



House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security

SECU • NUMBER 011 • 2nd SESSION • 39th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Friday, December 7, 2007

—
Chair

Mr. Garry Breitkreuz

Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security

Friday, December 7, 2007

● (0905)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Garry Breitkreuz (Yorkton—Melville, CPC)): I call this meeting to order.

This is the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security, meeting 11. We are continuing our sessions on Bill C-3, an act to amend the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act and to make a consequential amendment to another act. This is a continuation of last night's session.

Again we welcome the officials, who were here bright and early. It's probably midday for some of you, but we appreciate your coming. Most of you were here last night.

We will continue now with clause-by-clause consideration.

I want to thank the support staff we have here for the great job they've done overnight. They have the new package all ready, with the amendments in order and with correct numbering. I hope you all have that now. I appreciate the hard work everybody has done overnight.

(On clause 4)

The Chair: When we adjourned last night we had adopted amendment L-1 on page 7. We will now resume with amendment G-2 on pages 8 and 9. Amendment G-2 is a government amendment, and we will ask someone from that side....

Do you have a point of order, Monsieur Ménard?

[Translation]

Mr. Serge Ménard (Marc-Aurèle-Fortin, BQ): Yes, I would like to move a subamendment.

[English]

The Chair: Mr. MacKenzie, before he can introduce his subamendment, you have to introduce your amendment. Why don't you go ahead?

Then we will come back to you, Monsieur Ménard. You can't introduce a subamendment until we have the amendment introduced.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie (Oxford, CPC): If I have this correct, Mr. Chair, it's in our package as amendment G-2. I move that Bill C-3, in clause 4, be amended by adding after line 23 on page 7 the following:

(1.1) If the permanent resident or foreign national requests that a particular person be appointed under paragraph (1)(b), the judge shall appoint that person unless the judge is satisfied that

(a) the appointment would result in the proceeding being unreasonably delayed;

(b) the appointment would place the person in a conflict of interest, or;

(c) the person has knowledge of information or other evidence whose disclosure would be injurious to national security or endanger the safety of any person and, in the circumstances, there is a risk of inadvertent disclosure of that information or other evidence.

I think it's fairly self-explanatory.

● (0910)

The Chair: Did you all get that through the translation? Okay.

Monsieur Ménard, you had indicated you wanted to raise an issue.

[Translation]

Mr. Serge Ménard: I move that subsection (c) of this amendment be struck. I fail to understand why such a provision is being added here. The special advocates have undergone a security check and they have been chosen precisely because they could be entrusted with secret information and I imagine that they were sworn in and pledged to never reveal any secret information provided to them.

If these special advocates are going to be called upon to intervene in various cases and if the government wants them to form a team that it can trust in matters of security — and I believe that such is the case —, then I see no reason to add this provision. Indeed, this would prevent special advocates from defending various cases. Inevitably, in one case or another, they will be provided with secret information that will not apply in the following case. You are saying that there is a risk of inadvertent disclosure by them of secret information. In my view, this risk always exists.

We are creating this function because, in creating this team, we are going to seek out lawyers having sufficient honesty, integrity, competence and seriousness to keep some information secret. I do not get the point of subclause (c) whatsoever.

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Norlock, you were going to refer this to...?

Mr. Rick Norlock (Northumberland—Quinte West, CPC): Yes, I think we need to hear from the officials.

The Chair: Who would like to comment? Ms. Clairmont?

Mrs. Lynda Clairmont (Associate Assistant Deputy Minister, Emergency Management and National Security, Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness): I'm going to ask our legal counsel, Mr. Therrien, to talk to that with respect to the special advocates team.

The Chair: Mr. Therrien, go ahead when you're ready.

[Translation]

Mr. Daniel Therrien (Acting Assistant Deputy Attorney General, Citizenship, Immigration and Public Safety Portfolio, Department of Justice): This provision flows from the British experience with regard to special advocates. Indeed, the British observed that, in certain cases where there was a risk of disclosure, there was a phenomenon called tainting. Let us take the example of a special advocate who is called upon to intervene in a first case involving facts or issues related to a given organization or country. This same special advocate is then asked to play the same role in the context of a second case involving similar information, for example the same country or the same organization. The primary role of the advocate, within the confines of the second case, is to meet with the individual whose interests he is defending in order to gain knowledge of the facts as the individual understands them and wants to see them presented. It is during the course of this meeting that, not through dishonesty or through any lack of integrity but inadvertently, the advocate might make some disclosure.

