



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics

ETHI • NUMBER 023 • 2nd SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Thursday, May 15, 2014

—
Chair

Mr. Pat Martin

Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics

Thursday, May 15, 2014

•(1100)

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Patricia Davidson (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC)): It being 11 o'clock we will call this meeting to order.

We are continuing with the clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-520, An Act supporting non-partisan agents of Parliament. I believe where we left off on Tuesday was clause 9.

(On clause 9—*Holder of a position in the office of an agent of Parliament*)

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Patricia Davidson): Is there any further discussion on clause 9?

Madam Borg had the floor at the time we left.

Were you finished?

[Translation]

Ms. Charmaine Borg (Terrebonne—Blainville, NDP): I would like to repeat that this clause really shows the bill's fundamental deficiencies. I know the Conservatives have repeated that they want to vote against this clause, and I am very pleased about that. However, I do not understand how such a bill, which would open the door to these kinds of witch hunts, could have been introduced.

I am pleased that at least minor changes have been accepted. The fact remains, however, that this bill is fundamentally problematic and an insult to agents of Parliament.

Now I would like to hand the floor over to my colleague.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Patricia Davidson): Is there any further discussion?

Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): I'm just interested in clause 9, and it will be in clause 10 as well. This is one of the key issues that was raised by many people. I'm looking at an article in the March 21 edition of *The Lawyer's Weekly*, where lawyers for the federal commissioners are raising alarm bells, particularly about this clause of Mr. Adler's bill. It says that crown counsel Lisa Blais said that Bill C-520 "would give politicians a weapon to attack independent and impartial Parliamentary officers", and "It politicizes the public service". She particularly drills down on clause 9 and in the ability to demand investigations by members of Parliament or the Senate.

The article says, "if passed it could jeopardize the ability of the 40 lawyers who work for agents of Parliament to do their jobs, Blais warned." She also said:

Their professionalism [and] impartiality is questioned and suspect. If they make a very tough call in the context of their position, will this be used as a sword because some politician doesn't like an opinion that one of our members provides? So there will be a chilling effect potentially when it comes to our members discharging their duties.

My understanding is that Mr. Adler's no longer supporting clause 9. I'd like to ask him, does he agree with this assessment by federal crown lawyers that this would impede the independence of the parliamentary officers of Parliament, and is his decision not to support clause 9 an indication that he's recognized that mistake?

Mr. Paul Calandra (Oak Ridges—Markham, CPC): Madam Chair, I have a point of order.

Mr. Angus wasn't here at the last meeting, so he probably isn't aware of the fact that Mr. Adler has already indicated that he has already answered all the questions, and the opposition had an opportunity to do that when he appeared before the committee. At this point we've already indicated we'd be voting against clauses 9 and 10 on Mr. Adler's advice after he communicated and held further discussions with individuals. So I'm not sure what point this would serve since we've already indicated we're voting against.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Patricia Davidson): Thank you, Mr. Calandra.

I think we've already established that Mr. Adler was here before the committee as a witness. He's not here in that capacity today.

Is there any further discussion on clause 9?

(Clause 9 negated)

(On clause 10—*Tabling in both Houses*)

•(1105)

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Patricia Davidson): Is there any discussion on clause 10?

Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Mr. Adler was here before as a witness supporting all the clauses in the bill. Now he's no longer supporting the clauses in the bill based on, Mr. Calandra tells us, discussions with further individuals. Given the fact that it's extraordinary to see unanimous opposition to the key principle of his bill, I would like to know, being that we did ask Mr. Adler questions the last time and he was fully supportive of clauses 9 and 10 and now he's fully against clauses 9 and 10, would Mr. Adler tell us who gave him his advice that he realized that he was so wrong in this attack on the independence of the officers of Parliament and the ability of parliamentary officers to do their duty on behalf of the Canadian people? I think it would be helpful for us to know.

Mr. Paul Calandra: Madam Chair, that's not a point of order.

