion of the economy relies on oil and gas, in this instance a particularly ‘dirty’ form of hydrocarbon, a growing economy means more greenhouse gas emissions and therefore a need to reduce more.¹⁷⁸ Both business and environmental organizations play fundamental roles in influencing the government’s approach to climate change policy. During the Kyoto negotiations, for example, business coalitions argued that ratification of the protocol would cost \$40 billion and more than 450,000 jobs, and this loss would hurt the Canadian economy.¹⁷⁹ These coalitions included the Canadian Council for Chief Executives, Canadian Manufacturers and Exporters, the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, and the Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers.¹⁸⁰ According to the Canadian Chamber of Commerce, Canada’s oil sands accounted for one-third of economic growth in Canada in 2010 and 2011.¹⁸¹ They also stated that this growth has created benefits that spread outside of Alberta and across Canada. This includes growth in manufacturing, finance, and employment.¹⁸² According to industry lobby groups, outside of Alberta, between 2010 and 2035, the oil sands will have generated \$63 billion dollars for Ontario and \$28 billion dollars for British

¹⁷⁷ Ibid.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid, 180.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid, 172.

¹⁸¹ The Canadian Chamber of Commerce. *Is Canada Suffering From Dutch Disease?* (Policy Brief, 2012) 7

¹⁸² Ibid

Colombia.¹⁸³ It will also contribute \$14 billion for Québec, \$5 billion for Saskatchewan, and \$4 billion for Manitoba.¹⁸⁴ Industry lobbies promoted a strong economic incentive to extract natural resources as the benefits were weighed against the environmental costs. These numbers show the economic benefits spread across provinces, while certain provinces would be more responsible for the burden of economic costs in environmental protection. In 2015, with the fall in oil prices, the industry revenue was around \$90 billion down from \$148 billion in 2014.¹⁸⁵

In opposition to the business coalitions, fighting for the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol was a coalition of environmental organizations. These organizations included the Sierra Club of Canada, the David Suzuki Foundation and the Pembina Institute.¹⁸⁶ Harrison noted that the environmental organizations were very influential but “their resources and access paled in comparison to those of their opponents in the business community.”¹⁸⁷ The business community and their allies have more resources to invest in lobbying government directly, while environmental organizations had to resort to influencing public opinion.

Despite the concern from the business sector, the Kyoto Protocol was ratified as a result of pressures from environmental groups, public opinion, and parliament as a political institution. The government ultimately had the agency to choose the direction of policy it wanted to take but had to consider domestic influences. Conflict between federal departments and domestic

¹⁸³ Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers. *Economic Contributions*. <http://www.oilsandstoday.ca/ENERGYECONENVIRON/Pages/EconomicContribution.aspx> (Accessed May 16, 2015)

¹⁸⁴ Ibid.

¹⁸⁵ Millington, Dinara. *CERI Commodity Report – Crude Oil*. Canadian Energy Research Institute. January 2016.

¹⁸⁶ Harrison, *Struggle of Ideas and Self-Interest in Canadian Climate Change Policy*. 172.

¹⁸⁷ Ibid.

constituents provide the parameters for acceptable policy formulation. Federal departments disagree on the policy direction based on mandate and interests, as do domestic organizations and institutions. This influences government decision-making and the approach government takes in addressing climate change. The different influences these domestic constituents had on the Canadian government created the parameters for climate change policy. During the Chrétien government, this was the negotiation and ratification of the Kyoto Protocol and during the Harper government, this was the withdrawal from Kyoto and a domestic approach to climate change policy. This is demonstrated with the conflict between business and environmental interests. Although the Kyoto Protocol was ratified, the oil and gas industry continued to lobby the government and negotiate the terms of the implementation of the protocol.¹⁸⁸ If business interests could not stop the Protocol from being ratified, they could influence how it was going to be implemented, thereby protecting their economic interests. When business and environmental interests clash, the government must often compromise and choose a policy that takes some of the concerns from both sides into consideration. In this regard, the Chrétien government appeared to have placated the environmental groups by ratifying the Kyoto Protocol, but allowed business groups to have some flexibility by failing to provide information on implementation. Therefore, the environmental groups had the benefit of Canada's ratification of the Kyoto Protocol, and business groups had benefit of business-as-usual without any implementation.

Both the Chrétien and Harper governments tried to illustrate the mutual dependency of the economy and the environment through the exploitation of natural resources. In order to placate the interests of business groups and environmental organizations, the Chrétien and Harper

¹⁸⁸ MacDonald, *Business and Environmental Politics in Canada*, 2

governments leaned towards business interests, while continuing a voluntary environmental approach. Additionally, both the Chrétien and Harper governments made significant cuts towards environmental regulation and spending, although the Harper government made much more drastic cuts. As a result of such cuts, the Chrétien government could not meet the commitments of the Kyoto Protocol.¹⁸⁹

For the Harper government, the balance between economic and environmental interests always leaned toward the economic. Harper has a background in economics and has always maintained the importance of a strong economy. The Harper government framed the significance of climate change in relation to the economy and how it would affect business interests. Further, the Harper government took this domestic approach after observing the criticisms that the Chrétien government faced in regards to the Kyoto protocol. As most business associations and organizations criticized the Chrétien government for rushing into the Kyoto Protocol and not attempting to implement a made-in-Canada policy,¹⁹⁰ the Harper government sought to adopt a made-in-Canada approach that would allow for more input from the business coalitions and organizations to mitigate climate change while not harming their businesses. The omnibus budget bill passed in 2012 was entitled the “Jobs, Growth, and Long Term Prosperity Act”, which gutted or openly circumscribed multiple pieces of environmental legislation, clearly indicates the importance the government placed on the economy and economic growth.

The Act included a number of cuts to environmental regulation, conservation and assessment including cuts and changes to the Environmental Assessment Act, Species at Risk

¹⁸⁹ Smith, *Political Parties and Canadian Climate Change Policy*, 50

¹⁹⁰ Bjorn, Andrew et al. *Ratification of the Kyoto Protocol*, 96.

Act, Fisheries Act, National Energy Board Act, and Navigable Waters Act.¹⁹¹ The omnibus bill also saw the withdrawal of Canada from the Kyoto Protocol and the cessation of the National Roundtable on the Environment and Economy (NRTEE),¹⁹² which was an independent agency that advised the Canadian government on sustainable development and environmental issues since 1993. Finally, the Act reduced public participation in environmental assessment. This meant that assessments moved away from independent and impartial boards to the Prime Minister's Office.¹⁹³ Ultimately, this meant that the Prime Minister and the Government of Canada had more input into the environmental assessment of projects and therefore more control over the project and the reasonable limits of the impacts the projects would have on the environment. This means that there was a consolidation of power to the Prime Minister and Government, rather than the wider public. This consolidation can hurt the democratic process of environmental assessment by having less input from outside sources.

According to the organizational model, the provinces also provide a constraint on the policy making process. As mentioned earlier, the provinces hold the responsibility of implementing environmental policy. The relationship between the federal government, the Prime Minister and the provinces is important in the policy process. First Ministers Conferences are held with all the provincial premiers and the Prime Minister. Between 1993 and 2003, the Chrétien Government held 7 conferences that discussed the economy, jobs, healthcare, climate change and cooperation between the levels of government. In comparison, Harper has held only 2 conferences to discuss

¹⁹¹ MacNeil, Robert. "Canadian Environmental Policy under Conservative Majority Rule" in *Environmental Politics*. Vol. 23 No. 1 (2014) 175-176

¹⁹² Ibid.

¹⁹³ Ibid, 176.

the economy (2008 and 2009),¹⁹⁴ while Brian Mulroney held 14 between 1985 and 1992, and Pierre Trudeau held 23 conferences during his time as Prime Minister.¹⁹⁵ Furthermore, under the Harper government, there has been a growing rift between the provinces and the federal government. As of the 2015 federal election, there were only two conservative premiers, Paul Davis of Newfoundland and Labrador, and Christy Clark in British Columbia. It is speculated that the Harper government was not holding first ministers conferences, nor accepting invitations to meetings between the premiers, because there was a fear that the federal government and the prime minister would be ganged up against by the provincial leaders, and that the premiers would just ask for more money.¹⁹⁶ It would have been much harder for Harper to control the group of premiers and this creates difficulty in implementing any sort of environmental policy. As environmental policy requires cooperation between all levels of government, any disagreement between the levels makes implementation difficult. If the federal government disagrees with the provinces' implementation, the federal government might not meet its international obligations. Both levels of government influence the other's ability to make policy decisions and therefore both must work together in order to negotiate and implement pragmatic environmental policy. This cooperation did not happen with the Harper government, and therefore, the provinces were responsible for implementing their own environmental policies and regulations.

