



House of Commons  
CANADA

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

---

TRAN • NUMBER 031 • 2nd SESSION • 40th PARLIAMENT

---

**EVIDENCE**

**Wednesday, October 21, 2009**

—  
**Chair**

**Mr. Merv Tweed**



## Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities

Wednesday, October 21, 2009

• (1540)

[English]

**The Chair (Mr. Mervin Tweed (Brandon—Souris, CPC)):** Good afternoon, everyone. Welcome to the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, meeting number 31.

Our order of the day, pursuant to the order of reference of Monday, October 5, 2009, is Bill C-37, an act to amend the National Capital Act and other acts.

Joining us today, from the Municipality of Chelsea, is the mayor, Monsieur Jean Perras. Also with us are Claude Garand, past president of the Meech Lake Association, and Malcolm MacTavish, president of the Kingsmere Property Owners Association.

We're ready to go. You know the format, so I will ask you to begin, please.

[Translation]

**Mr. Jean Perras (Mayor, Municipality of Chelsea):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I would like to thank you for inviting us to participate in your committee's work. With me are Malcolm MacTavish and Claude Garand, who will speak after my introduction. Following that, we will be able to answer some of your questions.

First, who are we? The Municipality of Chelsea is located in west Quebec adjacent to the Gatineau Park. It is the home of 7,000 residents, 500 who live on privately owned property in the park. The Kingsmere Property Owners Association and the Meech Lake Association represent some 140 families who live in the Gatineau Park.

[English]

Chelsea is a recognized municipal leader in environmental protection. Chelsea's mission statement is to improve the quality of life for current and future generations by offering community, cultural, and recreational services and activities, the protection and enhancement of the environment, and the preservation of territorial boundaries.

We have won several awards: the Quebec public administration award for its ban on pesticides, and the Canadian Federation of Municipalities sustainable community award for the H2O project developed by the Municipality of Chelsea, Action Chelsea for the Respect of the Environment, and the University of Ottawa. This innovative project comprises three major components: water quality and quantity testing; the measurement of static water levels in local

wells; and testing of Chelsea lakes and waterways, which include Kingsmere Lake and Meech Lake.

**Mr. Malcolm MacTavish (President, Kingsmere Property Owners Association, Municipality of Chelsea):** Private property pre-dates the NCC, the Federal District Commission, and Gatineau Park. Chelsea residents and members of both associations can trace their roots back to the turn of the last century. Indeed, some of the members of these two associations represent family land holdings that pre-date the National Capital Commission, the NCC's predecessor, the Federal District Commission, as well as the formation of the park.

Our residents understand what a wonderful asset the park represents to the national capital region and to Canadians in general. We love the park, our two lakes, and the lands around them. Over the past half-century we have embraced a mixed private and public use and ownership philosophy. Moreover, we have contributed much to the social and economic well-being of Chelsea and west Quebec.

We believe strongly in the preservation of the environment, natural beauty, and heritage of Gatineau Park. Over the past 100 years our residents have demonstrated their dedicated stewardship of the park and community in which they live. Many of the hiking and cross-country ski trails that criss-cross the park were built by us. Area cleanup days, H2O Chelsea water sampling and surveys, water and trail medical rescues and evacuations, fire monitoring, and other similar beneficial public activities are routinely undertaken by us, and happily so.

Chelsea is a green municipality, perhaps the greenest community in our province and across the country. Municipal building codes and septic system control and monitoring in Chelsea are among the most stringent in Canada. This type of municipal government leadership is essential to any community and lends support to our goals of respect and preservation of the natural world around us.

[Translation]

**Mr. Jean Perras:** Chelsea and the two associations support federal, provincial and municipal government rules and regulations which are intended to protect the park and to ensure that publicly-owned lands are accessible to the public. This support is tempered only by our belief the present and future rules and regulations should not unduly or unfairly fetter ownership, access, or use of privately-owned family homes whether they be full-time or seasonal residences.

[English]

We fully support the NCC's continued management of the federal government's property holdings within the park. We also support the NCC's goal of clearly delineating the boundaries of the park and completing a comprehensive survey of the park to clearly establish the location and size of publicly owned lands—federal government and province of Quebec-owned lands—and privately owned properties.

[Translation]

**Mr. Claude Garand (Past President, Meech Lake Association, Municipality of Chelsea):** Chelsea and the two associations share the common and firmly held belief that there is no need for special legislation which restricts the resale of our residents' homes and properties. Any restriction on resale, such as the right of first refusal, is unnecessary and unfair: unnecessary in that the federal government already has the general power of expropriation which it has used over the years to acquire large tracks of land which could be commercialized; and, unfair in that it would artificially reduce property values, which essentially amounts to expropriation without compensation. We support an open real estate market and note that there is no impediment to the NCC bidding on properties which become available on the market.

We feel that the objectives of the NCC can be met either by accessing the open resale market or, in special circumstances, using the federal government's power of expropriation. The latter comes with appropriate checks and balances to ensure due and fair process accompanied by the requirement for ordinary public policy rationale underlying any expropriation of private homes.

Millions of Canadians from coast to coast enjoy the social and economic benefits of private home ownership. The majority of these Canadians count their home as their primary family asset. Private homes have been established at Kingsmere and Meech Lakes since the 1800s. We are also in general agreement with the NCC's most recent position on private properties and residential uses. Integral to this support is our assumption that none of the NCC's objectives will be interpreted in a way that would cause a change in the reasonable use and enjoyment of our homes and properties and that if there were such changes it would be because they would generally be applicable to other Canadians at or about the same time.

● (1545)

[English]

**Mr. Jean Perras:** Finally, Chelsea and the two associations support fully the maximum degree of consultation and cooperation among the three levels of government that influence and/or govern the park. We also pledge to be part of this process to the extent possible. Through understanding and cooperation we can all work to ensure the welfare of Gatineau Park and the continued harmony between public and private use.

*Merci, monsieur le président.*

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

Monsieur Proulx.

[Translation]

**Mr. Marcel Proulx (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.):** Thank you.

Mr. Perras, thank you for having come here today to meet with us.

I also thank you, Mr. Garand.

[English]

Thank you, Mr. MacTavish.

[Translation]

Mr. Perras, we are taking advantage of your presence while you are in the dying days of your mandate as mayor of the municipality. You have been the mayor for many years, and I congratulate you for that.

