



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

43rd PARLIAMENT, 2nd SESSION

Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 045

Monday, June 14, 2021

Chair: Mr. Scott Simms



Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage

Monday, June 14, 2021

• (1100)

[*English*]

The Chair (Mr. Scott Simms (Coast of Bays—Central—Notre Dame, Lib.)): Welcome, everybody, back to the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage. Of course, today we are doing some committee business. That is true. However, I think in the first part we want to deal with any of the motions we have out there that we'd like to discuss at this point.

I see a hand up. Monsieur Champoux.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martin Champoux (Drummond, BQ): Mr. Chair, I'd like to ensure that we have an opportunity to address the motion referred to us by the House asking that we discuss the issue of sexual harassment and psychological abuse of sports athletes. The motion was referred to us by unanimous consent in the House on April 28. I'd like us to discuss it and I wanted to wait for your cue to talk about it.

[*English*]

The Chair: Absolutely, Mr. Champoux. That's one of the things I wanted to bring up.

As far as the order of things goes, I see that I have two other people who would like to weigh in, so let me deal with that first before we get to some sort of an agenda about these motions.

Ms. McPherson.

Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would also like to bring forward the motion that I have given notice of. I'll read it, if that's your pleasure.

The Chair: Yes, okay. I want to take this sort of as it goes. Can I go to Mr. Rayes first?

Ms. Heather McPherson: Certainly.

The Chair: I'm just trying to come up with an agenda in my head as to what we want to do first.

Mr. Rayes, you have the floor.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes (Richmond—Arthabaska, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Like my colleagues, I'd like to remind everyone that I introduced a motion calling for a meeting before the end of the session, after Bill C-10, to address the issue of copyright and compensation for

publishers, creators and artists. Unless I am mistaken, that motion had carried.

I wanted to issue that little reminder, because I know we have several issues to address. Now, it seems to me that we agreed to devote at least one meeting to the topic, before the end of the session and after the study on Bill C-10.

[*English*]

The Chair: The short answer is that yes, we did.

Now, Mr. Rayes, do you want me to deal with that in the public portion of the meeting, or do you want to wait until committee business? I was planning to bring it up at committee business. Do you want to deal with it before we go to committee business?

• (1105)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes: I don't have a problem with that. I like the fact that we're working in a collegial manner, except for a couple of weeks that were a little difficult.

Mr. Chair, I just wanted to make that reminder, and I will count on you to tell me when to bring this up with all the committee members. The other motions from my fellow members are very relevant and Mr. Waugh's is also very intriguing.

[*English*]

The Chair: Okay. I'll leave that for committee business. I plan to bring that up first when we get into committee business, Monsieur Rayes.

From what I see right now, we have two things to deal with. We have on the table to discuss Ms. McPherson's motion from Friday, June 4. You all have a copy of that. We then go into the motion that was passed unanimously in the House on April 28. We'll get to that in just a few moments.

How about we deal with Ms. McPherson's issue first? She requested at the last meeting that it be brought up and be in public.

Ms. McPherson, you have the floor.

Ms. Heather McPherson: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

It's nice to see everybody on this Monday morning.

I will read the motion, and then I can discuss a bit why I think it is something we should be supportive of. The motion is:

That the Department of Canadian Heritage table with the committee, no later than June 20, 2021, a copy of the initial agreement, including any subsequent amendments, in both official languages, between Canadian Heritage and Netflix Canada, signed in 2017 and entered into under the Investment Canada Act.

I have brought this motion forward because I have some concerns, having seen the exemption for Netflix in the 2021 budget, and I'm worried that without being able to understand what is in that agreement, without being able to understand what is being given or what gifts are being given to Netflix, it's very difficult for us to understand whether it's an appropriate playing field, a level playing field, for the broadcasting sector.