¹⁹⁴ McKenna, Peter. "It's beyond time for Harper to call a First Minister's Conference" in *Globe and Mail*. Dec. 10, 2014.

¹⁹⁵ Canadian Intergovernmental Conference Secretariat. *First Minister' Conferences 1906-2004*.

¹⁹⁶ McKenna, Peter. *It's beyond time for Harper to call a First Minister's Conference*. Dec. 10, 2014.

The Canadian Energy Strategy is the provinces' attempt at implementing an environmental and sustainable energy policy.¹⁹⁷ The provinces have been negotiating the details of the agreements since 2012, without the federal government. It is a strategy to sustainably develop and distribute oil from Alberta, while protecting the environment.¹⁹⁸ Among its objectives, the Canadian Energy Strategy seeks to strengthen the Canadian economy, create jobs, address climate change, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and promote a competitive economy through investment in technology "that can contribute to the breadth of Canada's energy and environmental opportunities and responsibilities."¹⁹⁹ These objectives illustrate the line between promoting the economy and mitigating climate change. The sustainable development of Canada's oil and gas sectors would allow these sectors to prosper and create jobs, while protecting the environment from undue harm. The provinces can implement strong environmental policies that address the respective provinces' specific needs. For example, Alberta and Saskatchewan address the environmental impact of the oil and gas industries, British Columbia addresses the environmental impact of the logging industry, and Ontario addresses the impact of manufacturing.

The Canadian Energy Strategy shows that by implementing its own environmental policy, the provinces can push the federal government into responding. The Justin Trudeau government has attempted to build a working relationship with the provinces to mitigate climate change. His

¹⁹⁷ Council of the Federation. *Canadian Energy Strategy*. (July 2015) 4.

¹⁹⁸ Thomson, Graham. "Premiers will gleefully bash Stephen Harper in absentia" in *National Post*. July 16, 2015.

¹⁹⁹ Council of the Federation. *Canadian Energy Strategy*. (July 2015) 11

approach is to build upon the work that the provinces have done.²⁰⁰ This acknowledges the important role the provinces play in implementing climate change policy, and the unique challenges that face each province. The Chrétien government chose to ratify the Kyoto Protocol while not having a plan for the provinces and implementation. The Harper government chose to focus on a voluntary domestic approach that largely did not involve cooperation with the provinces. For the most part, the provinces do not need the Canadian government to act on policy, they can implement their own, but the Canadian government does need the provinces in order to implement any nationwide policy, and to meet any international agreement. Under the Harper government it was up to the provinces to initiate climate change policy within their borders. The relationship between the federal government and the provinces serves to demonstrate the power that domestic politics have over government decision-making. Compared with the United States, the Canadian federal government has much more centralized power, and therefore, has greater ability to negotiate and ratify international agreements. In the United States, individual states have the ability to veto ratification, whereas the provinces do not. The Canadian provinces influence the federal government at the implementation of an environmental policy.²⁰¹ The Canadian government can negotiate and ratify any agreement, yet the provinces hold the power of implementation. It is at this point in the policy process that the provinces can greatly influence the federal government's policy approach. Domestic organizations can put pressure on the federal government by negotiating and bargaining with the federal government, but ultimately it is the federal government that makes the final policy decisions.

²⁰⁰ Prime Minister of Canada. *Communiqué of Canada's First Ministers Conference*. <http://pm.gc.ca/eng/news/2016/03/03/communique-canadas-first-ministers> March 3 2016 (accessed April 12, 2016)

²⁰¹ Harrison *The Road Not Taken*, 97-98.

3.4 Governmental Politics Model

The governmental politics model looks at foreign policy output not only as the weighing of costs and benefits or as the collective goals of state organizations, but also as bargaining games. The players within these bargaining games will act according to “various conceptions of national, organizational, and personal goals; players who make government decisions not by a single, rational choice but by the pulling and hauling that is politics.”²⁰² Allison and Zelikow argue that to understand a government’s decision on a particular policy approach, “it is necessary to identify the games and players, to display the coalitions, bargains, and compromises, and to convey some feel for the confusion.”²⁰³ This means that domestic politics and bargaining influence the outcome of foreign policy initiatives. The core elements of the governmental politics model include the political players, what shapes the players’ positions, and the nature of the game. The ‘game’ is essentially the government’s ability to accommodate requests from domestic constituents and set the government’s agenda. This model of analysis can be applied to Canada’s climate change approach. The major individual players in climate change negotiations are the prime minister, departmental ministers and the provincial premiers. Their goals, perceptions, interests, and priorities are all shaped by the domestic political environment. Each individual belongs to a number of different organizations and affiliations. As stated earlier, some of these may have competing values and interests. Therefore, the individual’s decisions can be influenced by the organizations to which they belong.

In the case of climate change policy in Canada, the individual players are the prime minister and the environment minister, who each play an integral part of the decision making process and

²⁰² Allison and Zelikow, *Essence of Decision*. 255.

²⁰³ Ibid, 257.

influence the direction Canada will take with climate change policy. Their positions on policy initiatives are influenced by their priorities, goals, interests, stakes and deadlines. These priorities, goals and interests are influenced in turn by domestic politics, more specifically the public, interests groups, government and nongovernmental organizations, and municipal governments. To navigate through these various influences involves some political bargaining. This section will discuss the individual positions of Prime Ministers Chrétien and Harper on the economy and environmental policy. It will then look at the rules of this bargaining game and how it is played out among the various individuals and organizations including government agencies and non-governmental organizations (NGO's). Finally, it will expand on how federalism affects this bargaining.

The Chrétien government's climate change policy involved the pursuit of international consensus. Chrétien was concerned with Canada's role as an international leader in climate change policy. Staying in the Kyoto negotiations, even as the United States withdrew and knowing that Canada could not possibly meet the reduction requirements, was viewed as giving the Chrétien government more bargaining power within the international community and ensure that the outcome of the negotiations were in Canada's favour.²⁰⁴ As Alberta feared that they would bear an unreasonable amount of the costs associated with reducing emissions, it is reasonable to suggest that Harper's decision to withdraw from the Kyoto Protocol was influenced, at least in part, by his history in Alberta and his greater personal connection to the economy there. In 2002, the Alberta government launched a \$1.5 million publicity campaign to

²⁰⁴ Smith, *Canadian Parties and Climate Change Policy*, 51-52.

show their opposition to the Kyoto Protocol.²⁰⁵ Then Manitoba Premier Gary Doer was quoted as saying “we’re going to have David versus Goliath in this debate. We’re going to have the people of Canada who want this accord, who want to take action on climate change, being David and Goliath is obviously Alberta with its money and its resources.”²⁰⁶ Nevertheless, at the time of the Kyoto negotiations, the Chrétien government stated that it would pursue climate change policy as long as it did not create an economic burden for Alberta.²⁰⁷

Much of the political bargaining is done within cabinet, whereas parliament provides the forum for debating and discussing policy. Parliament also provides the opportunity for opposition parties to question the government on policy and its intentions. For ratification of the Kyoto Protocol to occur there was bargaining within the cabinet and parliament. Concerns on the process of ratification and implementation are voiced within parliament but ultimately it is up to the cabinet to ratify the agreement. During the parliamentary discussion of the Kyoto Protocol, the Canadian Alliance (precursor to the modern Conservative Party), led by Stephen Harper, vocalized opposition to Chrétien’s policy. On November 25, 2002, Harper criticized the Chrétien government and stated that before the Kyoto Protocol was ratified, there should be a specific implementation plan. Harper said that the “government admitted that it had no idea how the accord would be implemented.”²⁰⁸ He argued that the Kyoto Protocol was Chrétien’s “sad hunt

²⁰⁵ CBC News. “Alberta Launches Campaign against Kyoto” *CBC News*. <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/alberta-launches-campaign-against-kyoto-1.349305> Sept. 18, 2002, (Accessed April 12, 2016).

²⁰⁶ As quoted in CBC News. “Alberta Launches Campaign against Kyoto” *CBC News*. <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/alberta-launches-campaign-against-kyoto-1.349305> Sept. 18, 2002, (Accessed April 12, 2016).