Mr. Charlie Angus: That wasn't a point of order. That was a question.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Patricia Davidson): Excuse me. We've already established, Mr. Angus, that Mr. Adler is not here as a witness today. If Mr. Adler wishes to answer the question, he's free to do so, but he's not here as a witness.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Well, just to be fair, I fully understand that, Madam Chair. I'm not expecting him to be a witness, but this is his bill, and we're seeing a bill that they're now stripping. I think to show that he's done his due diligence, I'm giving him the opportunity to explain to our committee why he can't even get the support of his own caucus for the bill that he's brought forward.

That's not a witness question. That's a fair question to see if we can get a further understanding of the fundamental problems and the realization that he certainly presented some really problematic motions that even his own caucus is voting against.

I'm giving him, as a colleague, an opportunity to explain who it was who gave him the advice.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Patricia Davidson): Are there further discussions on clause 10?

Madam Borg.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Charmaine Borg: Thank you.

Once again, although I am pleased that clause 10 was not supported, the very fact that this kind of bill was introduced in Parliament, that the Conservative Party voted for it on second reading and that it was referred to the committee in this way, with two provisions permitting investigations of persons who are supposed to ensure that members obey the law, is extremely problematic.

The withdrawal of those provisions here today reflects a certain amount of good will, but the mere fact that they were introduced indicates a genuine lack of respect for agents of Parliament. This opens the door to witch hunts. Dean Del Mastro, for example, requested an investigation into Elections Canada because he was not happy with what that agency did and felt particularly targeted for partisan reasons.

What appears in clauses 9 and 10 is totally vague. It permits witch hunts, and we are fundamentally opposed to those clauses.

In the circumstances, I will be happy to vote against clause 10 along with my colleagues.

Thank you.

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Patricia Davidson): Is there further discussion on clause 10?

Mr. Calandra.

Mr. Paul Calandra: Madam Chair, I can appreciate that the NDP is in a very difficult spot today with their leader being before a committee of Parliament to try to account for the potentially gross misconduct that their leader and their party, and virtually all of their Quebec members and probably other members, have shown, and the disrespect they've shown to the taxpayers with respect to the millions of dollars that they have potentially used inappropriately. I know that Elections Canada is currently investigating them on.... I think, if I'm not mistaken, that I read it's millions—1.8 million or something—of potentially illegal flyers that were sent out into ridings in an attempt to influence the—

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Patricia Davidson): On a point of order, Ms. Borg.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Charmaine Borg: I do not know if the member has a point of order or whether he is talking about clauses 9 or 10. Whatever the case may be, I do not think his remarks are entirely relevant to those clauses of the bill. I ask that he make a bit more of an effort to abide by the rule of relevance to the subject we are discussing today.

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Patricia Davidson): I'm quite sure the relevance will appear.

Mr. Calandra.

Mr. Paul Calandra: Definitely, Madam Chair.

As I said, I can understand the frustration and the anger that the NDP must feel today in light of the fact that their leader, and basically almost their entire caucus, is potentially found in a very embarrassing and troubling situation where millions of taxpayers' dollars—hard-earned taxpayers' dollars. Let's be honest; the taxpayers work very, very hard.

I know that in my riding, Madam Chair, a lot of them get up at six o'clock in the morning and are at the GO train station by seven o'clock. They find their way to downtown Toronto. The farmers in my community are up at five o'clock in the morning. They milk their cows. They feed their chickens. They work all day, and they come in at nine o'clock at night and have dinner. All they ask is that the dollars they work hard for be treated with respect, Madam Chair. What they're seeing today, of course, in another parliamentary committee, is that the NDP and their leader just flagrantly disrespected Canadian taxpayers.

I know that the member opposite talked about our agents of Parliament in this bill. I think what Mr. Adler did was try to shine a light. He looked at something that he had heard a lot of people talk about. In fact, since I've been here I've heard a lot of members of the NDP talk about how they were worried that as the Liberals were being thrown out of office by the Canadian taxpayers for the gross misconduct they showed with taxpayers' dollars when they stole millions of dollars through the sponsorship scandal, they still have not turned over the \$40 million, for which we have been looking very hard. I remember when I first came here that a lot of the members of the NDP talked about how the Liberals—who were fired by the people of Canada—flooded their staff into different departments and they were all worried about this. We heard a little bit of that as we were out and about.

