



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

---

# Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs

EVIDENCE

**NUMBER 095**

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

---

Chair: Mr. Emmanuel Dubourg





## Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs

Wednesday, May 22, 2024

• (1710)

[English]

**The Chair (Mr. Emmanuel Dubourg (Bourassa, Lib.)):** I call this meeting to order.

Welcome to meeting number 95 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Veteran Affairs.

[Translation]

We are meeting today to discuss committee business.

Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format, pursuant to the Standing Orders. Members are attending in person in the room and remotely using the Zoom application.

As you know, it is very important to avoid acoustic incidents; we have to be careful. I would therefore ask members and those participating in the meeting in person to read the cards that are on the table to determine the guidelines to be followed in order to prevent acoustic incidents. Please keep in mind the preventive measures to protect the health and safety of all participants, including interpreters.

As you can see, there is a sticker on the table to put your earpiece on when you're not using it. When you are speaking, please refrain from bringing the earpiece close to the microphone to prevent feedback. These sound feedback events are dangerous for the interpreters. Thank you in advance for your co-operation.

I'd also like to remind you that all comments should be addressed through the chair.

Finally, allow me to say hello to our colleagues who are replacing members of the committee.

Today, we welcome Mr. Ste-Marie, who is here to replace Mr. Desilets. Mr. Paul-Hus is replacing Mr. Tolmie. Mr. Kitchen is here to replace Ms. Wagantall. Lastly, Ms. Damoff is replacing Mr. Sarai and is participating in the meeting by video conference.

Welcome to you all.

The last time we met for something other than our study on women veterans, we talked about an agreement. In addition, subamendments had been proposed to the amendment introduced by Mr. Casey, and they were adopted. We will now resume debate on the motion as amended.

Mr. Ste-Marie, the floor is yours.

• (1715)

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie (Joliette, BQ):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

It's a pleasure to be here today. I want to say hello to all the members of the committee. Mr. Chair, I recognize your great expertise in the art of shepherding the committee brilliantly.

At the March 18 meeting, it was agreed that, after the study on women veterans, we would return to the study of subamendments.

As the chair said, I'm replacing my colleague Luc Desilets. I support the motion as presented. I think the amendment and the subamendment may be interesting, but I think they dilute the essence of the motion, which is to shed light on the reasons why the rules of the competition were not followed to the end.

If I understand correctly, the amendment and the subamendment add another subject. In fact, we're saying that we're interested in the timeline. However, the purpose of the motion, as it stands, is to invite people who will help us understand why the process wasn't followed. That's obviously my party's position.

Since I'm loyal to my colleague and friend Luc Desilets, I will support the motion. Although I don't find the amendment and the subamendment uninteresting, I don't think they have any purpose. Therefore, I will not be voting in favour of them.

That's my position, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Ste-Marie.

Mr. Casey, you now have the floor.

[English]

**Mr. Sean Casey (Charlottetown, Lib.):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I have a couple of things to start. First of all, the notice of meeting indicated that we'd be embarking on committee business today, which I took to mean the planning of future business. There's been no motion presented to resume debate on any other motion, so I think it's a bit presumptuous that we launched into that without the prerequisite required.

I presume that Mr. Richards would like to have the floor. We're all really looking forward to what he has to say when he does have the floor, but right now he doesn't have the floor.

With that, Mr. Chair, I would move that, given that the planning of future business is something that is contemplated on the notice of meeting—

**The Chair:** Excuse me. Mr. Richards has a point of order.

**Mr. Blake Richards (Banff—Airdrie, CPC):** Mr. Chair, my understanding of the meeting, and I recognize the way the notice read, but all members of this committee will recall that when we last—

**Ms. Lisa Hefner (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.):** That's not a point of order. That's debate.

**Mr. Blake Richards:** If you'd like to let me finish—

**Ms. Lisa Hefner:** On what standing order?

**Mr. Blake Richards:** The chair will determine that, please.

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Mr. Blake Richards:** We had an agreement as a committee. We all agreed that we were going to finish the two things that we agreed we were going to finish—

**Ms. Lisa Hefner:** This is debate. You don't have the floor.

**Mr. Blake Richards:** —and we were going to immediately return to this. Mr. Casey has indicated he's about to make a motion of some other kind.

Chair, you had indicated at the start of the meeting that we were going to discuss this.