²⁰⁷ Simpson, Jaccard, and Rivers, *Hot Air*, 54.

²⁰⁸ Canada. Parliament. House of Commons. *Debate*, 37th Parliament. 2nd Session. November 25, 2002.

for a legacy.”²⁰⁹ Without an implementation plan, the government did not know how much the Kyoto Protocol would cost, nor did they know whether or not the requirements could be met.

However, at the time of the Kyoto ratification, the Chrétien Liberals formed a majority government. This meant that any bargaining between the Liberal government and the opposition parties or interests groups was in the former’s favour. Chrétien’s bargaining power was also increased by the knowledge that he was to retire soon. Therefore, he had less incentive to negotiate with the other parties, as he would not be Prime Minister much longer. Chrétien could also pass on the responsibility for determining the nature of the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol to the next prime minister and governing party. They would be the ones charged with finding a way to implement the agreement so that they could meet the international requirements and show the international community its commitment to mitigating climate change. In this way, Chrétien could show his support for environmental regulation and the mitigation of climate change, while not upsetting business coalitions and opponents of the Kyoto Protocol with the costs of implementation. The majority of the Liberal Party caucus supported Paul Martin as Chrétien’s successor and did not want to face another election with Chrétien as leader.

On December 10, 2002, with majority support in parliament, a vote was passed calling on the cabinet to ratify the Kyoto Protocol.²¹⁰ With Chrétien’s imminent retirement, many argued, including the opposition, that the Kyoto Protocol was part of his legacy as Prime Minister.²¹¹ Therefore, Chrétien moved forward with the ratification despite knowledge of the economic

²⁰⁹ Ibid.

²¹⁰ Harrison, *Struggle of Ideas and Self-Interest in Canadian Climate Change Policy*. 181.

²¹¹ Simpson, Jaccard and Rivers, *Hot Air*. 71.

costs and the faint possibility of meeting the reduction targets.²¹² He could ratify the Kyoto Protocol to cement his legacy as a champion for environmental protection while passing on the costs of implementation to the subsequent government. Another aspect that influenced Chrétien's bargaining position was the fact that he was from Québec. Québec is an important province for the Liberal Party and Chrétien. The rise of the Parti Québécois and the 1995 separatist referendum threatened the Chrétien government as the Prime Minister was very vocal against the separation movement in Québec.²¹³ The Kyoto negotiations played an integral part in the Chrétien government winning back the support of Québec. Throughout the Kyoto negotiations, Québec and Manitoba were the only provinces to show support. Hydroelectricity is an important commodity in those provinces and implementing the Kyoto Protocol would increase not only the importance of hydroelectricity within the provinces but also the provinces within the country.²¹⁴ Québec and Manitoba would become more important through their export of hydroelectricity to other provinces as the energy sector starts to rely on it more. Therefore, these provinces had an economic interest in pursuing the protocol.

The Harper government also faced a much different parliament than did the Chrétien government, as Harper won the 2006 federal election and formed a minority government. Chrétien won the 1997 federal election with 51 percent of the seats (155 out of a possible 301).²¹⁵ At the time of the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol in 2002, Chrétien held 172 out of

²¹² Ibid.

²¹³ Whitaker, Reg. "The Chrétien Legacy" in *Review of Constitutional Studies*. Vol. 9, No. 1 & 2 (2004) 12-14.

²¹⁴ Harrison, *Struggle of Ideas and Self-Interest in Canadian Climate Change policy*. 180.

²¹⁵ Elections Canada. *Thirty-sixth General Election 1997: Official Voting Results: Synopsis*. <http://www.elections.ca/content.aspx?section=res&dir=rep/off/dec3097&document=synopsis06&lang=e> (accessed April 12, 2016)

301 (57 percent) seats.²¹⁶ This represents a strong majority. When Harper was elected in 2006, the Conservative Party of Canada won 40 percent of the seats (124 of 308 seats).²¹⁷ It was not until 2011 that Harper won a majority with 53 percent (166 of 308 seats).²¹⁸ In December 2011, the Harper government withdrew from the Kyoto Protocol.

Bargaining within parliament as a minority government is much different than with a majority, and the Harper government needed the support of the opposition parties in order to pass legislation. As stated, the Harper government won the 2006 election with 124 seats. The Liberal Party won 103, the Bloc Québécois won 53, the National Democratic Party won 29, and there was 1 independent.²¹⁹ Therefore, the government had more constraints and influences on the formulation of policy. Any policy that the Harper government wanted to pass had to compromise with the opposition parties. At the time of election, the Harper government was opposed to Kyoto, and in the 2006 throne speech made no mention of climate change or environmental issues. There was only a brief mention of making a living off of natural resources and agriculture.²²⁰ This indicates that at the time of Harper's election, the environment was not an

²¹⁶ Elections Canada. *Thirty-seventh General Election 2000: Official Voting Results: Synopsis*. <http://www.elections.ca/content.aspx?section=res&dir=rep/off/37g&document=synopsis06&lang=e> (accessed April 12, 2016)

²¹⁷ Elections Canada. *Official Voting Results: Thirty-ninth General Election 2006*. <http://www.elections.ca/scripts/OVR2006/default.html> (accessed April 12, 2016)

²¹⁸ Elections Canada. *Official Voting Results: Forty-first General Election 2011*. <http://www.elections.ca/scripts/ovr2011/default.html> (accessed April 12, 2016)

²¹⁹ Elections Canada. *Official Voting Results: Thirty-ninth General Election 2006*. <http://www.elections.ca/scripts/OVR2006/default.html> (accessed April 12, 2016)

²²⁰ Harper, *Speech from the Throne*, 2006.

issue high on the government's agenda; rather, stabilizing the economy was of primary importance.

Harrison states that “the Conservative government of Stephen Harper has faced pressure for action on climate change from a relatively unified opposition.”²²¹ This unified opposition came from the support for the Kyoto Protocol from the Liberal Party, the National Democratic Party and the Bloc Québécois. In order to pass any environmental policy or legislation, the minority Conservative Party needed the support of some of the members of the other parties. The minority government, facing this opposition, was pressured into addressing climate change and climate change policy. Therefore, the domestic politics within parliament determined the approach the government would take in addressing climate change. Here, the Harper government faced growing pressure from the opposition.²²² In order for the Harper government to pass legislation, and eventually form a majority government, the Conservative Party of Canada needed to win over Québec.²²³ The government knew that meeting the emission reductions agreed to with Kyoto was impossible, but with the pressure placed upon it, the government had to respond. The Harper government then pursued the aforementioned “made-in-Canada” approach to climate change policy outlined in its 2006 election platform. This allowed for the federal government to address climate change voluntarily, without concern for the targets set in the Kyoto Protocol.

It is important to recognize the rules in the bargaining agreements and the constraints placed upon the players. These rules are related to the domestic determinants of Canada's foreign policy

²²¹ Harrison, *Struggle of Ideas and Self-Interest in Canadian Climate Change Policy* 176.

²²² Ibid, 170.

²²³ Smith, Heather A. *Political Parties and Canadian Climate Change Policy*, 58

approaches. Allison and Zelikow explain that the rules for the bargaining game “stem from the Constitution, court interpretation, executive orders, conventions, and even culture.”²²⁴ The executive and the constitutional division of jurisdictions between the provinces and the federal government have an important impact on the formulation of climate change policy. The constitutional jurisdictions give the provinces a position to bargain with the federal government. The informal rules of the bargaining between organizations, politicians and the federal government and how this bargaining determines foreign policy approach are described in Putnam’s levels of analysis.

3.5 Levels of Analysis

Putnam’s levels of analysis theory provides a foundation upon which to understand how bargaining within domestic politics leads to foreign policy approaches. Putnam suggests that bargaining involves domestic groups and organizations pressuring the government, as well as politicians “constructing coalitions” among the groups that favour their policy approach. He states that “at the international level, national governments seek to maximize their own ability to satisfy domestic pressures.”²²⁵ Domestic level bargaining, as described by Allison and Zelikow, influences the government to pursue policy approaches in the national interest. Putnam describes the negotiation process within the two-levels; domestic and international. Both the levels of analysis theory and the organizational model break down the state into smaller organizations. The state is not seen as a unitary actor. However, the levels of analysis theory looks at how negotiations at both the domestic and international levels influence government decisions. This

²²⁴ Allison and Zelikow, *Essence of Decision*, 302.

