



House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development

AANO • NUMBER 006 • 3rd SESSION • 40th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Tuesday, March 30, 2010

—
Chair

Mr. Bruce Stanton

Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development

Tuesday, March 30, 2010

• (1530)

[Translation]

The Chair (Mr. Bruce Stanton (Simcoe North, CPC)): Good afternoon, members, witnesses and guests. This is the sixth meeting of the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development. Here's the agenda.

[English]

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), we are doing a study of northern territories' economic development, in particular the barriers and solutions to those. This afternoon we welcome four important witnesses on this question.

We'll proceed, witnesses, in the order that you see on your agenda for today. We note that we're still waiting on a couple of witnesses. They will likely arrive, we expect, in the course of your deliberations. The way this normally goes—I'm sure some of you have done this before—is we'll open with a presentation of up to ten minutes from each organization, after which we'll go to questions from members.

Did you have a question, Mr. Duncan?

Mr. John Duncan (Vancouver Island North, CPC): Are we expecting the other witnesses?

The Chair: Yes.

Mr. John Duncan: Okay. Otherwise, I was going to suggest they change their seating. Sorry for the interjection.

The Chair: No, we are expecting them.

I'll just again suggest to the witnesses as well that they keep within the ten minutes. We'll give you a little bit of latitude but not too much. Try to keep your pace of speaking somewhat moderate. We do have the simultaneous translation occurring for both English and French. We'll be able to provide that for you.

Let's begin by welcoming Sharon Matthews, the vice-president for the assisted housing sector of the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation. Ms. Matthews, you have the floor.

Ms. Sharon Matthews (Vice-President, Assisted Housing Sector, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation): Great. Thank you, Mr. Chair and members of the committee.

I'm very pleased to be here on behalf of Canada Mortgage and Housing to discuss federal housing programs and activities in the north. As Canada's national housing agency, a core part of CMHC's public policy mandate is to support affordable housing for low-income Canadians and first nations in all parts of the country, including the north.

We deliver this mandate through a number of programs. For example, through CMHC the government currently invests about \$1.7 billion annually in support of almost 625,000 households living in existing social housing right across the country. Also through CMHC, the federal government provides funding for the construction of new social housing under the affordable housing initiative and for the renovation of existing homes for low-income Canadians through a suite of renovation programs.

In September 2008 the federal government announced funding of more than \$1.9 billion over five years to improve and build new affordable housing and to help the homeless. As part of this investment, both the affordable housing initiative and CMHC's suite of renovation programs were renewed until March 31, 2011.

This spending supports housing such as the nine-unit seniors project built in Haines Junction in the Yukon with almost \$1.8 million in federal funding through the affordable housing initiative. The project was built with input from the seniors living in the community and includes additional common space for group activities.

All of the provinces and territories cost-share and deliver the affordable housing initiative, and most cost-share and deliver the renovation programs. In addition, households in the north have benefited from the \$300 million northern housing trust announced by the Government of Canada in September 2006 to respond to the need of affordable housing in the territories. This initiative has further added to the housing stock in the north.

CMHC was also instrumental in putting into operation the innovative \$300 million first nations market housing fund. This fund is designed to give eligible first nation members who are living on reserve access to private market lending for home ownership similar to those living off reserve, while respecting the communal nature of land ownership on reserve.

As the committee is also aware, CMHC's been given a major role in implementing Canada's economic action plan, which includes more than \$2 billion in funding for two years to build new and repair existing social housing. Of this amount, \$200 million has been earmarked specifically to support the renovation and construction of housing in the three territories. This funding has been made available to the territories through mandated affordable housing agreements, although the territories are not required in this case to cost-match the federal funding.

This funding is being used, for example, to build a new children's receiving home in Whitehorse, an eight-bedroom facility that will be completed this spring. As a result of this project, children and youth under the care of Family and Children's Services in Whitehorse will soon have a quiet and safe place to live while they're in transition.

Canada's economic action plan also includes an investment of \$1 billion over two years for renovations and energy retrofits of existing social housing. Most of this funding, about \$850 million, is being delivered and cost-shared again by provinces and territories through amendments to existing agreements. The remaining \$150 million is being delivered by CMHC to renovate and retrofit existing social housing that we directly administer.

Also included in the action plan are investments of \$400 million to build new affordable housing for low-income seniors and another \$75 million for new housing for people with disabilities. Again, these investments are being delivered by provinces and territories under existing agreements.

In total, close to 14% of the money to be delivered by provinces and territories under the action plan initiatives will be invested in the north. This includes the \$200 million for northern housing. An additional \$400 million over two years is being invested under Canada's economic action plan, specifically in housing on reserve. Projects are already under way in over 400 first nation communities as a result of this investment. CMHC is responsible for delivering about \$250 million of this amount.

It is understood that there are limited construction periods in the north and remote areas, as well as a challenge associated with getting materials on site in a timely and cost-effective manner. Accordingly, when the action plan initiatives were launched this last spring, CMHC indicated it would work with each of the territories to find alternatives to the normal program requirements to help them address this particular challenge. Many of the projects in Nunavut, for example, will be using prefabricated components to permit very timely construction as well as to take advantage of some of the very latest in energy efficiency technologies.

In addition to these social housing investments in the action plan, CMHC is also administering the municipal infrastructure lending program, which is providing up to \$2 billion in low-cost loans to municipalities for housing-related infrastructure. Last September, for example, the City of Whitehorse was approved for a low-cost loan of more than \$1 million for a project to replace underground and roadway infrastructure. This project will also service new lots that are being developed by the city and will reduce the risk of flooding, improve the efficiency of the sewers, and provide some safer walking access to pedestrians.

So whether we're talking about the existing social housing stock, the affordable housing initiative, CMHC's suite of renovation and on-reserve programs, or the action plan, these investments in social housing are creating jobs and helping to ensure Canadians have safe, affordable, and suitable housing that meets their needs.

Thank you again for the opportunity to be here today, and hopefully I'll be able to answer any questions that you might have.

●(1535)

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Matthews.

Now it's the turn of Mr. Edjericon, who is Chairman of the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board.

[*English*]

Sir, you have up to ten minutes. Go ahead; you have the floor.

Mr. Richard Edjericon (Chairman, Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board): Thank you very much.

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, and thank you, Mr. Chair. I'll do my best to keep my speech to ten minutes.

My name is Richard Edjericon, and I'm the chair of the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board in the Northwest Territories. The review board is one part of the environmental assessment and regulatory system that was set up under the Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act in December 1998. It is the only environmental assessment body under the act in the Mackenzie Valley.

The review board is set up as an administrative tribunal and also as a co-management board. This means that it's made up of equal numbers of nominees from land claim organizations and governments, both territorial and federal. The structure facilitates a process that gives all potentially affected people in the Mackenzie Valley a say.

We take an objective look at exploration and development projects to see if there will be any significant impacts as a result of their activities. Each project is assessed in four main areas of impact: biophysical, social, economic, and cultural. Unique to our process, the review board also assesses the degree of public concern regarding a proposed development. Using scientific data, traditional knowledge, statements from individuals and organizations regarding potential impacts, and environmental, socio-economic, and cultural impact studies, the board does a thorough assessment of the proposed development referred to us, as is our mandate under the act.

To be referred for an environmental impact assessment, a regulatory authority, such as the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board or the National Energy Board, a federal or territorial government department, or the review board itself must decide whether the proposed development might have a significant adverse impact on the environment or cause public concern. Land claim organizations and local governments may also refer a project for environmental assessment.

After careful consideration, the board makes recommendations to mitigate development impacts so that a project can proceed without a significant impact on the environment and without causing significant public concern. The complexity of our process means that an environmental assessment can take between one to two years. We have been criticized for the length of time an assessment takes, and we have recently undertaken steps to streamline our process to reduce this time commitment.

In the event that an assessment shows that a project is likely to have a very significant impact or may cause public concern, the review board can refer it for a full environmental impact review, which is conducted by a separate independent panel that is appointed by the board.

Fewer than 5% of all proposed development projects in the Mackenzie Valley are referred for environmental assessment. Presently we have five active assessments before the board. One is nearing completion after two years. One is about to proceed, as the developer has just filed what is called a developer's assessment report, which is a detailed report by the developer of the planned project. The other three are waiting to proceed, pending receipt of the developer's assessment reports.

We are very much aware that aboriginal people in the Mackenzie Valley want jobs. I was also a former chief of the Yellowknives Dene First Nation for four years, from 1999 to 2003. At that time, unemployment was more than 80%. But five years later, with the start of the BHP Billiton diamond mines after a full environmental impact review that lasted three years, employment in my community is more than 80%. In Detah alone, about \$5 million in salaries is earned annually as a result of these diamond mines.

Aboriginal people in the north are not against development, but they want to see it proceed in an environmentally responsible manner and they want to share the benefits.

Of the 5%, the review board has referred only two projects to a full environmental impact review in the 11 years since the inception of the act. One was the Mackenzie gas project, which was referred

under the Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act, with CEAA and the Inuvialuit Final Agreement. The other was De Beers' Gahcho Kué diamond project, which De Beers has delayed due to the recession.

All these bodies—the review board, the land and water board, and the regional panels of the land and water board—derive their authority from the Mackenzie Valley Resources Management Act, which in turn derives its authority from settled land claims. As such, these co-management boards are protecting the environment and at the same time are facilitating environmentally responsible development on behalf of aboriginal people and all residents of the Mackenzie Valley.