Mr. Adler came forward with this bill. He followed the right process. Imagine that, Madam Chair. He brought it into the House of Commons for debate. He then appeared as a witness. He went and heard testimony from our agents of Parliament. He then went back, after he heard that testimony, took some more advice, spoke to people within his riding, and spoke to our caucus.

I know that we, as a committee, reached out to members opposite and we did what committees are supposed to do. We reviewed a bill and we came forward with amendments. Mr. Adler had a number of reasoned amendments. We've changed the bill based on what we heard at committee, and based on what he has heard as he has talked to people.

What we've seen over the last two days here by the members of the NDP is nothing short of a disgrace. It's just a flagrant attempt to try to move the channel away from what has been happening in Parliament over the last few days with respect to the gross and really quite ugly potential misconduct of the NDP when it comes to millions of taxpayers' dollars.

I was up early today, and I had the opportunity, Madam Chair—this is relevant to clause 9—to watch the Leader of the Opposition on CTV news. Question after question, he refused to answer. He just flat out refused to answer. Yesterday he even attacked the poor reporter from CTV news who questioned him about something with respect to him and his party being investigated by Elections Canada. He said that it wasn't true, that it was just a fabrication. Yet today, where is the Leader of the Opposition?

Imagine this, Madam Chair: The leader of the opposition is ordered to appear before a committee to account for the millions of dollars of potentially stolen taxpayers' dollars in offices. This is the best part of it, and I'm sure my colleagues saw this; this is one of the best parts: the Leader of the Opposition said, "Well, these people, they had cellphones that were in Montreal."

Well, my gosh, guess where my cellphone is registered: Toronto, and do you know why? Because that's where most of my constituents are calling me from.

When you go to the House of Commons NDP office in Montreal, what do you see out front? You're not going to believe it. You won't see "House of Commons". You'll see "NDP". When you call that phone number, you're thanked for calling the NDP, and if you want to leave a donation, press two.

These are House of Commons resources.

• (1110)

They're doing House of Commons work in Saskatchewan, colleagues. I don't remember the last time the NDP actually had a member of Parliament in Saskatchewan. If anybody knows, please rise on a point of order and help me understand that. But apparently they're doing constituency work in Saskatchewan—

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Patricia Davidson): Okay, Mr. Calandra

[*Translation*]

Ms. Charmaine Borg: Madam Chair, I have been very patient.

• (1115)

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Patricia Davidson): Is there a point of order?

[*Translation*]

Ms. Charmaine Borg: Madam Chair, I have a point of order. I have been very patient. I really listened to what the member said. I tried to understand how Mr. Calandra's remarks were relevant to clauses 9 and 10. He mentioned them once, but I do not think his remarks are relevant to our present discussion of clause 10.

We have taken the floor to explain the reasons why we voted against certain clauses of the bill. To my knowledge, that is the purpose of today's meeting.

I have shown patience, thinking that Mr. Calandra might get around to clause 10, but I consider his remarks irrelevant to that subject.

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Patricia Davidson): We'll just remind you once again, Mr. Calandra, about relevance.

Mr. Paul Calandra: Yes, absolutely. I'm getting around to that, Madam Chair. I appreciate that.

As we talk about clause 10, in order to truly understand what Mr. Adler has done and why this is coming, I think you have to set a framework for it so that people can truly appreciate what has gone on.

I note that in his testimony recently, when he was asked about his potentially illegal use of House of Commons resources, my colleagues.... It was apparently, according to the Leader of the Opposition, an innovation. It's an innovation of the NDP to have House of Commons resources in provinces in which they have no members of Parliament. What an innovation that is, my friends. Imagine that.

I'm sure the hard-working taxpayers of my community, those farmers, those people who get up early and bust their ass all day, are really grateful for the innovation that the NDP have come up with, misappropriating hundreds, millions of taxpayers' dollars. What an innovation that is. The NDP have innovated how to take money from Canadians' pockets, use it for political purposes, and accomplish absolutely nothing. That's a great innovation.