I would like to be able to discuss the principles of the bill that has been tabled with you. I would like to know, as a municipal authority and as a person who has knowledge of this, if you agree with us. Subclause 9(1) of Bill C-37 adds to the National Capital Commission's mandate because it includes the concept of transportation in the region.

We believe we should be much more specific in order to clearly establish the presence of the National Capital Commission in the planning of interprovincial highways and public transportation, and we are going one step further. We believe that, since the National Capital Commission would be involved in interprovincial transport—which includes the bridges, the management of existing bridges and future crossings over the Ottawa River within the territory of the National Capital Region—that this should be transferred and be overseen by the National Capital Commission.

The Champlain and Portage Bridges are already managed by the National Capital Commission. It would be a question of transferring the Chaudières Bridge, the Interprovincial Bridge and the federal part of the Macdonald-Cartier Bridge, which are currently managed by Public Works and Government Services Canada. There would obviously need to be a budget to go along with that.

I would like to hear your opinion on this issue. Even though your municipality does not reach as far as the banks of the Ottawa River, it benefits from interprovincial transportation within the municipality of Ottawa. In fact, the STO services cater to a Québécois clientele made up of your residents. The STO is held up more often than in the past by the lack of interprovincial links, by problems on the roads network, etc. I would therefore like to hear what you think about the mandate that should be given to the National Capital Commission in terms of transportation in the National Capital Region.

● (1550)

**Mr. Jean Perras:** I will answer that wearing two different hats, if I may.

First of all, we were supportive... During the consultations that led to the National Capital Commission's most recent master plan, we said that there would have to be an approach to public transportation in the park. In our opinion, we feel it would be a good idea to develop a strategic plan for the future of the park, to ensure that there be fewer vehicles, with the STO, the Ottawa Commission and the National Capital Commission working together. On some weekends, it is almost impossible to drive around the park because of the number of cars. In our brief, two or three years ago, we stated that it would not be a bad idea if the NCC and other organizations concerned with collective transportation, with public transport got together to develop a park strategy.

Secondly, as an administrator of the STO, I can tell you that the Société de transport de l'Outaouais has always had very close ties to Ottawa and the NCC as far as the bridges are concerned, as far as getting traffic to move much more quickly. Currently, on some mornings, it is almost impossible to cross these bridges.

Whether or not the federal government gives this authority to the NCC, we must find a solution to this problem. We believe, at the STO—and I'm speaking on behalf of the Municipality of Chelsea—that a broader mandate for the NCC in terms of transportation, and of public transportation in particular, could help us to resolve the traffic problems in the morning and the evening.

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** My question is for Mr. Perras, but Mr. Garand and Mr. MacTavish, please feel free to answer as well.

Within the municipality, there are other lands, other properties that belong to the National Capital Commission, beyond what is recognized as being Gatineau Park.

I refer you to proposal clause 10.4(2) in the bill, which reads as follows:<sup>(2)</sup> The Commission shall give due regard to the maintenance of the ecological integrity, through the protection of natural resources and processes, of any property of the Commission that is an immovable located in Gatineau Park.

It is an issue of giving due regard to the maintenance of the ecological integrity. We believe that we should rather be speaking about giving priority to the maintenance of the ecological integrity. In fact, it would be much clearer for the National Capital Commission if it was an issue of giving priority to the maintenance of this ecological integrity, rather than simply giving due regard to the maintenance of the ecological integrity. What do you think?

Moreover, my question is focused not only on Gatineau Park lands, Mr. Perras, Mr. Garand and Mr. MacTavish, but also on the other lands that belong to the National Capital Commission. You can answer us as far as the lands within your municipality are concerned, but we are going far beyond that. We are also talking about the greenbelt, on the Ottawa side, and other National Capital Commission properties.

How do you see that, Mr. Perras?

**Mr. Jean Perras:** We have always agreed that the National Capital Commission's priority is to ensure the biophysical and ecological integrity of Gatineau Park. Furthermore, we have already stated that in written briefs and during meetings with the NCC at all levels, from the working level right up to the level of the CEO.

You are referring to lands that are not necessarily in the park. There are a few along the right-hand side of Highway 5 if you are heading towards Wakefield.

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** On the east side.

**Mr. Jean Perras:** On the east side. The park is on the left.

We always said that if the NCC wanted to sell this land—and it has been talked about in the past that these lands that are somewhat set back from the park would be sold—we would take them on one condition: to preserve them in order to ensure the biodiversity, ecology and the integrity of the park, etc. We would therefore be very supportive of that proposal.

• (1555)

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** Thank you, I will return to that on my next turn.

**The Chair:** Mr. Laframboise.

**Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ):** I'll give a short introduction, but the first question will be put by Mr. Nadeau.

First of all, Mr. Perras, I want to congratulate you for the excellent work you have been doing for the last 16 years, I believe, since you have headed up the municipality. I had the opportunity to know you in another political life. The Municipality of Chelsea, that you have governed, is recognized in Quebec as being a leader in terms of the environment and protection of its biodiversity. I know that you are proud of that and that you did not fear any election, but that you have made the choice not to run. Therefore, once again, congratulations on your excellent work.

I give the floor to Mr. Nadeau.

**Mr. Richard Nadeau (Gatineau, BQ):** Mr. Perras, Mr. MacTavish, Mr. Garand, good afternoon. As you know, we are studying Bill C-37. You must certainly have looked at the bill itself. When I ask you questions, it is to provoke debate in order to ensure that when we take the next steps, we will be able to improve this bill to ensure that it respects the mandate we wish to give it as legislators.

Having said that, I have in my possession a letter from the Meech Lake Association from 2004. This residents' association is asking that parking lot 12 be closed, so that the public could no longer have access to Blanchette Beach because there were too many people using it, to the detriment of the people of Chelsea. That being said, it is still in the park.

Is it part of your philosophy, of your approach as far as Gatineau Park is concerned, and in the eyes of your residents' associations, that private enclaves should exist?

**Mr. Claude Garand:** Our approach concerns the respect for private properties situated in the park and their reasonable use—in the same way that other Canadians benefit from their own property. That is the long and the short of it. We have always wanted to have a good relationship with the NCC. It is an issue of common sense.

[English]

**Mr. Malcolm MacTavish:** I agree with Mr. Garand. The Meech Lake Association is made up of single-family homeowners essentially, and we enjoy the same rights and privileges as homeowners in the municipality of Chelsea, where we live, in the province of Quebec, and in the country. We've always believed that those privileges and rights should not be compromised in any way.

