



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development

AANO • NUMBER 037 • 2nd SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Tuesday, April 21, 2015

—
Chair

Mr. Blake Richards

Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development

Tuesday, April 21, 2015

●(0845)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Blake Richards (Wild Rose, CPC)): We'll call the meeting to order this morning. Welcome to the 37th meeting of the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development. Obviously this morning we'll be conducting our clause-by-clause review of Bill S-6. We do have a number of amendments that have been submitted and we'll run through them for each clause. We will be starting with clause 2 because clause 1 is the short title.

(On clause 2)

The Chair: I see that we have a number of amendments here. Does anyone care to speak to those amendments? Just so that all members are aware, LIB-1 and NDP-1 are in fact identical amendments; therefore, we can only proceed with one. As well, we do have PV-1 and PV-2, which would amend the same lines as LIB-1. So if the latter is adopted, we could not move forward with them either.

Ms. Jones, do you wish to speak to LIB-1?

Ms. Yvonne Jones (Labrador, Lib.): Thank you very much.

The first amendment that we have here is an amendment to clause 2. Basically the amendment would delete lines 11 to 18. It deal with the powers that have been delegated to the federal minister. During a number of meetings that we held with representatives from the territory, and also in our public sessions in Yukon, it was quite evident from the majority of presenters that there were huge concerns with the powers given to the federal minister under this particular section of the act. Many people certainly indicated that will be was an erosion of powers normally held by the aboriginal governments in that area, and they were adamant about making changes to this section of the bill.

In fact nearly every person who presented to the committee on that particular day made recommendations that there should be changes with regard to this section of the act. They specifically outlined what the impact would be with this particular change. Therefore, we felt it was necessary to make this amendment in the bill, and I would like to move that amendment this morning.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Jones.

Mr. Strahl.

Mr. Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Fraser Canyon, CPC): I'd like to point out that the Umbrella Final Agreement permits delegations. Specifically, section 2.11.8 states:

Government may determine, from time to time, how and by whom any power or authority of Government or a Minister set out in a Settlement Agreement...shall be exercised.

We believe that this clause is consistent with the Umbrella Final Agreement.

The Chair: Mr. Bevington.

Mr. Dennis Bevington (Northwest Territories, NDP): Yes, we'll be supporting this amendment as we put forward a similar amendment. Quite clearly this goes beyond that particular section within that act. It speaks to the evolving nature of the Yukon government, first nations governments in the Yukon, and the relationship that is so important for their future and for the prosperity of that territory. This amendment will take out something that really is inappropriate in this day and age. It is inappropriate that this type of action would be taken without the third party being part of that discussion, part of that agreement. It's very paternalistic that the government has not moved passed a point almost 20 years ago when this agreement was made up. They're relying on something that is part of the past and not the future.

●(0850)

The Chair: Seeing no other speakers, I will call the question on the amendment.

Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill, NDP): Can we have a recorded vote?

The Chair: You certainly can.

Ms. Yvonne Jones: Can I say one more thing before we vote?

The Chair: Go ahead.

Ms. Yvonne Jones: There was a lot of discussion around this section in the public forum about significant change in the legislation and what it would mean. Many people who presented to us felt that it wasn't appropriately defined and therefore it could have bearing on how the new section would be interpreted.

I think proposed section 6.1—and this was pointed out by many people—wasn't clear as well, under the designating of powers to a territorial minister, as to who was going to cover the financial cost of that responsibility and whether that was going to be covered by the federal government or territorial government. Who was going to pay for that? That was a concern that was expressed. As well, there were concerns expressed, as I said, around what constituted significant change.

I don't think we can say that it's not different from what we've already seen or how the board was managed in the past because it is different, and the difference hasn't been clearly defined to those people who are going to be impacted by this.

We would again encourage the committee, based of what you've heard and what has been recommended by people in Yukon, to accept the amendment before us today. It's certainly what they desire and wish in terms of practice under this legislation.

The Chair: We've had a request for a recorded vote, so I'll let our clerk conduct that.

(Amendment negated: nays 5; yeas 3) [See *Minutes of Proceedings*]

The Chair: As that amendment has been defeated, we will not proceed with NDP-1.

The next one would be PV-1. I do see that we have Ms. May.

Of course, the rules do allow for you to give a brief intervention on your amendment if you'd like to.

Ms. Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Again, on the record, it isn't due to the rules that I'm here; it's due to a motion that was passed by this committee. The rules would allow me to present these amendments as substantive amendments at report stage in the House of Commons, but due to the motion passed by this committee, I'm here to present my amendments here.

The initial Green Party amendment is very clearly required if we are to show the due respect that we should and must, under our Constitution, pay to the first nations of the Yukon. The Council of Yukon First Nations' brief was very strong in putting forward that they had not been meaningfully consulted during the review process and that this was inconsistent with the Umbrella Final Agreement.

To be quite clear, I think the process in this particular bill violates section 35 of our Constitution in failing to respect the constitutionally enshrined rights of first nations. The sharing of authority found in the principle of tripartite power and consultation is a very clear principle. By allowing the unilateral delegation of authority from the federal minister to the territorial minister, this provision as drafted, unless amended by Green Party amendment 1, will potentially violate this principle.

On behalf of the Green Party, I seek to amend this portion of the bill to require explicit consent of the first nations, restoring the duty to consult Yukon First Nations on the delegation of authority. I will just quote from the brief of the Yukon First Nations: "To be consistent with the treaties, Yukon First Nations must be equal partners with Canada and Yukon in decisions concerning handing over authority."

I'd urge the committee to accept this amendment. It's within the spirit of what the government intends to do with this bill but will ensure its constitutionality and respect for first nations.

• (0855)

The Chair: Does anyone else wish to speak to that amendment?

Okay, I'll just remind the committee that if this amendment is moved, then amendment PV-2 would not be moved.

Does the committee wish to proceed with this amendment?

I see no indication one way or the other. I see some shaking of heads no—

Ms. Niki Ashton: If I may speak to that, we certainly support paragraph (a) of the amendment and see it in the spirit of what we were proposing early on. While we prefer the amendment we put forward in its entirety, we do want to support the spirit of what is being proposed here.

The Chair: Ms. Jones.

Ms. Yvonne Jones: Thank you.