In the Mackenzie Valley, we all know about the huge environmental problems caused by Giant Mine, the legacy of which has ongoing environmental impacts.

● (1540)

It is in this sense of helping proposed projects proceed to environmentally sound developments that the review board is a solution for responsible development and not a barrier. There are things we can change in our process to streamline it and make it timelier, and as mentioned earlier, we have undertaken to do that. We are committed to continuing improvement in our process, and we work closely with developers, communities, and land claim organizations to ensure that our process is fair, timely, objective, and thorough.

I'd like to talk about the barriers to development in the Mackenzie Valley as we see them. All of them, in our estimation, are capacity issues that need more resources in the form of funding, staffing, or policy direction, or all three, in order to be resolved. All of them have impacts on the successful completion of fair and thorough environmental assessments, delays in which also work to delay or even deter development. I will list them in point form, with a brief explanation of each.

First is capacity to develop and complete land use plans: We have noticed that in areas where there is a land use plan in effect, there are very few referrals for environmental assessments. We get more referrals from areas without a land use plan. With a land use plan, a developer has all the rules, so to speak, about where, when, and how a development can take place. The regional land and water board can look at the land use plan and compare it to the proposed development plan and issue permits or refer it for assessment. Presently there is a completed land use plan only in the Gwich'in area of the Northwest Territories. The Sahtu, Tlicho, Dehcho, and Akaitcho regions of the Mackenzie Valley currently don't have a land use plan.

Second is capacity to collect baseline biophysical, social, and cultural data, or to do cumulative effects monitoring by independent or government researchers.

I'm just going to point them out.

Third is capacity to document traditional knowledge.

Fourth is the capacity of the federal government to consider review board decisions and conduct a "consult to modify" process.

That's it, Mr. Chairman. I can get into the details later if I am asked.

Merci.

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

Now we would like to welcome Paul Quassa, vice-chair, and Marg Epp, senior finance officer, each from Nunavut Planning Commission. It's great to have you with us here this afternoon. As you probably have gathered by now, we start with a ten-minute presentation, and we'll do that. We'll have one more witness presentation after yours, and then we'll proceed to questions from members.

Mr. Quassa, please proceed.

Mr. Paul Quassa (Vice-Chair, Nunavut Planning Commission): [*Witness speaks in Inuktitut*]

Thank you, Mr. Chair and committee members.

We appreciate the opportunity to speak to you today. We will present a few highlights from the brief previously submitted to you.

The Nunavut Planning Commission, or NPC, is an institution of public government established under the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement, to which some of you may know I am a signatory. The commission has the primary responsibility to prepare and implement a land use plan that guides and directs resource use and development in the Nunavut settlement area. This single land use plan will be a significant milestone in the management of lands for the Nunavut settlement area.

The creation of a Nunavut land use plan, as mandated in the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement, is one of the major determinants that would encourage northern economic development by supporting industry to invest and explore in Nunavut. Nunavut will be the only territory in Canada where land use is administered under a single land use plan. This will enable industry and other land users to strategically plan their investment in Nunavut in a timely manner, and design their project proposals in accordance with the guidelines in the Nunavut land use plan.

The second component to this is the pending Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act. This act will clarify procedural questions related to the formulation and implementation of land use plans and environmental assessments. Proponents will have certainty with the one-window approach, and the process timeline is clear with all regulatory agencies.

Nunavut territory has a unique situation and an environment that has no comparison to the rest of Canada. It is an area of Canada with a high potential opportunity for resource development, but few

means of getting it out. The introduction of the Nunavut land use plan and the pending legislation to implement it create a welcoming environment for industry to invest in Nunavut. With the investment of big industry come the spinoff businesses, training, and education opportunities that will help sustain local economies.

I will hand it to Marg.

• (1545)

Ms. Marg Epp (Senior Finance Officer, Nunavut Planning Commission): Thank you, Paul, and Mr. Chair.

The isolation of Nunavut's communities creates many barriers for the emergence and sustainability of small business. A lack of capacity, both in terms of human resources and infrastructure, threatens the viability and sustainability of small business. The lack of buildings and of the capital to erect those buildings limits business start-ups and business growth.

Markets are limited due to the lack of infrastructure to bring products to a larger audience. Freight costs are prohibitive to profit margins. An absence of roads and deep-sea ports impairs opportunities to reduce shipping costs in both directions. The acquisition of the inventory required for business is triple the cost of doing business in southern Canada. Bargaining in goods restricts you to the small window of our shipping season, and often causes expensive delays and lost contracts.

Energy costs are one of the highest cost components of any business and of living in the north. Renewable energy sources need to be developed to reduce the costs of living and doing business in Nunavut. There is a shortage of human resources in the north as well. The Government of Nunavut is the largest employer of skilled labour. It is difficult for business to compete with that. Not every community can provide training facilities and/or courses required to fill the demand for the various skilled labour positions.

Taking the appropriate training means being away from your family and community for extended periods of time. This is not always feasible. Professional business and support services are also not readily available. Many communities do not even have banking services. Nunavut is still very young in terms of an established business community. Learning to navigate business procedures and other government requirements, often coupled with a language barrier, can be daunting to any potential business owner.

These are just a few of the issues. We've expanded on these and more in the brief previously submitted. Nunavut still needs to build capacity and create infrastructure before sustainable growth can take place. The pending land use plan and the NUPPAA legislation to implement it will clarify the procedures and streamline the process of how land use will be managed. This will create a welcoming environment for industry to invest in. This will not alleviate all of the barriers; however, partnering small business with industry can have positive results for both parties.

• (1550)

Mr. Paul Quassa: For the Nunavut Planning Commission to be successful in the implementation of the new legislation or the draft legislation that is coming about, NUPPAA for short, and the Nunavut land use plan, additional financial and human resources capacity is required.

For example, a public registry will need to be developed, implemented, and maintained. This will require additional technical staff, a new database program, and considerable financial resources. Our core funding is still based on the 1993 level, with only FDDIPI adjustments. These do not even cover our cost of living increases.

The commission needs government to address the financial deficiencies with the funding allocation from the federal government.

Nunavut is on the edge of an exciting new era of resource and economic development. All levels of government, industry, local communities, and entrepreneurs have a vital role in partnering to ensure that we create advantages in the changing legal and political environments.

Again the commission thanks you for the opportunity to appear here today. We look forward to answering any questions this committee may have.

Qujannamiik.

[Translation]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Quassa and Ms. Epp.

Lastly, I want to welcome Mr. Overvold and Ms. Heidi Wiebe.

[English]

Mr. Robert Overvold is a board member and Ms. Wiebe a senior planner with the Sahtu Land Use Planning Board.

We welcome you here. We understand we weren't able to connect when we were in the territory in November, so we're delighted that you could make the time to join us today.

Please go ahead with your presentation.

Mr. Robert Overvold (Member, Sahtu Land Use Planning Board): Thank you, Mr. Chair and committee members.

I would just like to make an observation to start. I noticed, sitting around this table, that I'm the only male not wearing a tie. It's not that I don't own one; I just forgot it in my hotel room this morning. I was thinking of running to my MP's office and borrowing one, but alas, it didn't happen. I apologize for that.

An hon. member: Would you like mine?

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Robert Overvold: My name is Bob Overvold, and I'm a member of the Sahtu Land Use Planning Board. We will be presenting on behalf of our chair, who was supposed to come down here but unfortunately had to cancel because of illness. She sends her regrets.

I am here today with Heidi Wiebe, our senior planner. Again, thanks for inviting us to participate in today's panel discussion on the

barriers and solutions for economic development in Canada's northern territories.

We believe that land use planning is part of the solution. The Sahtu Land Use Planning Board has three key messages to share and leave with you today.

First, a completed and approved Sahtu land use plan will increase regulatory certainty and consistency by clearly defining where development is appropriate, and under what conditions, at the start of the process. In fact, I would go further, to say that to attempt to achieve an efficient regulatory regime without a land use plan in place is to my mind probably impossible.

Second, completion and approval of the Sahtu land use plan will promote the economic well-being of residents and communities as they define it, while protecting their social and cultural values as well.

Third, very similar to the point of my colleague Paul, if the board gets the funding it has requested this year, then we will complete the Sahtu land use plan by the end of March next year.

We commend your committee's focus on advancing the economic prosperity of northerners and addressing the challenges they face in promoting their economic well-being, as stated in your October 30, 2009, news release.

The planning board is similarly mandated to develop a land use plan that protects and promotes the social, cultural, and economic well-being of residents and communities in the Sahtu settlement area, having regard to the interests of all Canadians. The Sahtu land claim agreement requires active participation of residents and communities and requires the board to devote special attention to the rights of participants under their land claim and to the lands used by them for wildlife harvesting and other resource use.

Planning decisions are driven first and foremost by communities. The plan serves to inform everyone else about community values so that development can proceed in a manner that respects those values and benefits northerners. Communities require economic development to provide revenues and jobs. They want to encourage development that will promote their economic well-being outside of their most important areas.

The planning board works with communities to identify development opportunities and constraints and to find ways to maximize those opportunities and the benefits for communities, while protecting the values they have identified.

Finding the right balance between the level of conservation and development is key. Finding that balance is the biggest challenge of any planning process. Ultimately, the balance must reflect community input regarding where and how development is most appropriately carried out.