From my perspective, it is worrying to see Netflix being excluded. I think that for us as committee members to do our job, it's important that we have an opportunity to examine this and ensure that it meets the highest standards that we would expect to be undertaken for this. That's why I've brought the motion forward. I can answer any questions anyone might have, but I think it is part of our job to make sure our broadcasting sector is not disproportionately privileging one company over others, and certainly not a company that is not a Canadian company over others. That's my motion. I'd like your support, please.

The Chair: Thank you.

Ms. Dabrusin.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin (Toronto—Danforth, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

What I absolutely disagree with is the premise underlying the motion, about Netflix facing exclusions. I think most people who are Netflix subscribers have probably received a notice, in fact, of the company's intention to be contributing towards Canadian taxes. Regardless of that part, I actually think that in the interests of transparency, I would support this motion, but I disagree with the premise and think that there are some inaccuracies that would need to be addressed. Perhaps when everyone takes a good look at C-10, as well as their Netflix notifications and the actual budget implementation act, that might be clarified.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Mr. Champoux, you have the floor.

Mr. Martin Champoux: I agree with much of what my colleague said, Mr. Chair. I fully support the motion.

I am surprised, by the way, that we need to request documents of which we should have known at least the broad outlines long ago. This agreement certainly has significant implications and consequences that we should be aware of. In the interest of transparency, it's the least we can do to secure access to the broad outlines of this agreement between the government and Netflix. I fully support this motion.

The Chair: Mr. Rayes, you have the floor.

Mr. Alain Rayes: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I concur.

Since we want to discuss other business, and, to save time, I would ask for a vote on Ms. McPherson's motion. I think you will quickly realize that we have consensus on that motion.

[*English*]

The Chair: Okay, very good, Mr. Rayes. You've inspired us to move on.

Seeing no further comment on that, we now go to a vote. You've all seen, read and heard what was put forward by Ms. McPherson. All those in favour?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

Mr. Chair: I'll bring this up again in the next conversation, folks, when we talk about the agenda that is coming up, but right now, we're going on to what was accepted in the House by unanimous consent. It was resolved.

Mr. Champoux, before I give you the floor, we're just going to paraphrase some of this stuff. It's just a précis, if you don't mind.

That, following the allegations of psychological abuse, neglect, sexual harassment and racial discrimination of five former members of the Canada Artistic Swimming (CAS) Senior National Team by coaches and staff, the House:

This is where I'll cut some of it down. It's fairly lengthy. It goes on:

(a) recognize that national sports organizations are environments which, due in particular to the extremely intense competitive atmosphere

and so on. Then it says:

(b) recognize that it is the responsibility of the government to do everything in its power to protect our high performance athletes

and:

(c) ask the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage to undertake a study on the establishment of an independent body for handling complaints in sport which will establish a climate of trust so that victims can report without fear of reprisals

I know you all have a copy. I thought I would just do that in case anybody is watching us through a webcast, but that's what we're discussing.

Mr. Champoux, you have the floor.

• (1110)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martin Champoux: I will be brief, Mr. Chair, because you summed things up pretty well.

This motion received unanimous consent in the House. I assume my colleagues are already somewhat aware of what this is all about.

I remind you that major sporting events will gradually resume, including the Olympics. The allegations and incidents that we are seeing in various amateur sports circles are nothing new. High-performance athletes have often experienced this tension and had to live with harassment for many years.

I would even say that people close to committee members have been athletes, or are athletes, or are part of the sports world, and could testify to this themselves. They may have themselves witnessed incidents of this kind during their athletic careers. We need to address this issue as a matter of extreme urgency because these events have been allowed to go unchecked for too long. Every time it happens, it gets swept under the rug. Penalties are imposed, but nothing concrete is done to address the root of the problem.

In the short time remaining in this session, we have a duty to begin a study, which may be brief, but must be effective, for the sake of our athletes. We owe it to them. It's of the utmost importance. I find it unacceptable that athletes who aspire to high performance levels can be put at risk in situations like this. It's heartbreaking and revolting. This is a very legitimate motion and we should give it our utmost attention.

