Climate Justice & Net-Zero:

A submission to Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development with amendments to Bill C-12

Heather Mahony, Christie McLeod, & Matt Hulse
on behalf of Lawyers for Climate Justice

Lawyers for Climate Justice

Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development
House of Commons
Sixth Floor, 131 Queen St.
Ottawa ON, K1A 0A6
By email: ENVI@parl.gc.ca

March 17, 2021

Re: Amendments to promote climate justice within Canada's Bill C-12

I. INTRODUCTION

On behalf of Lawyers for Climate Justice, we are pleased to submit this brief to the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development (the "Standing Committee"). Formed in 2019, Lawyers for Climate Justice is a multi-disciplinary group of lawyers and articled students from across Canada that is focused on advancing climate justice within the legal profession in Canada.

We submit this brief to propose several amendments to Canada's Bill C-12 (the "Bill") to incorporate a climate justice approach into the proposed *Canadian Net-Zero Emissions Accountability Act*.

Climate justice can be defined as follows:

> "To ensure communities, individuals and governments have substantive legal and procedural rights relating to the enjoyment of a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment and the means to take or cause measures to be taken within their national legislative and judicial systems and, where necessary, at regional and international levels, to mitigate sources of climate change and provide for adaptation to its effects in a manner that respects human rights."[1]

In this brief, we propose three overarching measures by which the Bill can be better aligned with climate justice:

1. Directly acknowledge the disproportionate impacts of climate change so that they can be meaningfully addressed, and provide affected communities and those experiencing disproportionate impacts with procedural rights to participate in policy design and implementation;
2. Prioritize emissions reductions over carbon removals in achieving emissions targets in order to avoid exacerbating inequality and injustice; and
3. Include enforcement mechanisms to ensure Canadians can hold the federal government accountable to the commitments enshrined in the Bill.

Our brief will set out these measures in turn.

[1] International Bar Association Climate Change Justice and Human Rights Task Force (July 2014) *Achieving Justice and Human Rights in an Era of Climate Disruption*. Accessed 14 March 2021 online: www.ibanet.org/Document/Default.aspx?DocumentUid=0F8CEE12-EE56-4452-BF43-CFCAB196CC04 at pp.2 ("*IBA Climate Justice Task Force Report*")

II. DISCUSSION

A. DISPROPORTIONATE IMPACTS AND MEANINGFUL PARTICIPATION BY THOSE IMPACTED

Address the Disproportionate Impacts of Climate Change and Climate Policies

The impacts of climate change are not - and will not be - borne equally or fairly by all Canadians. Climate change impacts occur differently across Canada and exacerbate inequitable social conditions, including those based on race, gender, income, disability, and age. It also has a disproportionate effect on Indigenous peoples by virtue of their relationship to the land. While the recitals to the Bill allude to climate justice principles, such as a recognition-of-rights approach and ensuring emissions reduction plans promote resilience and inclusivity, more should be done in the substance of the Bill to ensure these principles are given effect.

The Bill should recognize that climate change has and will continue to disproportionately affect different populations within Canadian society, and should provide measures to mitigate, and where possible, prevent these impacts, with a particular emphasis on the disproportionate impacts experienced by Indigenous peoples.

Climate legislation can consider these types of effects. For example, the New Zealand *Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019* requires the Minister to include in their emissions reduction plan a strategy to recognize and mitigate the impacts of reducing emissions on Indigenous peoples and to ensure that Indigenous peoples have been adequately consulted on the plan.[2]

The New Zealand legislation also directs the Minister and the Climate Change Commission (the government's independent expert advisory body) to have regard to "the distribution of [impacts of actions to achieve the emissions budget and the 2050 target] across the regions and communities of New Zealand, and from generation to generation" when considering how the emissions budget and 2050 target may realistically be met.

Recommendation #1: Amend section 10 of the Bill to require that emissions reductions plans prepared under this section describe how the plan addresses and mitigates the disproportionate impacts of climate change and climate policies on groups most affected, including Indigenous peoples and future generations.

Ensure the meaningful participation of Indigenous peoples and other interested groups in the design and implementation of plans and policies

Section 13 of the Bill requires that there be an opportunity for Indigenous peoples and other interested persons to make submissions to the Minister when a greenhouse gas emission target or reduction plan is being set, established, or amended. However, the Minister has unlimited discretion as to the process for, and format of, such submissions. Further, the input of the advisory body is accorded the same consideration as all other parties, when they should instead have a much more pronounced role. As climate justice requires procedural fairness, the Bill should establish principles that the Minister must follow when setting the process for public submissions.