Development that occurs in accordance with an approved land use plan will promote the social, cultural, and economic well-being of residents and communities of the settlement area, as well as of other Canadians.

• (1555)

Many reports have been written about the challenges of the northern regulatory system. Key among these challenges is the broad uncertainty about where development is acceptable in general. There is the central question that land use plans must address what types of development are appropriate, where, and under what conditions.

We do this through a system of zoning and conditions. Conservation zones protect the most significant cultural and ecological areas and are closed to development. Special management zones protect specific values. By that I mean, for example, that there may be an important woodland caribou calving area, and while the area may be open for development, the developers must take a special look at that condition, that value, and see how they could proceed with their development and still protect that value.

Special management zones protect specific values through broad conditions while allowing development to proceed. All other areas are considered “general use”, where development may proceed subject to existing regulatory requirements. In the absence of land use plans, these zoning decisions are transferred to other parts of the regulatory system, such as environmental assessment and permitting—and Richard is part of that regime, the environmental review board—that were not designed to answer such questions. As a result, without a land use plan in place, in our view the whole system bogs down.

In the 2005 NWT environmental audit, the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board indicated that many environmental assessments are either being triggered or their complexity increased by the absence of land use plans.

Once the Sahtu land use plan is completed and approved, developers will know where they can and can't go and what values they need to pay special attention to in preparing their applications. This knowledge will allow them to make informed decisions about where to focus their efforts and develop their projects in a way that respects local values. With applications designed better and in accordance with an approved plan, regulators will be able to focus on what their main job is. They'll be able to focus on project-specific questions and carry out their processes with greater efficiency.

Several reports have reached this same conclusion and have recommended the immediate completion of land use plans in northern Canada. I mentioned the Auditor General's report, the 2005 NWT environmental audit, Neil McCrank's report, and most recently the joint review panel's report on the Mackenzie gas project. All have indicated the need for completing land use planning north of sixty.

With all the benefits of a land use plan, one might wonder why this critical document is not yet complete. In our case, in the past the Sahtu land use plan had numerous challenges including loss of board quorum over different years, significant under-funding, and loss of staff. The board has had to advance the process slowly as funding was made available and staff could be hired. Over the last two years

the Sahtu land use planning board has developed into a fully functional planning organization with full board appointments, qualified staff, and sufficient funding to advance the plan.

The board has made considerable progress during this time and will be putting out a new draft shortly—by the end of May of this year. If we get continued funding, as we have requested this year, the board is confident, and I stress “confident”, that we can complete the Sahtu land use plan by the spring of 2011, in one more year's time.

Once complete, the plan will be submitted for approval to the Sahtu Secretariat Incorporated, the Government of the Northwest Territories, and INAC on behalf of the Government of Canada. The plan comes into effect the day it is approved by the minister of INAC. However, our funding is not yet guaranteed this year, and without it we cannot complete the Sahtu land use plan.

The board is at a critical junction in its history. When our current board members were appointed two years ago, and I was one of them, they committed to completing the plan within our terms, and we each have two-year terms. We are on schedule to meet that target and have received very positive comments from the communities, government, and industry about our work to revise the plan so far. We are committed to completing this important process and filling this large gap in the Sahtu regulatory regime.

• (1600)

In conclusion, we believe that a completed and approved Sahtu land use plan will fill a critical gap in the regulatory system that will allow other components to run more efficiently. It will not only benefit industry and regulators by providing certainty, but will also benefit the residents and communities by encouraging development that meets their needs. Assuming that the board continues to be funded this coming year, we anticipate completing the Sahtu land use plan and submitting it for approval within one year.

Thank you very much for this opportunity to present to you today. We are happy to answer any questions you or your committee members may have, Mr. Chair.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Overvold. I want to thank all the witnesses for their testimony. We will now go to questions from members.

[English]

I have Mr. Bagnell down for the first question. Mr. Bagnell, go ahead for seven minutes.

Hon. Larry Bagnell (Yukon, Lib.): Thank you all for coming. It's a great help for us.

Ms. Matthews, you noted the \$300 million northern housing trust announced in 2006. Can you tell me when that ended, when the expiry date was for spending that money?

Ms. Sharon Matthews: The \$300 million was actually administered through the Department of Finance, not through CMHC. My understanding was that the money was transferred that year and that the different territories had the opportunity to spend it over time. I do believe that most of it has now been spent.

•(1605)

Hon. Larry Bagnell: Seeing that it was mentioned in your speech, do you know if there is a follow-up to that? Now that it's been spent, is there a new round of \$300 million, or what is replacing it?

Ms. Sharon Matthews: That's something you would have to ask the Department of Finance, I'm afraid. It would not be something that CMHC would be dealing with. In my remarks, I was trying to cover the different funding that had gone to housing.

Hon. Larry Bagnell: Okay.

I'll move on to land use planning. I assume everyone here and every witness we've had before and everyone we will have, and anyone listening, thinks that completed land use planning is a huge asset to help economic development. If there's anyone listening, here or anywhere, who does not think that's true, let me know, but I assume that's true and I assume you think that's true.

Therefore, I'd like to ask Richard, for one, had land use planning been available in all of the various regions along the Mackenzie Valley pipeline route, would your evaluation process not have taken so long with all of the complaints it received?

My second question is for all of the land use planning people: Paul, Robert, Marg, Richard, everyone. Our study is on the barriers and solutions to economic development, so from a federal government perspective what barriers are in place, if any, prohibiting you from reaching completed land use plans as quickly as possible, for all the great reasons you mentioned we need them? What would you recommend that the federal government do to help those along?

That will probably take up all of my time once everyone answers.

Mr. Richard Edjericon: Thank you. I will do my best to answer that question.

On the land use plans in the Northwest Territories, the way I see it right now, we have one that's completed. That's basically in the Gwich'in territory. So when developers come in to do projects, they will go into the Gwich'in area. They'll go to their offices and make an application, but at least developers have an opportunity to take a look at what the rules are going to be in that jurisdiction. It makes it easier for developers. I guess it gives them a certainty about what is needed for them to make application, to follow through and that kind of thing. In the Northwest Territories, as part of Neil McCrank's

recommendations he did make a recommendation that the land use plans be completed in the Mackenzie Valley. If these things get done, I think it gives certainty to developers and everybody out there.

But most importantly, right now the communities have capacity issues. Right now a lot of people in the communities don't have moneys to process applications or even go through it, so that's a capacity issue that they're also facing at the local level. I'm hoping, as part of the regulatory initiative announcement coming out—I don't know when it's going to come out, but I'm hoping this spring—that this is something they're going to take a look at, and put money towards land use planning in the Northwest Territories and the Mackenzie Valley. By doing that, it definitely will help the capacity issues at the local level as well.

I'm hoping that answers your question.

Hon. Larry Bagnell: Okay.

The Chair: We'll just move right down the row, if we can. Mr. Matthews, would you like to comment? No?

Mr. Quassa and then to Mr. Overvold.

Mr. Paul Quassa: Thank you.

Very briefly, from the Nunavut planning perspective, the barrier has been lack of funding, not enough resources in that area, and certainly one of the areas that I think my colleague Bob mentioned briefly was the appointment process. This takes too long. We had situations where out of the nine board positions that we had, at times we only had five because the appointment process was taking so long. Sometimes it takes about six months to a year, maybe sometimes two years, even, to appoint some of the members who have been nominated by the appropriate bodies, such as the Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated, the regional Inuit associations, the Government of Nunavut, and the Government of Canada.

Those nominations do sit in the minister's office at times for too long. At one time we almost had to not have a commission meeting because we were going to have no quorum because of no appointment. So that has been the barrier to our process when land use planning, as you say, is very important in our area, in all the areas that have that entity.

•(1610)

The Chair: Mr. Overvold, go ahead.

Mr. Robert Overvold: Thank you.

I referred to the challenges—I prefer to use challenges, as opposed to barriers—but you spoke to them. Obviously there is funding and appointments, and perhaps I don't disagree with what Paul says, but I've seen it in our area, and not only is it perhaps not being dealt with fast enough in the minister's office, but we often don't get timely nominees from the GNWT and the Sahtu Secretariat too. So to me it's a very fixable solution. People just have to put their heads around it. Timeliness, I think that problem can be fixed.

In our case, I think the barrier—and I again referred to it in my presentation—is trying to come up with the right balance, whether it's the balance between areas that are going to be conserved and areas that are open for development. What is the right balance?

When we do drafts of the land use plan, we send it out for comment, not only from the parties—that is, the Sahtu Secretariat Incorporated, the governments of the NWT and Canada—but also stakeholders, industry, CAP, the NWT Chamber of Mines, that type of thing.

The Chair: We will have to hold you there, Mr. Overvold. If there is a thought remaining there, perhaps you can incorporate it in one of your other answers.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Lemay, go ahead, please. You have seven minutes.

Mr. Marc Lemay (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Good afternoon.

I get very concerned when I listen to you. Perhaps I'm wrong, but it seems to me that everybody is preparing land use plans. Everybody is planning and that takes a lot of time. I imagine you read the McCrank report.