I wish to underscore that all of the provisions we are discussing now aim to establish a balance between the desire to adopt the fairest process possible, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the protection of information the disclosure of which would impair national security. It is a matter of balance and judgment. It is our view that the British experience proves that it would be prudent, in this search for balance, to afford ourselves the possibility to rely on the provision in question.

• (0915)

[English]

The Chair: Ms. Barnes.

Hon. Sue Barnes (London West, Lib.): Thank you. I'd like to ask a couple of questions on this, just so that I'm clear in my own mind.

Part of what we're trying to establish here is special advocates with expertise. But I'm hearing you say something suggesting that this means that somebody who has been on one case would never be allowed to...you would rule them out for the same country; you would never let one special advocate be the special advocate in a second case if it involved the same country.

Could you clarify that?

Mr. Daniel Therrien: I was too broad in my characterization. What I'm trying to say is that there will be overlaps in the facts of cases that may lead to this concern with tainting. I'm trying to describe what they might be, but I'm not saying that simply because a special advocate played the role for country X, he would automatically be disqualified from representing the interests of a person from the same country in a future case. You would have to look at all of the information and determine whether there is this risk of tainting by inadvertence.

Hon. Sue Barnes: You've said that Britain has had this problem. Have they put into their legislation a similar clause? I didn't think they had.

Mr. Daniel Therrien: I believe they do not legislate to that level of detail, but in the British system, first of all, it is not the judge who decides on the appointment of the special advocate, contrary to what is proposed here; it is the government. The government has

discretion to appoint or not to appoint a given individual, and the information we have is that in the way the program is administered, the government takes into consideration that risk of tainting.

Hon. Sue Barnes: Thank you.

The Chair: Next is Mr. Dosanjh.

Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh (Vancouver South, Lib.): Thank you.

I understand the thrust and the rationale for this particular clause. It is not an automatic disqualification if, in the judge's opinion, there could be tainting more than disclosure, because as Monsieur Ménard says, special advocates are trained to not disclose. They are all lawyers.

My concern is something different. It is to do with the exculpatory evidence. It is more likely that if you have a special advocate acting in the cases connected with the same country, that special advocate may have possession of exculpatory evidence with regard to the individual who's before the judge and for whom he or she is being appointed.

How do you deal with that? I think if there is exculpatory evidence in the knowledge of the special advocate, disclosure of which does not endanger the national security, that exculpatory evidence should be available and that special advocate should be appointed.

How do you deal with that? This clause, if left in, might deprive a particular detainee of this exculpatory knowledge that the special advocate may have. I don't know whether there's an easy way of separating these issues.

Mr. Daniel Therrien: It is not easy, but the jurisprudence requires the ministers who file the certificate, or their counsel, to reveal exculpatory evidence related to the foundation of the certificate.

Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh: And that's in the decisions of the courts?

Thank you.

The Chair: We're debating the subamendment. To be clear, you were wanting, Mr. Ménard, to remove proposed paragraph (c)?

Yes? Okay, then, let's focus our—

• (0920)

Mr. Serge Ménard: I hope it's within the scope of the bill this time.

The Chair: You're getting back at the chair, aren't you? Okay.

Mr. Serge Ménard: Yes. I'm mad. This is why I speak English.

Voices: Oh, oh!

Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh: That's why I speak English.

Voices: Oh, oh!

The Chair: This has happened once before.

Mr. MacKenzie.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: Thank you, Chair.

I think it's important that we have this discussion, but I also think it's important that we look at what this section really deals with.

If you go to the proposed subsection itself, it says, “the judge shall appoint that person unless the judge is satisfied that”. It's not an arbitrary thing on the part of the crown that somebody's not going to be appointed. The judge would have to be convinced. I think that gives the safeguard we're looking for.

The Chair: Mr. Wrzesnewskyj.

Mr. Borys Wrzesnewskyj (Etobicoke Centre, Lib.): I'll pass.

The Chair: Mr. Ménard, did you indicate that you wanted to make another comment?

[Translation]

Mr. Serge Ménard: Yes, I believe that this is yet again something that would discredit the office we are creating. It is clear, upon reading this, that the idea is to have lawyers with the least possible amount of experience. As Mr. Dosanjh so rightly stated, if we find people whose knowledge of this type of case is sufficient to be aware of exculpatory evidence, then it will be concluded that we do not want these people. To my mind, there is no measure between the defence, the incapacity of a lawyer and the risk entailed. I am in perfect agreement with Mr. Dosanjh: lawyers are trained to keep secrets. First of all, they are bound by solicitor-client privilege and they recognize this. I am convinced that the special advocates will be more than trained and that they will always be mindful of keeping secret information confidential. I believe that this would discredit the special advocate function.