As private members' bills have been introduced over the years, we've had a fear that our enjoyment and privileges of home ownership would be somehow restricted. We feel that we have a pretty good working relationship with the municipality and the NCC. We're largely very happy with what the NCC has done in maintaining the integrity of the park, for example, and in its relationship with us. Marie Lemay is a fantastic CEO.

• (1600)

[Translation]

**Mr. Richard Nadeau:** Mr. MacTavish, you understand that, regarding the presentations that are made during the seven minutes, that includes my questions, your answers, and we are time-constrained. I am moving on to another subject but I in no way wish to insult you.

I am thinking of the concept of a national park. We know that Gatineau Park is not a national park like the one in Banff or other parks elsewhere in Quebec or in Canada, that are managed by the federal government. They are all however public parks. So when associations or movements within a park—this is an issue of private enclaves—are asking to limit public access, this bothers me somewhat. In fact, for me, a park is made up of its boundaries and of what is within them. And what is within them must be able to attract the citizens of Quebec or the rest of Canada to be able to engage in activities. In my opinion, as far as the letter and the functioning of the park itself is concerned, the public aspect is the most important. It is the aspect I want to highlight. I am not saying that your properties should be invaded, but the public aspect is very important.

Mr. Perras.

**Mr. Jean Perras:** I understand your point of view. What is written endures, apparently. It is formal proof that the record stands.

I can tell you that, since that time, we have evolved. At that point in time, our municipality's position on the issue was based on better supervision of vehicle traffic. I swear to you that some years on the 24<sup>th</sup> of June and the 1<sup>st</sup> of July, we could not even get to the end of the road because there were so many cars parked on both sides. In the event of a fire at the other end—we are responsible for fire trucks—the trucks could not even get to the end of the road. We found a solution, together with the NCC. We have just signed a memorandum of understanding called a "process of collaboration between the NCC and the municipality". The objective is to preserve, to work together to plan and to better work together on the quality of life, the protection of the environment but also public safety, which is the mandate of our municipality.

**Mr. Richard Nadeau:** I'm going to move on to another question.

As far as national parks are concerned—I am thinking of the one in Banff, because I studied it in an attempt to try and find something

comparable—people talked about leases. That is to say that people who have private lands—and you must understand that there are not many—have leases. In that case, there can be no development, no further expansion, using that private land or private property situated within the park.

Would you support that approach, Mr. Garand?

**Mr. Claude Garand:** I do not believe that kind of approach is necessary because at the moment, we are talking about private property. There are not many development opportunities. Moreover, I believe that would take away the rights of the people who already own private properties in the park.

[English]

**The Chair:** Merci, Monsieur Nadeau.

Mr. Bevington.

**Mr. Dennis Bevington (Western Arctic, NDP):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thanks to the witnesses for coming out today.

I was a mayor for a very long time in a community next to Canada's largest national park, Wood Buffalo, and I always want to give advice to be careful about what you do in your relationship with national parks, or with any other park for that matter.

To the mayor, do you have any plans that would be affected or altered if this bill passes, the planning that goes on in your community?

**Mr. Jean Perras:** Not really. It all depends on what will happen to the private properties. But I don't see any.... On the contrary, we have supported this bill since it was written. We've said so to the NCC, we've said so to the government, we've said so to several of you around the table. I think our brief clearly established that we are supportive, with the one exception that my two colleagues have mentioned, that we need to conserve the property rights as they are established.

You should also understand that there is a good portion of that park—17% or 18%—that the Government of Quebec still considers as the property of the Quebec government. So in the development of that bill, I hope that the chair will also have the wisdom to sit down with the Government of Quebec and ask them how they feel about the whole evolution of this file so that we make sure that all three levels of government work together on the future of that. As I've mentioned, we signed a protocol last year with the NCC that clearly talks about the same issues that are in there.

• (1605)

[Translation]

It is an issue of promoting an awareness of the environment; of ensuring better cooperation in the planning and management of the environment for habitats and species; of increasing the participation of the various partners in this environment; of improving the quality of life of the residents in the region and of sharing the data and information so that we have a better common understanding. These are objectives that we set for ourselves working from the NCC plan, but they also reflect Bill C-37 very well.

[English]

**Mr. Dennis Bevington:** In your present relationship with the park, are there aspects of infrastructure that perhaps the park is responsible for, such as roadways, that have not been maintained to the level that you think they should be?

**Mr. Jean Perras:** I can see you were a mayor before.

Yes, we have that discussion with the NCC every day about the state of Notch Road, Mine Road, Meech Lake Road, and Kingsmere Road. Right now the ball is in our court, and we have to pay for all of the refurbishing and the maintenance and not too much improvement, unfortunately. So we're still discussing a better separation of the fiscal plate with the NCC so that we can have a bigger share in order to permit us to make those roads as safe as possible.

**Mr. Dennis Bevington:** Do you see this bill as giving you any additional support in that regard?

**Mr. Jean Perras:** I didn't see the budget annex to the bill.

**Mr. Dennis Bevington:** Yes, you have the same issues that we do, I'm sure.

I use the park for cross-country skiing and bicycling, so I appreciate the natural beauty of the park, but I sometimes wonder if it.... You say that the capacity is very full at certain times, but many times when I'm up there, I'm virtually by myself in the park. Has there been enough promotion of the use of the park? Do you feel that there could be an enhancement to the business opportunities with more complete seasonal coverage? Is that part of what the National Capital Commission is talking about?

**Mr. Jean Perras:** We've talked about that. The park is really the jewel in the crown of the Outaouais region, at least, and of the national capital as a whole. Yes, it could be better advertised. It could be linked to other key activities in the park, such as the Hull-Chelsea-Wakefield train. We have had those discussions, but we'll leave it to the NCC to develop its tourism industry.

**Mr. Dennis Bevington:** As to the private property owners, I actually own a cabin in the middle of a national park, and the restrictions on that cabin are quite pronounced. It is something that really comes down to a park management plan that will be interpreted by park staff. Do you have a sense of how that will play out with this proposed act?

**Mr. Malcolm MacTavish:** As I said earlier, the NCC has been pretty good about maintaining the park, and we, as property owners, are also very much involved in taking care of our own. We're involved with lake testing and cleanup and things like that.