I'm speaking to the representative from the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board, Mr. Overvold. When I read the McCrank report, I see it stated that, in 2008—this is now two years later—the settlement of land claims... Wait, I'm going to read it to you because it's interesting. At a seminar, Walter Bayha—I don't know whether you know him—said: "The appointment process stalls Boards' decision-making and is outside their control." I just heard Mr. Quassa say the same thing, and probably Mr. Edjericon will say the same thing as well. Where is it blocked? Where does it stop? Is it at the minister's office? We will have to make recommendations. So how can we help you? Should we tell the minister to act?

I have a supplementary question. Today, March 30, are you still waiting for appointments so that you can operate, or is everything in place? Can you tell us today whether you are still waiting for appointments? They are all here, even the parliamentary secretary, who isn't listening to me there.

An hon. member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Marc Lemay: But we're going to tell him, and he's going to hear it. The parliamentary secretary is stuck to the minister. So if you're waiting for appointments today, now's the time to say so. Tell us whether that's what's stalling the process, as was the case in 2008. I'll leave you the four remaining minutes to answer that question.

•(1615)

[*English*]

The Chair: Perhaps we'll start with Mr. Overvold.

Mr. Robert Overvold: Thank you.

As I said in my presentation, we have a full board, so all our appointments are made. Our terms are not up for about another year, and hopefully the appointments then will be timely.

Again, I don't disagree with Paul. The problem is timely appointments, but in my view, it's also getting timely nominations from, at least in my area, the other parties—the GNWT and the Sahtu Secretariat.

So everyone has to do a better job in getting people appointed. In my view, the blame doesn't rest with Canada.

The Chair: Mr. Quassa.

Mr. Paul Quassa: Thank you.

In our case, we have two more members we have been waiting for for the last two or three years now.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marc Lemay: Wait! Pardon me, sir. I didn't understand. I would like you to repeat that slowly. Did you say you had been waiting for appointments for two or three years?

You have to answer because the secretary has to hear that!

Yes?

[*English*]

Mr. Paul Quassa: Yes.

The Chair: Go ahead.

Mr. Paul Quassa: That is true. As I've said, we've waited for about two years. At times, we have waited three years. I can't remember, since I've been on the board, the full board sitting there all at once. We've never had that situation yet, as far as I know. Since 1993, when we signed the final agreement, it started from there.

Thank you very much.

The Chair: Mr. Edjericon, did you want to add anything on this particular question? Go ahead.

Mr. Richard Edjericon: Yes.

Thank you for your question, *mahsi*.

One of the things I just want to make note of is that currently we have a full board. We had one appointment that came due in the fall, I think, from the Sahtu region: Mr. Danny Bayha. Prior to his appointment coming due, six months before it expired, we sent a letter to the Sahtu board and said that the position was going to be coming due. They sent us a letter, which was also sent to Ottawa for approval. From the time the position expired, it took 30 days to renew. I was really surprised that they acted that quickly.

Currently we have two GNWT vacancies that just came due. We sent notice to the Government of the Northwest Territories six months ago, as well, informing them that those positions were going to be coming due. I'm not sure how long it's going to take for them to put somebody in there.

I've been the chair for two years. One of the things I've been working on is those barriers and working with the government to make sure those positions are filled. But prior to that, I know positions have taken anywhere from 30 days to two years to fill.

The Chair: We're essentially out of time there. Merci, Monsieur Lemay.

Now we'll go to Mr. Bevington for seven minutes.

Mr. Dennis Bevington (Western Arctic, NDP): Thanks, Mr. Stanton.

Welcome, witnesses. I'm certainly pleased to be here with you.

I'm not going to spend a lot of time on appointments. I did that about a year ago when we had Mr. McCrank in front of us. At that time, we discussed the problems pretty fully. I really am pleased that you're reinforcing some of the issues around appointments, but I think we've had a good discussion on it.

Mr. Edjericon, I've heard that one of the issues you have with the present arrangement with the federal government comes after you work through an environmental assessment and then you move it on. The federal government departments interact with you at the assessment level; and when it gets to Ottawa, you have to repeat the process.

Perhaps you could explain that particular issue, for better understanding of the people here about that problem, with the repeat of federal departments on particular environmental assessments.

• (1620)

Mr. Richard Edjericon: Thank you, Mr. Bevington.

Actually, he's my MP for the Northwest Territories, so it's good to see him.

A little earlier, I mentioned that some of our environmental assessments can take anywhere from a year to two years in the Northwest Territories, because it's a big process to go through. If you can imagine, companies like BHP, Diavik, and De Beers, big companies like that, can take two years to come out with a final report. There's a rigorous process in place, as well, coming to a final decision on a project like that.

We have very good board members from up and down the valley. We have business people. We have trappers sometimes on a board, and that kind of thing. So we have a different perspective. The people coming on the board have very good experience, and they're careful. They do their due diligence in terms of going through the environmental assessment process.

There's a whole process leading to the public hearing. Once it gets to that point and a decision is made, then it goes to Ottawa. Once the board makes that decision, it leaves our office. We put a decision document together on whether a project should proceed or not—if it has public concern or significant environmental impact to the area—and send it to the minister.

So we have done that. We've done that with BHP, Diavik, and De Beers in the Northwest Territories. It's taken some time. Sometimes responses from the minister's office can happen quickly. Sometimes, if there's an election or something's happening, it gets delayed. There are times when some files that have left our office are currently sitting in Ottawa waiting for a decision. We have more files coming up on environmental assessments this year, so this year's going to be another busy year.

In Neil McCrank's report, it talks about looking at a solution in terms of having an organization within INAC track these reports, because sometimes they could take anywhere from one to five years. We're hoping the new regulatory initiative that's going to come out soon may identify that.

I've read some of those documents in the budget, and it's in there, I think. It just needs to be clarified. That's all I noticed in it.

Thank you.

Mr. Dennis Bevington: Okay.

Now to the Sahtu planning board, and perhaps the Nunavut Planning Commission could speak to this as well.

I think you identified an issue around quantum of land set aside for protected status, versus land that's open for development. This seems to be a hang-up with the federal government and with the territorial government, yet within the land use plans, don't you have an opportunity every five years to review these quantum?

Maybe you could lay that out, because I think that's been a real problem for the federal government to give up the control to say okay, there's 40% of the land that is protected. These planning boards have flexibility. If both of you wanted to speak to that, I'd appreciate it.

Mr. Robert Overvold: Yes, that's true.

Again, I look at it more as a challenge, as opposed to a problem of talking this through.

First and foremost, we go in as a board saying we're a co-management board, and we represent the interests of the three parties who have to approve the plan. It goes to finding the right balance between lands that will be protected and lands that will be open for development.

The ultimate protection is conservation. There are other things in the Sahtu settlement area, including proposed protected areas—Canada protected areas—and we're working on a possible national park there as part of Nahanni Park, the northern watershed.

But you're absolutely right, all plans—and I'm assuming this will be the case in Nunavut—do go through reviews. Even though we don't have a plan yet completed in the Sahtu, we've had cases where communities had asked for an area to be protected but were now rethinking it, saying they wanted a part of it to come out because they were interested in a development project there, and they needed jobs in their communities. So even before we have a plan, they're doing it, but certainly, once a plan is approved, they could revisit areas that are protected and have them opened or created as management zones.

• (1625)

The Chair: We're out of time.

Perhaps, Mr. Quassa, if you have a thought on that, when we get to the next round you could maybe add that in to one of your responses. We'll get back to that.

Thank you, Mr. Bevington.

Mr. Duncan, seven minutes.

Mr. John Duncan: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would just like to put on the record that I was indeed listening, Monsieur Lemay. I heard you loud and clear on terms of the appointments. We've now heard from two of the three boards that they have a full complement. I'll get a response for you from the Nunavut people.

Perhaps that will be my first question. How many federal appointments are there on your board, and how many of those federal appointments are empty? I'm asking the question. I don't know the answer, but I'm sure you can tell me.

Mr. Paul Quassa: There are two members from the federal government, and I believe both of them are now appointed. But because one of them is now elected at a regional level, they're wondering if that person is eligible to be on our commission. She was appointed by the federal government. We have two seats that are now there.

Mr. John Duncan: And the other federal one is full or empty?

Mr. Paul Quassa: As I said, the other one is pending. I think they're looking for a legal opinion on whether that person could still be appointed and represent the federal government. There are two seats there.

Mr. John Duncan: I think we're talking about a fairly small situation, not a large one, as was originally contemplated by Mr. Lemay.

My second question—

The Chair: I think the witness just wanted to add another thought on your last question.

Mr. Paul Quassa: Mr. Chair, just to make it clear, there are other appointments that are still outstanding. Those two have been appointed, but the other one is still a question mark.

Mr. John Duncan: But only two of them are federal appointments?

Mr. Paul Quassa: There are two federal, two territorial government, and then four are from Inuit organizations.

Mr. John Duncan: Thank you for that.

My second question is for Richard Edjericon. There are reports now that it's anticipated the Mackenzie gas project will not proceed before 2018. Even with that statement by the proponents, they're saying they won't really know even that until 2013. I was just wondering how that affects current assessments and plans. It must be difficult to proceed in any direction, given that between now and 2013 there's a complete absence of knowing which way it's going. Does this affect your level of activity at all, or not really?

•(1630)

Mr. Richard Edjericon: No, not at this time. In the Mackenzie Valley, that project was referred to EIR, the environmental impact review. That consists of the Mackenzie Valley Environmental Impact Review Board, CEA, and the Inuvialuit Game Council.