²²⁵ Putnam, *Diplomacy and Domestic Politics*, 434.

also includes the formulation of foreign policy and the ability to implement international agreements domestically.

Putnam argues that the win-set is determined by three domestic factors. The first is the “power, preference, and possible coalitions among ... constituents.”²²⁶ As illustrated with Allison and Zelikow’s organizational model, the constituents or organizations can determine the win-set of international negotiations. The organization’s influence is dependent on how large the organization is, the scope of its mandate and a number of other factors such as public opinion. These factors influence how much clout the organization has in government policy formulation. When organizations’ interests conflict with each other, the win-set becomes smaller; that is, the various constituents cannot agree on the parameters of the policy. Putnam also states that the politicization of the policy issue can also affect the win-set and the parameters of the agreement. He argues that “politicization often activates groups who are less worried about the costs of no-agreement, thus reducing the effective win-set.”²²⁷ This has to do with the polarization of certain political issues. Climate change and the Kyoto Protocol have been greatly politicized and many groups, organizations and constituents are active in the negotiation process. This is because many groups are invested in the extraction of natural resources or in the mitigation of climate change. The outcome is that the various constituents can demand more in the negotiation process. The domestic constituents²²⁸ were vocal in their opposition and support for the protocol and therefore the win-set that the federal government had to work with in international

²²⁶ Ibid, 442.

²²⁷ Ibid, 445.

²²⁸ Domestic constituents include all domestic political interests, such as organizations, institutions, different levels of government, interest groups and individual citizens.

negotiations was greatly reduced. This highly politicized issue created some intense debates and domestic constituents formulated many opinions. The opinions on climate change and the Kyoto Protocol were divisive and therefore domestic constituents were less likely to compromise their position. This made it difficult for governments to create and implement an environmental policy within the constricted win-sets. The government has less area to create an agreement that pleases both sides, as both sides are at odds and in disagreement as to what path the government should take.

The second influence on the win-set is formed by political institutions such as parliament.²²⁹ This can be seen in the negotiation of the Kyoto Protocol, and the Harper government's "made-in-Canada" approach to climate change. The Chrétien government held a majority government and, therefore, the win-set was much larger. Having the majority within parliament meant that the Chrétien government could have greater leverage in negotiating the agreement. The win-set of any agreement reached internationally would be larger and therefore more easily agreed upon domestically. On the other hand, the Harper government held a minority government when elected in 2006. This meant that despite a strong position against the Kyoto Protocol, the Harper government faced strong opposition and had to address climate change. It was not until 2011, when the Harper government gained a majority within parliament, that it could withdraw from the Kyoto Protocol. The Harper government needed a majority as the opposition parties (Liberal Party of Canada, the National Democratic Party and the Bloc Québécois) all supported the Kyoto Protocol.

²²⁹ Putnam, *Diplomacy and Domestic Politics*, 448.

Finally, the win-set can be determined by the strategies of the negotiators.²³⁰ This is similar to Allison and Zelikow's governmental politics model. The governmental politics model focuses on the negotiation between political players. Their negotiation strategies can determine the parameters of the win-set and therefore the ability of the government to formulate and implement an effective policy. Putnam argues that the win-set can be influenced by side-payments and bargaining. This can be seen within climate change negotiations. Both the Chrétien and Harper governments pursued voluntary policy implementation, which attempted to mitigate the dispute between economic and environmental interests. Corporate groups could voluntarily implement the policy, while environmental groups still had some sort of environmental regulation. In theory, the voluntary approaches would help corporations with relief from existing regulations and taxes, improve stakeholder relations as mitigating climate change becomes a more important issue, as well as provide them with influence over the government in future policy negotiations.²³¹ Organizations and corporations could show the government what programs they had in place to protect the environment, thereby increasing their negotiating power.

There are a number of different types of voluntary environmental programs and policy in place within Canada. These programs can be either public, negotiated, or unilateral; the most common in Canada are negotiated and unilateral. Negotiated programs are created between organizations and corporations and the government. These programs, however, are not the most effective as firms believe that the costs outweigh the benefits and do not want to be subjected to government regulations.²³² An example of a negotiated environmental program involves a

²³⁰ Ibid, 450.

²³¹ Heriques, Irene and Perry Sadorsky. "Voluntary Environmental Programs: A Canadian Perspective" in *Policy Studies Journal*. Vol. 36, No. 1 (2008) 145.

²³² Ibid, 154-155.

memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the federal government, the Ontario provincial government and automotive manufacturers. The MOU was an agreement negotiated between the federal Minister of the Environment, the Ontario Minister of the Environment, the president of the Canadian Vehicle Manufacturers' Association, Ford Motor Company of Canada, General Motors of Canada, and DaimlerChrysler Canada.²³³ These groups agreed that they would voluntarily reduce pollution in their manufacturing, minimize waste and become more environmentally conscious in their day-to-day operations. Unilateral agreements, created and implemented by the organizations on their own, have proven to be the most common type of voluntary program. They are more flexible, require less oversight and are cost effective.²³⁴ There is debate as to whether or not this type of voluntary environmental program is effective as there is a lack of public data, therefore it is unknown if these programs really work.²³⁵

Both the Chrétien and Harper governments recognized the importance of reconciling economic development with environmental protection and sustainability. In an attempt to appease both environmental groups and other industrial groups, the Chrétien Liberal Party's 1993 platform, *Creating Opportunity: The Liberal Plan for Canada*, also known as the *Red Book*, put a focus on the greening of industries.²³⁶ This illustrates the position that the government occupies as interest groups push to have their interests heard in government and the extent to which policies that the government pursues benefit their interests. The *Red Book* stated

²³³ Canadian Automotive Manufacturing Pollution Prevention Project. *Seventh Progress Report*. (December 2000) 2.

²³⁴ Heriques and Sadorsky, *Voluntary Environmental Programs: A Canadian Perspective*, 162

²³⁵ Ibid, 161.

²³⁶ Liberal Party of Canada, *Creating Opportunity: The Liberal Plan for Canada*. 1993. Np

that “sustainable development – integrating economic with environmental goals – fits in the liberal tradition of social investment as sound economic policy.”²³⁷ Furthermore, “the national environmental agenda can no longer be separated from the national economic agenda.”²³⁸ The Harper government made very similar statements in the 2008 *Federal Sustainable Development Act*. This act stated that “the Government of Canada accepts the basic principle that sustainable development is based on an ecologically efficient use of natural, social and economic resources and acknowledges the need to integrate environmental, economic and social factors in the making of all decisions by government.”²³⁹ This quote illustrates the close relationship that the environment, economy and society had under the Harper government. Society has an interest in both growing the economy while mitigating the effects of climate change. As stated, the effects of climate change can influence the areas of health, economic well-being, and other aspects of Canadian life. According to the Harper government, there is a balance between the three areas. An environmental policy must be in the national interest and maintain societal expectations, while not damaging the economy and the environment. Once again, the government reserves the right to formulate a policy that will work within the domestic constraints, influenced by the economy, the environment and society.

The Conservatives’ *Federal Sustainable Development Strategy* (FSDS) is required by the Federal Sustainable Development Act to create a strategy every three years. This strategy outlines how the government has progressed in achieving the goals of the previous three years and what goals it intends to achieve in the next three years. The aim of the FSDS was to create

²³⁷ Ibid.

²³⁸ Ibid.

²³⁹ Government of Canada. *Federal Sustainable Development Act*. 2008. Np.

more government transparency on how the government is “addressing climate change, and air quality, maintaining water quality and availability, protecting nature and Canadians, and shrinking the environmental footprint.”²⁴⁰ The FSDS defines sustainable development as “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.”²⁴¹ There are a few key components within the FSDS that illustrates how the Harper government intends to address climate change policy. The strategy stresses a voluntary and individual approach to climate change mitigation. This allows the private sector to innovate and make environmental decisions. The FSDS also notes that the environmental targets must be “relevant” and tied to government priorities and its mandate.²⁴² This means that ultimately the government decides what policy is in line with its agenda and its interpretation of the national interest. The FSDS illustrates the voluntary programs that the Harper government implemented. The act was the outcome of domestic bargaining and pressures from constituents on both sides of the environmental debate. The Harper government viewed that the FSDS, as a made-in-Canada approach, was in the best interest of the nation and more effective than the international Kyoto Protocol.