**The Chair:** Yes, I know, but—

**Mr. Blake Richards:** I'm asking that you rule on whether we're on the—

**Ms. Lisa Hefner:** You're talking over everyone else, including the chair. You don't have the floor. It's not a point of order.

**The Chair:** Excuse me, please.

**Mr. Blake Richards:** I do have the floor, thank you.

**The Chair:** I gave the floor to Mr. Casey because he hadn't said anything about his motion yet. I can't presume what he's going to do.

**Mr. Blake Richards:** Chair, what I'm asking you to rule on is that you had indicated at the top of the meeting you were going to return to this. I'm asking you to rule on whether that is what we are on or not. Otherwise, Mr. Casey will be able to move a motion despite the fact that you as chair have ruled otherwise, so please tell us if your ruling is that we are—

**The Chair:** Yes.

Mr. Richards, yes—

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie:** Mr. Chair, I also have a point of order.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Mr. Richards, as I said, I don't know his intentions, so he has to finish.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie:** I also have a point of order.

**The Chair:** Mr. Ste-Marie, you have the floor for a point of order.

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm not a regular member of this committee, but I had understood, based on the minutes of March 18 and the information you

provided at the beginning of the meeting, that we were picking up where we left off.

• (1720)

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie:** I took the floor on the assumption that we were debating this.

**The Chair:** Okay.

That's not a point of order.

Mr. Casey started talking, and now we're going all over the place.

[*English*]

**Mr. Bryan May (Cambridge, Lib.):** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Mr. Brian May, please.

**Mr. Bryan May:** They may have just turned it on, but there was no interpretation for that entire exchange.

**The Chair:** Okay, let us check.

Is it okay now?

**Mr. Bryan May:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair.

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

As I said, let's go back to Sean Casey.

Sean Casey, you have the floor.

**Mr. Sean Casey:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Given that committee business is what's indicated on the notice of meeting, given that committee business affords us an opportunity to plan future business because we don't have anything planned for the rest of the calendar, at least in terms of nailing down what we're going to do, given that committee business is normally done in camera, I move that we go in camera.

**The Chair:** We have to take a vote.

Well, first of all, do I have unanimous consent to go in camera?

**Mr. Blake Richards:** You certainly do not because Liberals cannot keep their word.

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** I'll turn it over to the clerk for a recorded vote.

(Motion negated: nays 6; yeas 5)

**The Chair:** We're continuing the discussion on the amendment as presented by Mr. Casey, and on which Mr. Ste-Marie spoke.

Is there any further discussion?

[English]

**Mr. Blake Richards:** Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

You indicated that we're on an amendment by Mr. Casey. Can you indicate what the amendment is that we're actually debating then?

**The Chair:** First of all, I have to say that there was an amendment from Mr. Casey, and there were subamendments from Ms. Blaney and Mr. Sarai. Those subamendments were adopted.

**Mr. Blake Richards:** Could you read, Mr. Chair, the amendment that we are debating?

**The Chair:** For the benefit of all, I'll read it in English first.

Sean Casey moved that the motion be amended by adding after paragraph (d) the following:

(e) That the committee write a letter to the National Capital Commission (NCC) in regards to their role in the construction of the National Monument to Canada's Mission in Afghanistan to assure the committee that the project will respect established deadlines and that Afghanistan war veterans who wish to see the monument built quickly will not experience additional delays.

That's the amendment we're talking about.

• (1725)

**Mr. Blake Richards:** For clarification, where is this being added?

**The Chair:** Pardon me?

**Mr. Blake Richards:** I don't recall this amendment, so I'm trying to understand it. Where does it fit in the motion?

**The Chair:** Maybe Sean can explain. Before, it said "That the committee invite". Ms. Blaney amended it to say "That the committee write a letter to".

After that, Mr. Sarai added, "If the response is not satisfactory to members of the committee then the NCC officials responsible be asked to appear before the committee for no more than one meeting." That's what we have.

**Mr. Blake Richards:** I guess I'm unclear. Who are we writing a letter to, and what are we asking for? I don't recall this being ever moved, so that's why I'm trying to understand.

**The Chair:** Yes, exactly.

Give me one second.

Both of the subamendments were adopted in the last meeting.

**Mr. Blake Richards:** Sure. However, I don't recall this amendment. I remember some amendments. There was an amendment Mr. Casey made that was asking to add a part (c) asking for Erin O'Toole to appear. I remember that. I remember there was an amendment made about correspondence for the members of the jury. I do not recall this one.