These are the people who gave the direction to go ahead and put this joint review panel together that did the report. Right now, it's done. We've finally assisted as much as we can to try to steer them in the right direction to get this thing out. We did that. The report is done. We're still waiting for the candidate to respond, and that kind of thing.

But at our level, it's business as usual. We'll continue on. Some people say that the pipeline is going to start flowing by 2018. If you hear that, I presume that when you say flowing, then you subtract the years to build the pipeline. I heard 2013, in around there, as to when it's possible that the pipeline might be starting construction.

We don't know where things are at until they go through their process through the National Energy Board and so on. It's up to the proponent to decide that.

Mr. John Duncan: Thank you.

I have a question for Sharon. The mandate of CMHC is sometimes misunderstood when it comes to the north. We already had that confusion in one of the areas in the north. There's also similar confusion at times for on-reserve and other housing that would be affected by the mandate of this committee.

When I was looking through your notes or listening to your speech, you were talking about social housing a lot and affordable housing a lot. We have first nations who don't have social housing, but they have a need for affordable housing. None of the existing arrangements seem to accommodate that in any way.

It's been suggested to me that we have low-income people who have gone out of their way to try to build their own housing. They always fall just a little bit short, and if there were something there that would actually be less liability for government or CMHC to accommodate that little missing bit and—

The Chair: We're just about out of time.

Mr. John Duncan: —I'm wondering if this has been brought to your attention before and if there's a thought process to maybe try to address this.

The Chair: A brief answer, if possible.

Ms. Sharon Matthews: I'm not sure I understand the question in terms of our mandate. I did speak very much to social housing and affordable housing. CMHC is working with the provinces and the territories, and I know you're focused particularly on the territories. There's a considerable amount of funding that has flowed through CMHC from the federal government.

The way we partner in most of this is we do not design the programs, we do not determine the best way to get those funds on the ground. The view is that working in partnership, we can do the funding and we can have some overall federal accountabilities in terms of how that funding is going to get used.

Having the local territorial housing corporations and governments determine exactly what those programs are and how to design them, who to serve and how best to operate, is a much more efficient and a much better local answer.

The Chair: I'm sorry to have to shorten you up on that, but we'll have to move on.

Just before we go to the next round, which is a five-minute round, I just want to revisit this issue of the appointments and the timing of them.

Mr. Quassa, you clarified that in fact there were two points. I'm doing this just for the record. You mentioned, though, that there were some seats on the planning board that were vacant anywhere from two to three years.

I note in the background, for example, that those nominees come from regional Inuit associations, some from NTI, and the Government of Nunavut. In your view, is getting nominees the problem in terms of the delay, or is the delay when a nominee is put forward to be approved? I think that's what we need to know here, if you could just clarify or comment on that.

• (1635)

Mr. Paul Quassa: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

It is the appointment stage. Nomination is not really a problem. We've seen maybe once or a couple of times where the nomination stage from the RIA took a little longer, but in most cases it is the appointment process that takes longer.

The Chair: So the nomination has been put in and this might be from one of the associations, but there's a delay in hearing back that the appointment has been made. I just wanted to make sure of that for the record. Thank you.

[*Translation*]

Now we'll go to the second round.

Mr. Russell, you have five minutes.

[*English*]

Mr. Todd Russell (Labrador, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Good afternoon to each of you. It's good to have you here.

On the Nunavut Planning Commission, or the Sahtu planning, how do you get funding? There's some talk about the appointment process, and I think we got that clarified somewhat. Then there's the issue of financing, and some people would equate that to capacity in order to carry out the mandate of each of your organizations.

Can each of you tell us how the funding comes to you? Does it come to your territorial government? Does it go through the land claim group? How does that work?

Ms. Marg Epp: Thank you.

We are funded by the federal government, from INAC, through the implementation branch. That's where our funding comes from. Our issue is that we're still based on the original 1993 agreement, when the Nunavut Planning Commission was formed. That funding agreement has not changed. It was supposed to be a five-year deal at that time, and it has not ever been renewed. So we're still at that plateau level of that core funding, and all we get is the FDDIPI increases. Well, the FDDIPI increases in Nunavut don't even cover our cost of living and their cost of doing business.

So it's hard for us to move forward with new staff and with the new requirements that we have for creating and then implementing the land use plan when we don't get the funding increases we need to do that.

Mr. Todd Russell: Thank you.

Mr. Overvold.

Mr. Robert Overvold: Funding for working on land use planning is really part of the land claim. In 2003 core funding for the operations of the board was set for a ten-year period at around \$350,000 or thereabouts. But we find that basically enough to cover the administration and the board meeting a number of times a year, et

cetera. Money to actually do the work of developing a plan has been lacking for some time.

Money comes from INAC, obviously, and only from INAC for this. In 2008 we were encouraged to put together a three-year funding proposal to complete the strategic plan, which we did. For the past two years—not this coming fiscal year but the past two years—we did receive additional moneys in the area of \$500,000 to \$600,000 on top of our \$350,000 core. We're very pleased with that, and based on that we've made progress. As I was referring to in my presentation, for this coming fiscal year, starting a couple of days from now, we have no guarantee we're going to get that additional money. We know we'll get our core funding, but we're at this critical stage of trying to complete it in one more year, so we need it.

Mr. Todd Russell: What would the situation be with the Mackenzie Valley?

Mr. Richard Edjericon: Thank you, Mr. Russell.

We're similar to my colleague here, Robert Overvold. With our board the funding comes from the Gwich'in land claim group. We get our funding on a ten-year basis as well, and it's due in 2012. It comes from the claims implementation office as well. We get approximately \$2.3 million a year, plus we get supplementary funding and so on. But to really implement the act as laid out we definitely need anywhere from between \$5.5 million to \$6 million annually. So we've been struggling with that. But in two years I think we'll sit down and try to talk about those numbers again.

• (1640)

Mr. Todd Russell: Thank you. I think it's important for us if we're going to make recommendations going forward around capacity or about financing of these various agencies that we've created and negotiated, basically, and constitutionally protected, I would say.

The Chair: We're just about out of time. We're at 15 seconds—

Mr. Todd Russell: Fifteen? Oh, my gracious.

On housing, there was a comment made when we were in Nunavut that there are some new units going up, with an increase of \$100 million and that type of thing in certain parts of the economic plan, but there's no new money for operation and maintenance of the new units.

The Chair: Short comment, Ms. Matthews.

Mr. Todd Russell: So you have the pressures of the old and now you're going to have the pressures of the new. What role would you play in that?

Ms. Sharon Matthews: The federal government's role is on the new construction, so it is putting money in. Whether it's through the affordable housing initiative, through the stimulus measures, that's money for new construction. In terms of the operating costs, the intent is for those to be covered either by the groups themselves through other equity contributions or through the territories. So the federal government, not including the territories, has a cap of about \$75,000 capital that it will put in. When you put in that capital, it's cost-matched by a province; \$150,000. In most of the rest of Canada that can get you a pretty good affordable unit. Then the ongoing costs are fairly reasonable and can be carried by the revenues in terms of rent geared to income, what a tenant would be expected to pay.

In the territories there are none of those caps on the federal dollars, so that \$200 million can be used and there is no application of that cap. So they can use more federal dollars for the capital contribution. So that would lessen some of the ongoing operating costs.

The Chair: Okay. We let that go a little farther, but I think it was important to get that on the record.

Thank you, Mr. Russell.

Let's go to Mr. Clarke for five minutes. Mr. Clarke, the floor is yours.

Mr. Rob Clarke (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'd like to thank the witnesses for coming in. Some of you have travelled many miles and have had some long days, but I appreciate your appearing before the committee here.

My first question is for CMHC, for Sharon Matthews.

When you were giving your testimony, I noted a couple of things. One is that I didn't see the financials for the year. I was curious about how the finances broke down. If you could provide a breakdown to the committee so that we could take a look at it for the financials, that would probably be very—

Ms. Sharon Matthews: Are you talking about the housing funding that's going to the territories?

Mr. Rob Clarke: That's correct. It would be very beneficial for the committee.

Ms. Sharon Matthews: I've spoken of the \$200 million.

Mr. Rob Clarke: Right. I'm just wondering how the breakdown is.

Ms. Sharon Matthews: Okay. You have the \$200 million northern allocation—

Mr. Rob Clarke: Right. Let me finish, first.

I'm very curious about the yearly financials, but you also mentioned that this government invested \$1.7 billion annually. Then I see in 2008 an additional \$1.9 billion over the next five years.

I'm curious about the current financial situation that CMHC is in. Do you know what the surplus is? Is there a surplus in a bank account somewhere right now?

Ms. Sharon Matthews: I think you're talking about the mortgage insurance side of our business. There is technically what people

would refer to as a surplus. It's really important to understand that it isn't truly a surplus, because it actually is in the Government of Canada accounts.

That money is sitting there, it is Government of Canada, and it is part of what money is available for deficit reduction. There is no money per se that is unaccounted for in the government accounts, so there is no surplus per se.

• (1645)

Mr. Rob Clarke: I'd like to share my time with Mr. Payne as well.

Mr. LaVar Payne (Medicine Hat, CPC): Thank you.

I missed part of that. I'd like to go back to the planning boards. I wasn't quite clear, Mr. Quassa, on exactly the process for the nominations of residents and about who finally makes the appointment. Is it federal or territorial?