Again, I just want to express our support for this amendment. Obviously we would have preferred to have the section deleted, but that not being the case, this at least allows for the consent of first nations in dealing with how the delegation is done, so we would support the amendment that is proposed at this stage.

The Chair: Are there any other speakers?

(Amendment negated [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: We will not proceed with amendment PV-2 as it is identical to amendment PV-1.

We next have amendment PV-3. Ms. May, do you wish to speak briefly to amendment PV-3?

Ms. Elizabeth May: Yes, Mr. Chair.

Our third amendment is to amend, on page 1 at line 18, so that "delegation made under subsection (1) must be made in compliance with the Yukon Northern Affairs Program Devolution Transfer Agreement". Again, this is to ensure that failures in the bill's drafting can be amended.

The failures in the drafting to which I refer, of course, are the lack of adequate and meaningful consultation with Yukon first nations in bringing forward Bill S-6. At least through this amendment we would ensure that compliance with the previous Yukon Northern Affairs Program Devolution Transfer Agreement authority would ensure that there would be respect for the devolution transfer agreement in the way the bill goes forward.

The Chair: Do I have any other members? Mr. Strahl.

Mr. Mark Strahl: Mr. Chair, I don't know how you would like to run this, or if I can direct my questions to the officials and ask them if they have concerns with bringing in another agreement outside of YESAA and linking the two. Could I ask the officials for clarification on that?

The Chair: Certainly, Mr. Strahl. We have the officials at the table, and I would welcome their responses to any points or questions raised by members, if members choose.

Mr. Strahl, would you like to address this to—

Mr. Mark Strahl: I had some concerns with this proposed amendment and was hoping you could address why it was drafted the way it was and the concerns you might have with bringing in the devolution agreement to this.

Ms. Tara Shannon (Director, Resource Policy and Programs Directorate, Northern Affairs, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development): There isn't an existing reference to the devolution agreement because of that agreement's structure, which speaks to jurisdictional responsibilities, not explicitly to delegation itself, and I think it's probably best if I turn to legal counsel Tom Isaac to speak to some of the technical issues.

Mr. Tom Isaac (Senior Counsel, Negotiations, Northern Affairs and Federal Interlocutor, Department of Justice): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The amendment would seek to have a delegation be compliant with the Yukon Northern Affairs Program Devolution Transfer Agreement, but that agreement doesn't address any issues with respect to the delegation of authority between the federal minister and the territorial minister.

There would be quite a bit of ambiguity as to what "compliance" would mean. The Yukon transfer agreement doesn't have any provision that a delegation by a federal minister to a territorial minister would be compliant with it. That is not addressed, so the question of what "compliance" would mean would be ambiguous.

The Yukon Umbrella Final Agreement has a provision that allows for public governments to delegate responsibilities among themselves to determine what powers of a public government minister should be exercised by whom.

YESAA has a provision that says the delegation would have to be compliant with those final agreements, and the Yukon Northern Affairs Program Devolution Transfer Agreement itself has a provision that says nothing in that agreement can be inconsistent with the land claim agreements, so from an interpretive prism, it's the government's view that the Yukon final agreement should be the test of whether a delegation is within law or not within law, and not the Yukon devolution transfer.

• (0900)

The Chair: Thank you for that.

Mr. Strahl, do you have anything further to add?

Mr. Mark Strahl: No.

The Chair: Do any other members wish to speak to this amendment?

Seeing none, I would ask, all those in favour of amendment PV-3?

(Amendment negated [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: We will then obviously not proceed with amendment PV-4 because it's identical.

That looks like the end of our amendments on that clause. Can I carry clause 2 on division?

Ms. Niki Ashton: We're opposed. Yes.

(Clause 2 agreed to on division)

The Chair: I see no amendments on clauses 3 through 13. Does the committee want to proceed with clauses 3 to 13 on division?

(Clauses 3 to 13 inclusive agreed to on division)

(On clause 14)

The Chair: On clause 14, I see that we have some amendments here as well. The first one I have is amendment NDP-2.

Is there anyone from the NDP who wishes to proceed with that one?

Ms. Ashton.

Ms. Niki Ashton: Yes, Mr. Chair.

It's pretty straightforward. This is one of the core demands made to us by Yukon first nations and Yukoners who oppose Bill S-6. We stand with them in opposing the bill, but in particular in asking for the deletion of clause 14.

The Chair: I will have to rule that this amendment unfortunately is not in order. It seeks to delete a clause. As per *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, what can be done there instead is that members who do not want to see a clause proceed can certainly vote against the clause. The amendment would not be in order.

We would then move to amendment PV-5. I'll note here as well that amendment PV-6 is identical, so if amendment PV-5 is moved, we cannot proceed with amendment PV-6.

Ms. May, would you like to speak briefly to amendment PV-5?

Ms. Elizabeth May: Yes, of course, Mr. Chair. As you can see, we were trying to juggle. With so many committees meeting at the same time this week, all having passed those identical motions that require the Green Party to show up for clause-by-clause in all of them, we weren't sure whether it would be Mr. Hyer or me. I apologize for the fact that there are duplicates in the package.

On amendment PV-5, what we're attempting to do is similar to what amendment NDP-2 did, but rather than delete it, we recognize the same difficulty with this section. The brief from the Council of Yukon First Nations has been very clear in finding these sections to be deficient, as these were made at the last-minute and without meaningful consultation with Yukon first nations. The clause as written would automatically exempt projects from being subject to any new assessment if the authorization was renewed or amended. This is viewed with real concern, in that the approach could mean that there would be a wide-scale exemption of many projects.

What I'm attempting to do with this amendment—what the Green Party is attempting to do—is to create a reverse onus, so that in cases where there is an authorization that's renewed or amended there would be an automatic requirement for a review, except when, in the opinion of the board, there is no significant change to the original project. The effect of the bill as drafted could remain the same, but it creates a far greater likelihood that projects that should be reviewed if they are being renewed or amended will receive proper review, unless the board is of the view that they should not.

I recommend to the committee that this is a prudent amendment and would meet at least some of the concerns. Obviously I don't speak for Yukon first nations—I imagine that at this point they are considering constitutional challenges to Bill S-6—but this would be a practical and I think prudent amendment, meeting the spirit of the law.

Thank you.