In contrast with the FSDS, the Liberal Party’s *Red Book* is not mandated by any government act; rather, the *Red Book* is a party platform that sought to get the party elected to form government. Therefore, the section on sustainable development and the environment is very brief and vague. The Red Book does acknowledge that the environmental agenda can no longer

²⁴⁰ Environment Canada. *Planning for a Sustainable Future: A Federal Sustainable Development Strategy for Canada 2013-2016*. (Sustainable Development Office, Nov. 2013) 1

²⁴¹ Ibid, 6.

²⁴² Ibid, 19.

be separated from the economic agenda.²⁴³ The FSDS notes that part of the solution to the environmental/economic issue facing Canada is separating greenhouse gas emissions from the economy.²⁴⁴ This will allow the economy to grow while not increasing greenhouse gas emissions. The FSDS stated that Canada is moving towards this separation as greenhouse gas emissions have decreased while the economy has increased.²⁴⁵ This separation will also mean that constituent groups that represent the economy and the environment will less likely be at odds.

Both the Liberal *Red Book* and the Conservative FSDS acknowledge the important role that government plays in adopting and implementing climate change policy. The *Red Book* is focused more on the federal government and regulating itself than mitigating climate change across Canada. The FSDS also describes how it intends to do so over the next three years. It argues that the federal government must lead by example so that provinces, municipalities, individuals and organizations can follow.²⁴⁶

The FSDS is an example of how the federal government responds to the pressures of domestic politics and domestic constituents. The government acknowledges that both the economy and the environment are important to Canada and that they are linked. The FSDS responds to the domestic pressures that push for more environmental regulation and policy by showing how the government is working with domestic constituents to address climate change

²⁴³ Liberal Party of Canada, *Creating Opportunity: The Liberal Plan for Canada*. 1993. Np

²⁴⁴ Environment Canada. *Planning for a Sustainable Future*, 24.

²⁴⁵ Ibid.

²⁴⁶ Liberal Party of Canada, *Creating Opportunity: The Liberal Plan for Canada*. 1993. Np

across Canada. It also indicates the importance of businesses and the economy. The FSDS also describes how the government will work with Indigenous groups to conserve and protect the environment. Indigenous groups play an important and unique role in climate change policy formulation and implementation. The location of indigenous communities increases their vulnerability to the effects of climate change. This, combined with a general lack of political and economic clout to address the issues that they face, makes climate change a challenge.²⁴⁷ Indigenous groups also have a unique connection with nature.²⁴⁸ Of course many Indigenous groups have an economic interest in resource extraction and development and therefore Indigenous groups cannot be generalized into one single group.²⁴⁹ Klein states the idea that “many Indigenous people would view the extractive industries as their best of a series of bad option should not be surprising.”²⁵⁰ In order to create economic opportunity among Indigenous groups, many will turn to mining and oil companies.²⁵¹ Much like the state is made up of different institution, organizations and domestic constituents, Indigenous people are made up of many different positions, ideologies, and interests. The vulnerability that Indigenous groups face in regards to climate change often concerns stereotypical indigenous activities, such as hunting and fishing.²⁵² That being said, various governments and organizations still need to work with

²⁴⁷ Abate, Randall S. and Elizabeth Ann Kronk “Commonality among Unique Indigenous Communities: An Introduction to Climate Change and its Impacts on Indigenous Peoples” in *Climate Change and Indigenous Peoples: The Search for Legal Remedies*, ed. Randall S. Abate and Elizabeth Ann Kronk. (Northampton, Mass.: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2013) 4.

²⁴⁸ Ibid.

²⁴⁹ See Cameron “Securing Indigenous Politics: A critique of the vulnerability and adaptation approach the human dimensions of climate change in the Canadian arctic” (2012)

²⁵⁰ Klein, *This Changes Everything*, 386.

²⁵¹ Ibid.

²⁵² Cameron, *Securing Indigenous Politics*, 108.

Indigenous groups to utilize their unique position to both formulate and implement effective environmental policy. The FSDS acknowledges this and outlines the importance of both the economy and the environment, and the relationship between government and domestic constituents in mitigating the effects of climate change and environmental destruction.

The constituents, political institutions and political bargaining all show how domestic politics influences the federal government's approach to climate change policy. Allison and Zelikow's rational actor model, organizational model and governmental politics model provide a foundation to understanding the impact of domestic politics. Putnam's levels of analysis expands on the governmental politics model to describe how domestic bargaining can determine the outcome of foreign policy. The government holds the final decision-making ability within the parameters that are set by domestic politics.

3.6 Conclusion

The formulation of climate change policy in Canada is influenced by domestic politics. The three models serve as the framework to analyze the impact of domestic politics on foreign policy approaches through governmental decision-making. The organizational model and the governmental politics model illustrate how domestic politics can determine the implementation and formulation of environmental policy. The rational actor model is the outcome of the bargaining and negotiation between domestic constituents. The outcome is shown in the policy direction the government takes. What is in the national interest and what goals the state pursues are influenced by domestic politics. The formation of these goals and interests are determined by

utilizing cost-benefit analysis and choosing the option that maximizes the benefits while minimizing the costs.

Putnam's levels of analysis furthers the examination by illustrating how bargaining among domestic constituents and the federal government creates acceptable parameters for policy formulation and implementation. Allison and Zelikow's theories are tied closely to Putnam's theory. Climate change and environmental policy are an interesting case study for the ability of the government to formulate and implement policy. Many domestic constituents and organizations have an interest in determining the government's decisions on environmental policy. The relationship the environment has with the economy in Canada means that any environmental policy has an impact on the economic growth of the state. Analysing the Chrétien and Harper governments with the different theories allows for greater understanding of how the government can arrive at different positions on environmental policy. The Chrétien government had a more stable economy, public support for the Kyoto Protocol and environmental protection, as well as a political climate that allowed for the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol without any implementation. The Chrétien government was in a good position to bargain with both environmental and business coalitions to achieve its goals.

The Harper government was elected at a time of economic uncertainty therefore, the focus was moved away from environmental protection toward economic growth. While the Chrétien government only needed to worry about the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol, the Harper government inherited the implementation of the agreement and the economic costs associated with it. Business coalitions had a much more convincing argument for abandoning the Kyoto Protocol in favor of a made-in-Canada approach. The provinces were also charged with a

growing interest in the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol as implementation of environmental agreements is the responsibility of the provinces.

Applying Allison and Zelikow's and Putnam's theories to the formulation and implementation of climate change policy allows for insight on the influences behind government decision-making. Environmental policy is a very contentious and politicized issue that has many vested interests and affects many individuals and organizations. Therefore, the government faces lots of pressures and influences. As illustrated, domestic politics influences government decision-making, thereby influencing the government's direction and policy choices. The concluding chapter will discuss the importance of analyzing the influence of government decision-making and what can be learned from looking at the various domestic influences.

Chapter 4

Conclusion

4.1 Introduction

This chapter will discuss the findings of the research. It will look at the how the various approaches all supported the theory that policy is largely determined by domestic politics. The chapter discusses the theoretical and policy implications of this study, which present a wider understanding of policy construction and governmental decision-making in the international sphere. It further illustrates that, domestic constituents, such as organizations, institutions, interest groups, and individuals, play a large role in influencing government decision-making. While the government has the ability to choose policy approach and direction, it is domestic politics that constrain this ability. Finally, the chapter will discuss the limitations of the study and propose areas for further research.

The thesis sought to examine the extent to which domestic politics influences foreign policy initiatives as well as the forces behind domestic pressure. Through the rational actor model and cost-benefit analysis, the findings concluded that the government's interpretation of the national interest is the greatest determinant of its approach to climate change. Within the state, different organizations, institutions and departments seek to influence government to achieve their goals and influence what the government views as in the national interest. Through their mandates, goals, and political influence, they can determine the parameters of policy and affect policy implementation. Another critical determinant is the bargaining between political players and decision makers. Through Allison and Zelikow's governmental politics model and Putnam's levels of analysis, the bargaining between political players was illustrated, showing that the

approach to foreign policy and the agreeable parameters of international negotiation was determined by domestic bargaining.

4.2 Findings

The thesis demonstrated that the formulation of climate change policy can be better understood by examining domestic politics. Despite a similar voluntary approach to the implementation of environmental policies, both the Chrétien and Harper governments faced different domestic circumstances. Domestic politics influenced how the governments interpreted the national interest and in turn how they formed policy. Domestic politics placed parameters on what was considered an acceptable policy.