Mr. Paul Quassa: The final appointment decision is made by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development.

Mr. LaVar Payne: Okay. Thank you.

I guess the other question I have is around the boards. Feel free, Richard or Robert, if you want to join in. For these boards to make decisions and move forward, is some form of quorum required? How does it work?

Paul, go ahead.

Mr. Paul Quassa: Very briefly, in our case we have a quorum. If there are seven of us who have been appointed and yet there are nine seats, we only count the seven who are appointed, and half of that is the quorum. So I'd say that four is a quorum, if there are seven who are appointed, but we're not counting the other two who are not appointed yet. It works according to how many have been appointed at that time.

Mr. LaVar Payne: It depends on who is actually appointed.

Mr. Paul Quassa: Yes.

Mr. LaVar Payne: Okay.

Robert?

Mr. Robert Overvold: It's very similar for a lot of the boards in the NWT. I'll use ours as an example.

It's a five-person co-management board. Essentially, that means that the aboriginal group—in this case, the Sahtu Dene and Métis—have 50%. SSI gets two appointments, and then governments get one each—Canada gets one and GNWT gets one—and then there's a chair.

It's a co-management board, with two by the aboriginal group, two by governments, and one chair.

Mr. LaVar Payne: Did you have something to add too, Richard?

Mr. Richard Edjericon: Yes, thank you.

We're similar too. Basically our quorum is four: two government and two non-aboriginal government claimant groups. Right now we have the Gwich'in Sahtu as claimant groups, and the Tli Cho, and we also have a representative from the Deh Cho; they're also claimant groups. We have two federal that are filled and two have just expired, so if one of the two feds fall sick, then we don't have quorum. This is one of the reasons why we stress to government that it's important to fill these positions right away.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Payne.

Now we'll continue with Mr. Lévesque for five minutes.

Mr. Yvon Lévesque (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, BQ): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am pleased to be meeting with our witnesses.

I very much sympathize with you, given the recurring red tape associated with the establishment of new agencies. As you know, I come from the riding of Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik, and we aren't too concerned about these matters. Perhaps things don't operate the same way as in Quebec either.

I'm very pleased to see Ms. Matthews today. In Nunavik, in particular, the federal Minister of Indian Affairs and the Quebec minister acknowledged that Nunavik now needed 1,000 housing units in order to be up to date. A negotiation has just been completed. The parties agreed on 340 housing units over five years.

I understand that the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation may not have a lot of working capital. Ms. Matthews, am I mistaken in saying you currently have approximately \$8 billion? Is it the Corporation that tells the various ministers involved the amount that is granted? If not, is it the minister who, through his bargaining power, can obtain the necessary funding to perform his duties?

We know that 340 housing units over five years for 14 communities represents 24 units per community. That doesn't even cover the annual population increase in each of the villages. I would like you to explain to me how the money is granted to the department and, based on the negotiations, in Quebec.

• (1650)

[*English*]

Ms. Sharon Matthews: On this one, I'm afraid, it is the Department of Indian Affairs, not CMHC, that is party to that agreement. CMHC will provide some advice and guidance in terms of research and on the ground, but we wouldn't be party to that agreement.

What I can tell you is what we do in Quebec, in particular in northern Quebec.

For CMHC, I've spoken about the \$1.7 billion, the additional \$1.9 billion in affordable housing initiatives. We got the renovation programs renewed. There's a great deal of funding out there at a federal level. In fact over \$3 billion a year right now is being provided by the federal government.

Quebec gets over \$600 million of that overall pot, and it's broken down for affordable housing, the stimulus dollars, or whatever. As I was saying in answer to one of the earlier questions, with the vast

majority of the dollars we have for housing, we work in partnership with the Province of Quebec. They cost-match 50-50. In exchange for that, it is they who design, deliver, determine where the client groups are, whether it be in the south or the north, and what not.

As I said, I'm afraid I don't have a lot more information on the agreement you wanted me to refer to; that would be Indian and Northern Affairs. But certainly there is a lot of money flowing to the province of Quebec for affordable housing, and the Quebec government has the ability to choose how and where to use it within the province.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yvon Lévesque: The Minister of Indian Affairs has asked you for \$600 million for Nunavik.

[*English*]

Ms. Sharon Matthews: Out of all of the money that CMHC would administer on behalf of the federal government for affordable housing, \$600 million is what goes to the province of Quebec.

I can break it down for you. About \$400 million of it is for support of existing social housing on the ground. So \$400 million of the \$1.7 billion that I spoke to in my opening comments would go to the Province of Quebec under a social housing agreement, which they administer.

In addition, they get about \$29 million under the affordable housing initiative. They're getting \$29 million in the suite of renovation programs. There is also about \$22 million or \$23 million for on-reserve programs.

CMHC directly delivers the on-reserve programs. The rest of it would be largely done by the Province of Quebec. With those funds, there are federal parameters around how a province would manage, and there's an accountability framework, but by and large they would manage and make the choices in terms of whom they're serving and how those programs are designed.

The Chair: Merci, Monsieur Lévesque.

Let's go now to Mr. Rickford for five minutes.

Mr. Greg Rickford (Kenora, CPC): Thank you to all of the witnesses. As my colleague Rob said, many of you have come from a long distance to be with us today.

I believe my questions will be mostly to Ms. Matthews, vice-president for the assisted housing sector at CMHC.

I would like to preface my questions with recognition of what a terrific organization this is. It may not be in your sector per se, but I've had the opportunity to work with CMHC quite recently to help some municipalities out on some key infrastructure projects. I was very impressed with the calibre of the people, the scope of the work they do, and their willingness if not enthusiasm to help municipalities.

That said, I want to talk about the effectiveness of delivery through territorial housing corporations. As I understand it, CMHC has been delivering funds under Canada's economic action plan through existing arrangements with the territories. Typically this means that the housing corporations in each of the respective territories receive the funds.

This is a little bit of review here. I had an opportunity to review the Auditor General's report on the territories' housing corporations. With respect to the Northwest Territories, Madam Fraser noted that they needed to improve their management to ensure that they are meeting housing needs and being optimally cost-effective.

With respect to Nunavut, she identified some concerns around the need to monitor the activity of community partners, or to gauge whether units are being allocated to areas with the greatest need, and prioritizing maintenance or repairs.

She was somewhat more positive about the Yukon's performance but noted that they needed to be attentive to long-term strategic issues and to doing a better analysis of whether they are meeting housing needs.

Can you comment on how you're working with these partners to ensure that funds are being delivered in an effective manner to those who are in the most critical of housing needs?

• (1655)

Ms. Sharon Matthews: As I've said earlier in the discussion, there is a federal accountability framework in place. The partnering with territories and provinces allows for a 50-50 leveraging of cash, so there's a really important benefit to working in partnership.

The accountability framework involves such things as audited financial statements at the end of every year. We go through these to make sure the funds are actually spent as intended. There are also evaluation requirements built into various agreements.

I could certainly put forward to the committee a listing of that accountability framework, if it would help you.

Mr. Greg Rickford: I'd appreciate that, and I think all members would. Thank you.

I'm going to skip to Nunavut's housing needs. During our committee's visit to Iqaluit, I was struck by the activity.

Ms. Sharon Matthews: They're busy.

Mr. Greg Rickford: Yes, it's a very busy place. Certainly our government wanted to develop the kind of action plan that addresses the social, economic, and health consequences of overcrowding, noting that Nunavut was at twice the national level up until we took over government.

In 2006, our action plans focused on building up to 3,000 public housing units. If I understand this correctly, they were needed immediately just to bring overcrowding in Nunavut on par with the rest of Canada. Is that true?

Ms. Sharon Matthews: I can't speak to the number of units. Under the economic action plan, we were talking about dollars going out.

When the action plan was set out, the expectation was that nationally there would be something like 200,000 units impacted. I can tell you that we're well on our way to exceeding that.

Mr. Greg Rickford: With respect to the 3,000 additional units for Nunavut since our 2006 call to action, do you have any idea, or perhaps somebody else could say, where we're at with that 3,000?

Ms. Sharon Matthews: I couldn't off the top of my head. I don't have the details on the units for Nunavut. I can tell you in terms of the money they've received. I can walk you through.

Under the action plan, there was the \$100 million. They also got funding for seniors, persons with disabilities, they got funding for retrofit as well, but I can't give you the breakdown on the units, I'm afraid.

Mr. Greg Rickford: Thank you.

I was going to get into some of the innovation in northern housing. This is something we haven't talked about yet. I think I've got about 30 seconds, but I just wanted to highlight a few of them.

As I understand, you've partnered with the Yukon Housing Corporation. We're increasing energy efficiency, reducing use by over 50%, also consistent with the desires of the community members, and the Nunavut Housing Corporation's award-winning fiveplex housing project's an excellent example of innovative projects that focus on energy efficiency, affordability, and sensitivity to Inuit lifestyle. Can you tell us more about the success of these projects?

Perhaps Paul wants to chime in on that.

The Chair: We have no time. Just a very short comment—

Mr. Greg Rickford: Mr. Chair, these are good-news answers. These people have travelled a long way.

Ms. Sharon Matthews: The Nunavut fiveplex was an award-winning design. A number of fiveplexes have been put together. There's a great deal of energy efficiency because the five units are being built together. As you said, it's very culturally sensitive to the needs up there.