[2] New Zealand *Climate Change Response (Zero Carbon) Amendment Act 2019*, ("*New Zealand Zero Carbon Act*"), s.3A(a)(ad)

For example, the former Ontario *Environmental Bill of Rights* provided minimum levels of, and mechanisms for, public participation that had to be met before the Ontario Government could make decisions on environmentally significant proposals with respect to legislation, policy and regulatory instruments.[3] Such mechanisms included the creation of a registry, notice requirements, minimum time frames for public comment, and participation rights commensurate with the class of decision being made.

The Bill also does not presently require that the Minister meaningfully consider any submissions made under section 13. Prescribing a process to consider submissions would promote accountability and mitigate the risk that Canada fails to meet procedural fairness obligations or breaches the duty to consult. For example, the Ontario *Environmental Bill of Rights* requires the Minister to "take every reasonable step" to ensure that public comments received are considered when making decisions, and requires that the resulting decision be reported.[4]

Recommendation #2: Amend section 13 of the Bill to include minimum levels of, and mechanisms for, public participation.

***Recommendation # 3*:** To ensure transparency concerning how submissions are considered in decision-making processes, amend section 13 of the Bill to require that all submissions are made publicly available.

***Recommendation # 4*:** Delete reference to the advisory body in section 13 and insert a clear process for consultation with the advisory body in preparing reports under sections 14, 15, and 16.

Provide for Indigenous Representation and Climate-Relevant Expertise on the Advisory Body

Subsection 20(1) of the Bill establishes an advisory body to provide the Minister with advice on achieving net-zero emissions by 2050. Section 21 of the Bill states that the advisory body members will be appointed by the Governor in Council on the recommendation of the Minister, and will be appointed on a part-time basis. However, the Bill does not prescribe the expertise or composition of the advisory body, which creates the possibility that the advisory body cannot properly advise the Minister on climate mitigation because it does not have the necessary expertise or reflect the diversity of the Canadian population.

Responding to climate change not only requires an understanding of climate science, but also technical, economic, social, and environmental matters. In Canada, this also includes Indigenous knowledge. The advisory body cannot rely on such expertise within the federal civil service if it is to be independent from the government. It must also be free of interests that might undermine the goal of a low carbon transition, including interests stemming from the fossil fuel industry. The independence of the advisory body is essential to ensure their advice remains rooted in science and equity. Therefore, the advisory body itself must possess this expertise or have this expertise available to it, such as through a dedicated secretariat.

[3] *Environmental Bill of Rights,* S.O 1993, c. 28, Part 2. As amended to Last amendment: 2018, c. 17, Sched. 15, s. 1-12. https://www.canlii.org/en/on/laws/stat/so-1993-c-28/114592/so-1993-c-28.html

[4] *Environmental Bill of Rights, 1993*, SO 1993, c 28 s.35 and 36; see also https://ero.ontario.ca/page/consultation-process.

Further, any advice provided to the government on addressing climate change should reflect the views of those who are disproportionately impacted by climate change. In particular, it is important that Indigenous peoples from across Canada be represented on the advisory body as this group is disproportionately affected by climate change. By virtue of their Aboriginal and Treaty rights and due to the relationship that many Indigenous peoples have with the land, climate change affects Indigenous peoples differently than non-Indigenous Canadians.

A diversity of Indigenous representation on the advisory body is also required because climate change is being experienced differently - in nature and scale - by different Indigenous populations across Canada. For example, northern Canada is warming much faster and to a greater degree than southern Canada, while thawing permafrost and an ice-free Arctic ocean cause different problems and require different solutions to drought, forest fires, and sea-level rise.

Indigenous representation will bring important knowledge to the advisory body. The connection of Indigenous peoples to land creates different types of knowledge that are essential to addressing climate change. Many Indigenous peoples use and rely on land-based knowledge systems - often known as Indigenous Knowledge - that have been taught and passed down from previous generations since time immemorial. This knowledge is rich with observations about the environment, including the impacts of the changing climate over recent decades. Living through these changes also means that Indigenous people have been adapting to climate change during this time. Indigenous knowledge should be used to inform federal climate policies and adaptation responses and should be considered on equal footing to western science.