The differences in policy approaches came from facing different political climates within Canada. The Chrétien government saw Canada as an international leader on climate change; therefore, this government participated in the Kyoto negotiations. Chrétien also had a majority in parliament, which increased Chrétien's ability to negotiate and implement policies. On the other hand, the Harper government was a minority when first elected and had less influence in negotiating in parliament. The Harper government needed to cooperate with the opposition parties to reach its goals. Additionally, the economy of the Chrétien era was much stronger than that of Harper's. The Harper government faced economic recessions which placed more importance on the economy than the environment. Finally, both the Chrétien and the Harper governments had differing relationships with business coalitions, personal opinions and leadership styles that produced different policy approaches.

The research presented highlights influences on government decision-making and the impact of domestic politics on policy formulation. The strength in the research lies in the ability to draw

comparisons between different governments with regards to their different responses to domestic influences. This comparative approach has demonstrated that domestic politics plays a critical role in influencing the government. Political institutions, coalitions, organization, individuals, and provincial governments all have an interest in the environment, environmental policy and implementation. The amount of influence that they hold over the federal government is limited to shaping what Putnam calls the win-set. The stronger and more influential these organizations and individuals are, the more impact they have on the parameters of the policy. Nevertheless, as stated, the federal government makes its own policy decisions within these set parameters.

The analysis presented on environmental policy can be applied to other policy areas. Since most government decisions are influenced by domestic constituents, any policy decision can be analyzed by following Allison and Zelikow's models to look at how domestic politics influences the ability the government has in formulating and implementing policy.

One limitation of this approach is that there are various domestic influences that are not well documented. For example, as much as the cabinet is responsible for negotiating policy, it is hard to know exactly what goes on behind the closed doors. As illustrated, the government has the ability to choose the course of action on a given issue. Therefore, the outcome of government decision-making cannot be guaranteed. There might be some cases in which the government formulates policy in contradiction to majority of domestic constituents want or what is in the national interest as a result of determinants that are not visible in the records.

The influences of choice are not commonly documented and therefore, there are some limitations in the methodology and available resources. There are a few primary and secondary sources that would have provided a greater understanding on the weight of the influences and

therefore the decisions that were made. Without direct access to the decision makers, both Chrétien and Harper, Cabinet ministers, and various interest groups, the thesis relied on other secondary resources to examine domestic influences. Party platforms, speeches and environmental policy provide insight into how the government views the issue of climate change, and what direction they intend to take. These resources are vague and rarely provide concrete decisions on to how the government will respond. This is on purpose. Providing vague statements in order to give the government a wider win-set. The lack of documentation on what constituents directly influenced the government, and how the government weighed these options, limited the available primary and secondary sources.

There are also limitations in using the rational actor model in analysing government decision making. One such limitation is that, as previously mentioned, the state does not always act rationally. There are times in which the state will act in contrast to public opinion and the national interest for various reasons. A less than ideal option might be acceptable to the state, even though there are other benefit maximizing options. This might be the case in situations in which the state does not have all the necessary information, or the information given is weighted poorly. An example of this can be seen in the climate change debate, in which media outlets in an attempt to create balanced reporting, misinformed the public on the scientific consensus on man-made climate change. The debate on human influenced appeared more contentious in the scientific community than it actually was. Another example is lobbying the government. As mentioned, oil and gas advocates lobby the government much more frequently than environmental organizations. This could possibly indicate that the information the government gets is not balanced and that they do not have all the information. Without all the information available, it is impossible to arrive at a fully rational choice.

Furthermore, the rational actor relies on cost-benefit analysis while limiting other influences, such as ideology and psychological influences. The rational actor model shows us how an actor chooses an option, but fails to indicate how and why some options were rejected and others were accepted. These influences are hard to measure and analysing the rational actor through the framework of economics provides a clearer image of the sources of influence.

Also, the research presented is limited to Canada. Other states have various unique domestic structures that will influence the government differently. For example, democratic state will be influenced differently than a nondemocratic state. Likewise, a presidential and parliamentary system might operate differently. A good example of a region in which this research would produce different results is Europe. The European Union can influence the policy approaches and implementation of such policies, just as domestic politics can. The resulting analysis of this influence might have differing conclusions to the one presented here.

4.3 Theoretical and Policy Implications

Allison and Zelkow's models, as well as Putnam's levels of analysis theory, can be used to explain other foreign policy approaches, such as security, trade, and economic development. Canadian climate change policy was chosen as it represents a point of contention within domestic politics and many groups and individuals have an interest in influencing the policy approach of the government on this topic. The various approaches used within the study can also describe the inconsistencies of the governments' policy approaches. For example, while the Chrétien government saw the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol as in the national interest, as determined by various domestic constituents, the Harper government did not. Instead, the Harper

government was inclined to view climate change policy through an economic lens and therefore, pursue a more domestic approach.

The analysis between the connection of policy formulation and domestic politics contributes to the wider understanding of what influences government decision-making. The research combines the levels of analysis theory to decision-making models in order to illustrate how the government arrives at decisions. The thesis adds to the body of research on both environmental policy and government decision-making. It further contributes to the understanding of how governments make decisions and therefore can be a good indicator of the direction other governments take and why.

The research can generate further analysis of the areas of climate change and environmental policy, which have become a major political issue in recent years. Climate change as a political topic is fairly new and research involving the climate sciences and the effects of climate change continue to advance. Therefore, governments need to continually adapt to new information. If the effects of climate change are not mitigated, the issue will become much broader and involve much more of the government's time and money in addressing.

Canada needs to consider the international influences when making decisions on climate change policy. The Justin Trudeau government has acknowledged this aspect of policy influence, while maintaining the importance of domestic influences. Since climate change policy requires an international, as well as a domestic approach, the priority should be on protecting the domestic environment. The Canadian government should pursue international agreements, and address climate change worldwide by focusing on the domestic policies. International agreements such as the Kyoto Protocol, are agreed upon internationally and then implemented by

individual states to suit their needs and unique situations. In considering the interest of domestic constituents, the Canadian government can build policies that do not hurt the economy and allow for companies and interest groups to pursue their own interests.

4.4 Recommendation for Further Research

The research can be applied to other aspects of foreign policy beyond climate change. Applying the rational actor model, organizational model, and governmental politics model to other international agreements would illuminate the role that domestic politics plays in determining their outcomes, as well as the various responses from states. Looking at other international agreements and the domestic determinants could potentially help in the prediction of foreign policy choices. Knowing what the domestic coalitions are and what organizations and interest groups are involved could help determine how the government views the agreement in terms of its national interest and in turn predict the choices that will be made. Taking into consideration the fact that issues such as climate change will require Canada to act on a global scale rather than succumbing to domestic pressures, further research is needed to indicate what will be needed to mitigate the effects of climate change.

While this study has demonstrated the effects that domestic politics has on the formulation of Canadian climate change policy, there are a number of unanswered questions. Myers and Kent outline a few of these important issues that need to be addressed going forward in the formulation of climate change policy, including how to ensure that the government acts as a whole. This thesis outlined how different political actors, departments and organizations influence government decision-making. Further research would identify in more detail how these different domestic constituents bargain and formulate policy. Myers and Kent also state that

current climate change policy is too preoccupied with the short term. That is, for proper mitigation of climate change, there needs to be long-term commitment to agreements. Another common issue that would require further research is how to transition a government to act rather than react. Much of climate change policy is reactionary. It is important to pre-emptively address climate change issues in order to mitigate the problem. Finally, this thesis covered a number of domestic constituents and how they influence government decision-making, including the role of public opinion and the national interest. However, further research is needed on how the media influences both the public opinion and government decision-making. The media is an important tool for communication and setting government agendas. It should be further analyzed to see exactly how much influence it exerts.²⁵³

Also, this thesis primarily looked at the domestic influences. The international level also can play a role in influencing the decisions of states. Particularly through agreement such as the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), or supranational unions like the European Union. The international level has influence on government decision-making as well, and would be worth further examination.

4.5 Conclusion

Canada's actions towards addressing climate change in the future will incorporate aspects of both the Chrétien and Harper governments. The government will have to consider Canada's role as an international leader on climate change as well as one that protects the domestic economy. Moving forward, the Trudeau government wants Canada to be a leader in helping

²⁵³ Myers, Norman and Jennifer Kent. 2008. "The Citizen is willing, but Society Won't Deliver: The Problem on Institutional Roadblocks". International Institute for Sustainable Development. Pg. 17

developing countries mitigate climate change, build a sustainable economy, and work with the provinces, territories, cities, and indigenous groups.²⁵⁴ There is a general consensus among Canadians that climate change needs to be addressed and that the effects of climate change will impact their lives.²⁵⁵ The political climate that the Trudeau government faces is somewhat different from the Chrétien and Harper governments. Further research can show how the change in domestic politics influences the Trudeau government and all subsequent Canadian governments.