For example, the kitchens are much, much bigger than you would normally see in regular housing. There's also a rear access you can use if you're a hunter. There are sinks and there are cutting areas you can isolate from the rest of the home. There is a lot of very interesting technology there. Again, I could give you a write-up and provide that to the committee, but it's a really good example of some of the new technologies.

• (1700)

Mr. Greg Rickford: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: I noticed Mr. Quassa was nodding his head in that respect.

Mr. Bevington, did you have another question? You're up next, if you want to, for five minutes.

Mr. Dennis Bevington: You're giving me another chance, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Yes. Then we have Mr. Duncan, followed by Mr. Bagnell, and then that will be about it.

Go ahead, Mr. Bevington.

Mr. Dennis Bevington: I would like to get Mr. Quassa to respond to the question I asked earlier about some of the impediments to getting the land use plan done in terms of where he saw the problem with the federal government and the land quantum.

As Mr. Overvold pointed out, in the development of a land use plan some lands are always going to be set aside. I've found that in following the negotiations on those, those have been issues of a great deal of interest to the federal government. Do you find this is something that impacts on the land use plan process?

Mr. Paul Quassa: I'm sorry, I didn't quite understand.

Mr. Dennis Bevington: In developing a land use plan, certain lands are going to be set aside, non-development lands. A quantum is established. What I've noticed in the Northwest Territories, and I think Mr. Overvold spoke to it as well, is that these quantum are of great concern to the federal government, sometimes to the territorial government as well. Yet there is a review process for any land. That's a similar situation in Nunavut?

Mr. Paul Quassa: I can say that when we're developing a land use plan, we talk with all the stakeholders: planning partners, Nunavut municipalities, Inuit organizations, the Government of Nunavut, the Government of Canada, industry, non-government, environmental organizations. All these are full partners in identifying what types of lands are going to be used for what and what areas are not going to be used for any development.

Right now a consultation process is going on here in Ottawa with all the federal departments, whether it's Environment Canada, Transport, DND. All of them are here, meeting with our colleagues. I think we try to involve everybody.

If I understood your question correctly, I don't see any problem in that area.

Mr. Dennis Bevington: Where do you identify the problems in coming to a conclusion on a land use plan?

Mr. Paul Quassa: Again, it's the monetary sources that slow us down a lot. In some cases, it's slowing us down when we don't have enough resources.

As Marg had stated earlier, we're operating on a 1993 budget that hasn't changed since. It's the monetary issue that slows us down.

Mr. Dennis Bevington: You really haven't had the debate over land quantum for protected areas—

Mr. Paul Quassa: No, not that I know of.

Mr. Dennis Bevington: —not like in the Northwest Territories.

Mr. Paul Quassa: No.

Mr. Dennis Bevington: Okay. Thank you.

Do I have some more time?

The Chair: You have one minute and a bit, Mr. Bevington.

Mr. Dennis Bevington: Okay.

Mr. Edjericon, when you talk about having sufficient resources to conduct environmental assessments, what's the present state of that in terms of your board, the expertise on your board to conduct the environmental assessments going forward: the staffing, the expertise that you might have within your operation to do that?

• (1705)

Mr. Richard Edjericon: Thank you, Mr. Bevington.

Right now, we have a staff of around 15 people in our office. We have people who are very educated in their fields, and scientists, in a lot of ways, bringing a project to our table and breaking it down into plain language so that the trappers, business people, and everybody we have around the table can understand it.

It's important that we have people like that around the table working for us. It makes our job easier when we have to make decisions on very important files. We've always encouraged staff like that, who are educated, but sometimes they are really hard to find and we have to find them wherever they are in Canada. It's important that we have scientists like that on our staff.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Bevington and witnesses. We have time for only two brief questions, maybe two minutes each, from Mr. Duncan and then Mr. Bagnell. After that, we'll take a brief recess.

Go ahead, Mr. Duncan.

Mr. John Duncan: Are you're sure we can't have three and a half minutes each?

The Chair: No, two minutes, right on the nose.

Mr. John Duncan: I want to go to the financing question. I was hoping to get an answer from each of the boards and commissions.

Paul Quassa, you're talking about the 1993 formula. What is the anticipation going forward in terms of revision of your financing? Is it not conceivable, possible, or probable that the Government of Nunavut will want that activity and sphere to operate efficiently, for multiple reasons, and they will prioritize that it should be funded to get to the desired objective; or is it somehow constrained from doing so? That's my question.

Mr. Paul Quassa: Maybe I'll get Marg to reply. She's our economic adviser.

Ms. Marg Epp: I'm not sure what the role of the GN would have to do with that. We work directly with INAC on the funding issues. Every year, we are asked to put together a budget. We put together a needs-based budget, and then they turn around and tell us, "Well, you have x number of dollars that you can spend this year." So I'm not sure what the point of that process is, because we're consistently \$1.5 million short.

Going forward here, the draft of the land use plan is going to be done this year. As the land use plan gets implemented, we will be reorganizing to some degree. Our focus will then change from creating the land use plan to implementing and monitoring it, which needs a reorganization of our staff and dollars in different places.

When you add the extra layer of NUPPAA onto that and the implementation that we have to follow through on, based on what NUPPAA requires us to do, we're way short. We're \$2.5 million to \$3 million short, because we have to create the public registry. We have to add additional staff, because then it's going to be very heavy on conformity determination versus creation. So we're very short on funding in terms of moving forward.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Ms. Epp and Mr. Duncan.

Let's go to Mr. Bagnell for two minutes.

Hon. Larry Bagnell: Just on a point Mr. Rickford brought up, if there were 3,000 units in Nunavut—just to point out the shortage—if they got \$200 million of the \$300 million, that would be only \$67,000 a house. I was on a reserve in Vancouver on the weekend and the chief told me it was \$140,000 a house. I know it left a huge majority of the housing still to be done.

That's why I hope they have a new program. There was a big scandal when the minister said it was for aboriginal people, and then they flowed it through another government. That was a huge scandal in my riding. Hopefully that's not repeated.

My question is about appointments to boards. I only raise it because this isn't the first time we've heard about it. We've heard about it all over the place, and I'm worried that the minister is saying he's going to cut the number of people on boards. I'm worried about someone's representation, or as you said earlier, quorum or any of these things.

Have you heard of any cuts to boards in the north in your areas, or even in other boards? Or are there problems with boards not being filled? Anyone.

• (1710)

The Chair: We'll start with Mr. Edjericon, and we'll go across the panel.

Mr. Richard Edjericon: Thank you, Mr. Bagnell.

Because the Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act was created as a result of land claims in the Northwest Territories, there's an obligation there by Canada, and a constitutional obligation as well. So in terms of appointments to the board or anything like that, we don't see.... I think it's status quo as usual. I'll leave it there.

The Chair: Mr. Quassa, do you have any comment on that, whether you've heard of any such reductions?

Mr. Paul Quassa: No. Again, our land claims agreement is constitutionally protected. It's already identified as to how many board members or commissions or any other IPGs we'll have.

Nothing can change until it's amended. The amendment process is such that the Inuit and the federal government have to agree first before any amendments can be taken.

The Chair: Finally, Mr. Overvold, is there any indication there for you?

Mr. Robert Overvold: No. We're just looking quickly at the Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act and the actual land claim agreement. We seem to be safe.

The Chair: Okay. That's great.

Members and witnesses, thank you very much. You've done an excellent job, I should say, staying on time today. I know that's sometimes very difficult to do. Members also, I thank you for your patience and cooperation.

We're going to take a brief suspension here, just for a couple of minutes so we can say goodbye to the witnesses. Members, I'd ask you to stay for a few minutes. We have just a small piece of committee business to conduct, so don't go away.

The meeting is suspended.

- _____ (Pause) _____
- _____

The Chair: *Allons-y.*

First I would entertain a motion for unanimous consent to proceed to committee business.

We have consent.

Many of you know that we've had with us Mary Hurley, who is our analyst, and has been, not just for this committee over the 40th Parliament, members, but stretching all the way back to the second session of the 35th Parliament. We're talking about 1996, when Mary joined this committee. At that time she had been working for the Library of Parliament for two years before she was assigned to this committee.

I'd like to use this time to have a representative from each of the parties at least have an opportunity to wish her well in the years ahead. If each of the representatives could perhaps just say a short bit in that regard, then we'll finish up with my final comments.

I'll start with Mr. Duncan, then we'll go to Mr. Russell, Monsieur Lemay, and Madam Crowder.

• (1715)

Mr. John Duncan: First of all, thank you to the chair for arranging for this and making sure it's on the record, because I know from Mary's perspective that would be very important.

I'm the only member on the committee here who precedes Mary on the committee. The chair was doing some homework and noticed that the other day.

I do have some memories, of course, and one of them is going to the school in Sechelt when I represented that area. It was my riding. It's no longer my riding, but I still have strong memories when we were doing a schools study. That was my first Parliament, the 35th. We ended up in Stanley Park at the teahouse, I think.

You were there.

Ms. Mary Hurley (Committee Researcher): That wasn't my study.

Mr. John Duncan: That wasn't your study?

Ms. Mary Hurley: No, that was Gilles Barrette.

A voice: You are so old, John.

Mr. John Duncan: Gilles is still here, but in the department now. I don't know whether I should continue this story. Anyway, I will.

