



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

# **Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development**

---

AANO • NUMBER 053 • 1st SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

---

**EVIDENCE**

**Wednesday, December 5, 2012**

**Chair**

**Mr. Chris Warkentin**



# Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development

Wednesday, December 5, 2012

• (1620)

[English]

**The Chair (Mr. Chris Warkentin (Peace River, CPC)):** Colleagues, I'm going to call to order this 53rd meeting of the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development.

Colleagues, as you are aware, today we've had some changes to our schedule, and therefore we've made some changes to the orders of the day. We're going to be moving to the second hour of representation, so it will be our privilege today to have David Akeagok, deputy minister of the Environment of the Government of Nunavut, as well as chief negotiator of devolution.

We also have Christopher Douglas, who is special advisor to the premier.

Thank you so much for being here. We appreciate your testimony. After your opening statement we will turn to committee members to ask questions.

We will turn to you as we begin.

**Mr. David Akeagok (Deputy Minister of the Environment, Chief Negotiator, Devolution, Government of Nunavut, Government of Nunavut):** [*Witness speaks in Inuktitut*]

Good afternoon. As the chair mentioned, my name is David Akeagok, and I am the deputy minister of the Department of Environment in the Government of Nunavut. On behalf of Premier Aariak, I would like to thank the committee for your invitation to the premier to appear before you. Premier Aariak sends her regrets. I am appearing on her behalf.

I am appearing to speak in support of part 1 of the bill, the Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act. As Premier Aariak has noted, the bill marks an important milestone in creating an effective regime for Inuit and the government to manage resource development in Nunavut together.

The bill fulfills a major commitment Canada made under the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement. In 1993, the Inuit of Nunavut and Canada signed the largest land claims agreement in the country. The Nunavut Land Claims Agreement requires that new federal legislation be created to set forth the powers and functions of the resource management boards created under the agreement. In this case, they are the Nunavut Impact Review Board and the Nunavut Planning Commission. These two boards play an essential role in land and resource management in Nunavut. They are composed of members appointed or nominated by Inuit as well as by the territorial

and federal governments. They have been in operation since 1996, under the authority and powers granted to them under the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement and the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement Act.

Between 2002 and late 2009, the Department of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, the Government of Nunavut, and Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated worked together to complete the federal legislation that would set out clear roles for the boards. The Nunavut Planning Commission and the Nunavut Impact Review Board also participated in that work. I would like to acknowledge the hard work officials from the Government of Nunavut, the federal Department of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development, Nunavut Tunngavik, and the two boards have put into the development of this bill.

The working group was guided by the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement as well as by the experience of drafting similar legislation in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon. The working group also benefited from the work the board, Inuit, and the government have been doing since 1996.

The Government of Nunavut believes this bill will make a number of improvements to the regulatory regime in Nunavut. Specifically, the Nunavut section of this bill will make the work of the Nunavut Impact Review Board and the Nunavut Planning Commission stronger by backing it up with solid federal legislation. It will also create a clear regulatory process with predictable timelines.

The bill will integrate the process of approving project proposals by the Nunavut Planning Commission and the Nunavut Impact Review Board. The bill establishes a one-window approach to project approval, with the Nunavut Planning Commission as the entry point for all project approvals. The bill establishes three-party approval of the land use plan by Inuit, Canada, and the Government of Nunavut.

The bill further clarifies the role of the Canadian Environmental Assessment Agency in Nunavut. This will eliminate the overlap of jurisdictions, which has caused confusion and delay elsewhere in Canada. The bill will make it clear which projects are subject to assessment. It will also set out in a schedule all government authorizations that must comply with the requirements of the bill before being finalized.

• (1625)

The bill sets out the regulatory approval process in a clear manner and organizes the processes chronologically.

The bill allows for enforcement of land use plans and project certifications on Inuit-owned lands, crown lands, and commissioner lands.

The bill requires that public hearings be conducted in Inuktitut if requested by a member, proponent, or intervenor.

The bill includes specific directions to regulators to include in their permits applicable terms and conditions of the land use plans and project assessment certificates.

The bill includes specific timelines for regulators and ministers to make decisions. This will bring certainty and predictability to Nunavummiut, to industry, and to other stakeholders.