Indigenous representation on the advisory body would be consistent with the direction in the Prime Minister's mandate letter to Minister Wilkinson to ground Canada's new conservation plan in "science, Indigenous knowledge and local perspectives."[5] The inclusion of Indigenous peoples on the advisory body will ensure that Indigenous knowledge forms part of their advice to the federal government.

As examples from the United Kingdom and New Zealand show, it is possible to establish an advisory body that has climate-related expertise and Indigenous knowledge.

Both the UK *Climate Change Act 2008* and the New Zealand *Climate Change Response (Zero Emissions) Amendment Act 2019* specify the types of experience and knowledge that members of their respective advisory bodies must have.[6] The required expertise focuses on climate science, climate change mitigation and adaptation, governance, policy development, economic analysis, and an understanding of a range of sectors and industries.

Importantly, the expertise required by the New Zealand legislation also reflects the country's Indigenous community by requiring the advisory body to have "technical and professional skills, experience, and expertise in, and an understanding of innovative approaches relevant to ... the Treaty of Waitangi, the

[5] Office of the Prime Minister (13 Dec 2019) *Minister of Environment and Climate Change Mandate Letter.* Accessed 8 March 2021 online: https://pm.gc.ca/en/mandate-letters/2019/12/13/minister-environment-and-climate-change-mandate-letter
[6] *UK Climate Change Act,* Schedule 1, s.1(1); *New Zealand Zero Carbon Act,* s.5H(1)

Māori world (including Māori traditional knowledge, language, custom and protocol), and Māori economic activity".[7]

Recommendation #5: Amend section 21 of the Bill to specify the climate-related scientific, economic, technical, and social expertise required by the members of the advisory body to ensure that it can independently and competently advise the Minister on matters relating to emissions targets and plans to achieve targets. Ensure that the requisite expertise includes Indigenous knowledge.

Recommendation #6: Ensure that the composition of the advisory body includes minimum requirements for Indigenous representatives from across Canada, including southern and northern communities.

Recommendation #7: Amend sections 4 and 8 of the Bill to expressly state the importance of considering Indigenous Knowledge in setting targets.

B. ACHIEVING NET ZERO REQUIRES PRIORITIZING EMISSIONS REDUCTIONS

Section 6 of the Bill states that the national 2050 target will be "net-zero emissions". This does not necessarily mean Canada will reach *zero* emissions by this date or specify how Canada will progress to its climate target. As written, the net-zero target in the Bill will allow Canada to continue emitting greenhouse gases, while relying on natural or technological measures to remove carbon from the atmosphere. The net-zero target could also allow Canada to receive carbon "credits" for financing efforts to reduce emissions in other countries.

How Canada will progress to net-zero can be understood by determining Canada's fair share of emissions reductions to achieve the global goal of limiting warming to 1.5°C. Following the UNFCCC's principle of "common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities", as a wealthy nation with a large share of historical emissions, Canada has a moral and historical responsibility to undertake significant emissions reductions. One prominent method to calculate a country's fair share of emissions reductions, the Climate Equity Reference Calculator (CERC), has determined a 2030 target for Canada of:

- Domestic emissions reductions of 60% below 2005 levels; and
- International mitigation support (e.g. financing, capacity building, or technology transfer) to developing countries for emissions equaling 80% of Canada's 2005 levels.[8]

This calculation not only considers Canada's domestic mitigation potential, but also the fact that developing countries often lack the resources to implement the mitigations necessary to reduce emissions for which they are not responsible.

CERC does not calculate Canada's 2050 fair share target, but it is not unrealistic to extrapolate that Canada would need to reduce its domestic emissions by 100% below 2005 levels by 2050, with further

[7] *New Zealand Zero Carbon Act,* s.5H(1)(d)(ii).
[8] Holz, C. (n.d) *Deriving a Canadian Greenhouse Gas reduction target in line with the Paris Agreement's 1.5°C goal and the findings of the IPCC Special Report on 1.5°C.*Climate Equity Reference Project. Accessed 9 Feb 2020 online: https://climateactionnetwork.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/CAN-Rac-Fair-Share-%E2%80%94-Methodology-Backgrounder.pdf

international mitigation support required. Regardless of the exact figure, it is clear that Canada has a moral obligation to reduce its domestic emissions as close to zero as possible by 2050.