Thank you.

[*English*]

The Chair: Ms. McPherson.

Ms. Heather McPherson: I just have a very quick question about this. From my understanding, the scope of this motion is that it would look particularly at artistic swimming, but we know that athletes across Canada in a number of different sports would actually be impacted in similar ways. It is not something that is unique to artistic swimming. Would there be scope to examine this outside of that, or, because of the time constraints we have, will we be looking solely at one sport as opposed to any others?

The Chair: Before I go to Mr. Rayes, yes, that's going to be part of the discussion we can have regarding the whole schedule in the broader context as to what we do first. We have to line that up.

In the meantime I will do some consulting about this, Ms. McPherson. I think you raise a very good point as to the scope of the study. I'll leave it at that for now. We can probably discuss this again a little later. Thank you for bringing that up.

Mr. Rayes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I fully agree with my colleague Mr. Champoux's premise regarding the motion to undertake a study.

With respect to Ms. McPherson's question, if we are going to undertake a study, it should be of all sports, not just one. I coached soccer for 26 years and I can tell you that I've seen several cases of coaches or officials who have been found guilty. If we initiate a study to provide relevant information to all parliamentarians and to determine what can be done, that study should look at all sports.

That being said, I'd like to go back to my request for a motion, which I believe had already carried. My motion only asks for one meeting, and I feel we need to devote more than one meeting to Mr. Champoux's request if we are to do our job properly.

I believe we have two more meetings from now to the end of the session. So maybe we could see what can be done in the short term, even if it means having a meeting to lay the groundwork if we

come back to the House in the fall, so that we can do our job well on the issue that Mr. Champoux is raising.

• (1115)

[*English*]

The Chair: Madame Bessette.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Lyne Bessette (Brome—Missisquoi, Lib.): Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Champoux, Mr. Rayes, I understand— [*Technical difficulty*].

[*English*]

The Chair: Madame Bessette, I apologize. The interpreters are having a problem with your sound. I think it might be cutting in and out.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

We can't hear Mrs. Bessette. Perhaps the sound would be better if she turned off her camera.

[*English*]

Mrs. Lyne Bessette: Can you hear me now?

The Chair: I can hear you now, but go ahead and we'll see how it goes.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Lyne Bessette: I want to say that we will need more than a few meetings to do this study on athletes.

Actually, I think the problem is too big to be studied in one or two meetings. You all know that I have been in the sports world. So that's the comment I wanted to make.

The Chair: Thank you, Mrs. Bessette.

[*English*]

Folks, we have a couple of things to consider here. I know that during committee business we normally do this in camera. We have a choice. We can either stay in public or we can go in camera to discuss the committee business. It appears I need a motion to do that, and I can't move the motion myself to go in camera. Otherwise we have to stay public. Would anyone like to move a motion, or no?

Mr. Rayes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Chair, if members want the rest of the meeting to be public so that we can save time, I don't see a problem with that, unless you want to have the rest of the meeting in camera or someone says that is essential. I feel the issues we are discussing could be of public interest. I don't see a problem with that and it would save us time technically.

[English]

The Chair: Okay. As I said, I have no issues being in public either. It's just that every time we've done meetings talking about the future schedule, we've always done them in camera. I'm just doing this based on our usual practice, but if you want to stay in public, that's fine; we can do that. If you don't, you can just move a motion to go in camera.

Mr. Champoux.

[Translation]

Mr. Martin Champoux: I'm very much in favour of Mr. Rayes's proposal to hold the rest of the meeting in public. I believe what we are discussing today is not secret or confidential in any way. We advocate transparency on the committee, so let's set an example.