Again, can you clarify where in the original motion this is being placed? To whom is the letter being written, and we're asking for what?

**The Chair:** Listen, I know we were in discussion about the report on women veterans. First of all, Sean Casey can add to that. He presented the amendment to your motion saying, "That the committee invite the Hon. Erin O'Toole, former minister"—

**Mr. Blake Richards:** Yes, I recall that.

**The Chair:** —and "that the Department...provide the official report of the jury".

We also have two subamendments. One is from Ms. Blaney and the other one is from Mr. Sarai. Those two amendments were adopted. That's why I said we are now discussing the amendment presented by Mr. Casey after the subamendment was adopted.

Thank you.

**Mr. Blake Richards:** What you're saying is that the amendment to invite Erin O'Toole.... I won't read the whole thing. We all understand.

**The Chair:** That's what we are discussing right now.

**Mr. Blake Richards:** That amendment was passed. Is that correct?

There was also an amendment I recall about producing the correspondence received from the members of the jury since June 2023. I believe that amendment was made, and I believe it was passed, as well. I could be mistaken. Now you're talking about a third amendment. Maybe that one was defeated. It is indicated here in my notes that this amendment was on February 12.

Chair, I'm not the only one who appears to be confused here, from what I see in the room. Perhaps we could ask you, the clerk or the analyst to read us the motion as it stands with whatever amendments have been made to it. That could indicate to us what the amendment on the floor is. There still seems to be quite a bit of confusion about what's going on here.

• (1730)

**The Chair:** Okay, wait a second.

[Translation]

To respond to Mr. Richards' point and also to clarify what we're resuming discussion on, I'll begin by reading Mr. Richards' motion as amended. I'll then read the proposed amendments.

[English]

**Mr. Wilson Miao (Richmond Centre, Lib.):** Mr. Chair, is it possible to circulate that to all the members of the committee, so we have something to follow?

**The Chair:** Okay. Yes. The clerk is going to send it to your P9, but I'm going to read it too. It reads:

That in relation to its study on the National Monument to Canada's Mission in Afghanistan, the committee

(a) Invite the Deputy Commander of Military Personnel, Lieutenant-General Lise Bourgon; and

(b) order the production of all memoranda, briefing notes, e-mails, correspondence or any other records of conversations or communications (including text messages, Microsoft Teams messages, WhatsApp messages, Signal messages or other electronic messaging) with regard to the National Monument to Canada's Mission in Afghanistan, transmitted, since May 1, 2014, between

- (i) the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Office of the Minister of Veterans Affairs,
- (ii) the Department of Canadian Heritage and the Office of the Minister of Canadian Heritage,
- (iii) the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Privy Council Office,
- (iv) the Department of Canadian Heritage and the Privy Council Office,
- (v) the Privy Council Office and the Office of the Prime Minister,
- (vi) the Office of the Minister of Veterans Affairs and the Office of the Prime Minister, and
- (vii) the Office of the Minister of Canadian Heritage and the Office of the Prime Minister, provided that these documents shall be provided to the clerk of the committee, in both official languages and without redaction, within 21 days of the adoption of this motion.

[Translation]

The amendments are as follows:

- (c) That the committee invite the Hon. Erin O'Toole, former minister of Veterans Affairs, to respond to questions about the selection of Richmond Landing site in 2014 for the National Monument to Canada's Mission in Afghanistan, and specifically why Veterans were not properly consulted.
- d) And that the Department of Veterans Affairs Canada and the Department of Canadian Heritage provide the official report of the jury established for the selection of the firm responsible for the design of the National Monument to Canada's Mission in Afghanistan.

That is the amended motion that we are now debating.

Now, here is the last amendment that has been moved and that we are debating:

- (1735)

[English]

That the motion be amended by adding after paragraph (d) the following:

- (e) That the committee write a letter to the National Capital Commission (NCC) in regards to their role in the construction of the National Monument to Canada's Mission in Afghanistan to assure the committee that the project will respect established deadlines and that Afghanistan war veterans who wish to see the monument built quickly will not experience additional delays. If the response is not satisfactory to the members of the committee then the NCC officials responsible be asked to appear before the committee for no more than one meeting.

Is that clear now?

Okay.

[Translation]

Thank you.

[English]

We'll move to debate.

Mr. Casey.