• (0905)

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. May.

Mr. Strahl.

Mr. Mark Strahl: We believe this clause reflects section 12.4.1.1 of the Umbrella Final Agreement, which states that “Projects and significant changes to Existing Projects” are “subject to the development assessment process”.

A similar provision exists in the Nunavut Planning and Project Assessment Act in section 145, and in environmental assessment legislation in British Columbia, in subsection 18(6) of the Environmental Assessment Act of British Columbia, so we think it is consistent with the UFA.

The Chair: Do any other members wish to speak to this particular amendment?

Ms. Jones.

Ms. Yvonne Jones: I'd like to speak in support of this particular amendment because, again, it was one of the areas in which there was a lot of debate, not only in the public forums that we held in Yukon but also in many of the individual meetings that we held with stakeholders in that area. Again, I want to get back to the piece regarding significant change and the fact that it has not been defined in the act and that it really is open to interpretation, which could be very wide-scaled in many cases.

The other piece to this was when they talked about renewing or amending an original project. In lots of cases, circumstances change. We live in the north where we're going through things like climate change. We're going through a lot of environmental changes that could have an impact on different projects at different stages. So sometimes it doesn't have to be significant for it to have tremendous impact and require consultation.

I think the amendment really allows for more flexibility and for more input by people who live in that area, so that they will be able to express their concerns and review at certain points in time where a project may be and what the impact of that project could be in the area where they live.

I don't think the intent of the amendment is to slow development in any way. I don't think the intent is to cause grief to any of the companies that are operating in this area, but rather to be more inclusive, to ensure that there is full awareness and engagement of all people who live there, and that at certain points in time when there are changes in industrial development or projects of significant development, they will at least have an opportunity to provide input and to re-evaluate where those projects are in terms of their impact upon the Yukon. For those reasons I feel it is important that the amendment be supported by the committee.

The Chair: Mr. Strahl.

Mr. Mark Strahl: I think I've addressed our opinion on the significant change portion.

However, the second part of this amendment contemplates giving the board additional powers, and I just want to ask the officials whether or not again the original agreements that we're basing this on contemplated that. How would you give the board this new power in the current framework?

The Chair: Ms. Shannon or Mr. Isaac, did you want to respond?

Ms. Tara Shannon: What I would say is that there was initially some consideration of having this rest with the board. However, through consultations it was made clear to us that it would be inappropriate to have the decision of significance rest with the board. That concern was put forward to us by the board itself, as well as by first nations. It is because the board is a recommending body, and it is the decision bodies that actually make the determinations on projects and on those recommendations. Therefore, the decision of a determination of significance more properly rests with the decision bodies. Depending on where a project is located, a first nation could be a decision body, as well as a territorial minister and, in very limited circumstances, a federal minister.

• (0910)

The Chair: Do any other members wish to speak to this?

Mr. Bevington.

Mr. Dennis Bevington: Just in terms of practical consideration, I think back to the Ekati mine decision that was made in 1997. After the decision was made, Ekati deleted one of its pipes from the project, a pipe that would have created a 40-year mine life. Mine life dropped to 25 years without that particular pipe, and that had a significant impact on the economic conditions of that mine for the people of the Northwest Territories.

There was no reassessment of the mine. There was no reappraisal of the mine life in order to maximize the use of natural resources for the people of the north. That decision was made by a federal Liberal minister at the time, and we had to live with it.

When we talk about someone other than a northerner determining significance, we can look at the record, and the record, I think, is not good.

Under the act, the board would be responsible for looking at all aspects of a mining project or any other project, including the social and economic aspects, in terms of their value to the people of that particular region. It's very important that those considerations be taken into account. That's why I think, practically speaking, northerners would like to see northerners making those decisions of significance.

That's my addition to this debate. I'm sure this government in its paternalism will continue on the road that it's on, and we'll have to deal with that, but it's unfortunate that there's not more understanding about these issues by the government.

The Chair: Do any other members wish to speak?

(Amendment negated [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Seeing no other amendments, shall clause 14 carry on division?

Ms. Niki Ashton: Are we able to have recorded votes on this side?

Mr. Dennis Bevington: When amendments are being put forward, we will look at having votes. There are no amendments being put forward. Those are not clauses that we're testing.

The Chair: Recorded vote, all those in favour of clause 14?

(Clause 14 agreed to: yeas 5; nays 3)

(Clause 15 agreed to on division)

(On clause 16)

The Chair: On clause 16, I see we have some amendments here as well. First on my list is amendment NDP-3. Does anyone wish to move that?

Ms. Ashton.

Ms. Niki Ashton: Mr. Chair, we're proposing the deletion of clause 16. This represents a core concern or demand made by Yukon first nations and Yukoners opposed to Bill S-6 and it's seen as being detrimental to their ability to continue to guide the process of development in their territories and their territory. We stand with them in asking for this clause to be removed from Bill S-6.

● (0915)

The Chair: As per my ruling on the previous amendment that sought to delete a clause, this amendment is inadmissible. It is attempting to delete the entire clause, and that would have the same effect as choosing not to vote for the adoption of the clause, so it would be inadmissible.

Now we will move to amendment LIB-2. If this one is moved and adopted, we would not proceed with amendment PV-7 as it's on the same lines.

Ms. Jones, did you wish to speak to amendment LIB-2?

Ms. Yvonne Jones: Yes, please. Thank you.

I'm moving that clause 16 be amended (a) by replacing lines 20 and 21 on page 6 with the following:

56. (1) A designated office shall, after a proposal is

I don't know if the clerk wants to read it back what the amended version would be. Of course, the other part of it would delete lines 4 to 20 on page 7. You can look at that there. Of course, the purpose of that is with regard to the timelines.

Again, this was an issue that was brought forward by nearly everyone who presented to our committee. They had tremendous concerns about this, about the time limits that were being referred to and set, and the role that governments were playing in enforcing these particular timelines. They certainly felt that they were not consulted appropriately about those timelines and they raised a lot of very significant issues about this. They felt that these issues are undermining a process that had been working in their area when it came to the environmental assessment and permitting process for many of the companies they were dealing with.