How we achieve net-zero is also important; in pursuing Canada's fair share of climate mitigation and achieving net-zero, Canada must prioritize *emissions reductions* over carbon removal.

Emission reductions deliver immediate and permanent effects to atmospheric carbon and do not contribute to additional climate impacts, including triggering positive feedback loops. Many carbon removal measures – both engineered and nature-based - are unproven at scale, limited in scope, costly, and potentially reversible. The effects on atmospheric carbon from emission reductions cannot be substituted for future promises of carbon removal and it is reckless to assume that carbon removal techniques will be available on the necessary timeframe and scale required to achieve our target.

Carbon removal does have a *supplementary* role in reaching net zero: addressing Canada's hardest-to-reduce emissions. However, using carbon removal for emissions that could otherwise be reduced could actually undermine effective climate mitigation and and have adverse consequences for vulnerable populations around the world. This is due to the risk of "mitigation deterrence", in which the delivery or promise of carbon removal serves to delay or deter emissions reductions.[9]

There are three types of mitigation deterrence:

1) **Substitution & Failure**: where carbon removal formally substitutes for emissions reductions in plans and policies and then fails to deliver removals matching the amount of the promised substitution. E.g. a forest planted to sequester carbon burns in a wildfire, carbon leaks from processing equipment, or direct air capture technology fails to reach commercialization.

2) **Rebounds**: where carbon removal causes additional and unanticipated emissions via rebounds or other indirect side effects. E.g. captured carbon is used in enhanced oil recovery processes and actually increases total oil production.

3) **Foregone Mitigation**: where the anticipated or imagined future availability of carbon removal encourages or enables the avoidance of emissions reductions without any planned or formal substitution. E.g. oil and gas companies invest in additional fossil fuel infrastructure and increase absolute emissions while planning to achieve net-zero by 2050 by relying on carbon removal.[10]

One solution to avoid mitigation deterrence is to prioritize the role of emissions reductions by setting separate targets for emission reductions and carbon removal in the Bill. Indeed, such targets are already in use in jurisdictions around the world. For example, Sweden's *Climate Act* requires Sweden to cut its domestic emissions by at least 85% below 1990 levels and allows the remaining 15% of emissions to be offset by other measures, which are defined in the legislation.[11]

---

[9] McLaren, D. (23 May 2020) *Quantifying the potential scale of mitigation deterrence from greenhouse gas removal techniques*, Climatic Change, 162, 2411-2428. Accessed 10 Dec 2020 online: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10584-020-02732-3#citeas

[10] Ibid.

[11] Swedish Environmental Protection Agency (26 Oct 2020) *Sweden's Climate Act and Climate Policy Framework*. Accessed 12 Dec 2020 online: http://www.swedishepa.se/Environmental-objectives-and-cooperation/Swedish-environmental-work/Work-areas/Climate/Climate-Act-and-Climate-policy-framework-/

The use of carbon credits (i.e tradable instruments generated by emissions reductions or carbon removals in foreign jurisdictions) to achieve Canada's targets can also reinforce inequality or injustice. There are growing trends for individuals, corporations, and jurisdictions in developed countries to offset their emissions via nature-based solutions (e.g. protecting or planting forests) in developing countries. To offset emissions at the scale required would take-up significant amounts of land. This practice has already been shown to displace farmers, people in poverty, and Indigenous peoples and growth of offsets could lead to "unprecedented landlessness, hunger and food price rises" that disproportionately impact those who have least contributed to climate change.[12]

Recommendation #8: Amend section 6 of the Bill to require that net-zero emissions be achieved by reducing emissions at least 90% below 2005 levels by 2050.

This is less than Canada's fair share in 2050 but is a pragmatic choice that sets a floor (but not a ceiling) on emissions reductions, and is comparable with Sweden's threshold, which uses a more stringent baseline of 1990.

Further, noting that some provinces in Canada already use cap-and-trade schemes that incorporate internationally traded carbon credits, we suggest that these be permitted to continue to support the achievement of Canada's emissions target, subject to the following recommendation:

***Recommendation #9*:** Include a provision to ensure that any international carbon credit schemes used to meet Canada's target only employ effective climate mitigation strategies, support social and environmental objectives, and do not exacerbate inequalities. This could be achieved with a regulation under the Bill that sets criteria for acceptable carbon credit schemes.