Finally, the bill provides for offence provisions in relation to land use plans and project certification.

As the committee can see, this is an important piece of legislation for the north, and it will contribute to the economic development of Nunavut.

Additionally, as members of this committee may know, the Government of Nunavut is currently engaged in devolution discussions to transfer jurisdiction over land and resources from the federal government to the Government of Nunavut. A devolution agreement has been concluded with the Yukon, and an agreement in principle has been reached with the Northwest Territories.

An effective regulatory system, which Bill C-47 will create, is a key component of devolution. The Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act will assist in creating a transparent and effective regulatory system in Nunavut. It will allow the Government of Nunavut to take on management of lands and resources in a seamless way without disruption to resource development in Nunavut.

This legislation is an important achievement by the federal and territorial governments and Inuit to strengthen Nunavut's institutions and enable Nunavummiut to advance along the path towards greater self-reliance.

Mr. Chairman, that's all I have in terms of opening remarks. I would be happy to take questions from committee members.

*Quyanainni.*

**The Chair:** Thank you very much. We appreciate that opening statement.

We will now turn to Mr. Bevington for the first seven-minute round.

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

Thank you very much to the witnesses for being here today.  
*Quyanainni.*

I'm pleased to have an opportunity to ask you questions on this. We are very delighted that you have a piece of legislation that you are anxious to see go through the process here and become law.

You can see the timeframe that's been involved in this. I'm a little curious as to what the sticking points were in this legislation that led to this taking so many years for the federal government and Nunavut

to agree on. Could you maybe give us a sense of the issues where the two governments weren't in sync?

**Mr. David Akeagok:** *Quyanainni.*

From 2002 to 2009 it has been a very complex file. It has been worked on very carefully by two governments, along with Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated. With a tri-party working group, I don't think there were a lot of sticking points in terms of what the major issues were, but it did take quite a bit of time to do the drafting.

As well, just trying to have the same wording in the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement and the new legislation, and trying to line those up with the regulatory—it took a good number of years to get that through.

*Quyanainni.*

● (1630)

**Mr. Dennis Bevington:** You have provisions in here for regulated timeframes. Were those in the original drafts that were made on this a decade ago?

**Mr. David Akeagok:** In the first bill that was introduced, the timeframe was shorter. This bill has increased the length of the timelines, which we're very happy to see.

*Quyanainni.*

**Mr. Dennis Bevington:** I've sat on environmental assessment boards myself in the Northwest Territories. When it comes to timeframes, industry, for instance, is responsible for providing enough information so that a board can accept a particular phase of the environmental assessment.

Do you think this act now gives you enough leeway to deal with those issues, such as lack of information for developing first the environmental impact statement and then the return? A number of steps along the way require information.

Do you feel these timeframes will in any way inhibit the government from dealing with these issues in such fashion as to ensure the right decisions are going to be made?

**Mr. David Akeagok:** Thank you very much for that question.

In Nunavut we just practised that with the Baffinland environmental assessment review. That is a huge project being undertaken within Nunavut for which we followed the legislation being drafted as a model in order to go through the regulatory process. Sometimes we needed time, either within the board or within our own government. There are provisions to allow for that. That's one that seems to work, and it is supported through this legislation.

**Mr. Dennis Bevington:** On Monday, NTI submitted a whole series of amendments they want made to this bill. They call them minor in nature.

Do you agree with that assessment, and do you agree with the amendments they have proposed?

**Mr. David Akeagok:** What NTI has submitted to the committee represents one of the areas that has been worked on for a good number of years. NTI have used the same wording used in the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement. From the assessments we did on what they submitted, that's what they're asking for.

In that regard, our government is satisfied with the bill before your committee. I believe NTI will be speaking to you on their points later this week. We have maintained the position that this should be worked on by the three parties, and we were satisfied by the working groups that we should move forward. From the government's standpoint, this is what we would like to see go through.

*Quyanainni.*

**Mr. Dennis Bevington:** I have a minute left, so it's not too much time to deal with those specifically. As you say, we're going to spend quite a bit longer with NTI on these, so we'll have a chance to look at them.

Do you have a timeframe to get these land use plans in place? Is there some sense that this will happen in a good fashion? Do you have an arrangement made?