What I found very interesting was that even when one of the mining companies there was presenting, they also supported amendments to these clauses. They were very supportive of the first nations governments and other Yukoners who felt that this needed to be changed and that there were sections here that would have a significant impact upon the way they were doing business. The other thing I found very interesting is that in a lot of the presentations with regard to YESAA and the process, whether it included timelines or whatever the case may be, there were lots of references made to the fact that this was a unique Yukon-made

process and that this legislation was in place because it worked in their particular area and for the players there. There was a lot of discussion around that. Even the Yukon premier made comments with regard to that. I don't think we can ignore what this bill will mean for that process and what impact it will have on the people in the Yukon region. Again, I would encourage my colleagues at the committee level to look at supporting these amendments.

● (0920)

The Chair: Okay.

Thank you.

Does anyone else wish to speak to that amendment?

I don't see any other hands there.

(Amendment negatived)

Ms. Yvonne Jones: A recorded vote, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: We've conducted the vote already, Ms. Jones.

If you want to request that a little sooner we can do that.

We will then move to PV-7.

Ms. May, did you wish to speak to PV-7?

Ms. Elizabeth May: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

As you can see, we're dealing with a very similar issue to the amendment that was just defeated, but with a different approach.

I turn the attention of the committee to letter received in January; it was tabled with this committee. It was a letter to the Minister of Aboriginal Affairs from Grand Chief Ruth Massie. The proposed timelines in this act under the Yukon environmental assessment act will compress reviews.

I think it's important to note the grand chief's point that all stages of the Yukon Environmental and Socio-economic Assessment Act process are "already subject to fixed timelines that are established in the YESAA regulations and rules established by the Board."

She goes on to say:

The proposed timelines for screenings by the Executive Committee and panel reviews would not provide adequate time to complete the assessment of complex projects. This means that assessments of large projects that may impact Yukon First Nations' rights and interests may not be thorough and complete. It will also likely reduce the time provided in the assessment for Yukon First Nations' review of proposals and, as a result, reduce the effectiveness of engagement and consultation with the Yukon First Nations.

These are, again, significant intrusions, incursions, and disrespect to first nations' rights as enshrined in our constitution. It violates existing commitments made by the Government of Canada in right of the crown. It violates the fundamental connection that undermines all treaty arrangements between first nations and Canada when we make unilateral changes to agreements previously made with first nations.

The amendment I'm proposing would reduce the impact of time limits and create a greater respect for the existing agreements that we have reached with Yukon first nations.

The Chair: Does anyone else wish to speak to PV-7?

Mr. Bevington.

Mr. Dennis Bevington: I'd just say, in the spirit of trying to find some compromise here, that we're supporting these amendments, but we really think this whole clause should be excised. As Ms. May pointed out from the letter from Grand Chief Ruth Massie, this is taken care of; it's in the hands of the board already.

This is just paternalism once again. It's just another example of interfering in what should be a process that is governed primarily by Yukoners, and Yukoners have spoken up pretty well on this.

Why is this government taking this turn? This government came in talking about strong provinces and regions, but when it comes to the north, it wants to get its greedy hands on the resources. It's just a little too much. It should just back off a little bit with its paternalism.

The Chair: I see no other members who wish to speak to that.

(Amendment negated [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Next I have amendment PV-8.

Ms. May, did you wish to speak to PV-8?

Ms. Elizabeth May: Sorry, Mr. Chair. I was double-checking with my colleague that the Liberal Party did, in fact, support that last amendment. I'm relieved.

Ms. Yvonne Jones: And I did.

Ms. Elizabeth May: I guess we were on a recorded vote on that one.

Mr. Chair, this amendment is in the same spirit. This again would shorten and eliminate timelines, and the only required timeline would be one in which within nine months of the day the proposal is submitted, there would be a report to the executive committee on the progress of the evaluation of the project. That does create a new timeline. It does create some additional pressures in reporting. But it doesn't violate the existing commitments and existing timelines by replacing everything we find in subsection 56(1), found on page 6, to just above clause 17, which deals with subsection 58(1) of the act.

My amendment would delete all that and replace it with a report to the executive committee on progress.

• (0925)

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. May.

Does anyone else wish to speak to PV-8?

(Amendment negated [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: As I see no other amendments, shall clause 16 carry? On division?

(Clause 16 agreed to)

(On clause 17)

The Chair: We actually have a number of amendments here.

Does anyone care to move an amendment?

The NDP?

Mr. Dennis Bevington: Okay, we'll move NDP-4.

I'll let you do your job.

The Chair: Thank you.

Obviously, as per my previous rulings on amendments that seek to delete a clause, that would be inadmissible.

We would then move to LIB-3.

Ms. Jones, do you wish to move that?

Ms. Yvonne Jones: Thank you.

The first part of my amendment would amend clause 17 by replacing lines 23 and 24 on page 7 with the following:

58.(1) The executive committee shall, after a proposal

The second part of the amendment would change the clause by deleting lines 10 to 26 on page 8.

I'll speak to that for a minute. Again, it was felt by the people we'd consulted around this particular bill that this section was not conducive to the work they were doing. It was not acceptable in terms of the process they currently had in place. They really felt that these amendments were being imposed upon them. They certainly didn't feel that they were developed in consultation with government. Many of the first nations groups felt it was in violation of their constitutional duties, in violation of their treaty agreements that they had signed. In fact, some of them even talked about the fact that they had retained less traditional settlement lands simply because they were depending upon the YESAA process of land use to guarantee that their interests were protected.

They certainly feel that these amendments that are being proposed right now do not protect their interests in any way. They certainly feel that this is being arbitrarily imposed. In fact, they really feel that in order for them to maintain the agreements that they have in place, their constitutional rights under their treaty agreements, this particular section needs to be deleted completely.

Understanding that the committee does not accept recommendations to delete full clauses of the bill, we are looking at how we can best amend this and delete certain sections of it to be able to further meet the requirements and the wishes of first nations governments in Yukon. I would ask that the committee support this based on what is fair and right and in the best interests of the people who live in Yukon.

The Chair: Do any other members wish to speak to that amendment?

Seeing none, all those in favour LIB-3?

(Amendment negated)

The Chair: We'll move then to PV-9.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Again we're in the area of various new sections in Bill S-6 that propose different timelines, this one being: "The executive committee shall, within 16 months after the day on which a proposal is submitted...or referred to it". It then goes on with various recommendations to decision-making bodies.