C. INCLUDE ENFORCEMENT MECHANISMS TO ENSURE ACCOUNTABILITY

This Bill will not advance climate justice unless individual Canadians and others affected by the impacts of climate change have the ability to hold the Government - now and in the future - to account for achieving Canada's emissions targets.

Canada, like jurisdictions all around the world, has consistently failed to achieve its climate targets over recent decades. In a worrying cycle, successive governments have set emissions targets but then failed to meet them, and have staved off political consequences by setting more ambitious targets further down the road. However, there are dangerous environmental and social consequences; it is a cycle we cannot afford to continue.

Providing clear mechanisms for enforcement and compliance in the Bill is an effective way of ensuring that targets are achieved and plans are detailed and robust. Enforceable provisions are a tangible demonstration of climate sincerity.

[12] ActionAid et al. (Oct 2020) *Not Zero: How "net zero" targets disguise climate inaction.* Accessed 9 Feb 2021 online: https://www.corporateaccountability.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/NOT-ZERO-How-net-zero-targets-disguise-climate-inaction-FINAL.pdf

The Bill places mandatory obligations on the Minister to set targets, take into account certain information, establish plans, as well as the contents of plans and reports. However, the most critical objective of the Bill - achieving net-zero emissions by 2050 - lacks a clear enforceability mechanism.

The United Kingdom's *Climate Change Act 2008* makes the Secretary of State responsible for ensuring that the UK's 2050 emissions are 100% lower than the 1990 baseline.[13] Scotland's *Climate Change (Emissions Reduction Targets) Scotland) Act 2019* imposes this duty on the "Scottish Ministers".[14] The German *Climate Change Act* states that the emissions reduction to be achieved by the target year of 2030 is shall be at least 55% below 1990 levels.[15] In each instance, the legislation requires that emissions are reduced by a certain amount upon a certain date. The United Kingdom, and in particular Scotland, go further by stating the political actors responsible for achieving this reduction.

In comparison, section 6 of the Bill merely sets a target for Canada to aim at. There are no requirements that Canada actually achieve net-zero by 2050 or its milestone targets along the way. Given our history of meeting our targets, the example set by other nations in climate legislation and critically, by the scale of the climate crisis, this is unacceptable. It demonstrates a failure to truly commit to reducing emissions.

In relation to setting, amending, and achieving emission targets and emission reduction plans, there is no clear path by which citizens can hold the Minister to account for the obligations established under the Bill. By contrast, legislation from various jurisdictions in Canada and around the world have included mechanisms for citizens to hold governments to account with respect to environmental and climate obligations. For example, Ontario's *Environmental Bill of Rights* provides citizens who previously made submissions on certain classes of decision standing and a direct right of appeal of such decisions.[16] As noted by the International Bar Association, in the US, many federal environmental statutes (such as the *Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, Resource Conservation and Recovery Act,* and *Endangered Species Act*) contain specific provisions allowing for 'citizen suits' by 'any person,[17] and "open standing" provisions are also made available in the legislation of other jurisdictions including, for example, Canada, Michigan, the Philippines, Ecuador and Uganda.[18]

The International Bar Association has published a Model Statute for Proceedings Challenging Government Failure to Act on Climate Change, with the stated hope that "[t]he adoption of some or all of the Model Statute by judges, rules of court or legislation will help ensure timely critical GHG emission cutbacks and achieve climate justice."[19] The Model Statute includes provisions relevant to matters which

[13] *UK Climate Change Act*, s.1(1)
[14] Scotland, *Climate Change (Emissions Reduction Targets) (Scotland) Act 2019,* asp 15. Accessed 28 Dec 2020 online:https://www.legislation.gov.uk/asp/2019/15/section/1/enacted
[15] Germany, Federal C*limate Change Act (Bundes-Kilmaschutzgesetz).* Accessed 28 Dec 2020 online: https://www.bmu.de/fileadmin/Daten_BMU/Download_PDF/Gesetze/ksg_final_en_bf.pdf
[16] *Environmental Bill of Rights, 1993, S.O. 1993,* s. 38(3)
[17] *IBA Climate Justice Task Force Report*, pp. 7.
[18] *IBA Climate Justice Task Force Report*, pp. 9, endnotes endnotes 41 through 46.
[19] International Bar Association Climate Justice and Human Rights Task Force (Feb 2020) *Model Statute for Proceedings Challenging Government Failure to Act on Climate Change*. Accessed 14 March 2021 online: https://www.ibanet.org/Climate-Change-Model-Statute.aspx ("*IBA Model Statute*"), Preface, pp. i.