I also noted Mrs. Bessette's comments and, indeed, I don't expect that we can resolve this issue or debate it in just one or two meetings. It's going to take a lot more than that, absolutely. However, I do feel that we need to start the work, because we need to do it at some point and it hasn't been done yet. Also, we need to show the athletes that we have heard them and that we finally understand the issue. We need to tell them that even though it is late, we're taking action, we're doing something for them and we're making sure that this kind of environment in amateur sport or in high-performance sport will never be tolerated again under any pretext or circumstances.

It's fine with me that we have one meeting, but continue the work afterwards. However, we need to make it clear to the athletes, coaches, and all those around our athletes in amateur and high-performance sport that we understand the problem, that we feel it is late, but that something needs to happen.

I propose that we at least lay the groundwork for what we want to do on this. We can pick up there, whatever happens this summer, but please, let's start the work. Let's show them that we care about this and that we are as outraged by it as we should be.

I will let us discuss it, but no matter how much time is left, we must begin this study.

• (1120)

[English]

The Chair: Okay. Before I go to Ms. Dabrusin, I'll just start right now. We've started in committee business, just so that everyone knows. I certainly have no problem going public. That's great. We'll stay in public for now. We'll talk about the business. What I'm going to do is list the motions that we have passed for upcoming studies and other things we want to look at as well. Before I do that, however, I'll go to Ms. Dabrusin.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think it's a good idea to go through the list of the motions, because there are many. One that I wanted to highlight was the one that was brought by Mr. Waugh, which I think many Canadians—certainly, when I'm speaking with my constituents—would be very interested in knowing more about.

It would seem that, given that it involves getting department officials, which might be a little easier than getting general witness lists together, it's something that we could probably move towards, even

by this Friday. I know we have a long list of motions to consider, but if I could put my support for moving that towards the top of the list for the end of this week, for our next meeting, that's where I would put it. I see Mr. Waugh giving his thumbs up. I'm only speaking for him because he can't speak today because of his sound issues. Thank you.

The Chair: That was very generous of you.

I'm not moving off of the issue about sports; I will get back to that in just a few moments. Right now, though, I will give you the broad context of what we're looking at over the next little while, upcoming studies or ones already before the committee.

The supplementary estimates (A) are to be considered, as we normally do. The seventh allotted day, Thursday, June 19, is really our deadline for reporting them back. It's too late to do votes on supplementary estimates (A), as Bill C-10 took a big chunk of the time, but we can study the estimates as subject matter. I'll just leave that right there, that we can do that if you so desire.

Let's get into the motion on anti-Asian racism that was adopted on March 26. I don't have to go through the whole motion. It was just talked about. I will say, however, that there was one stipulation in it that said, "no later than 180 calendar days from the adoption of this motion; and that, pursuant to Standing Order 109, the government table a comprehensive response." Now, 180 calendar days from the adoption of the motion on March 26 is Tuesday, September 21. Please bear that in mind. That's basically when we come back. I forgot the actual date.

On to the next one, which was adopted on April 12:

That the Committee devote at least one meeting before the summer recess to hear from witnesses on the continuing challenges for publishers, creators and artists as it pertains to fair compensation for their work in...educational publishing in Canada.

That's number three.

We also have this motion, which was adopted on June 11. It reads, in part, as follows:

That the Committee invite officials from the Department of Canadian Heritage to testify about the funding for the discovery of the remains of 215 Indigenous children on the grounds of a former residential school in Kamloops....

That was from Mr. Waugh.

We also have the ongoing issue of Facebook, and the correspondence we've had since our summons to Mr. Zuckerberg, about his appearing before committee. I can brief you on that so far, and perhaps Mr. Housefather can as well, as he's been involved. There is that issue.

• (1125)

We just adopted the motion by Ms. McPherson regarding the deal from 2017—the agreement between Netflix and the Department of Canadian Heritage.

The final one would be the independent body for complaints in sport as a study we look into, as we just spoke about.

Before I go for comments, I want to highlight those two things regarding a timeline.

We have the anti-Asian racism motion, which talks about “no later than 180 days from the adoption of the motion”, which takes us to September 21. The educational publishing issue asks for one meeting before the summer recess.