I know in the Northwest Territories they have had a great deal of difficulty in finalizing land use plans. It's been a real hang-up for our government and for the whole process in the north.

• (1635)

**Mr. David Akeeagok:** Currently the Nunavut Planning Commission is conducting community consultations on the plan they have drafted, which will have a Nunavut-wide focus. That's taking place right now. I'm awaiting the community consultation results to see if there are going to be any amendments or any refinements on the draft that's before our territory.

*Quyanainni.*

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

We'll turn to Mr. Rickford next, for seven minutes.

**Mr. Greg Rickford (Kenora, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, David and Christopher, for coming today.

We're talking about a piece of legislation that I think represents a new path forward with respect to major project development across the north. I want to commend the hard work your government has done—and our department as well—for what, by all accounts, based on your testimony today, has been a positive experience, one that, to quote some of the testimony we've heard so far, is aimed at a streamlined planning and review process, and as you've said, David, that brings “certainty and predictability”.

I think this is important in three main regards, and there may be others. It strikes me that the consultation process was thorough, and that, secondly, an emphasis was placed on what could be two competing claims, in a sense—economic development and of course the environment—as these projects move forward.

My colleagues are going to deal with the economic development and the environment piece. I want to focus for the next five or six minutes on the consultation process.

I was wondering, David, and perhaps Christopher, if you could tell us, to the extent that you're aware, about the nature of your participation—the government's participation—in the consultation process. Do you feel that your comments and/or your concerns were not just raised, because I'm sure you did that ably, but that they were adequately considered and responded to in this process?

If we have time, I'd like to go to a couple of residual questions on consultation.

Go ahead.

**Mr. David Akeeagok:** Our premier and our minister, once this legislation was tabled, provided a press release in support of this legislation. It showed that there has been very good work between the two governments in terms of consulting with each other and drafting this bill. It is very unique legislation that allowed us as territorial governments to have influence on the federal legislation. Yes, we are very happy with the level of consultation that took place leading up to this legislation.

**Mr. Greg Rickford:** Christopher, do you have anything to add to that, briefly?

**Mr. Christopher Douglas (Special Advisor to Premier Eva Aariak, Government of Nunavut):** No, I think David covered that.

Thanks.

**Mr. Greg Rickford:** As you said, David, this was a tripartite process in a technical sense, although there were other stakeholders who played a major role, certainly in the consultation process, to be able to arrive at a comprehensive agreement in the form of NUPPA, which is one component of Bill C-47. It strikes me, then, that in order for us to arrive at where we are today in terms of bringing this legislation forward, all parties, particularly the government and, as you mentioned, NTI, would need to have some degree of satisfaction, if not complete satisfaction, with this legislation moving forward.

Your sense from going through that process, David...and certainly, again, Christopher, this is an invitation for you to comment on that process, not just in terms of consultation, but in terms of a feeling that at this point all parties—and certainly the three that would form the tripartite, as you said, David—feel comfortable with where we're at in order to move forward with this comprehensive piece of legislation.

**Mr. Christopher Douglas:** What I would say, from working with Premier Aariak, is that we see this legislation as an important step forward towards the process of devolution, which David may talk about in more detail. It has been important to have the federal government, the territorial government, and Nunavut Tunngavik all working on this together, and working on the steps forward, so that we have that smooth transition towards devolution. The success that has happened in drafting this bill I think points towards a successful devolution process, and the premier is very pleased about that aspect of it.

• (1640)

**Mr. Greg Rickford:** On the feedback from what I referred to earlier in my questioning, the feedback from the other stakeholders, am I to assume, then, that there was a high degree of comfort with the process and what we arrived at in terms of the NUPPA component of Bill C-47?

**Mr. David Akeagok:** Yes. I think NTI, Nunavut Tunngavik, can speak for themselves on the comments they provided, but through the tripartite agreement, all three were comfortable enough to move this forward. There may be some technical wording they would rather see, but the three parties were satisfied with the overall concept and the spirit of this legislation, and we have been looking forward to the passage of this legislation. It has been a long time coming.

It is one that, if and when we get the devolution agreement and have control and administration of the land, will allow us to have either mirror legislation or use this legislation. That part is still up for negotiation with the federal government. But we are very pleased to see legislation like this, and if it can go through and be accepted, it will help our government to make control and administration of the crown lands a lot more seamless.