should be addressed in the Bill. For example, Article 4.1 confirms the standing of "any person" to bring proceedings while Article 18 deals with available remedies.[20]

Recommendation #10: Amend sections 6 and 7 of the Bill to place clear and mandatory obligations on the Minister of the Environment to achieve the 2050 and milestone targets.

Recommendation #11: The Bill should include provisions conferring standing and confirming causes of action (judicial review, statutory claims) sufficient to enable Canadians to enforce the Government of Canada's obligations in the Bill in courts of competent jurisdiction, and providing that the full suite of remedies and relief are available to the courts when reviewing decision-making under the Act, including when emissions reduction plans are not followed and emissions targets are not met (e.g. declaratory relief, certiorari, mandamus).

III. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Thank you for the opportunity to present our submissions to the Standing Committee. Bill C-12 is a critical element of Canada's response to climate change. This response must be equitable and align with the principles of climate justice. Our recommendations seek to ensure that Canada's response aligns with these principles by acknowledging and addressing the disproportionate effects of climate change on marginalized peoples, ensuring that the achievement of emissions targets avoids further injustices, and provides the ability for Canadians to hold our leaders accountable for meeting our emissions targets.

Recommendations:

1. Amend section 10 of the Bill to require that the emissions reductions plans prepared under this section be required to describe how the plan addresses and mitigates the disproportionate impacts of climate change and climate policies on groups most affected, including Indigenous peoples.
2. Amend section 13 of the Bill to include minimum levels of, and mechanisms for, public participation.
3. To ensure transparency concerning how submissions are considered in decision-making processes, amend section 13 of the Bill to require that all submissions are made publicly available.
4. Delete reference to the advisory body in section 13 and insert a clear process for consultation with the advisory body in preparing reports under sections 14, 15, and 16.
5. Amend section 21 of the Bill to specify the climate-related scientific, economic, technical, and social expertise required by the members of the Advisory body to ensure that it can independently and competently advise the Minister on matters relating to emissions targets and plans to achieve targets. Ensure that the requisite expertise includes Indigenous knowledge.

[20] *IBA Model Statute,* pp.32 and 56.

6. Ensure that the composition of the advisory body includes minimum requirements for Indigenous representatives from across Canada, including from southern and northern communities.
7. Amend sections 4 and 8 of the Bill to expressly note the importance of considering Indigenous and/or Traditional Ecological Knowledge in setting targets.
8. Amend section 6 of the Bill to require that net-zero emissions be achieved by reducing emissions at least 90% below 2005 levels.
9. Include a provision to ensure that any international carbon credit schemes used to meet Canada's target only employ effective climate mitigation strategies, support social and environmental objectives, and do not exacerbate inequalities. This could be achieved with a regulation under the Bill that sets criteria for acceptable carbon credit schemes.
10. Amend sections 6 and 7 of the Bill to place clear and mandatory obligations on the Minister of the Environment to achieve the 2050 and milestone targets.
11. Include in the Bill provisions conferring standing and confirming causes of action (judicial review, statutory claims) sufficient to enable Canadians to enforce the Government of Canada's obligations in the Bill in courts of competent jurisdiction, and providing that the full suite of remedies and relief are available to the courts when reviewing decision-making under the Act, including when emissions reduction plans are not followed and emissions targets are not met (e.g. declaratory relief, certiorari, mandamus).

Lawyers for Climate Justice is a multi-disciplinary group of lawyers and articled students from across Canada that is focused on advancing climate justice within the legal profession in Canada. We believe the legal profession – as individuals, law firms, associations, and regulatory bodies - has an ethical obligation to consider what role we should play in responding to the climate crisis. Lawyers for Climate Justice aims to advance this deliberation in Canada through public advocacy, advocacy within the legal profession, and providing legal support to the climate movement.