I guess, colleagues, that explains why the NDP have never had the pleasure and the trust of the Canadian people to sit on this side of the table, and that's why they continue to lose election after election. I think it's 16 straight elections that they've lost, my friends. Again, if I'm wrong, please correct me; if anybody out there knows that I'm wrong. Maybe it's 17, I don't know, but it's 16 straight elections.

Of course they did have the opportunity once, in the province of Ontario—and I'll wrap up with this—and it was an absolute catastrophe, of course. In fact, the NDP were so bad at government, the NDP premier at that time was so embarrassed by his own government, that he actually left the party. He was so embarrassed about his own government and his five years in office that he left the party and wrote a book telling people just how bad the NDP are and why they basically should never be trusted with taxpayers' money.

In summary, Madam Chair, I look forward to debating more clauses. We've spent so much time on this bill after what I thought was good faith that I feel very energized right now. We have a couple of hours. Let's debate every single clause. We have clause 10, clause 11, and who knows, maybe the title. We can spend a lot of time talking about the title while we learn more of the innovations of the Leader of the Opposition and the creative ways he found to take taxpayers' money and try to hide that fact from the people of Canada.

Madam Chair, ultimately what I'm trying to say here is that Mr. Adler has done his work, and the committee has done its work, and that's why at this point we have decided, because of the absolute, utmost respect we have not only for the agents of Parliament but for the people who work in the professional public service, to make these changes.

Also, the bill has been brought forward, as Mr. Adler has pointed out, out of the utmost respect for the people of Canada, who want to make sure that the professional public service that serves them and serves members of Parliament, and by extension, obviously, the 34 million Canadians out there who send basically 50% of their paycheque to service government at all levels.... They want to have that same confidence.

I applaud Mr. Adler for bringing this bill forward. I applaud most of the members of this committee, at least on this side, who have taken the process for what it is worth and, at least on this side, have shown that when Parliament works, it can work very well, unlike the childish and silly antics that we've unfortunately seen from the NDP.

Ms. Charmaine Borg: I was actually talking to a real clause though.

Mr. Paul Calandra: I want to actually just highlight—I know it bothers the NDP when I highlight some of the good work of the Liberals on this. But Mr. Andrews of course—just for your own edification, Mr. Scarpaleggia—has been a very good contributor to this. He has worked very well. I guess that's the type of diligence that comes when you've actually had the responsibility of governing. I guess that's something that doesn't come with the NDP. So if you would take that message back to him, I would appreciate that.

In summary, Madam Chair, that's why we will be voting against the clause.

• (1120)

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Patricia Davidson): Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Well that was very interesting. We learned about chickens and cows in Markham and hundreds of millions of dollars and gross misconduct. But I didn't hear anything about the clause.

Mr. Paul Calandra: I could go again, Madam Chair.

Mr. Charlie Angus: No, I have the floor.

The question here is that we're dealing with a clause about a bill that has actually undermined the work of the officers of Parliament. So we have Mr. Adler who sits over there giggling when he's listening to the story of the chickens and the cows in Markham, but as a colleague I'm asking him to explain what the motivation behind this clause was so that we can decide whether or not this clause will move ahead.

Mr. Adler seems to prefer to hide behind the antics of my colleague from Markham and I don't think that's professional. So the question of this bill—it's a very serious bill. Just remind us. We're on clause 10 which is connected to clause 9. When we receive a letter from Michael Ferguson, Auditor General of Canada; Karen Shepherd, Commissioner of Lobbying of Canada; Marc Mayrand, Chief Electoral Officer of Canada and now definitely with a black X under the Conservative attack; Graham Fraser, Commissioner of Official Languages; Chantal Bernier, Interim Privacy Commissioner of Canada; Suzanne Legault, Information Commissioner of Canada; Mario Dion, the Public Sector Integrity Commissioner of Canada—I know that this letter was cc'ed to you Madam Chair...

Talking about the clauses, this is what we're talking about. We're not talking about chickens in Markham right now. These clauses provide that:

...an Agent of Parliament may examine an allegation raised in writing by a member of the Senate or House of Commons that an employee has conducted himself or herself in a partisan manner in the performance of his or her responsibilities. Following an examination, the Agent of Parliament must submit a report to Parliament by transmitting it to both the Speaker of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Commons for tabling in both Houses....