I don't actually—

**Mr. Dennis Bevington:** Are things such as tree removal and opening up areas around your property for fire protection the types of things that might be part of ordinary conduct on private property?

•(1610)

**Mr. Malcolm MacTavish:** Do you mean things that private property owners would undertake?

**Mr. Dennis Bevington:** Yes.

**Mr. Malcolm MacTavish:** Any homeowner takes pride in taking care of his or her property.

**Mr. Dennis Bevington:** There are no restrictions.

**Mr. Malcolm MacTavish:** There are no restrictions. There are certain municipal restrictions on the size of trees you can remove and things like that, but as I said, the NCC has done a pretty good job and continues to do that. I'm not sure if in the bill itself just making their mandate more streamlined would improve their ability to maintain the park. I'm not sure.

**Mr. Claude Garand:** I just want to add that the Municipality of Chelsea obviously has a very green orientation. One example of what has been done recently was the hiring of someone whose specific mandate is to make sure that at a municipal level the water courses are protected and that kind of thing. Someone came to my home at Meech Lake and indicated to us what kinds of things we could do to protect the environment close to the lake, how it should be done, and how property should be maintained to ecologically respect the surroundings. That is just an indication of how the municipality takes care of those aspects.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I will assure the mayor that both the provinces of Ontario and Quebec have been invited to come before the committee.

I appreciate your advice.

We'll go to Mr. Jean.

**Mr. Brian Jean (Fort McMurray—Athabasca, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Tweed. I would like to share my time with Ms. Brown, if possible.

I want to take up where Mr. Nadeau started in relation to the recommended closing of Blanchet Beach and the boat launch. I had an opportunity in July and August to take my motorbike up to that area and to actually go all the way to the end and back around, and quite frankly, I didn't find it as full as you indicated. Although the beach was full, I noticed how many Canadians were enjoying their opportunity to be at the beach and in the surrounding area. I am wondering why you would recommend that the beach be closed, since it is an asset for all Canadians to enjoy, and quite frankly, they seemed to enjoy it quite readily.

**Mr. Claude Garand:** I'm not sure what the reasons were, actually. I wasn't involved during the period when the request was made to close the beach, so I'd rather defer to Mr. Perras.

**Mr. Brian Jean:** If I may interrupt for just a moment, the reason I ask is that it seemed to indicate that there was some problem with traffic. That seemed to be one of the major reasons, and also that the beach is overflowing with Canadians who want to utilize their assets. But you have also recommended that even if you close the beach, you will continue to need some form of policing to ensure that people don't park in certain areas, and you're asking for additional coverage and supervision for that and for all of the park. Isn't it really a supervision issue and not necessarily a safety issue?

In July and August, in both months, I was there on sunny days, and I didn't have any problem with traffic. I had no problem finding a place to park my motorbike. Of course I didn't have such a big vehicle, but it didn't seem to be that crowded as far as traffic went. I didn't think it was unsafe at all.

**Mr. Jean Perras:** As I mentioned before to Monsieur Nadeau, it was an issue historically, but not every day. I agree with you. For sure, yes, you can go through Blanchet on most days and not have a problem. The problem stems from several days in the summer. Historically, we had major issues: gridlocks and people parking everywhere on private properties, walking all over the place. I tell you, if we had had a fire, for example, at the Prime Minister's residence at the end of Meech Lake—because the Prime Minister's residence is right after Blanchet—we could have had a major problem because we couldn't be there in time with our fire trucks.

**Mr. Brian Jean:** You're suggesting the issue is a matter of illegal parking, possibly a matter of some supervision on those days when it's busier.

**Mr. Jean Perras:** That's what we're doing right now. Since then our police are ticketing much more. One of our employees spends most of the weekends there, redirecting traffic. We've established communication lines between Meech Lake, Blanchet Beach, and O'Brien Beach, so when beaches close down and when the parking lots are full, we stop people from going to the beaches because there's no parking whatsoever. Personally, I think the problem has been solved to a certain degree.

•(1615)

**Mr. Brian Jean:** Thank you very much.

I'd like to turn it over to Ms. Brown.

**The Chair:** Ms. Brown.

**Ms. Lois Brown (Newmarket—Aurora, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you for being here today.

I've had occasion to spend some time in Gatineau Park, and it is a very beautiful part of the country. You're very privileged to be there.

One of the things that you talked about today and that I've heard from all three of you in your discussions here is cooperation. I've noticed in this presentation you wrote about support for NCC stewardship of Gatineau Park. You talked about the association supporting federal, provincial, and municipal government rules and regulations intended to protect the park. In the next paragraph, you say you fully support the NCC's continued management, and again, further on you say, "Through understanding and cooperation, we can all work together to ensure the welfare of the Gatineau Park and the continued harmony between public and private use".

I guess my question is this. Could you let us know how the Municipality of Chelsea and the NCC are cooperating on matters? You've talked about having written an MOU that's in place. Could you expand on some of those areas where you see that cooperation happening? How is that relationship building?

**Mr. Jean Perras:** Well, for example, for the last five years we've had a program that was created by the municipality, called H2O Chelsea. On the different lakes and rivers in Chelsea, we've had volunteers on weekends testing the water. All of those results have been shared with the NCC for Kingsmere Lake, for Meech Lake, for Gatineau River, and so on and so forth. That was part of the MOU, but we had started it in advance. The MOU just came and confirmed that.

Another one is a new program we created a year and a half ago, called Nature Chelsea. The objective of this program is to ensure that we know exactly the state of our biodiversity, both fauna and flora. We know the NCC has quite a good collection of species. They know about the species, so since the beginning of this new program we've been sharing information, database, to make sure both sides understand. We're going to share that with the ACRE, which is the regional Chelsea environmental group. The University of Ottawa has also said it would play a role in transferring science and knowledge between the NCC and Chelsea. So we've been quite active and we want to continue making that.

Also, I'll put on another hat. I'm the warden of the regional government, the MRC des Collines-de-l'Outaouais, and with our police officers we patrol the park when need be. For example, when there are break-ins in cars at Blanchet Beach, our police officers will come in and try to figure out what happened and so on. Those are some of the responsibilities that we have and that we share with the NCC, because they also have the RCMP patrolling the place. Since our police officers are so close to the park on a daily basis and sometimes the RCMP are not necessarily there—let's say, nights and weekends—we end up helping with the patrol of the park.