What my amendment proposes to do at this stage is that rather than enforce a predetermined project completion timeline, at that point the board would report to the minister on the timeline required for the completion of the evaluation project. This would seek to retain the independence of the board in handling its own matters, and it will of course create a timeline moment. It creates a moment where the executive committee will have a requirement to report to the minister on how things are going and give the minister a timeline.

Again, this is in the context of a situation where there are already timelines and the process has been working well. Bill S-6 proposes to essentially fix something that isn't broken and in the process would violate fundamental commitments to first nations for full consultation, meaningful participation, and treatment with respect, a government-to-government relationship as equal partners.

To try to repair some of the damage of Bill S-6, I propose this amendment.

• (0930)

The Chair: Does anyone else wish to speak to PV-9?

(Amendment negatived [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: We won't proceed with PV-10 as it is identical to PV-9.

(Clause 17 agreed to: yeas 5; nays 3)

(Clauses 18 to 20 inclusive agreed to on division)

(On clause 21)

The Chair: I see a couple of amendments to clause 21. Does someone care to move NDP-5? Ms. Ashton?

Ms. Niki Ashton: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Again, this is a fundamental demand made by Yukon first nations and Yukoners in opposition to Bill S-6. This clause is seen to repeal the hard work that Yukoners have done to be able to direct their own future in terms of development. We know this to be an issue not just for the folks on the ground but also for companies that are keen to invest with some stability in Yukon. Therefore, we stand with them in proposing the deletion of this clause.

The Chair: As per my previous rulings, amendments seeking to delete a clause are inadmissible, so that would be an inadmissible amendment.

We will then move to PV-11.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I certainly commend my friends in the NDP for trying to remove offensive parts of this act. It may be that the approach taken by the Green Party is not as robust as attempting deletions, but since deletions aren't possible at this stage, we'd like to suggest with amendment PV-11 that we remove the more offensive parts of proposed section 66.1 all the way through to the following page by changing proposed subsection 66.1(1) to "The executive committee shall establish a panel of the Board, and fix its terms of reference, within the time limit specified by the Board", thus deleting everything else in that section over to the next page.

Again, this is to ensure that the decision-making power for timelines remains within the purview of the board and is not specified by legislation.

The Chair: Does anyone else wish to speak?

Mr. Bevington.

Mr. Dennis Bevington: I wanted to touch on one aspect of this whole affair, and I think I can do it now.

First nations have a very specific interest in this, but the people of the Yukon in general have a very specific interest. Under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, people in the north have a right to a legislative assembly and there is equality in this world.

You know, as a person who has lived and worked in this system my whole life, I don't get the same kind of powers and authorities that people could aspire to in the provinces. When you're in a situation where a territory has been given authority through a board—and we see now that that authority is being harnessed, being held back, being moved back into the federal regime—I find this to be abhorrent

We're taking a step backwards from political rights in Yukon. We're taking a step backwards for the people of the Yukon from where they were. It's tough enough living and working in the territories when you don't have the rights, but when you are given something that is your due and then you find later on that somebody wants to take it back, they want to curtail your rights, this is just scandalous in many ways. It's scandalous what this government is doing to the people of the north.

Yes, they can pressure the territorial governments. They hold the gold, and they can pressure the territorial governments to go along with these types of acts. That's what's happened here. It's happened in the Northwest Territories and it's happening now in Yukon. I think it's even more significant in Yukon because they have been taking things away, and that's just not correct.

I wish people across the way would understand the nature of what's going on and how we all are Canadians. We all should have similar rights. Those of us who don't have them should have the expectation of receiving those rights in the future.

This particular act may seem minor to you; it may seem like a minor amendment. It may seem to be not that important. But what people get when they don't have everything is important to people. They don't have all of the rights that you do. When they've had something, it's important that it isn't taken away. In any way that the federal government can consider that they have the moral authority to take something back from us is really unfortunate.

You know, I'm not trying to.... If it doesn't happen today, if you are legislators in the future, it's important that you understand that the goal—

• (0935)

The Chair: Mr. Bevington, I have allowed you quite significant latitude here. I think that unless you're going to bring it back to the amendment, then you better—

Mr. Dennis Bevington: I'm finished.

The Chair: Okay.

Is there anyone else who wishes to speak to the amendment?

(Amendment negatived)

The Chair: Then we'll move to the consideration of clause 21.

Ms. Niki Ashton: Can we have a recorded vote?

The Chair: Okay, we will have a recorded vote.

(Clause 21 agreed to: yeas 5; nays 3)

The Chair: I see no amendments to clause 22.

(Clause 22 agreed to on division)

(On clause 23)

The Chair: Moving to clause 23, we do have a number of amendments here.

First on the list I have LIB-4.

I'll just note that if this is moved by Ms. Jones, then we would not proceed with NDP-6, PV-12, and PV-13 because they're identical.

Ms. Jones, do you care to move LIB-4?

Ms. Yvonne Jones: Yes. I propose that clause 23 be amended by deleting lines 1 to 23 on page 12. This is the section that talks about how the panel of the board can make recommendations and what the requirements of the board would be, and says that the minister can certainly ask the board to extend time limits and so on and so forth.

Basically, I think it's fair to say that the people we spoke to would have preferred to have clause 23 not be approved at all in this bill. I guess it's for a number of reasons, but first of all, again, they feel that it is a violation of their treaty agreements and what they had agreed upon with the federal government. They certainly feel that they were not consulted appropriately and that these recommendations are not coming forward as a result of concerns they have expressed or any recommendations they've made.

As well, I think we can't just look at this bill in the context of which government is in power today. It has to be looked at in the context of which governments may be in power in the future as well. Once you remove the powers of an independent board to make those kinds of decisions in their own area, their own territory, and then give the ultimate power and control to government, they have completely lost any control they might have of governance within their own areas, in areas that are inherently theirs, lands that are inherently theirs in which they have self-government agreements with the Government of Canada.

All of these clauses, including clause 23 of this bill, are seen as being absolute violations of first nations governance agreements between the Government of Canada and first nations people. The outfall of changes in this bill not only will impact first nations but will in fact impact all Yukoners, and it sets a very dangerous precedent as to how we move forward with developments in aboriginal lands across Canada.