You can keep this provision if you wish, but I find it perfectly useless. Once again, this will convince people that the special advocate function is just a lot of window dressing, as several witnesses have stated.

[English]

The Chair: I would just like to get Mr. Therrien to comment on one comment that you made, sir, and this is needed for balance. I think you used that expression. Would you mind just clarifying that for me?

Mr. Daniel Therrien: I'm back to the motivating factor for the whole bill, which is the Charkaoui decision of the Supreme Court, the need to strike the right balance between the protection of the rights of the individual who is the subject of the certificate and the legitimate protection of government information that is secret and where disclosure would have a detrimental effect on national security.

So this goes to the heart of it. The special advocate is there to try to achieve that balance. Their role and the rules of operation of the special advocate go to this balance. That's what I meant.

The Chair: So you feel this would be in line with what the Supreme Court mandated we do?

Mr. Daniel Therrien: I think so.

The Chair: The question is on the—

[Translation]

Mr. Serge Ménard: I believe that you are misinterpreting the Supreme Court's decision. I recognize that there might be [*inaudible: editor's note*], but what you say goes to the very heart of our difference of opinion. The Supreme Court did not tell us what to do; it told us that the act was not appropriate and that it was not consistent with the requirements of Clause 7. It sent the whole thing

back to us in order for us to do the appropriate work. The Supreme Court is refusing to legislate. I have several times felt, through its decisions, that the Supreme Court is tired of seeing the legislator slough off all of the difficult issues by sending them its way. Very clearly, the Supreme Court did not tell us what to do; it gave us examples of attempts at solutions that were tried elsewhere. There is nothing... I understood the word mandated as meaning that this is what we must do. The Supreme Court did not tell us what to do in this case; it is important that we be aware of this. If this Bill is not amended, the Supreme Court will send it back to us stating that it is not consistent with the requirements of Clause 7.

• (0925)

[English]

The Chair: Briefly, Mr. Therrien.

[Translation]

Mr. Daniel Therrien: I simply wish to underscore that my comments do not mean that the Supreme Court requires this provision.

Mr. Serge Ménard: You are not the person who said it.

[English]

The Chair: The question is on the subamendment.

(Subamendment negated)

The Chair: Now the question is on the main amendment. That number was G-2.

Is there any further discussion on that? If not, I will call the question.

(Amendment agreed to)

The Chair: We will now go to G-3. It's page 10 of your package, and page 7 of the bill, line 27.

Would you like to introduce it, Mr. MacKenzie?

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: No, I'd like to withdraw it.

The Chair: Liberal amendment 2, pages 12 and 13 of your package. From the Liberal side, who would like to introduce this?

Mr. Dosanjh.

Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh: Could we postpone the consideration of this until...? If you get to the next one, I think that deals with—

The Chair: Are you talking about G-4?

Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh: Yes. If you are able to successfully deal with that, then there would be no need to deal with this.

The Chair: With consent of the committee, we can.

There's no objection? Let's go to G-4, then, page 14 of your draft....

You have to move it and then we'll discuss it.

Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh: If we can add “administrative support and resources”....

The Chair: Okay. There's a subamendment coming up to G-4, but first introduce G-4, please.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: I'd like to ask one question: does it have to be amended if we add words to it as we introduce it? Does it have to be introduced in the manner in which it is?

Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh: Yes, and then you can amend it, if you want—or my amendment; it doesn't really matter.

The Chair: Sir, you can move it and add some words.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: Okay.

The Chair: It does not have to be a subamendment if, while you're moving it, you put in those words.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: Okay. The motion is:

The Minister of Justice shall ensure that special advocates are provided with adequate administrative support and resources.

Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh: Period.

The Chair: Make that change on your copy, everybody, so you know.

Okay, so now we're debating that amendment as introduced here.

Hon. Roy Cullen (Etobicoke North, Lib.): Call the question.

The Chair: Any questions?

Monsieur Ménard.

[Translation]

Mr. Serge Ménard: What was bound to happen happened.

Two more “*défenseur*” were forgotten along the way. There is one on line 18, page 7, and another one between lines 26 and 27.

Could you take it for granted that every time the word “*défenseur*” appears in French, it will be changed to “*avocat spécial*”?

[English]

The Chair: Yes.

[Translation]

Mr. Serge Ménard: So we do not need to...