Now I'll ask for comments.

Oh, good. I see Mr. Champoux.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martin Champoux: You look happy to be giving the floor to someone, Mr. Chair!

I have some questions and proposals that could be discussed.

My first question is about the study on anti-Asian racism. I remember very well the context in which we passed the motion on this issue. Obviously, we're all very committed to completing the study, but didn't think at the time it was proposed that Bill C-10 would take us so long.

On the one hand, I'd like to know what will happen if we don't meet the September 21 deadline. Since we aren't likely to be in session this summer and we don't really know what will happen this fall, what would the consequences of not meeting that deadline be?

At the same time, can we commit to giving this study priority upon returning to the House and request an extension on the deadline, given the circumstances and the fact that Bill C-10 took longer to complete?

My second question is actually a proposal, and it has to do with Mr. Rayes and his expectations regarding copyright. Copyright is very important to me as well. We had made a promise to Mr. Rayes and to ourselves that we would deal with this issue, because it is urgent and needs to be addressed.

With respect to the issue of harassment and abuse in high-performance sport, I propose that we begin the study on Friday. We could call in officials and one to three representatives from sports federations that we would like to hear from as part of the study. On Monday, we could do the study we promised Mr. Rayes we would do on copyright.

This would make for a busy end to the committee's session, but an extremely efficient one as well.

I am throwing the proposal out there and comments are welcome.

We are also left with the September 21 deadline that we are unlikely to meet.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Champoux.

Just before I go to Ms. McPherson, for clarification, there are no punishments per se if we ignore a deadline. These are just self-imposed deadlines, and there are no heavy ramifications if we do not

meet them. However, you would need to move a motion if you want to change something within that, as far as the dates are concerned. I hear what you're saying.

Ms. McPherson.

Ms. Heather McPherson: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I just brought up the House calendar. We would have one meeting in September before the deadline, so I just wanted to clarify that it would be possible to have a meeting.

• (1130)

The Chair: Yes. Thank you.

Ms. Heather McPherson: Certainly this is a topic that is very important to me, and it's very important to all members on this committee, I am sure, that we examine this. Unfortunately, as many have said, the work on Bill C-10 took much longer than we anticipated, and we have not been able to get to our other pieces of work.

The only thing I want to raise, which I think is important, is the motion Mr. Waugh brought forward regarding the minister visiting or the officials visiting with regard to the children who were found in Kamloops.

I say that because, of course, it's urgent; it's timely, and it's something we need to look at. I would not want the committee to let that fall off either, though I recognize that we are looking down the barrel of three meetings and that is all we have left together.

The Chair: Yes, we have three meetings left.

Just for clarification, in September we don't really have the schedule per se. If we maintain the current one then, yes, Ms. McPherson is right that we would have one meeting, so please bear that in mind. That is, of course, dealing with anti-Asian racism, and our self-imposed deadline is September 21.

Ms. Dabrusin.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: I think we're slowly coming to a bit of agreement on the idea of starting with Mr. Waugh's study. I am not seeing complete agreement, but at least I think I heard that from Ms. McPherson as well. Given that it's Indigenous History Month and that Indigenous Peoples Day is on Monday, there are a lot of reasons, and I think it's a pressing issue that many Canadians are very concerned about.

My suggestion with regard to ordering, which is what we're talking about at this point, is that we could start with that study on Friday. Then on Monday, if we wanted to, we could go to Mr. Rayes's study about copyright, which requires a meeting before the end of the sitting.

The sports study, I agree, is important. The only concern, if I heard Ms. Bessette correctly, is that it requires more time than just one meeting, so that gives us some time to actually come up with a full witness list and a study plan, so that maybe could be what we would choose to kick off with when we get back in September.

That is my suggestion.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Dabrusin.

You're proposing this Friday to start with Mr. Waugh's study, and then on Monday to go to the copyright study—the publishing one.