I'm recommending that we make the changes I'm proposing here. In the absence of being able to remove the clause from the bill, I really feel that this is the next best option to achieving those changes. I would ask the committee to support it.

● (0940)

The Chair: Ms. Ashton.

Ms. Niki Ashton: Seeing as how we proposed the exact same amendment, we will be supporting this amendment. I certainly agree with my colleague Ms. Jones on the key points in terms of the disregard of the role of first nations governments. It's obviously an attack on the rights of Yukon first nations with respect to development in their territories, stewardship, and the future of not just their own nations but also of the Yukon entirely. It speaks to how problematic key sections of this bill are that we have to propose to delete almost entire clauses. In our case, the NDP proposed the deletion of entire clauses as well.

There's no question that this is a sad day for Yukon first nations and Yukoners. They have been key and have shown time and time again in the past their willingness to work in partnership with the federal government, and they have taken the lead, as they should, for development in their territory. Yet we see a federal government that's turning around and, in key sections of this bill, showing anything but that respect for partnership, respect that they should be the ones driving the agenda, not a federal government.

The Chair: Does anyone else wish to speak to the amendment? Seeing no one, shall the amendment carry?

(Amendment negatived [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: It's defeated, which, as I indicated, means that we cannot proceed with amendments NDP-6, PV-12, and PV-13. I do have an additional amendment here.

Ms. May, did you wish to speak to amendment PV-14?

Ms. Elizabeth May: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Again, this is an attempt to remedy these egregious sections that deal with the time limits imposed by Bill S-6 on first nations and on a process that has been working well. Of course, I did support the previous ones; my amendment was identical, as you mentioned, to the Liberal and the New Democrat effort to make deletions.

What we're attempting to do here on page 12 is to bring the timeline under the purview of the board rather than having it handed down through this very last minute process and a mandatory five-year review, by replacing lines 5 to 23 very clearly with language that would ensure that the timeline is specified by the board.

● (0945)

The Chair: Does anyone else wish to speak to this amendment?

(Amendment negatived [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: We move to vote on clause 23.

Mr. Dennis Bevington: A recorded vote.

The Chair: Okay, a recorded vote on clause 23

(Clause 23 agreed to: yeas 5; nays 3)

The Chair: I see no amendments to the next three clauses.

(Clauses 24 to 26 inclusive agreed to on division)

(On clause 27)

The Chair: I do see an amendment here, PV-15.

Ms. May, did you wish to move PV-15?

Ms. Elizabeth May: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Under the motion, under which I am somewhat coerced to appear here today, I don't believe I have the power to move a motion. I believe my amendments are deemed to have been presented by—

The Chair: Do you wish to speak to it?

Ms. Elizabeth May: I do wish to speak to it. I thought you asked if I wished to move it. I would wish to move it. I wish also to vote on them. Many things I would wish, but I am following your motion.

The Chair: Thank you.

Please go ahead.

Ms. Elizabeth May: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

In speaking to this amendment, PV-15, again, this is an attempt to respect the process. I'm proposing an amendment that would appear on page 13, in clause 27, proposed subsection 77(2), replacing with the following: Currently it reads:

The executive committee or panel of the Board shall make a new recommendation to the decision bodies in respect of the project within the period prescribed by the rules,

It goes on to say:

which is not to exceed 60 days for a screening by the executive committee or 90 days for a review

etc. My amendment proposes to end that clause after “prescribed by the rules”, period. Then that would result in the deletion of everything down to the beginning of subsection 28.

The Chair: Does anyone else wish to speak to this amendment?

I see none.

(Amendment negatived)

The Chair: I move to the consideration of the clause.

(Clause 27 agreed to)

The Chair: I see we have no amendments from 28 to 33.

(Clause 28 to 33 agreed to on division)

(On clause 34)

The Chair: I do see a number of amendments to clause 34. First I have NDP-7.

Does someone wish to speak to that?

Ms. Niki Ashton: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

We do propose the elimination of this clause. We realize that the clause is an addition by this government as part of this bill that is opposed by Yukon first nations and Yukoners.

Again, it speaks to, as my colleague pointed out, the kind of paternalistic behaviour we see from this government with regard to Yukon first nations and residents of Yukon Territory. We stand with them in calling for this clause to be removed.

The Chair: As per my previous rulings, amendments that seek to delete entire clauses at committee stage are inadmissible. Therefore, this is an inadmissible amendment.

We would move to PV-16.

Do you wish to speak to that, Ms. May?

Ms. Elizabeth May: Yes, I do. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This, again, tries to ensure that we are respectful of existing agreements, existing powers and responsibilities, both of Yukoners....

I take the point that my friend Dennis Bevington made that although the Green Party has been speaking to the affront to first nations in Bill S-6, it is also an affront to Yukoners who are not aboriginal, because of the different powers and responsibilities within territories and the fact that agreements have been made that are being overturned and imposed under Bill S-6.

In this case, it's a very simple change that you'll find, Mr. Chair, under the section that begins “Policy Directions”, the proposed new section 121.1 in Bill S-6. Where the bill currently reads, “The federal minister may, after consultation with the Board, give written policy directions that are binding on the Board with respect to”, my amendment would simply change it to “respect to the exercise of any of its functions under this Act”.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

●(0950)

The Chair: Does anyone else wish to speak?

Mr. Strahl.

Mr. Mark Strahl: Yes, we believe that the Umbrella Final Agreement provides a blanket authority in section 12.19.2.15 for development assessment legislation to provide for “any other matter required to implement the development assessment process”. This authority would include policy direction and, again, there are four examples of policy direction having been provided to the Mackenzie Valley Land and Water Board under the Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act in the Northwest Territories. In each case, policy direction was used to clearly communicate expectations based on interim measures agreements with first nations. One was requiring that notification be provided to each of the Manitoba and Saskatchewan Denesuline regarding licences and permits in a given region; providing instruction to the board regarding its obligation under the Deh Cho First Nations Interim Measures Agreement; respecting lands withdrawn from disposal that may not be used in geophysical land use operations involving seismic operations; and, ensuring that the board carries out its functions and responsibilities in cooperation with the Akaitcho Dene First Nation and its pre-screening board. So whenever policy direction has been used, it has been used to protect the interests of first nations, and the UFA clearly provides for this clause.