Thank you.

**Mr. Greg Rickford:** Thank you.

I have no further questions.

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

We'll turn to Ms. Bennett now.

**Hon. Carolyn Bennett (St. Paul's, Lib.):** Thank you very much.

To follow up on my colleagues' questions, I think we were a bit shocked to get the 45-page document from NTI when we thought everybody was happy with this. With all the consultation, and as you say, with the spirit being on the same page, when you get 45 pages of changes, it's a bit surprising. Could you live with those changes from NTI, or are there ones that you don't think are necessary?

**Mr. David Akeagok:** If the wording they are proposing to change, in terms of being consistent with the Nunavut land claims, the actual wording.... From my assessment, that 45 pages is based a lot on the wording of the legislation itself.

We don't have an issue with changing words, but what we would have an issue with is if there are any further delays in terms of getting this legislation through. It's critical legislation that the three parties would like to see in terms of the next move in our claim implementation.

**Hon. Carolyn Bennett:** In terms of its recommended amendments to section 39, the federal government is to clarify that it is responsible to fund the commission and the board.

Your planning commission stated:

To be successful with our organizational transition and the on-going implementation of NUPPAA, additional human and financial resources will be required.

Their amendment says—I guess we want to know what provisions have been made regarding the commission's request for “an initial \$2,918,284...to effectively prepare for and implement the new legal requirements...\$1,878,284 in core funding...for ongoing implementation responsibilities”.

Is that your estimate of the costs, and has the federal government made provision for these additional costs?

● (1645)

**Mr. David Akeagok:** I'm going to refer that to NTI, Nunavut Tunngavik Inc., to answer. Their proposal for the implementation of the legislation, the passage of the legislation, still has to be worked on in terms of figuring out the funding portion. In terms of funding governments, there are provisions within the Nunavut Land Claims Agreement whereby the three parties fund the board. In that respect, there's adequate coverage in terms of where those funds will come from and how.

**Hon. Carolyn Bennett:** Would you need any additional funding from the federal government in order to implement it, from the Government of Nunavut's point of view?

Go ahead, Christopher.

**Mr. Christopher Douglas:** There are some new responsibilities that will be coming to the territorial government, for example, the role of conservation officers, in terms of enforcing aspects of the legislation.

In terms of the funding agreement between the two governments for those new duties and responsibilities, that's going to be worked on during this implementation plan that will come after the passage of the legislation.

**Hon. Carolyn Bennett:** You're comfortable that if the legislation passes, then the negotiations will open it up in terms of the money you will require for implementation.

**Mr. David Akeagok:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

We'll turn to Mr. Richards now.

**Mr. Blake Richards (Wild Rose, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I appreciate your coming to see us here today. I know you've come some way, so it's much appreciated that you've made the effort to be here. It's obviously an important piece of legislation, and I know it's important to you, to your government, and to the people of Nunavut.

Obviously economic development is something that's key, and there are all kinds of opportunities in Nunavut. You know that as well as anyone. Certainly our government has recognized the economic potential in the north, and it's something I know you would be happy to talk about all day if I let you, I'm sure.

I would like to hear a bit from you on how, in your view, this legislation does help to foster greater economic development in the Nunavut territory. How do you see it helping to develop that, and maybe give specific examples if you have them. Obviously there is lots of potential there, particularly with natural resources, but I would love to hear your thoughts on how this legislation will help to foster that economic development.

**Mr. David Akeagok:** As I mentioned in my opening comments, it will bring about certainty to the people of Nunavut. If there are any economic development opportunities in natural resources, there will be certainty that there will be a review process to allow for the environmental and economic opportunity for both of those. I think our government, through the Tamapta priorities that our premier is implementing, will bring about a good amount of certainty.

A prime example I will use is on the Baffinland project. Leading up to that, we used the boards—the Nunavut Impact Review Board and the Nunavut Water Board. This legislation has a model to make sure we don't duplicate a lot of efforts.

As you might know, the population in Nunavut is small. Having one window to give that opportunity helps all of us within Nunavut. It's streamlining a lot of these processes, which allows our population to effectively have their say in terms of moving this forward. The horizon we have and the projections on the resource development that is coming...it's growing, and it's growing quite substantially.