It's the same thing for our fire trucks. If there is something up at the Mackenzie King Estate during the winter, our fire trucks are the first ones there to make sure nothing goes wrong. So we do cooperate on a daily basis. We share information. We share knowledge. We share science. This MOU and the Gatineau Park master plan are right in line, I think, with those approaches.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I'm sorry, I'll have to cut you off there.

We'll go to Monsieur Proulx.

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** Monsieur Perras—and Monsieur Garand and Mr. MacTavish can certainly answer too—I'm referring to a letter that was addressed to the NCC back on April 26, 2004. It talks about the closing of Blanchet Beach and so on. It was brought up in a conversation a little while ago. Must I understand that this is outdated? I don't mean the letter, I mean the request.

**Mr. Jean Perras:** The municipality didn't write that letter. The lake association.....

We now have a system to control traffic and circulation to make sure that in an emergency, the fire trucks, the ambulance, and the police officers can get to the end of Meech Lake on time.

•(1620)

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** Okay.

Mr. Garand, it came from your association. Are you satisfied that the request is outdated now?

**Mr. Claude Garand:** I'd rather not answer. I'm not sure, because I'm not part of the executive now.

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** How about you, Mr. MacTavish?

**Mr. Malcolm MacTavish:** I can't comment. Because of the traffic on that road, I don't go down there very often.



[*Translation*]

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** Mr. Perras, your comments lead me to believe that your degree of satisfaction, as an administrator in your municipality, is not far from 100%.

Are you satisfied with the way in which the National Capital Commission is managing the park and its lands as well as the relationship it has with your municipality?

**Mr. Jean Perras:** It is a long process. There have been many changes and improvements over the last 20 years. Many work plans have been tabled by the NCC. This bill must be passed. It is a good bill that should improve our relationship even more.

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** It will bring together certain things.

**Mr. Jean Perras:** Yes. Is it perfect? No.

As I was saying to Mr. Bevington, we have been talking about a better way of distributing the NCC's tax base for years. We also would like our roads to be in better shape, for the services of the RCM police to be paid for us, etc. There is a lot of work left to be done, but let us say that in terms of appreciation, it's better than a passing mark.

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** That is what I understood.

As for the future management of these lands, I don't need to spell it out for you. Some groups are opposed to development, some would like to see more, and others want this area to be recognized as a national park. From what I understand, you feel that the status quo is reasonable.

I would like to move to another subject now. In the bill, there is a reference to a master plan that the NCC would have accepted, that the governor in council would accept and which would then be tabled in Parliament, without however being approved of by the latter. We in the Liberal Party believe that this plan should be approved by Parliament.

Speaking of this plan, I would suggest—and the Liberal Party is committed to this aspect—that the plan should take into consideration the potential distribution of jobs in the region. For years now, job distribution in the National Capital Region has been called for in the following percentages: 75 for the Ontario side and 25 for the Quebec side. No one is policing this. We believe that it should be the role of the NCC, within the framework of its master plan.

You have already had a career in the federal public service. You are aware of the issue. We do not want this to be strictly about jobs under the Canadian government's Treasury Board Secretariat. We want it to include all direct and indirect Canadian government jobs, that is to say all federal organization jobs. This would involve the addition of approximately 10,000 more jobs on the Quebec side of the Ottawa River. This would not necessarily have to be only within the former cities of Hull, Gatineau or Aylmer. It could go beyond that. However, we insist that this job distribution be part of the NCC's mandate, that it be part of its master plan and that this master plan be approved by Parliament.

What do you think?

**Mr. Jean Perras:** I will put on my hat as warden of the RCM des Collines-de-l'Outaouais to tell you that we are in the process of rewriting our master plan, the Regional County Municipality

development plan. In this plan, it is clearly established that we hope there will be economic development and job creation in the RCM des Collines-de-l'Outaouais.

Since Gatineau Park and the NCC play an important role in the objectives that we have set out because of the scope of the park in terms of recreation, tourism, and sports, any federal strategy that is developed together with the provinces would be welcomed by our RCM.

• (1625)

[*English*]

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** I have just a little point of clarification.

[*Translation*]

We are not only talking about Gatineau Park, but about the RCM as such. The greater part of the RCM is situated within the territory we call the "National Capital Region".

**Mr. Jean Perras:** I am thinking primarily of the municipalities of Pontiac and La Pêche, which border the park.

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** Okay, but that is outside the park.

**Mr. Jean Perras:** It is outside the park, however, we have an osmotic relationship with the park on a daily basis. We are for anything that can improve employment in the region.

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** All right.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Monsieur Nadeau.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Richard Nadeau:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gentlemen, clause 10.4(2) reads as follows: "The Commission shall give due regard to the maintenance of the ecological integrity [...] of any property of the Commission [...]"

All Quebecers and Canadians would like the NCC to maintain and rehabilitate Gatineau Park. We have to do a little more than simply wait, hope or give due regard to the park. The NCC has to have this responsibility with respect to the park. Should the park be damaged, the NCC has to be able to rehabilitate it and provide stewardship.

Would you agree that the NCC should be responsible for maintaining and rehabilitating the park?

**Mr. Jean Perras:** As my two colleagues said in their presentation, I have no problem with that providing that property rights are respected. On the contrary, any effort to rehabilitate and protect the biodiversity is good. The Government of Quebec and the other departments consider the Outaouais as being the region with the most biodiversity. That is why in Chelsea we created a conservation program called "Nature Chelsea". We signed a Memorandum of Understanding with the NCC, which says specifically that when necessary, rehabilitation will be done.

**Mr. Richard Nadeau:** All right, you also understand that should something happen on private property, the NCC would be responsible for taking the requisite action, if there are damages and legal liability. This is part and parcel of this full protection for the park.

Does that suit you, Mr. Garand and Mr. MacTavish?

**Mr. Claude Garand:** As far as I'm concerned, yes. I am positive that the residents of Meech Lake would agree that this responsibility should lie with the NCC. We would support this type of mandate.

[English]

**Mr. Malcolm MacTavish:** I would agree. I'd support that.

[Translation]

**Mr. Richard Nadeau:** I'm going to cover another topic, which is more delicate: expropriation. In Canadian national parks, the federal government does not have the authority to expropriate land. The NCC is entitled to expropriate land that is in the territory under its responsibility. You know what is in the act. We discussed this matter with Minister Baird, who met with us two days ago, if I'm not mistaken, and his comments were reported in *The Citizen*.