²⁵⁴ Trudeau, Justin. “Canada’s National Statement at COP21” Speech. Nov. 30, 2015.
<http://pm.gc.ca/eng/news/2015/11/30/canadas-national-statement-cop21> (accessed April 12, 2016)

²⁵⁵ Clark, Campbell. “Canadians Back Bold Climate – Change Action, Poll Finds” *The Globe and Mail*.
<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/politics/canadians-back-bold-climate-change-action-poll-finds/article27518927/> November 27, 2015 (accessed April 12, 2016)

Works Cited

- Abate, Randall S. and Elizabeth Ann Kronk “Commonality among Unique Indigenous Communities: An Introduction to Climate Change and its Impacts on Indigenous Peoples” in *Climate Change and Indigenous Peoples: The Search for Legal Remedies*, ed. Randall S. Abate and Elizabeth Ann Kronk. Northampton, Mass.: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2013
- Allison, Graham and Philip Zelikow. *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*, 2nd ed. New York, NY: Longman, 1999
- Angus Reid Institute. *Canadians Want More Action on the Environment*.
http://angusreid.org/canadians_want_more_action_on_the_environment/ (accessed Sept. 19, 2014)
- Baldwin, Andrew and Simon Dalby. “Canadian Middle-Power Identity, Environmental Biopolitics, and Human Insecurity” in *Canada’s Foreign and Security Policy: Soft and Hard Strategies of a Middle Power*, ed. Nik Hynek and David Bosold. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2010
- Bernstein, Steven. “International Institutions and the Framing of Canada’s Climate Change Policy: Mitigating or Masking the Integrity Gap?” in *The Integrity Gap: Canada’s Environmental Policy and Institutions*, ed. Eugene Lee and Anthony Perl. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2003
- Bjorn, Andrew et al. *Ratification of the Kyoto Protocol: A Citizen’s Guide to the Canadian Climate Change Policy Process*. Toronto, Ont.: Sustainable Toronto, 2002

- Boardman, Robert. "The Multilateral Dimension: Canada and the United States" in *Canadian Environmental Policy: Ecosystems, Politics, and Process*, ed. Robert Boardman New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1992
- Boykoff, Maxwell T. "Public Enemy No. 1? Understanding Media Representations of Outlier Views on Climate Change" in *American Behavioural Scientist* Vol. 57 No.6 (2013) 796-817
- Burchill, Robert. *The National Interest in International Relations Theory*. New York, NY: Palgrave MacMillan, 2005
- Cameron, Emilie S. "Securing Indigenous Politics: A critique of the vulnerability and adaptation approach the human dimensions of climate change in the Canadian arctic" in *Global Environmental Change* Vol.22 (2012) 103-114
- Canada. Parliament. House of Commons. *Debate*, 37th Parliament. 2nd Session. October 29, 2002.
- Canada. Parliament. House of Commons. *Debate*, 37th Parliament. 2nd Session. November 25, 2002.
- Canadian Association of Petroleum Producers. *Economic Contributions*.
<http://www.oilsandstoday.ca/ENERGYECONENVIRON/Pages/EconomicContribution.aspx> (Accessed May 16, 2015)
- Canadian Automotive Manufacturing Pollution Prevention Project. *Seventh Progress Report*. December 2000.

Canadian Chamber of Commerce. *Is Canada Suffering From Dutch Disease?* Policy Brief
(Economic Policy Series, 2012)

Canadian Intergovernmental Conference Secretariat. *First Minister' Conferences 1906-2004*.

CBC News. "Alberta Launches Campaign against Kyoto" *CBC News*.

<http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/alberta-launches-campaign-against-kyoto-1.349305> Sept.
18, 2002, (Accessed April 12, 2016).

Chrétien, Jean. *Speech from the Throne*. 35th Parl., 2nd Sess., 1996

----- . *Speech from the Throne*. 36th Parl., 1st Sess., 1997

----- . *Speech from the Throne*. 36th Parl. 2nd Sess., 1999

Clark, Campbell. "Canadians Back Bold Climate – Change Action, Poll Finds" *The Globe and Mail*. <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/politics/canadians-back-bold-climate-change-action-poll-finds/article27518927/> November 27, 2015 (accessed April 12, 2016)

Conservative Party of Canada, *Stand Up for Canada*, Conservative Party of Canada Federal
Election Platform. 2006

Constitution Act, 1867. Ss. 91-92, VI – *Distribution of Legislative Powers*.

Council of the Federation. *Canadian Energy Strategy*. July 2015.

Dahl, Robert A. and Charles E. Lindblom. *Politics Economics and Welfare: Planning and
Politico-Economic Systems Resolved into Basic Social Processes*. Chicago, Il: University
of Chicago Press, 1976.

Elections Canada. *Thirty-sixth General Election 1997: Official Voting Results: Synopsis.*

<http://www.elections.ca/content.aspx?section=res&dir=rep/off/dec3097&document=synopsis06&lang=e> (accessed April 12, 2016)

----- *Thirty-seventh General Election 2000: Official Voting Results: Synopsis.*

<http://www.elections.ca/content.aspx?section=res&dir=rep/off/37g&document=synopsis06&lang=e> (accessed April 12, 2016)

----- *Official Voting Results: Thirty-ninth General Election 2006.*

<http://www.elections.ca/scripts/OVR2006/default.html> (accessed April 12, 2016)

----- *Official Voting Results: Forty-first General Election 2011.*

<http://www.elections.ca/scripts/ovr2011/default.html> (accessed April 12, 2016)

Environment Canada, *Climate Change: Canada's Action on Climate Change*. 2009

----- *Planning for a Sustainable Future: A Federal Sustainable Development Strategy for Canada 2013-2016*. Sustainable Development Office, Nov. 2013.

----- *About Environment Canada: Mandate.*

<http://ec.gc.ca/default.asp?lang=En&n=BD3CE17D-1> (accessed Feb. 24, 2014)

----- *Canada's Sixth National Report on Climate Change*. 2014

Gale, Robert J.P. "Canada's Green Plan" in *Nationale Umweltpläne in Ausgewählten*

Industrielländern [a study of the development of a national environmental plan with expert submissions to the Enquete Commission "Protection of People and the Environment' for the Bundestag (German Parliament)] (1997) 97-120

Greenpeace, *Energy [R]evolution: A Sustainable Energy Outlook for Canada*. 3rd Ed, 2010

Government of Canada. *Federal Sustainable Development Act*. 2008

Harper, Stephen. *Speech from the Throne*. 39th Parl., 1st Sess., 2006

----- . *Speech from the Throne*. 39th Parl., 2nd Sess., 2007

----- . *Speech from the Throne*. 40th Parl., 1st Sess., 2008

----- . *Speech from the Throne*. 41st Parl., 2nd Sess., 2013

----- . *Prime Minister Stephen Harper Calls for International Consensus on Climate Change*.