[English]

The Chair: I was going to do that a little later on in the meeting. We will make that note and I can do that. It's on lines 19, 29, and 34 of the French text.

[Translation]

Mr. Serge Ménard: Sometimes it also is a plural.

[English]

The Chair: Okay.

Does the committee agree with making those changes Mr. Ménard has drawn our attention to in this clause?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Hon. Sue Barnes: Absolutely.

The Chair: Okay, it's agreed. There are no objections.

Now, let's go back. The question is on G-4.

All those in favour, please raise their hand.

• (0930)

Hon. Sue Barnes: As amended?

The Chair: As introduced.

Hon. Sue Barnes: Including “resources”.

(Amendment agreed to)

The Chair: Now we'll go back to the Liberal amendment.

Mr. Dosanjh.

Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh: We can simply—

[Translation]

Mr. Serge Ménard: I believe in the amendment there is also a “*défenseur*” that...

[English]

The Chair: Whoa, just a minute here. Let's do this in order.

Mr. Dosanjh first.

Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh: I would withdraw that motion whose consideration was postponed. That's Liberal-2, page 12.

The Chair: I'm looking at the French here, which is not...

[Translation]

Hon. Roy Cullen: *Avocats spéciaux*...

[English]

The Chair: We will make that change, Monsieur Ménard, that you're about to raise here. We can take it for granted that the change will be made. Okay? *Bien sûr*.

Mr. MacKenzie, do you have a translation for “and resources” that you added to your motion?

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: I'd do well to get it out in English.

The Chair: Okay. It's going to be taken care of.

Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh: I've withdrawn this motion, but I understand that amendment G-7 shall also pass if there's some consensus.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: Yes.

Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh: Because that is part of the special advocate.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: Yes.

Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh: It is a conditional withdrawal, yes.

The Chair: Conditionally withdrawn.

To be clear, you're not proceeding with Lib-2?

Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh: Yes, provided G-7 passes, and I think it will pass.

Hon. Roy Cullen: Have we any translation for “and resources”?

The Chair: Yes, they're going to look after it. Don't confuse me.

We'll go to Monsieur Ménard.

Are amendments BQ-5 and BQ-6 linked or...?

[Translation]

Mr. Serge Ménard: I do not understand. They are the same.

[English]

The Chair: BQ-6 and BQ-5. I don't....

[Translation]

Mr. David Dunbar (General Counsel, Canada Border Services Agency): One has “*défenseur*”.

An honourable member: “*Avocat spécial*”.

Mr. Serge Ménard: Since we did not yet know what the decision would be regarding the word “*défenseur*”, we tabled the two versions.

[English]

The Chair: I didn't get any translation.

[Translation]

Mr. Serge Ménard: We withdraw amendment BQ-5 and keep BQ-6.

[English]

The Chair: Okay, sorry. Let's wait for the interpretation.

Do you want to go over that again? The interpreter didn't interpret it.

[Translation]

Mr. Serge Ménard: We submitted the same amendment with two wordings: one has the word “*défenseur*”, in case the change in the translation were not accepted, and the other one has the words “*avocat spécial*”.

[English]

The Chair: Yes, right.

[Translation]

Mr. Serge Ménard: Of course, in this instance we will withdraw BQ-5 since everyone agrees to translate “special advocate” by “*avocat spécial*”.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you very much for that clarification.

You've moved amendment BQ-6 and withdrawn amendment BQ-5. Okay.

Is there any discussion on BQ-6? Do you wish to speak to it? Do you have any comments?

[Translation]

Mr. Serge Ménard: If everybody agrees, it is redundant.

[English]

The Chair: Monsieur Ménard, the problem is that the interpreter is not.... You're not quite close enough to the microphone. There we go.

[Translation]

Mr. Serge Ménard: We can also have the discussion right away.

I firmly believe that when we talk about solicitor-client privilege, the concept necessarily includes those limitations that are recognized in case law and as they appear in the rules of all bar associations and all law societies of Canada. Those limits are rather clearly spelled out, much better than what is suggested — with all due respect to the mover, Mr. Dosanjh—, in the next amendment.

We say that the special advocate has a solicitor-client relationship but there are certainly limits to that privilege, among which the fact that the solicitor must disclose information regarding serious crimes and also the solicitor cannot assist a client in the commission of a crime, as you well know.

Regarding the concept of “*secret professionnel*”, it says in English:

[English]

Privileged information as a lawyer.