The Chair: Does anyone else wish to speak to this amendment? Mr. Bevington?

Mr. Dennis Bevington: I think what the parliamentary secretary said can be taken in a number of ways. First nations in Yukon did not ask for the protection of the minister for policy direction. They did not consider that appropriate. What does that say about the nature of the relationship in Yukon right now? It says that they're not looking to the federal government to intervene in their process. It's been established that it's working. They're not asking for that. They're quite clearly saying no to it.

When the parliamentary secretary brings up the examples of the Northwest Territories where outstanding issues are still going on with land claims, he's really talking about another unique part of Canada. He's not talking about Yukon. This is one of the problems this federal government has with all this legislation. They're trying to cookie cutter the north, and that's simply not appropriate. It's really almost absurd from a northern perspective that the government would consider that Nunavut with its particularly structure, the Northwest Territories with its very different structure, and Yukon with its well-established unique structure are somehow going to be treated the same from now on.

I think the parliamentary secretary's argument flies in the face of what's going on in Yukon. I think this particular policy direction, although it might not be used by anybody, is an affront to people who have come to expect something different. You can say we don't need to worry about appearance. It's not important what people have come to accept as theirs. We're just going to walk right in and do what we want. That's pathetic.

The Chair: Does anyone else wish to speak to the amendment?

(Amendment negated)

The Chair: Next I have PV-17. Ms. May did you wish to speak to PV-17?

Ms. Elizabeth May: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair.

Again, this amendment is to specify that policy directions only apply if explicit consent of the first nations and of the territorial minister has been given. Then it continues to say that they do not apply "in respect" as it is currently drafted.

Again, I note that my friend Mark Strahl is making a point about similar language that we find in the Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act. This again is an example of where a federal act, the Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act, contains a similar policy direction, which has a narrower scope than what we're seeing under Bill S-6. I think amendment Green Party-17 should be given serious consideration by the committee for providing a narrower scope and greater respect for first nations and the people of Yukon.

● (0955)

The Chair: Does anyone else wish to speak to that amendment?

Ms. Jones.

Ms. Yvonne Jones: Yes, I'll speak to this amendment because I think this particular amendment can right some of the misdirection and misguidance in this bill that will be very problematic for Yukon first nations and Yukoners.

I think that any time the federal minister issues any kind of binding policy direction to aboriginal governance, it is going to be a

problem, and that's exactly what's happening in this particular bill. This amendment will at least seek consent of first nations and a territorial minister, and it will give them a little bit more leniency to have some input.

That said, I think it has to continue to be noted, as is felt by many, that a lot of the amendments in this bill are contrary to the treaties and the agreements that have been set in place by first nations governments in Yukon. This is very sad and unfortunate, because these decisions are going to be made in their lands, their settlement lands, where they have an inherent right and a legal agreement, and where they have a constitutional agreement that should be allowing them to assert control and input, and that's not going to happen. I wanted to say that and to say that I'll support this amendment.

The Chair: Mr. Bevington.

Mr. Dennis Bevington: This is one amendment that we won't support. We just simply will not give in on this and offer any solution that moves the Yukon territory backwards. We can't accept that.

The Chair: Ms. Jones, do you have a further intervention?

Ms. Yvonne Jones: I do. I want to say something else, because I think it was very clear at all the consultations.

I have no problem with the fact that the NDP doesn't want to support this particular aspect or with their view for not supporting it, but I think it was very evident that there was a desire by all the people who presented to us to reach an agreement with the Government of Canada, one in which they could reconcile their differences through dialogue and conversation, one in which they were saying that we can come to an agreement that is acceptable to all.

They really outlined the fact that we were able to do that with 90%-plus of the amendments in the bill, but there were four sections in this bill that they had not been consulted on and that they really had difficulty with. They really felt that, given the opportunity to have an open discussion with the government, they could reconcile those differences and come to an agreement on the amendments. Unfortunately, that did not happen. Unfortunately, this morning we are here putting forward recommendations on their behalf that are being voted down one after the other at the committee level by government members. It is really unfortunate that their voices have not been heard, despite the tremendous efforts they have made.

Is this particular amendment to clause 34 ideal? No, it isn't. It is not ideal. But one thing is for certain. If there is any way we can impose in this bill any additional powers that would give any additional input to first nations people and Yukoners, I think that we at least have to give it our best effort to make that happen.

I wanted to say that so that it's on the record. Thank you.

The Chair: Seeing no other speakers, shall that amendment carry?

(Amendment negated [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: We have an additional amendment here in PV-18.

Ms. May, do you wish to speak to that?

•(1000)

Ms. Elizabeth May: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Again, to put it on the record, I certainly respect the position of the official opposition that my amendments in attempting to improve legislation that's so egregious may be not worth supporting, but I'm grateful that my friend Yvonne Jones voted for it. It's nice to have any votes on the record, but the reality, particularly as all amendments, it appears, are being defeated en masse here before the committee, is that it will go down as a bill that doesn't meet the standards of the respective first nations as enshrined in our Constitution. It's likely to be overturned in the courts, but at great expense, and not just with the expense of the federal government spending money on lawyers to defend an indefensible bill, but the expense to—

The Chair: Ms. May, if you'll come to the amendment, because we—

Ms. Elizabeth May: I'm presenting my last amendment, Mr. Chair, and I've watched them all go down in defeat. Just permit me to finish this one thought.

It's at a cost that's not just financial. It's at a cost in the relationships between the Government of Canada and first nations. This amendment is an attempt to repair that. Again, as I said, I understand that my friends may not vote for this. It reads:

If there is a conflict between policy directions given under this section and the provisions of any Act of Parliament, any regulations made under an Act of Parliament or any territorial law, those provisions prevail to the extent of the conflict.

Now, this again matches the language that you'll find in the Mackenzie Valley Resource Management Act, so that the federal minister cannot issue policy directions that violate the act. At the last, I'll ask the members of the Conservative Party at this committee to consider actually passing one amendment. This one is consistent with language found under another act that's been found to be acceptable by this current administration.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

Does anyone else wish to speak?

Mr. Bevington.

Mr. Dennis Bevington: I'm just curious about this amendment, because what prevails in the time when there's a conflict between any act of Parliament or any territorial act?