This is clause 10 which we're talking about. Mr. Adler, I hope you're familiar with this part of your bill.

Overall, the Bill's provisions do not provide specific guidance on how they would interact with the current legislative and policy regime that governs political activities of public servants. The current regime includes Part 7 of the Public Service Employment Act, the Public Service Code of Values and Ethics, and the Values and Ethics Code adopted separately by each of our offices. For instance, in the absence of a definition of partisan conduct, it is unclear how this notion would differ from the definition of political activity contained in the Public Service Employment Act (PSEA). The PSEA provides that only the Public Service Commission can conduct investigations into allegations of political activities. This lack of harmonization or integration may create uncertainty for employees and may give rise to issues regarding competing redress mechanism and overlapping jurisdiction.

This is clause 10 we're talking about, Mr. Adler.

The following paragraphs highlight specific issues for the Committee's consideration.

This is what we're dealing with here, it's our committee's consideration of these clauses.

First, the requirement to declare a prior partisan position occupied during the past ten years at the earliest opportunity during an appointment process may impact on the hiring process. As Agents of Parliament, we have delegated authority to appoint employees based on merit principles outlined in the PSEA and the accompanying regulations. Consideration of prior politically partisan position would not be permitted during an appointment process. If an individual had declared prior politically partisan positions and, due to reasons of merit was unsuccessful in obtaining a position in the office of an Agent of Parliament, the decision not to hire that individual could be challenged under the PSEA on the basis that the declaration impacted the hiring process.

I have a simple question regarding clause 10. If the government is now realizing that Mr. Adler was absolutely wrong in bringing this forward, was it because of this letter that was signed by all of the agents of Parliament?

When Mr. Adler was putting this bill together, did he look at the Public Service Employment Act, or the Public Service Code of Values and Ethics, and the Values and Ethics Code which all pertain to clauses 9 and 10?

Mr. Adler, what was it that made you decide that clauses 9 and 10 had to go? It's a simple question.

• (1125)

Mr. Paul Calandra: I'm prepared to answer the question, and I appreciate that opportunity.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Patricia Davidson): We have a speakers list.

Mr. Paul Calandra: Well, I was asked a question and actually I would be happy—

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Patricia Davidson): I'm sorry, but the member's not free to ask questions directly of other members.

Next on the list is Mr. Ravignat.

Mr. Mathieu Ravignat (Pontiac, NDP): Were you done, Charlie?

An hon. member: That's fine.

Mr. Mathieu Ravignat: Thank you.

[*Translation*]

So far I do not think anyone has answered the fundamental question concerning clauses 9 and 10.

I would like to know what happened to clauses 9 and 10 of the bill. I think my question is relevant, regardless of whether Mr. Adler, the government or someone else answers it. When Mr. Adler came to testify before the committee, I remember he asked whether the Office of the Prime Minister, the government or the cabinet had in any way taken part in the preparation of the bill. I know this is a private member's bill, but I asked the question nevertheless. Mr. Adler's answer on the subject was vague.

The government is well aware of the content of bills, whether they are bills prepared by one of its members or bills that it introduces. At some point, for reasons of which we are unaware, the government decided to withdraw these clauses from the bill. It first impugned the independence of agents of Parliament, then suddenly came to the conclusion that was not a good idea. That suggests the government was initially trying to establish a tool it could use to gag agents of Parliament.

At some point, the pressure brought to bear by the commissioners, the opposition, the Canadian public and journalists became so strong that both clauses seemed to be a bad idea. That nevertheless indicates a very negative opinion of the role that agents of Parliament can play in our democracy. I denounce that and do not understand it.

Why did they initially include these clauses in the bill? Why does the government suddenly wish to withdraw them?

I am obviously delighted that these clauses, including clause 10, are being withdrawn from the bill. However, the story behind the events is not clear to the Canadian public or to journalists. I think that

[*English*]

the onus is on the government

[*Translation*]

and that it must explain the reasons for this reversal and why these clauses were initially included in the bill.