Should we wish to remove the National Capital Commission's expropriation power, would you agree that the following aspects should be linked to this decision, namely: that there be no division of private land, making it impossible to subdivide for further construction, and that there be no other development than that which already exists in the park. There would also be other issues, such as the sale of land by a property owner, but that is something else. I do not want to confuse issues.

So, no division, no development, meaning that what we see now—we'll take a photo—is what will remain. Somebody may renovate his house, or cottage, but it couldn't go any further than that. In exchange, we would remove this right to expropriate, because if this authority exists, it can be used.

What is your position on this matter, Mr. MacTavish, Mr. Garand?

•(1630)

**Mr. Claude Garand:** I think that we would need to discuss this matter further with our board because this is a new concept. I am not able to answer you at present. On the one hand, this would be good, but on the other hand, this may remove rights from some people. So I am not sure how this compromise would be viewed.

[English]

**Mr. Malcolm MacTavish:** I'm not sure either. There are municipal regulations that cover how you can deal with your property. I would think those are largely sufficient within our municipality. We should have full enjoyment of our homes. If a property has room for another lot, if you own the property, you should perhaps have the right to develop that or leave it to your children, or whatever, as long as it doesn't conflict with municipal regulations.

I would be concerned if there were further restrictions on the enjoyment of our private property rights.

[Translation]

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

Mr. Mayes.

[English]

**Mr. Colin Mayes (Okanagan—Shuswap, CPC):** At the last meeting we had some witnesses who requested that Gatineau Park be a national park. There was kind of an inference that the request was based on the fact that, as a national park, environmental protection would be enshrined, or the integrity of the park would be protected.

I too have been a mayor in my past life. Actually, Parks Canada declared part of our community a national historic site, so there were some challenges with putting in land use regulations, building restrictions, those types of things. There was a balance between the interest of the community and the citizens' rights to their property.

Does your community, Your Worship, have kind of a community plan as to what they want their area to be like?

**Mr. Jean Perras:** We have a master plan for the municipality and we have a land use plan for the regional government. Those two plans must *concord*; one comes under the other.

Let me try to answer your question in another way. I'm aware of most of the national parks across Canada. I have been to Banff and Jasper and Newfoundland and all that. One thing that I would like to say is that the whole debate about Gatineau Park stems from a perception by certain people that having human beings in the park is not a good thing. I think we are trying to demonstrate today that we've been part and parcel of the stewardship of that park, that if the park exists the way it is now, five or six generations of people, some of whom knew Mackenzie King, have been very good stewards. They have phoned us when they saw fire. They have found people in the park with broken legs. They have done the ski trails. So this whole debate about why people should stay in the park and all that I think is not appropriate debate. The people are there, they are good stewards, they feel for it.

Chelsea is really tough. I keep saying to a lot of mayors across Canada that when you cut a tree in Chelsea, you need to have a consultation, and there are probably 200 people in the room who don't want you to cut that tree. So it's not as if it's a free-for-all and let's kill all the biodiversity. On the contrary. I think we've proven today that with the H2O program, the Nature Chelsea program, the memorandum of understanding we've set, we're quite on top of things. I think the NCC appreciates the cooperation they're getting from the municipality.

**Mr. Colin Mayes:** There's a reason you've held office as long as you have, as you are very wise about what you say.

That's the conflict. It is between a passive part and an active part. It is the conflict between people who believe a park should be devoid of human participation and then there are others who feel that public participation brings the park alive. I think there is a balance in that.

I understand you have 1.7 million visitors to this park a year, so obviously there are corridors of activity and other areas that are set aside for environmental stewardship reasons. Is that part of your master plan?

•(1635)

**Mr. Jean Perras:** An example of part of our master plan is that we are now protecting all the wetlands of Chelsea. A lot of those wetlands are close to the park. Some of it is in the park and some of it is around the outside of the park. By protecting the wetlands we're protecting our groundwater, because all of our houses have one well and one septic system. If you don't protect the biodiversity and you don't protect the wetlands and nature's biodiversity and so on, you're shooting yourself in the foot if you live in the park or right next to the park.

**The Chair:** Mr. Proulx.

[Translation]

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Perras, subclauses 2(1) and 2(2) of the bill refer to territorial boundaries or geographic boundaries. The first refers to the National Capital Region and the second to Gatineau Park.

We had asked the NCC to provide us with maps so we could look at any changes with you. Unfortunately, our request came too late and the National Capital Commission provided us with these maps, which are difficult to read. We have managed to determine where we are based on the Outaouais River, but it is quite difficult apart from that.

I think that there are 32 pages of official descriptions in the bill. My colleague, a notary, spent entire nights examining this. Did you get the opportunity to look at these descriptions to see whether there are any changes? Have the boundaries changed or do they remain the same? What has been done is that the official descriptions have been set down in black and white on paper. These boundaries have existed since 1997, in resolutions by the board of administration. They go back to 1960 and were confirmed in 1997. In 2008, they were confirmed yet again. Does the official description, included in the bill, correspond to your knowledge and what you are used to in Chelsea?

**Mr. Jean Perras:** Based on our information, those are the current boundaries. We are able to use them.

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** So there are no changes.

**Mr. Jean Perras:** To our knowledge, no. We have talked about it with the NCC. Like you, we have not yet hired a notary or a lawyer to read all the provisions and draw up an inventory. This would cost us a fortune, and we do not necessarily have the necessary budgets.

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** I relied on the good faith of the National Capital Commission. We must not be doubt tiny Thomases, but I am confident. I wanted to know whether, in your opinion, there were any changes.

[English]

Do you agree, Mr. MacTavish, with Mr. Perras and Mr. Garand that there aren't any major changes? You're not finding sections of the park not in the park any more or sections of the municipality that are part of the park now?

**Mr. Malcolm MacTavish:** I've had great difficulty trying to determine that.

[Translation]

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** Mr. Chair, until what time are the witnesses here?

[English]

**The Chair:** They're here until about 5:10.

[Translation]

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** Mr. Perras, Mr. Garrand and Mr. MacTavish, are there any aspects of Bill C-37 that you do not want to see amended or, inversely, are there any changes you want to see, but do not? Perhaps this is the last opportunity I will have to ask you questions, this afternoon. Therefore, I want to know whether you want to share any recommendations or expectations with us.

Mr. Perras?