Ms. Elizabeth May: Am I permitted to respond?

The Chair: If the committee gives consent, sure.

Ms. May.

Ms. Elizabeth May: What I'm attempting to do with this amendment is that if there's a policy direction given under this section that does not conform to an act, the act will be a superior authority. In the event of conflict, one would look to the act, not the policy direction given under a minister.

So it's an attempt to provide more predictability and respect for the rule of law.

Mr. Dennis Bevington: Well, I'd just once again say that there's the Yukon legislature, which may pass a law, and then there's an act of Parliament. Now, there may be circumstances where both of those are constitutionally okay, where one doesn't supersede the other. What would we do in a case like that? What law would prevail over the policy? Or would it simply be that if the policy didn't match up to either of those laws, there would be no conflict in terms of rescinding the policy?

I suppose that's correct and that we can support this.

The Chair: Does anyone else wish to speak to the amendment?

(Amendment negated [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clause 34 agreed to)

The Chair: We have a number of clauses here with no amendments.

(Clauses 35 to 42 inclusive agreed to on division)

(On Clause 43)

The Chair: I see that we do have some amendments here. The first is NDP-8. Would someone care to speak to that?

Mr. Dennis Bevington: In clause 43, we're looking at limiting... by replacing lines 18 to 26 on page 18 with the following:

shall not exceed 25 years.

This is to ensure there is some outside limit to that particular legislation.

•(1005)

The Chair: We'll just note here as well that if this particular amendment is adopted, we will not be able to proceed with NDP-9, as the amendments are seeking to amend the same lines.

(Amendment negated)

The Chair: We can proceed with amendment NDP-9. Does someone wish to speak to that?

Mr. Dennis Bevington: I move NDP-9. This once again looks at a more full discussion on this particular topic.

These are requests that are coming from the people in Nunavut. I think they're reasonable. During the consultation on this section of the bill there were things that people wanted to see improved. This bill deals with their issues, and I think, quite clearly, there needs to be some support from the government for the Nunavut people in making sure the bill matches up to their expectations.

The Chair: Is there anyone else wishing to speak to this?

Ms. Jones.

Ms. Yvonne Jones: I support the amendment that my colleague is putting forward here, and again he's exactly right. This amendment was requested by people in Nunavut, and they would like to see this amendment incorporated into the bill. I would encourage the committee to accept it.

The Chair: Is there anyone else wishing to speak to it?

Ms. Niki Ashton: Can we have a recorded vote?

The Chair: We will have a recorded vote on NDP-9.

(Amendment negatived: nays 5; yeas 3 [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: I have NDP-10.

Does someone wish to speak to that?

Mr. Dennis Bevington: I'll speak to that, Mr. Chair.

We're moving that Bill S-6, in Clause 43, be amended by adding after line 26 on page 18 the following:

(2) Every 5 years, the Board shall review each licence issued under this Act in order to determine if it should be amended or cancelled in accordance with section 43.

It's providing the board with the authority to deal with licences that may not be appropriate to continue with.

The Chair: Is there anyone else wishing to speak to that?

Ms. Niki Ashton: A recorded vote, please.

The Chair: A recorded vote on NDP-10.

(Amendment negatived: nays 5; yeas 3 [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clause 43 agreed to)

(On clause 44)

The Chair: I do see an additional amendment here, NDP-11, to clause 44.

Does someone wish to speak to that?

Mr. Dennis Bevington: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We propose amending Bill S-6 in clause 44 by replacing line 19 on page 20 with the following:

section 55.2 by a maximum of six months to.

This amendment deals with the concern raised by the Nunavut Water Board in its written submission to the committee. They were concerned about the current ability of the minister to only extend an application by two months. They felt that was insufficient to deal with situations beyond the board's control, and stated:

For example, the Board has no control over ensuring that Board Member appointments are conducted in a timely manner that do not compromise the Board's ability to make quorum, to ensure Panels are properly balanced as required under the NWNSRTA and the NLCA and to reasonably allocate the Board's workload amongst the Board's Members (all of whom are part-time).

A case in point is that until October 2014, when the Board finally achieved a full complement of 9...Members, two positions on the Board had been vacant for almost two (2) years.... As a result of late appointments and staggered 3 year terms, there is also the potential every 2 and ½ years for the Board to lose quorum when, in a single year, the terms of up to five (5) Board Members end.

Amendment NDP-11 would increase the maximum time the minister would grant an extension, from two months to six months. It is simple administration but very important to people who have worked on these boards, where appointments are not always made in a timely fashion. This has happened under Liberal and Conservative governments, and I'm sure it will happen under the next government. These appointments will be difficult to make.

This is something that actually works for everyone, and it's what the board asked for. They recognize that as part of their operating

regime, they need this type of amendment. For the government not to support the amendment just seems a little ridiculous.

• (1010)

The Chair: Are there any other interventions on this amendment?

Ms. Niki Ashton: A recorded vote, please.

The Chair: We will have a recorded vote on NDP-11.

(Amendment negatived; nays 5; yeas 3 [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clause 44 agreed to)

The Chair: Seeing that there are no amendments to clauses 45 through clause 56, shall clauses 45 through 56 carry?

Ms. Niki Ashton: On division.

(Clauses 45 to 56 inclusive agreed to on division)

The Chair: Moving back to the short title, shall clause 1 carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: On division.

The Chair: Shall the title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: On division.

The Chair: Shall the bill carry?

Ms. Niki Ashton: I'd like a recorded vote.

The Chair: Okay, we'll have a recorded vote.

(Bill agreed to: yeas 5; nays 3).

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: On division.

The Chair: That concludes our consideration of clause by clause.

I would just remind members that for Thursday's meeting, following committee business, we do have one of our IT professionals coming to help us prepare for paperless committees. I would remind you all to bring your iPads. They'll ensure that your iPads are up to snuff for that and then provide us with instruction on how to proceed with paperless committees.

Mr. Bevington, you had something to say?

Mr. Dennis Bevington: I just wanted to say thank you, Mr. Chair. I won't be with you at this committee any longer.

Mr. Mark Strahl: That's a shame.

Mr. Dennis Bevington: I just wanted to thank you. I think you did a good job in your conduct on this bill.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Bevington.

With that, the meeting is 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>