I think that is an important question. It is not a question on the merits of the bill that is being asked solely by the opposition. It is also being asked by journalists and serious people.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

• (1130)

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Patricia Davidson): Madam Borg.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Charmaine Borg: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I just want to explain my reasoning and to state the reason why I will be voting against clause 10. It is quite similar to the one I gave when I voted against clause 9.

Although I am pleased that the government will be withdrawing this clause, I nevertheless have a problem with the fact that a bill was introduced that permits this kind of attack on agents of Parliament.

We have not had a chance to hear testimony from the Information Commissioner of Canada because the process of hearing evidence was conducted very quickly. I therefore want to share with you what she told us about clause 10 that we did not have a chance to hear here.

She wrote this: Report will be made public even if there was no basis for the allegation.

Someone's reputation could therefore be tarnished even if there are no grounds for examination or investigation.

She also noted: Privacy concerns in the requirement to submit a report to Parliament following an examination; the necessity for such report making public personal information may not be reasonably justified in every circumstance.

She is obviously still talking about privacy issues. This is something that we raised. We wanted to bring forward amendments. Unfortunately, they have been negated to date.

Lastly, she emphasized this: Issuing a report would likely lead to a breach of confidentiality obligations of the Access to Information Act in relation to ongoing investigations.

If she has concerns about the Access to Information Act, she is really the person to be listened to on the subject since she is the commissioner responsible for this matter.

All in all, we are looking at a clause that would make witch hunts a possibility. It shows a lack of respect for agents of Parliament, whereas they are the ones who are supposed to report members' breaches of the rules. We have seen situations in which agents of Parliament have been attacked without justification. That was the case of Mr. Poilievre, who attacked Marc Mayrand because the latter did not support a bill. We want to limit these kinds of attacks.

I am really disappointed with this bill, which the Conservatives supported on second reading in the House of Commons. However, I am pleased because we will nevertheless be limiting, even if only slightly, the harm the bill will cause to agents of Parliament, their offices and all their employees. However, our amendments requiring that the clause would apply only to people in positions of power were rejected.

The mere fact that these two clauses were put before our committee and adopted by the Conservatives in the vote at second reading is a great shame and a major problem for our agents of Parliament.

We heard that from several witnesses and read it in the letters we received. Remember that not everyone had a chance to testify because we simply went through the process very quickly.

That is what I had to say on the subject. I will be voting firmly against this clause.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Patricia Davidson): Thank you.

We'll now go to Mr. Calandra.

Mr. Paul Calandra: We're ready for the vote if there are no other comments, Madam Chair.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Patricia Davidson): Shall clause 10 carry?

(Clause 10 negatived)

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Patricia Davidson): Shall clause 11 carry?

I'm casting the deciding vote, which is in favour of clause 11.

(Clause 11 agreed to)

(Clauses 12 and 13 agreed to)

•(1135)

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Patricia Davidson): We're moving on to the short title, and we have amendment CPC-5.

Note that amendments CPC-5 and CPC-6 are consequential. If amendment CPC-5 is adopted, so is amendment CPC-6, and conversely, if amendment CPC-5 is defeated, so is amendment CPC-6.

I would ask someone to please introduce amendment CPC-5.

Mr. Hawn.

Hon. Laurie Hawn (Edmonton Centre, CPC): Madam Chair, it's very short, so I'll just read it.

This is amendment CPC-5:

That Bill C-520, in Clause 1, be amended by replacing line 5 on page 1 with the following:

“Non-Partisan Offices of Agents of Parliament Act.”

(Amendment agreed to)

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Patricia Davidson): Shall the short title as amended carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: No.

(Short title agreed to [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Patricia Davidson): Shall the title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: No.

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

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Patricia Davidson): Shall the bill as amended carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Some hon. members: No.

(Bill as amended agreed to [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Patricia Davidson): Shall the chair report the bill as amended to the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Patricia Davidson): Shall the committee order a reprint of the bill as amended for the use of the House at report stage?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Patricia Davidson): Thank you.

Now we will move on to committee business.

Mr. Calandra.

Mr. Paul Calandra: I make a motion to adjourn.

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Patricia Davidson): The motion is non-debatable.

(Motion agreed to)

The Vice-Chair (Mrs. Patricia Davidson): 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>