Speech. Berlin, Germany. 4 June 2007

Harris, Paul G. "Introduction: the global politics of climate change" in *The Politics of Climate Change: Environmental Dynamics in International Affairs* ed. Paul G. Harris. New York, NY: Routledge, 2009

Harrison, Kathryn. *Passing the Buck: Federalism and Canadian Environmental Policy*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 1996

----- . "The Road Not Taken: Climate Change Policy in Canada and the United States" in *Global Environmental Politics*. Vol. 7, No.4 (2007) 92-117

----- . "The Struggle of Ideas and Self-Interest in Canadian Climate Policy" in *Global Commons, Domestic Decisions: The Comparative Politics of Climate Change*. ed. Kathryn Harrison and Lisa McIntosh Sundstrom Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press, 2010

Harrison, Kathryn and Lisa McIntosh Sundstrom. "Introduction: Global Commons, Domestic Decisions" in *Global Commons, Domestic Decisions: The Comparative Politics of*

Climate Change. ed. Kathryn Harrison and Lisa McIntosh Sundstrom Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press, 2010

Heriques, Irene and Perry Sadorsky. “Voluntary Environmental Programs: A Canadian Perspective” in *Policy Studies Journal*. Vol. 36, No. 1 (2008) 143-166

Hoffman, Andrew J. *How Culture Shapes the Climate Change Debate*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2015

Iida, Keisuke. “When and How Do Domestic Constraints Matter? Two-Level Games with Uncertainty” in *the Journal of Conflict Resolution*. Vol. 37 No. 3 (1993) 403-426

Ipsos. *New Survey on Canadians’ Views on Climate Change and the Economic Crisis*.
<http://www.ipsos-na.com/news-polls/pressrelease.aspx?id=4302> March 2, 2009 (accessed Sept. 19, 2014)

Ipsos. *Support (74%) Remains High For Kyoto Protocol*. <http://www.ipsos-na.com/news-polls/pressrelease.aspx?id=1667> November 8, 2002. (accessed March 20, 2016)

Klein, Naomi. *This Changes Everything: Capitalism vs. The Climate*. Toronto Ont.: Alfred A. Knopf Canada, 2014

Laforest, Rachel and Susan Phillips. “Citizen Engagement: Rewiring the Policy Process” in *Critical Policy Studies*. Ed. Michael Orsini and Miriam Smith. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2007

LaRochelle-Côté, Sébastien and Jason Gilmore. “Canada’s Employment Downturn” in *Statistics Canada Perspectives on Labour and Income*. Vol. 10 No. 12. (2009) 5-12

Lee, Eugene and Anthony Perl. "Introduction: Institutions and the Integrity Gap in Canadian Environmental Policy" in *The Integrity Gap: Canada's Environmental Policy and Institutions*. ed. Eugene Lee and Anthony Perl. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2003

Levasseur, Karine. "In the name of charity: Institutional support for and resistance to redefining the meaning of charity in Canada" in *Canadian Public Administration*. Vol. 55 No. 2 (2012) 181-202.

Liberal Party of Canada, *Creating Opportunity: The Liberal Plan for Canada*. 1993.

Lohmann, Susanne. "Linkage Politics" in *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*. Vol. 41 No.1 (1997) 38-67

MacDonald, Douglas. *Business and Environmental Politics in Canada*. Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Press, 2007.

MacDonald, Douglas and Heather A. Smith. "Promises Made, Promises Broken: Questioning Canada's Commitments to Climate Change" in *Readings in Canadian Foreign Policy: Classic Debates and New Ideas*. ed. Duane Bratt and Christopher J. Kukucha. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2007

MacNeil, Robert. "Canadian Environmental Policy under Conservative Majority Rule" in *Environmental Politics*. Vol. 23 No. 1 (2014) 174-178

Mayer, Frederick W. "Managing Domestic Differences in International Negotiations: The Strategic Use of Internal Side-Payments" in *International Organization*. Vol. 46 No. 4 (1992) 793-818

McKenna, Peter. “It’s beyond time for Harper to call a First Minister’s Conference” in *Globe and Mail*. Dec. 10, 2014.

McCright, Aaron M. and Ryan E. Dunlap. “The Politicization of Climate Change and Polarization in the American Public’s View of Global Warming, 2001-2010” in *The Sociological Quarterly* Vol. 52 (2011) 155-194

Millington, Dinara. *CERI Commodity Report – Crude Oil*. Canadian Energy Research Institute. January 2016

Mitchell, Ronald B. *International Politics and the Environment*. London, UK: Sage Publishing, 2010

Morgan, M. Granger. “Policy Analysis for Decisionmaking About Climate Change” in *Economic and Policy Issues in Climate Change*. ed. William D. Nordhaus. Washington, DC: Resources for the Future, 1998

Myers, Norman and Jennifer Kent. *The Citizen is willing, but Society Won’t Deliver: The Problem on Institutional Roadblocks*. Winnipeg, MB.:International Institute for Sustainable Development. 2008

Natural Resources Canada. *About us*. <https://www.nrcan.gc.ca/departement> (accessed Feb. 24, 2014)

Nossal, Kim Richard. “Analyzing Domestic Sources of Canadian Foreign Policy” in *Readings in Canadian Foreign Policy: Classic Debates and New Ideas*. ed. Duane Bratt and Christopher J. Kukucha. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2007

Nye, Joseph S. Jr. "Redefining the National Interest" in *Foreign Affairs*. Vol. 78 No. 4 (1999)
22-35

Oberthür, Sebastian and Hermann E. Ott. *The Kyoto Protocol: International Climate Policy for the 21st Century*. New York, NY: Springer- Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 1999

Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. *Human Rights and the Environment*.

<http://www.ohchr.org/EN/Issues/Environment/HREnvironment/Pages/HRandEnvironmentIndex.aspx> (accessed June 3 2016)

Pal, Leslie A. *Beyond Policy Analysis: Public Issue Management in Turbulent Times*. 3rd ed.
Toronto, Ont.: Nelson, 2006

Partington, P.J. and Matthew Bramley. *Evaluation of the Government of Canada's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Policies, Prepared for the Climate Change Performance Index 2012*. The Pembina Institute. 2011

Phillips, Susan D. "Policy Analysis and the Voluntary Sector: Evolving Policy Styles" in *Policy Analysis in Canada: The State of the Art*. Ed. Michael Howlett, David H. Laycock, and Laurent Dobuzinskis. Toronto, Ont: University of Toronto Press, 2007

Prime Minister of Canada. *Communiqué of Canada's First Ministers Conference*.

<http://pm.gc.ca/eng/news/2016/03/03/communique-canadas-first-ministers> March 3 2016
(accessed April 12, 2016)

Privy Council Office, *About Cabinet*. <http://www.pco-bcp.gc.ca> (Accessed April 2, 2016)

- Putnam, Robert D. "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games" in *International Organization*. Vol. 42 No. 3 (1988) 427-460
- Rosenau, James N. "Toward the Study of National – International Linkages" in *Linkage Politics: Essays on the Convergence of National and International Systems*. ed. James Rosenau. New York, NY: The Free Press, 1969
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. "On the Social Contract" *The Basic Political Writings*. 2nd Edition. ed. Donald A. Cress. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing, 2011.
- Savoie, Donald J. *Breaking the Bargain: Public Servants, Ministers, and Parliament*. Toronto, Ont.: University of Toronto Press, 2003
- Simpson, Jeffery, Marks Jaccard and Nic Rivers. *Hot Air: Meeting Canada's Climate Change Challenge*. Toronto, Ont: McClelland & Stewart, 2007
- Smith, Heather A. "Stopped Cold: Action by Canada on climate change has been blocked by opposition both inside and outside government" in *Policy Alternatives*. Vol. 24 No.4 (Fall 1998) NP
- ."Dollar Discourse: The Devaluation of Canada's Natural Capital in Canadian Climate Change Policy" in *Canadian Environmental Policy: Context and Cases*, 2nd ed. ed. Debora L. VanNijnatten and Robert Boardman. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2002
- ."Political Parties and Canadian Climate Change Policy" in *International Journal*. Vol. 64, No.1 (2009) 47-66

- Soroka, Stuart N. "Agenda-Setting and Issue Defenition" in *Critical Policy Studies*. ed. Michael Orsini and Miriam Smith. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press, 2007
- Thomson, Graham. "Premiers will gleefully bash Stephen Harper in absentia" in *National Post*. July 16, 2015.
- Thorne, Melissa. "Establishing Environment as a Human Right" in *Denver Journal of International Law and Policy*. Vol. 19, No. 2 (1991) 304-342
- Trudeau, Justin. "Canada's National Statement at COP21" Speech. Nov. 30, 2015.
<http://pm.gc.ca/eng/news/2015/11/30/canadas-national-statement-cop21> (accessed April 12, 2016)
- Tsebelis, George. *Nested Games: Rational Choice in Comparative Politics*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1990
- United Nations. *Report of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment*. Stockholm, Sweden, 1972
- Vogt, Paul. "The Manitoba Cabinet" in *Manitoba Politics and Government: Issues, Institutions, and Traditions*. Ed. Curtis Brown and Paul G. Thomas. Winnipeg MB: University of Manitoba Press, 2010
- Williston, Byron. "Moral Progress and Canada's Climate Failure" in *Journal of Global Ethics*. Vol.7, No.2 (2011) 149-160
- Whitaker, Reg. "The Chrétien Legacy" in *Review of Constitutional Studies*. Vol. 9, No. 1 & 2 (2004) 1-29