[Translation]

We talk here about something that is well defined in case law. There is no need to try to add what Mr. Dosanjh proposes, where it says that the special advocate:

may disclose to the appropriate authorities information that has been disclosed to him or her by the permanent resident or foreign national if, in the opinion of the special advocate, such disclosure is necessary to prevent the commission of a criminal offence.

Furthermore, I think that this provision moved by Mr. Dosanjh, as it would appear in the act, would discourage some people to disclose everything they should be telling their lawyer.

An individual who does not know the laws of the land might wonder if what he or she might disclose to the advocate is legal in this country or not. An individual who consults, who talks to an advocate, must have the assurance that this advocate is not there to judge or to harm him.

This is why I would rather stick to the notion of solicitor-client privilege, which has been widely interpreted in case law and has legal meaning in its use by all bar associations of the country. There is a mention of a “criminal offence”. Could the commission of a criminal offence be the fraudulent rental of a car with a credit card belonging to somebody else or things of that order?

Nevertheless, I am convinced that in your mind and in the minds of all of us, it is obvious that if an individual discloses to an advocate plans for a terrorist attack, such an attack would obviously be illegal and viewed as similar to murder, as we have seen in organized crime cases. These certainly are not lesser offences. This is why I would prefer to stick to the notion of solicitor-client privilege, the limits of which are well recognized.

● (0935)

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Dosanjh.

Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh: Inasmuch as I want to agree with my colleague, Mr. Ménard—we used to be attorneys general together a long time ago—I disagree. I think Mr. Ménard's motion does not import the concept of solicitor-client privilege to the extent of imposing the obligation on the special advocate to actually provide information, disclose information to the law enforcement authorities with respect to any commission of a crime that might be contemplated.

To that extent, I would forgo our motion as well, because it is not as well worded as the motion from the government. The motion from the government, G-5, imports and actually excludes the solicitor-client relationship, and then deems it back for a specific purpose, therefore deeming back the obligation on the special advocate not to disclose any future crime information. I think that is more neatly done, and I'm prepared to abandon or withdraw our motion.

• (0940)

The Chair: If there's no more discussion, then the question is on BQ-6.

(Amendment negated)

The Chair: We will go to Lib-3. You have already indicated that you would defer to G-5.

Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh: It's withdrawn.

The Chair: Okay, it's withdrawn.

Let's go to G-5.

Mr. MacKenzie, would you please introduce G-5?

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: Yes. Mr. Chair, I would ask that the committee adopt motion G-5, which is that Bill C-3 in clause 4 be amended by adding after line 19 on page 8, the following, and it is on the document. Do I need to read it?

The Chair: I don't think so. You all have it before you? Is there no more discussion?

(Amendment agreed to [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: I need to indicate that we will replace “*défenseur*” in four places on page 8 with “*avocat spécial*”.

We now go to G-6.

Mr. MacKenzie, when you're ready.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: I would ask that the committee adopt the motion as listed on G-6, replacing lines 27 to 33 on page 9 with the wording that's before us.

The Chair: I'll give you a minute if some of you have not had an opportunity to go through it.

Is there any discussion?

(Amendment agreed to [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: I will also draw to your attention that on page 9 of the bill we will replace “*défenseur*” with “*avocat spécial*” on lines 7 and 33 of the French version.

Are there any questions?

We now go to G-7, which is on pages 23 and 24 of your package.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: Mr. Chair, I would ask that the committee adopt G-7, which is replacing line 17 on page 10 with the following, which is in the document before us.

The Chair: Is there any debate? Yes, Ms. Barnes.

Hon. Sue Barnes: Yes, I just have a question. I understand that “the bar of a province” would include territories, too.

Mr. David Dunbar: Yes.

The Chair: Okay. Is there any other discussion?

Mr. Serge Ménard: Just a moment. I haven't finished reading.

The Chair: Yes. I will not incur your wrath. Go ahead.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Chair: Mr. Cullen, do you have a comment?

Hon. Roy Cullen: It's not immediately occurring to me what the difference is between the line currently in the bill and this line. They look identical to me.

The Chair: Is anybody ready to comment?

Hon. Roy Cullen: Oh, it has the number.

The Chair: Yes, the numbering is different.

Only the numbering is different, Monsieur Ménard. There is no difference, only the numbering. I understand it's the (1).

• (0945)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Serge Ménard: I agree in principle.

[*English*]

The Chair: All those in favour?

(Amendment agreed to [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: I have to notify you that on lines 6 and 12 of the French text, we're going to change *défenseur* to *avocat spécial*, just to be consistent with what we have said previously.