The man who moderated the all-candidates meeting, the big televised one where I was the wannabe against the 14-year incumbent, happened to be in the teahouse. When we all walked in, all the MPs plus all the staff were there, and he came over and said I was on one of my junkets. It was a beautiful day in the winter in Vancouver and I was, in a sense, embarrassed. I think he thought I did this every second week or something.

Anyway, there've been some very special times through the years, and I can recall many instances with national leaders, Ovide Mercredi and others. I was reminded about how old I'm getting the other day because Ovide Mercredi came to the freedom event in Rod Bruinooge's office and buttonholed me. I looked and I wondered who this was. I knew this man. Then he made a comment about erecting a blockade. He was kidding, but sent a signal to me that this is the same guy. The floodgates opened.

So many issues were brought up in that timeframe, like the concern about section 67 of the Human Rights Act, the exclusion of first nations, the treaties in the north. We were doing a lot of the legislation for the treaties in the north. Now we're doing a northern economic development study. That's all water under the bridge, but it all happened while we were on committee.

There was the optional legislation, the one size doesn't fit all stuff, the First Nations Land Management Act and other things. We had the comprehensive agreements, Westbank, Nisga'a, and so on.

Mary, with your retirement, we're losing an institutional memory and an institution at the same time. I just want to say from our side of the table that we really appreciate everything you've contributed, and we're going to miss you.

[Applause]

Ms. Mary Hurley: Thank you very much.

● (1720)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Duncan.

Mr. Russell.

Mr. Todd Russell: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Even John's memory.... I'm glad I haven't been here as long as you have.

On behalf of myself, Larry, and all who have served on the committee as part of the Liberal Party and our delegation—and I'm surely going to say this on behalf of Nancy Karetak-Lindell, who has continued to correspond with Mary since she left the House of Commons—I can say that I've been here on this committee for five years, ever since I was elected, and you've been here as well.

Through that time, you've been a steady hand when change has come to this committee, whether there have been new chairs or new members.

You have been knowledgeable, and more than knowledgeable, about almost every issue that has confronted us. You have been our memory when some of us do lose it and cannot recall what has happened five, ten, or that many years ago. You have been accommodating. I think that's important, given the nature of business around here at times, and the many pushes and strains one can have to take a certain position. You have been accommodating, yet fair and objective, and I know those principles are very dear to you. We have talked about things, and you have always been that wonderful balance and wonderful measure.

I would also say that you have tremendous research abilities that each of us has been witness to, and benefited from, as parliamentarians. Indeed, this whole institution has benefited from your abilities. And as we've been witness to your abilities, I think you have been witness to some great things in Parliament, whether it was the apology nearly two years ago, or historic land claims agreements, like the Nisga'a or the Labrador Inuit agreement, and there are many others. You know you can take great pride in having been part of those historic events.

Most of all, I believe that you're a wonderful person, and that's been exuded through your work. Not everybody can do that. Not everybody can exude their personal abilities through their work and maintain that wonderful balance. So you're a wonderful person, above all.

I wish you good health and happiness as you go forward. And there will be many, many years, I am sure of that.

I want to thank you on behalf of us and our party.

[Applause]

Ms. Mary Hurley: Thank you very much.

The Chair: Mr. Lemay.

[Translation]

Mr. Marc Lemay: When I first arrived on the committee, I saw that lady seated in a chair and I wondered what she did.

Ms. Mary Hurley: She wondered the same thing.

Mr. Marc Lemay: She probably wondered the same thing about me. I have legal training, particularly in criminal law, but Indian Affairs didn't suit me as well. My leader asked me to take charge of that file. I must say I was vaguely aware of it, from a distance, but it wasn't the same thing when I arrived here.

Since 2006, I have been the Bloc's Indian Affairs critic. I have noted the outstanding and remarkable work done by Ms. Hurley. When I saw her in the House yesterday, and I'm going to repeat it here for those who haven't heard it. Ms. Hurley sent you the Library document yesterday concerning Bill C-3, which we will soon be examining, I was stunned. I'm being sincere. I was pleasantly surprised to see the scope of Ms. Hurley's knowledge and, especially, her patience. She did the research so that she could provide us with an extraordinary 15-page history of the Indian Act. Yesterday I realized that we were going to lose her. I hope the person who replaces her has the same qualities: discretion, concern for a job well done and knowledge of the file. That is what I will remember about Ms. Hurley.

In addition, I will especially remember the fact that we all went to Nunavut together, that we tried to buy some souvenirs. I get the impression that Rob Clarke and I intended to buy quite a bit more than you, poor Ms. Hurley. One day I hope it will be possible for you to go back there without Rob Clarke and me so that you can buy the works you deserve.

On behalf of the Bloc, I of course wish you the best possible retirement. I hope you have prepared for retirement and that you are ready for it. Don't worry though: if you want to come back to Parliament, the debates will still be the same. If you have the time, I'll invite you to visit a few aboriginal communities. Perhaps you haven't had the time to visit many, but if you have the opportunity, you will see there are some extraordinary aboriginal and Inuit communities in Canada and Quebec.

On behalf of the Bloc, thank you very much. You have been an outstanding reference authority. I am telling you that on my own behalf and probably on behalf of Mr. Lévesque as well. Now I know who she is, someone who works for the Library of Parliament, someone who does her job very well.

Thank you, and I wish you a happy retirement.

● (1725)

Ms. Mary Hurley: Thank you very much, Mr. Lemay.

[*English*]

The Chair: We'll go to Ms. Crowder.

Ms. Jean Crowder (Nanaimo—Cowichan, NDP): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to echo my colleague's words with a heartfelt thanks for the contribution you've made to this committee. I've been here since 2006. As you're well aware, there have been many challenges for all of us, because there have been so many new members on the committee.

I really appreciate the patience you've shown with our questions and our scrambling to come to grips with really complex issues. The research you and your team have provided has been thorough. It has been analytical. It's raised important aspects of legislation or studies we've been considering that perhaps we wouldn't have come to on our own. That thoughtful analysis is really essential for us in doing our jobs appropriately. I have every faith that the parliamentary library team will find two people to replace one of you. That's really what it will be.

I just had a procedural question. If we filibuster long enough past your retirement date, do you have to stay?

On behalf of the New Democrats and all of my colleagues, I just want to express our thanks for your professionalism, and I wish you all the very best in your retirement. If you should ever come to the west coast and are interested in seeing some unique first nations ways of being in the world, I heartily welcome you to my riding and other places on the west coast. I'm sure that Mr. Duncan does too.

Thank you again, Mary. I wish you all the best in your retirement.

Ms. Mary Hurley: Thanks very much. Thank you.

[*Applause*]

The Chair: Thank you very much, members. I know that your comments are echoed by your colleagues in each of the parties. While I appreciate everything you've said, I can tell you from the chair's perspective that the ability and value that the research analysts bring to this role just cannot be calculated.

Mary has in fact served eight different chairs in the course of her time here, going back to 1996. Several of them would do one stint, miss a year or two, and then come back. You will know that the complexity and far-reaching implications of the work this committee considers require somebody with the knowledge Mary brings to the file. It is just unbelievable.

Mr. Duncan mentioned earlier that there are some members around here.... I notice that Mr. Bagnell in fact was on a committee back in the early 1990s as well, and others have mentioned their time on the committee. But it is an extraordinary task to be able to put it together in terms that members can, in a fairly short time, digest, be able to contemplate and pose questions so that the right information is drawn out and reports and recommendations can be salient and on point. This is a tremendous job that Mary has provided this committee for over 14 years.

With that, I really just want to say not just on behalf of the committee that's here with us today and the 40th Parliament but on behalf of all the committee chairs who have served this committee and the members going back to 1996—I know that they would echo those same sentiments—Mary, on behalf of all of us stretching back during your time, congratulations and many good years ahead. Health and happiness to you in all of your endeavours.

We have a gift for you. We have something to present and we need you to open this. We're going to do that right now. You can stand up.

● (1730)

Ms. Mary Hurley: I need a few minutes to prepare my speech.

An hon. member: You won't need any footnotes for this.

Ms. Mary Hurley: No. I'm a big footnote person, as you know.

The Chair: This is a limited edition print by an Ojibwa artist by the name of Doris Cyrette. She comes from Fort William First Nation near Thunder Bay.

You'll know that Mary is in fact a birdwatcher. That's one of the things she does.

[*Translation*]

She watches the birds all the time.

[*English*]

Hold this up, Mary. Doris actually paints birds, and the name of this print is “The Mentor”. We thought it was particularly appropriate, because Mary Hurley has been our mentor for 14 years.

Congratulations, Mary.

[*Applause*]

Ms. Mary Hurley: Thank you very much.

This is unexpected. I don't have a speech, so I'll just tell you that it's been a privilege to work with parliamentarians over the past 16 years—14 years on this committee. I think the issues and the concerns that come before this committee are among the most

important in the country. They're complex. I am very gratified to think that I've been able to be of assistance to parliamentarians when they deal with them.

I'm sure that you're going to continue to benefit from the same assistance as you move forward. I find it kind of ironic that my very last meeting is the meeting prior to your commencing study of a piece of legislation that was the last piece of legislation I worked on. I wish you all the best in your endeavours as you deal with issues on this committee. They're important. They need your careful attention. I am sure you'll give it.

Thank you very, very much.

[*Applause*]

The Chair: 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>