•(1640)

**Mr. Jean Perras:** Mr. Proulx, I think we said in our brief that we are in favour of the spirit of the proposed legislation. I believe that my two colleagues really discussed this at length. As they stressed, the only thing that concerns us is the right to first refusal.

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** So tell us about how you interpret this right of first refusal.

**Mr. Jean Perras:** Based on our understanding, a property owner who wants to sell his house at Kingsmere or Meech Lake would first have to determine whether the NCC wants to buy it or not under the first refusal clause. But the effect of this is to take the property off the market. I think that our friends and citizens in both neighbourhoods would not agree with that idea. We have clearly stated this.

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** In short, they would not agree to giving the National Capital Commission a right of first refusal on private properties already located within the boundaries of the park. Is that correct?

**Mr. Claude Garand:** Yes.

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** You would like it to be left up to the market, if I can put it that way, and that the property owners be able to sell their property to their children, their family, their friends or anyone else without the National Capital Commission having anything to say about it. Is that correct?

**Mr. Claude Garand:** That is right. We believe that the property owners should have the same rights as other Canadian citizens and that it should be an open real estate market.

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** You would like property rights to be equal, even if the properties are within the park.

Do you have any further comments, Mr. Perras?

**Mr. Jean Perras:** It is inside the park, but it is private property within...

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** I understand what you are saying.

**Mr. Jean Perras:** However, we said to the NCC and to the NCC mandate review panel, two or three years ago, that we agreed the commission should buy back a certain number of lands, where there are sensitive areas, lands upon which there is important biodiversity or where there are species in need of protection or at risk, areas where there are marshlands or places where there is significant flora. We are not against the NCC buying them and protecting them. On the contrary, I think it is a good idea. However, it must stop there.

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** It should not necessarily be a question of expropriation.

**The Chair:** Mr. Nadeau.

**Mr. Richard Nadeau:** Under its mandate, the NCC may acquire private land within Gatineau Park. For example, in its 2004 master plan, there are properties smaller than four acres that are situated in conservation areas, fenced-in properties that fragment ecosystems or prevent authorized recreational uses, properties that negatively affect a park's facilities, attractions or visitors' welcome centres, properties located in residual enclaves, always bearing in mind the idea that the park must be considered as an area for the public.

You can see that the NCC does indeed enjoy some prerogatives as far as the properties are concerned. What we are discussing are issues that have a long-term effect, the right of first refusal, of mutual consent, donations and purchase with a life-long lease. If the NCC implemented all of these factors, if they were applied to the letter, I have the impression that there would be a lot of negotiations between the residents' associations, the municipalities and the NCC.

• (1645)

**Mr. Jean Perras:** During our recent discussions with the NCC in view of preparing the statement of position, we agreed on a plan. The bill addresses this indirectly. In paragraph 13 of our presentation on transparency and cooperation, we specifically address the issue of discussions between the Quebec and federal governments, the NCC, the Regional County Municipality and the three municipalities in order to come to an agreement.

I believe we could come to a consensus that will be to the benefit of all parties around the table. We have been suggesting this for some years, but it has never happened. This bill may pave the way.

**Mr. Richard Nadeau:** We must not forget that Mr. Baird told us two days ago that it remains a park. Gatineau Park is not a place in which we want to see any development. That at least is what we understood.

More specifically, I would like to talk about the issue of the final occupant being a person who has property rights, with the right to transfer the property to his or her heirs, but in the case of a sale, that occupant is obliged to sell to the NCC at market value. Would you agree with this approach?

**Mr. Claude Garand:** I would not agree because it is impossible to establish market value in the absence of a market. In the case of a sale to the NCC, how is market value established? We feel that it should be an open market, and that the NCC is always free to buy the property on that market.

[English]

**Mr. Malcolm MacTavish:** I would agree with my colleague. Furthermore, the NCC has in the past purchased properties on the

open market, even recently, so it's not a difficult process for the NCC to do that. I think over time, when properties become available, if they want to bid on them, then of course the NCC is most welcome to.

But fundamentally—and this is our central fear—we are afraid that our rights as private property owners, as homeowners in the park or surrounded by a park, would be in jeopardy.

[Translation]

**Mr. Richard Nadeau:** You spoke of territorial integrity. In Canadian national parks, for example in Banff, if we want to increase or decrease the size of the park, the Province of Alberta has something to say about it. If we wanted to increase or decrease the size of Gatineau Park, the Province of Quebec has nothing to say about it.

Would you agree that the bill should have a provision allowing Quebec to have some input in the increase or decrease of the size of Gatineau Park, as is the case for Canadian national parks?

**Mr. Jean Perras:** As I said earlier on, given my information, I'm under the impression that the Quebec government is still the owner of 17%, 18% or 19% of the park. I do not see why the Canadian government, the Quebec government and the municipal and regional governments would not sit down together to come to an agreement on the expansion and preservation issues. I think that this is the solution that will allow us to move forward and resolve the series of problems that you have all raised today. We cannot continue to communicate through the media; we must all sit down together.

The Municipality of Chelsea had launched the idea of a consultation process involving all four parties, if we include the RCM des Collines-de-l'Outaouais. We are responsible for the development framework which, according to the Planning and Development Act, is fundamental in terms of land management in Quebec. I do not see why we would not sit down together to discuss it.

[English]

**The Chair:** Merci.

I'm going to open the floor up for one more round of five minutes.

Monsieur Proulx.

• (1650)

[Translation]

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Perras, your municipality probably carries out more transactions and has more talks and discussions with the National Capital Commission than any other, because of the park. Obviously, the municipalities of Gatineau and Ottawa also have discussions, but you have a very particular and special relationship with them because Gatineau Park is in your municipality.

Bill C-37, in subclause 3(1) and in clause 8, confirms the abolition of the commission's executive committee. Currently, there is a board consisting of members. From this board are drawn the members of the steering committee. Let's call it an executive committee, if you will. Bill C-37 abolishes this executive committee. I feel this has advantages and disadvantages. In our opinion, this would lead the CEO—who could be male or female—to take on more power between board meetings. Decisions must be taken in certain situations. These decisions were quite easily made by the executive committee. With the new situation, there would only be a board, including 14 members.

Furthermore, yesterday I commented to the minister that the new number of 14 members could be somewhat awkward. They have yet to answer me as to how they would make a decision in a potential situation where the votes were seven to seven, but that is another problem.

Does the fact that there would no longer be an executive committee change anything for you in your dealings and almost daily discussions with the NCC? Does it suit you that the CEO have more power and initiative?