All right. We've heard those.

Mr. Champoux.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martin Champoux: Mr. Waugh's motion is extremely important, but I wonder how much of it falls under the purview of the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage and not the Standing Committee on Indigenous and Northern Affairs.

Many issues are dealt with by our committee and others at the same time, but in this case, I wonder why this issue is not instead being dealt with as a priority by the Standing Committee on Indigenous and Northern Affairs rather than the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage.

[*English*]

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Mr. Chair, can I answer that question?

The Chair: One moment, please.

The question was directed at Mr. Waugh. I probably should give him the option of voicing his opinion, if he so desires, or I could just go to Ms. Dabrusin.

Mr. Waugh, could you just hold your microphone close to your mouth when you speak?

Mr. Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon—Grasswood, CPC): Yes. I believe it is timely, Mr. Chair. That is the reason. Canadian Heritage gave \$40,000 as a grant for the radar ground penetration. Other indigenous groups are asking if they can get the same grant for the machine, to find the bodies spread out over this country.

I know you're having trouble hearing me, so that's all I'll say. The heritage department gave the \$40,000 for the radar equipment, and that's why there are big stories about this everywhere in this country.

The Chair: Okay.

Ms. Dabrusin, did you want to comment on that?

• (1135)

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Just to reaffirm what Mr. Waugh said, it was the pathway to healing program, and it was a heritage-funded part, so it does actually fall within heritage, this piece.

The Chair: Thanks to both of you for that clarification.

Mr. Rayes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Ms. Dabrusin's proposal is very compelling, and the issue raised by Mr. Waugh is timely and topical. As the saying goes, "let's strike while the iron is hot". So I feel we should, as Ms. Dabrusin suggests, start to address this issue on Friday. I also agree with her proposal to work on the copyright issue on Monday.

To follow through on Mr. Champoux's request to send a clear message, given the complexity of the issue, I feel we're going to spend a lot of time on the study he is requesting, which I want to

say is very timely. Perhaps we could get a unanimous motion from the committee, which would demonstrate how important the issue is to us, so that when we return to the House, the committee will have been able to prepare over the summer and taken steps to present a plan. That way, all members will have time to send in their list of witnesses from different associations and experts on the subject and we could get to work on it as soon as the House is back in session. The subject will still be topical, I'm sure, because it's a big issue and we need to deal with it.

That would send a clear message, given the importance of the issue. Since we don't have enough time, we can start to tackle it, but postpone it until later. I would rather do it right when the House is back in session.

[*English*]

The Chair: Mr. Housefather.

Mr. Anthony Housefather (Mount Royal, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I also agree that it would be timely to do Mr. Waugh's study on Friday. I think everybody in the country is talking about what happened with residential schools, and as Monday is National Indigenous Peoples Day, I think this is the time to do it.

[*Translation*]

I'd like to address Mr. Champoux's question, because as a former athlete, I feel this is a really important issue. Perhaps on Monday we could invite representatives from two national organizations, including the Canadian Olympic Committee, just to kick off the study so that Canadians can address and discuss the issue over the summer. In the fall, we could return to the study in much greater depth.

This is a very important issue. I believe we could begin studying it on Monday, but I will concur with the committee's decision.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you.

I'm seeing a couple of things here that are starting to line up. After today's meeting, we have two meetings left.

I'm hearing that we should start with the motion put forward regarding the Kamloops residential school issue on Friday, and then the following Monday we'll debate the motion on educational publishing in Canada.

Do I see any dissension from that? I don't see any, and it looks like we can put that to rest for the end of this spring.

I would like to have some direction, though, about where....

Mr. Louis, go ahead.

Mr. Tim Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga, Lib.): Are we limited? Mr. Waugh's motion is important. Is there a hard deadline if we find a good discussion? Does that have to stop in one meeting? Is that something we have to put in, or are we starting with that study?