There are no more amendments.

(Clause 4 as amended agreed to)

(Clauses 5 to 10 inclusive agreed to)

(On clause 11)

The Chair: Madame Faille.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Meili Faille (Vaudreuil-Soulanges, BQ): I have a question for the officials on Clause 11.

The Clause lists a number of courts and tribunals, such as the Federal Court of Appeal, the Immigration Division, the Immigration Appeal Division of the Immigration and Refugee Board, but there are other review bodies within the Board.

Will these bodies be listed? I know that there are bills pending on the Immigration Appeal Division. Presently, appeals are allowed only on the immigration side. But in the case of a non-citizen, of a person claiming refugee status...

[*English*]

The Chair: Did one of our officials get the question?

Mr. Dunbar is looking at it carefully. Let him just examine it for a moment.

Mr. Warren Woods (Senior Policy Analyst, Operational Policy Section, National Security Policy Directorate, Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness): If I understand the question correctly, you're looking at clause 11 of the transitional provisions and you're wondering why the Refugee Protection Division of the Immigration and Refugee Board is missing from this provision.

We are talking explicitly about division 9 of IRPA, and division 9 relates to the use of proceedings before the Federal Court and before the IRB that involve the use of confidential information. These proceedings, during the use of confidential information, exist at the Immigration Division of the IRB and at the Immigration Appeal Division of the IRB, but they do not take place during proceedings at the Refugee Protection Division. So that's why it's not listed.

[Translation]

Ms. Meili Faille: Thank you.

[English]

The Chair: Okay.

(Clauses 11 and 12 agreed to)

• (0950)

The Chair: So “*défenseur*” will be replaced with “*avocat spécial*”.

Shall the title as amended carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Shall the bill as amended carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Shall I report the bill as amended to the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Shall the committee order a reprint of the bill?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Mr. MacKenzie, you were wondering if we could introduce it into the House this afternoon. Do you still wish to pursue that? How do we handle that at committee? Is that possible?

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: Mr. Chair, I would ask, if it's at all possible, that the legislative clerk and the clerk have it ready to present to the House. I appreciate that it's a very difficult request, if it can be done. But you've already done superhuman stuff to get us to this point, so we well understand.

The Chair: Is it okay with the committee, if it's possible?

This is only if it's possible. If it looks even probable but...

Hon. Sue Barnes: Maybe the legal counsel or the clerk could explain. There are processes after we've done amendments; different people inside government have to clean up the bill and all the typos. She knows what I'm talking about.

Hon. Roy Cullen: Not inside the government, inside the caucus.

Hon. Sue Barnes: Inside the Parliament.

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Roger Préfontaine): For a reprint, yes.

Hon. Sue Barnes: Yes, presumably there's editing and stuff. There are different sections.

As soon as possible I think is what we'd like.

The Chair: Would you mind just making a comment, please?

Ms. Joann Garbig (Procedural Clerk): It happens in-house. What I could explain is that once the committee has completed its work on the bill, if there have been amendments from the floor or slight modifications that the committee has made, we need to process those, have them translated as necessary. Any amendments that were adopted by the committee have to be assembled in the report. Sometimes we have these electronically in our system already and it's fairly straightforward to just plug them into the report. Other times we have to create the amendment. All this takes some time, which is why I'm a bit hesitant about guaranteeing that the report can be ready at noon today.

Thank you.

The Chair: Yes, Mr. MacKenzie.

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: I'd just like to say on behalf of the government side how much we appreciate the work that the chair and the officers here have done, and also the members opposite. This has been a very difficult situation for everybody, to deal with this in such a short period of time, and I just can't express enough how much we appreciate the cooperation we've received around the table from everyone. Certainly we hope that we won't see these kinds of things come before us in this manner in the future.

Thank you very much.

Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh: It's exciting.

The Chair: This is. This is Parliament at work. As the chair, I want to express my appreciation as well.

I want to thank all of our witnesses who have come.

Monsieur Ménard.

[Translation]

Mr. Serge Ménard: I agree with everything, except for one aspect.

I find it bizarre to say that amendments to expand the reasons for an appeal and the process to be followed are outside the scope of the bill. They were within the scope of the laws we considered. Therefore, I want to express my dissent with the recommendations that were made. I am looking forward to seeing the judicial decisions that will be made on this.

[English]

Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh: May I add our thanks from the opposition to all the officials, the House, and the government.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you all very much. It's been great working together.

This meeting stands adjourned.

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.

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.

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