**Mr. Jean Perras:** I would like to point out that the CEO was once a director general at the Municipality of Chelsea.

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** I was aware of that.

**Mr. Jean Perras:** So it is difficult for me to take a position on this.

Honestly, I cannot recall a single time when the current mayor or the previous one ever had to sit down with the executive committee or the steering committee. Therefore, I do not believe it will affect our daily dealings in any way.

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** It won't change anything.

**Mr. Jean Perras:** It will not.

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I thank the witnesses for having met with us and for having done overtime.

**The Chair:** Mr. Nadeau, you have the floor.

[English]

You don't have any more questions? All right.

Then I'll thank our guests for being here today. As we move forward, I'm sure you'll have more interesting comments to make to the committee.

I'm going to ask the committee to stay briefly after our guests leave. We have one budget issue that I want to present. It's being distributed to you as we speak.

Thank you to our guests.

We'll take a two-minute recess.

- \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_
- 
- (1655)

**The Chair:** I'm going to have to call the meeting back to order, if I may.

I have a couple of memos for the committee. If there are amendments that are going to be brought forward, we will need them as soon as you can get them to us, because we will be doing clause-by-clause next Wednesday.

Monsieur Proulx.

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** On Monday, when Minister Baird was here, he said that one representative from each of the four parties could meet with his officials so that we could look at... I don't want to say "friendly amendments"—let's call them "friendly accommodations". Mr. Jean and I were discussing this a little while ago. The problem we have is that we don't have a meeting set up with the minister's officials. At the Wednesday meeting you are talking about, there's going to be a very important witness, the NCC's executive director, Madame Lemay.

Until we are able to see what can be arrived at with Minister Baird's officials, it's difficult for us to say we will go through the clause-by-clause on a particular date.

- (1700)

**The Chair:** Mr. Jean.

**Mr. Brian Jean:** I have no difficulty. I think the suggestion by Mr. Proulx is an excellent one, and I'd be happy to volunteer on behalf of the government to meet with them and arrange, through our officials, a meeting that could take place with all parties.

I had one question related to the operational budget request, but I will defer it for now.

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** Is Wednesday, October 28, absolutely poured in concrete for the clause-by-clause?

**The Chair:** I'm sorry, but I have a speaking order to maintain.

Monsieur Laframboise.

[Translation]

**Mr. Mario Laframboise:** I understand what Mr. Proulx is suggesting. It is important to get feedback from the National Capital Commission.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of your comment is for us to table our draft amendments on Friday. That would be early, but Monday evening, once we will have heard from the witnesses, we would already have begun preparing our amendments. We could table them Monday evening, after hearing from the National Capital Commission. There could also be a meeting.

The problem is that we had set quite a short timeline to address this issue. We could always postpone the meeting to Monday of the following week and do something else next Wednesday, but give us at least until Monday evening to table our amendments.

[English]

**The Chair:** I have a suggestion, but I'll listen to Mr. Volpe first.

**Hon. Joseph Volpe (Eglinton—Lawrence, Lib.):** It's probably the same one that I had in mind, so go ahead.

**The Chair:** What I might suggest, if I may, is that next Wednesday, October 28, we have the NCC. We have Bill C-310 and we've booked it for Monday, November 2. But we don't have anything other than a subcommittee booked for November 4. We could ask that you submit your amendments by Monday, November 2, and that will give you the weekend after the NCC. We could deal with Bill C-310 on the Monday for one meeting and then go back on November 4.

I'm just throwing that out, looking for direction. We have some future business to discuss under the subcommittee. We can either defer it or deal with it in say the last half hour of that day. I'm not sure how much time we're going to need to do clause-by-clause. If there's a meeting arranged with the minister and party members, I'm hoping we can come forward with a proposal that's qualified and accepted by all.

Mr. Volpe.

**Hon. Joseph Volpe:** I think it's an excellent suggestion, and it's consistent with the understanding that we arrived at when we did the last steering committee. We said we were going to schedule the beginning of the next round immediately. But we were giving ourselves a day or half a day of the meeting in case we had to make an adjustment.

I'm sure the parliamentary secretary is in agreement with that understanding and with the intent of your suggestion. So that's great.

**The Chair:** So I will ask Mr. Jean to try to arrange a meeting with the minister and officials, or whoever we need to resolve the amendments issue with.

Is that reasonable?

**Mr. Brian Jean:** I apologize, Mr. Chair, but you say "amendments issue"?

**The Chair:** Well, I think what they wanted to do—

**Mr. Brian Jean:** Oh, the round table the minister suggested. Yes, absolutely.

**Mr. Marcel Proulx:** That's very reasonable. Thank you.

**The Chair:** You're welcome.

What you also have in front of you is a budget, which wasn't approved because we started the process ahead of time. It's actually to cover the costs of witnesses. It's a standard request for a total of \$3,800. I would ask for a motion to do that.

First, Mr. Jean, you have something to say?

**Mr. Brian Jean:** I just have a question.

I was hoping Mr. Kennedy would show up today, because he could clarify the \$300 to go to Montreal versus the \$1,500 to go to Toronto. Is the latter a normal fee? It seems like a lot more. I just wasn't sure.

I know Mr. Kennedy is from Toronto, so—

**The Chair:** It's the standard amount, and thank you for your input.

I need a motion for the budget.

● (1705)

**Mr. Dennis Bevington:** I so move.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** We'll see everyone on Monday.

The meeting is adjourned.









**MAIL  POSTE**

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

**Lettermail**

**Poste-lettre**

**1782711  
Ottawa**

*If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:*  
Publishing and Depository Services  
Public Works and Government Services Canada  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5

*En cas de non-livraison,  
retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :*  
Les Éditions et Services de dépôt  
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada  
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5

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

### **SPEAKER'S PERMISSION**

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

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

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

Additional copies may be obtained from: Publishing and  
Depository Services  
Public Works and Government Services Canada  
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5  
Telephone: 613-941-5995 or 1-800-635-7943  
Fax: 613-954-5779 or 1-800-565-7757  
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca  
http://publications.gc.ca

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

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

### **PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT**

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

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

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

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les  
Éditions et Services de dépôt  
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada  
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5  
Téléphone : 613-941-5995 ou 1-800-635-7943  
Télécopieur : 613-954-5779 ou 1-800-565-7757  
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca  
http://publications.gc.ca

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