The Chair: That's a valid point. Here's what I will put forward for the committee to consider.

The deadline you speak of is on the calendar. It's September 21. We don't know what the exact schedule is going to be when we reconvene in September, when the House sits again, but we do have a hard deadline of 180 days.

Here's what we could do. On Friday, we will have our initial meeting, and at the end of that meeting, we can have a discussion as to where to go from here. Again, this is a self-imposed deadline. It's not as strict. Maybe at the end of that meeting, if a motion is required to change it, we can do that.

Does everyone understand? I'm just saying to have the first meeting this Friday, and at the end of that meeting we can make a decision on where to go from there.

Mr. Champoux, go ahead.

• (1140)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martin Champoux: Mr. Chair, you say we're going to start the study at the first meeting, which is on Friday, but I'm not sure I understand what study you're talking about. The proposal we were discussing seemed to be to begin considering Mr. Waugh's motion and then consider Mr. Rayes's motion on Monday.

Currently, you seem to be talking about the anti-Asian racism study. Could you clarify that?

[*English*]

The Chair: My goodness, yes, I was. You're right. I was wondering why people looked so puzzled. I confused the two. I apologize. The 180 calendar days was from the anti-Asian motion.

One of the great things about being the chair of this committee is that you're so much smarter than I am. You're the best. I love it.

Nevertheless, that aside, we should probably still run the same type of thing this coming Friday. This Friday, we can have the full meeting, and at the end of the meeting, we can make a decision from there.

How's that? Thank you for your patience.

On Monday, we can follow up with the educational publishing in Canada issue regarding copyright.

That being said, would you like to start a discussion as to what our priority could be when we come back?

Here's the situation. At the end of June, this type of format will not be sanctioned anymore. Obviously, something has to be done, but nevertheless, that sort of thing ends, so most of the conversations, I would assume, when it comes to organizing the fall, will occur offline.

We can correspond through Aimée, the clerk, and we can decide how we want to organize by helping to set up witnesses before we come back.

However, that being said, there are several motions there. Do we have any thoughts on what we'd like to do when we reconvene in the fall? I'm just looking for a general priority list.

I see Mr. Rayes.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Chair, I feel if you were to ask the entire committee, they would reply that we should start with the study requested by Mr. Champoux. There will be ample time for the clerks, analysts and staff to put together a plan so that we can send out the lists of witnesses that we would like to call for the study.

That is what we'd like to propose in order to send a clear message about the importance of this issue.

[*English*]

The Chair: Does anyone else have any opinions on the fall? I won't say it would be written in stone, but possibly a priority list. I'll just leave it at that for now.

Seeing no further discussion, I'll leave Mr. Rayes' comment as the final comment on that.

We have two meetings left. We've come to the decision that on Friday, we will discuss Mr. Waugh's motion. We'll start that study. Then the following Monday we will have one meeting, as requested, on educational publishing in Canada. That will take us to the end of the spring sitting for the committee.

Is there any other business anyone wishes to discuss?

I apologize. Aimée just sent me a friendly little note reminding me about a witness list. We need some ideas on a witness list for this coming Friday.

Mr. Waugh, did you want to start? I don't know if you're able to put your hand up, but I think you may want to weigh in on this.

Could I just get you to hold on to your microphone again?

Mr. Kevin Waugh: Yes. In the motion it was department officials. The second one was the chief of the residential schools from the Kamloops area. We may want more in the second hour, and that's fine, but the first hour would be the department officials, because I believe they've received a lot of requests for this branch. The second one would be Kamloops.

We can send you the information from Kamloops. We'll get some names and numbers for you.

• (1145)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Martin Champoux: Mr. Chair, unfortunately we have no interpretation.

[English]

The Chair: I'm sorry. I will just rephrase what Mr. Waugh said, which was that the people who are specifically mentioned in the motion are there. To expand on that, if you want others, you have to let us know as soon as possible.