Without proper regulatory legislation, we did have concerns. But with the proper regulatory systems in place, from the Nunavut perspective, that's going to help our population, in terms of having their voice and having the decisions made by the people, for the people, in Nunavut.

*Quyanainni.*

● (1650)

**Mr. Blake Richards:** Thank you.

I guess we could look at a project that was recently approved in Nunavut—and I'll certainly take the opportunity now to congratulate you and the people of Nunavut on that approval—and that's the Mary River iron ore project. Obviously that project was able to proceed under the current system, but I wonder if you could give me a sense as to how this bill might help in the review of those kinds of projects in the future.

**Mr. David Akeagok:** As I mentioned, this draft legislation has already helped us review that huge project on the Mary River, and it's one that's given us certainty. There are definitely challenges, especially with the size and scope of the Mary River project. We're very pleased with how that process is coming along. Minister Duncan just recently approved it.

The next phase is for the project certification. The boards are already in place to say okay, we'll start that process. All the stakeholders know that process and all the stakeholders are getting prepared for that. Shortly after that, the Nunavut Water Board will do the licensing part.

Having clear timelines does help all the stakeholders, including us as regulators from the Government of Nunavut. This legislation will bring that clarity.

**Mr. Blake Richards:** In response to my first question, you mentioned the Nunavut Impact Review Board. Obviously this legislation clarifies the roles and responsibilities of both that board and also the Nunavut Planning Commission. I think what it will do is obviously create the ability for greater cooperation between them.

I just want to know what your thoughts are. Do you feel this will allow the board and the commission to become more efficient in their coordination and in their review?

**Mr. David Akeagok:** Yes, it will. On the Nunavut Planning Commission, this legislation allows all three parties to sign off on the land use plan, so that would be the two governments and Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated. Signing that brings certainty and acceptance on which part of the lands will be used and which parts will be

conserved. There will be good clarity if and when we do pass that Nunavut land use plan. If that is accepted by the two governments and Nunavut Tunngavik, it brings great certainty and assurance to the residents of Nunavut.

**Mr. Blake Richards:** Thank you very much for your testimony and for answering my questions. I appreciate it.

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

We'll turn now to Ms. Crowder, for five minutes, please.

● (1655)

**Ms. Jean Crowder (Nanaimo—Cowichan, NDP):** I want to thank the witnesses for coming before the committee today and for their testimony.

We on this side would have welcomed the Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act being reintroduced as a stand-alone piece of legislation. That would have allowed us to deal with it expeditiously. As you're well aware, Bill C-25 was introduced two years ago, in May 2010, actually. I know there were some minor changes, and we actually reviewed both pieces of legislation. There were minor changes to that legislation, but it would have been easy for our committee to deal with that stand-alone piece of legislation instead of bundling it in with the Northwest Territories and Yukon as well.

I've gone back to the old Bill C-25 for some testimony, and I also have a funding question. I know that part of this you may not be able to answer. In May 2010 a witness for the Nunavut Impact Review Board came before the committee to testify on something else, but in their testimony, with the legislation having been newly introduced, the witness indicated that additional resources will be required for the boards to participate in implementing and planning and then in equipping the organizations to meet new requirements and timelines.

On May 27, 2010, the deputy minister did provide assurances to the members of the committee by saying that implementation will add to the workload of certain agencies in Nunavut, including the Nunavut Impact Review Board, but that they would get the resources they needed. However, it was not made clear in the deputy minister's response exactly how much funding would be dedicated to this purpose and when it would be received.

As my colleague pointed out, regarding NTI funding responsibility, clause 39 recommends that the bill provide that the federal government be responsible for funding the commission and board.

In your testimony, you indicated that once the act is passed and the implementation plan is put in place, you feel confident that funding will be provided. You'll have to forgive me, but there's a degree of cynicism on my part about that, and perhaps a degree of disbelief, because I come from British Columbia, where the B.C. First Nations Education Act was passed in 2007 and is still not appropriately funded five years later.

I wonder if you have some assurances from the government about the timeframes for when funding will be committed and whether the amounts that are on the table are going to be sufficient to meet the needs, given the new responsibilities that are going to be on your plate.