Mr. Waugh, with a nod, were those the only people right now?

He says yes. The people mentioned in the motion are the people he wishes to invite for that particular meeting.

Madam Dabrusin.

Ms. Julie Dabrusin: Just following up on what Mr. Waugh said, there are certain witnesses who are listed directly within the motion. If there's a belief that we need additional witnesses, we could maybe provide some names by a certain date, rather than discussing it here.

You probably still have a full crew, based on what's said in the motion that Mr. Waugh set out. If, for some reason, part of that witness list doesn't work out, maybe it might make sense for us to have until.... I don't know. I would rely on the clerk for what's a reasonable timeline, given it's such a short timeline. We could provide additional names. Perhaps that might be one way of dealing with it.

The Chair: Mr. Champoux.

[Translation]

Mr. Martin Champoux: If we make it possible to add more witnesses to fill the time left in the meeting schedule for this brief study, I'd like to know how that will work.

Obviously, we need to stick to a ratio. Generally, when the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party call four or five witnesses, the Bloc Québécois and the NDP only have one to call. We would then have to make sure that we still respect the fact that each party will want to call witnesses.

[English]

The Chair: Yes. What I will do is this. We'll stick to the witness list as put in the motion itself, and then we can make a decision at the end of the meeting. I just wanted to make sure everyone was comfortable with that.

The other witness list I was speaking of was the one for Monday, which is Mr. Rayes's motion on educational publishing. We need to establish a deadline, which would be Wednesday, normally, two days from now. However, I would stress to everyone here, when it comes to that one meeting on educational publishing in Canada, please send the list to us as soon as possible, because we have to set it up. Since we have Friday and Monday meetings, it's like we have to set up witnesses for two meetings at once during the week.

I won't say anything further about the witness lists.

Mr. Rayes, it was your motion. Did you want to comment on any potential witnesses? Would you rather just send in your names in the next little while?

[Translation]

Mr. Alain Rayes: Mr. Chair, there are two major Canadian organizations. I'm sure that once each party sends you their list, the two main witnesses will be listed more than once. If we have a third, I

will rely on your and your staff's expertise to complete the list. If I count correctly, since we will have a meeting, we will hear from no more than three groups.

I will have someone from my office send you the names of the two major organizations, if they have not already done so. We can even do it by the end of the meeting, if everyone agrees, and make it easier for you.

[English]

The Chair: Okay. If we need to discuss it on Friday at the end, I'll clear a few minutes for that as well. Friday and Monday, I have specific deadlines, and obviously Wednesday. Honestly, if you have someone in mind, please send it to us as soon as possible, given the tight time frame we are under.

That being said, is there anything further?

On these two meetings, do you want to do the format that we ended with before Bill C-10, which was a two-hour meeting with no break, and let's say we have...? Well, it doesn't matter how many witnesses we have.

Would you rather do the two hours with all witnesses, or would you rather break it up, hour to hour, and then have different witnesses?

Mr. Champoux.

• (1150)

[Translation]

Mr. Martin Champoux: I will just share a thought, Mr. Chair.

I feel like it would be somewhat tactful if we reserve a period of time for the people directly involved in the Kamloops tragedy where they would be the only witnesses. It's just a thought that comes to mind. If we call witnesses who are not as directly involved in what happened at the residential school, we could schedule a separate time for them to appear.

[English]

The Chair: Okay. I think we're going to stick to the witnesses that are within Mr. Waugh's motion for now. I totally agree.

In the meantime, I'll schedule it for a full two hours with how many witnesses we have, and we'll see how far we go with that.

Is there any other business that anyone would like to bring up?

Great. Thank you, everyone.

The meeting is adjourned.

We will see you on Friday at our usual place and usual time.

Published under the authority of the Speaker of
the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

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 House of Commons website at the following address: <https://www.ourcommons.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité
du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

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 des communes.

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 de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante :
<https://www.noscommunes.ca>