**Mr. David Akeagok:** I think there were two components to the questions. One is on funding for the institutions of public government in the NIRB. There is a process to fund them through another tri-party agreement that has to get done, and that's through the contract relating to the implementation of the Nunavut Final Agreement. Within that contract, the institutions of public government are funded on an annual basis. That work is still ongoing, in terms of renewing that contract. That portion, ensuring the institutions of public government are getting adequate funding, should be addressed through the working party, the Nunavut Implementation Panel. With the number of projects that are coming forth, we're hoping that funding will be reflective of the number of projects that are coming. It's not contained within this legislation.

In terms of the other part of the question you raised, which is on our government and whether we're confident that we'll have adequate funding brought as part of this implementation, we have been working in very good faith on the drafting of the legislation. It is our anticipation that if we do need further funding to implement this legislation...I'm confident that there will be good faith among all parties to move that forward. We'd like to see that happen in good faith. It has already been identified what impact it will have on the territorial government.

Also, as part of the devolution agreement, those are still subject to negotiations, in terms of who does what and on the lands and controls and enforcement side, so I'll leave that portion in that area. But I'm confident that we've both been working in good faith for the needs of the Government of Nunavut and that that will continue.

*Quyanainni.*

● (1700)

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

We'll turn now to Mr. Wilks for the final questions.

**Mr. David Wilks (Kootenay—Columbia, CPC):** Thank you very much, Chair.

And thank you for being here today.

I'm going to focus on the environmental part of the document that's before me today, having reviewed a portion of it. One of the main objectives of this bill is to protect the ecosystem in Nunavut. Does the Government of Nunavut, which you belong to, think that this bill will contribute to the environmental protection in the territory?

**Mr. David Akeagok:** Yes.

**Mr. David Wilks:** Perfect. That's quick.

With that in mind, I was reviewing a lot of the enforcement that comes along with that. Could you describe how the enforcement provisions set out in the proposed legislation will support the regulatory framework that is currently in place to monitor environmental stewardship?

**Mr. David Akeagok:** Sorry, we're having a technology failure.

You wanted specific examples within that legislation, and that's what we're trying to—

**Mr. David Wilks:** In general.

**Mr. David Akeagok:** In general?

**Mr. David Wilks:** Yes.

**Mr. David Akeagok:** On the general side, there are provisions where our conservation officers will have the capability to enforce any of the terms of conditions that are laid in. That's where this legislation will allow us to provide enforcement within the federal legislation in terms of our interests.

**Mr. David Wilks:** Under subclauses 219(2) and 298(3) of this bill, it lays out that the fine will be no more than \$100,000, or imprisonment of not more than one year, or both. I'm assuming that through the tri-party agreement or through negotiations, everyone felt this was an adequate fine that would recognize the severity of anyone breaching any of the policies within the act.

Finally, from the perspective of the Nunavut people and those who were involved in the negotiation, why was it deemed necessary to include enforcement mechanisms in the Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act?

**Mr. David Akeagok:** With respect to any impact on the land within Nunavut, it has been our government's objective to have good, sound environmental stewardship. To protect that, we need some enforcement provisions to make sure the interests of the environment are considered, that we have a good, sound system, and that if there is going to be any impact in Nunavut, there should be some provisions.

● (1705)

**Mr. David Wilks:** Clause 74 of the bill states that if a project is not in conformity with any applicable land use plan, the commission can deem it inappropriate. I wonder if you could speak a little bit to the land use plan process and how you feel this conforms through this act.

**Mr. David Akeagok:** I apologize. I don't have a specific answer for that, but I would be willing to provide it. We're just having technical difficulties in terms of trying to get this legislation. We thought that to save paper, instead of printing, we would put it on our wonderful technology. We're just struggling with this right now.

If it's all right with you, Mr. Chair and the members, we can provide a written response.

**The Chair:** That would be great.

Mr. Wilks, the time is up.

We want to thank you for coming on such short notice. We know that we didn't provide you with much notice, and we certainly appreciate your willingness to be here.

This brings us to the end of this portion of our meeting. We will suspend, colleagues, to go in camera for some future business.

Again, I want to thank our witnesses before us today for coming on short notice and for bringing some very detailed answers on a comprehensive piece of legislation.

*[Proceedings continue in camera]*







**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](mailto: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](mailto: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>