**Mr. Sean Casey:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I just want to be clear. We've been provided with a copy of the original motion as amended. The first document we received is the original motion along with the amendments that we have adopted. Is that right? The second document is an amendment that I put forward, and there were two subamendments proposed to that amendment.

My question is whether we have completed debate and adopted those two subamendments.

**The Chair:** That's right.

**Mr. Sean Casey:** Then the debate is on the second page, with what's in red being incorporated into it.

**The Chair:** That's it exactly, yes.

**Mr. Sean Casey:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** You're welcome.

Would you like to intervene, Mr. Miao?

**Mr. Wilson Miao:** I also understand that PS Randeep Sarai also put in an amendment to that. Are we discussing that piece together with what MP Sean Casey has proposed?

**The Chair:** As Sean said, the things in red are what we are discussing.

The intervention of Mr. Sarai is to be discussed. If the response is not satisfactory, we will invite the NCC to appear before us.

Ms. Hepfner, go ahead.

**Ms. Lisa Hepfner:** Thank you.

Mr. Chair, I have a subamendment to Mr. Casey's motion:

That the amendment be amended by adding after the words "one meeting" the following:

That the letter that the committee sends to the NCC request the following information: (a) What is the contractually prescribed building time? (b) What is the currently estimated building time by the NCC architect and project manager? (c) The design is said to be more complex than usual for monuments in the NCR. What are the complexities of the design, and what is the impact that they estimate it will have on the construction cost and timelines? (d) What are the steps and milestones that have been planned for this construction project? (e) What is the current status of the project and concrete steps in construction? (f) What risks have been identified for this construction project?

I think these are all really important details that, if we're going to go forward with this study, we would need to be aware of.

Thank you.

- (1740)

**The Chair:** My understanding is that with your intervention, you would like to have those points included in the letter we're going to send to the NCC, Ms. Hepfner. Is that correct?

**Ms. Lisa Hepfner:** Exactly.

Thank you.

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Mr. Ste-Marie, you have the floor.

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I thank our honourable colleague for the subamendment he is proposing.

I understand that the amendment seeks to determine what the implementation timelines are and that the subamendment specifies what is being requested. For my part, I will repeat what I said at the beginning of the meeting: Looking at the issues of timelines and everything may be interesting, but my party's position is that the purpose of the motion is really to shed light on the process in order to understand why the rules of the competition weren't respected until the end. Even though the amendment and the subamendment may lead to an interesting investigation into the issue of timelines, for us, they are a diversion.

As I announced earlier, I will be voting against this subamendment for the reasons stated. The same goes for the amendment.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Casey, and then Mr. Richards.

[*English*]

**Mr. Sean Casey:** Mr. Chair, I would like to speak in favour of the subamendment.

First of all, regarding the amendment as initially put forward and subsequently amended, it initially called for the National Capital Commission to appear. Then Ms. Blaney, I expect in the interest of efficiency, made a subamendment so that we would ask for a letter as opposed to a witness. Then we subsequently agreed to a subamendment proposed by Mr. Sarai to say if the letter wasn't good enough, we would bring in people to talk about this.

What spurred all of this on was concerns, whether legitimate or not, over a delay in the commencement of the project. The primary reason for wanting to hear from the National Capital Commission was to be able to reassure veterans that the project is on track, that there are established deadlines and that those deadlines would be met.

I think the subamendment keeps within the spirit of that original amendment but adds some specificity. I think it would be welcomed by the veterans community to know exactly what the deadlines are that we're looking at and requiring some detail from the National Capital Commission, including their architect and project manager.

The third bullet talks about the complexity of the project and something like this being at the upper end of the range of level of complexity that the National Capital Commission is accustomed to dealing with, as well as some details on the complexities and how they would impact the construction cost and timelines. This is all good information to be disseminated to veterans who are obviously anxious to have this done. As well it asks for details around the steps and milestones.

I think number five is particularly important in that people will want to know the current status of the project and the next steps in construction. My expectation is that comments that meet that requirement would also indicate whether and how there have been any delays to date.

Our position has been that while it's all well and good to have this discussion here around whether it should be team Daoust or

team Stimson, the proper place for those discussions at this stage of the game is, quite frankly, in a court of law. Given that there has been no legal action commenced, given that there has been no application for an interim or interlocutory injunction, there is absolutely no reason that the project shouldn't be going forward. This letter should be able to provide the comfort to the community, to the public, to veterans, that this is in fact the case.

Finally, risks identified for the construction project would also be valuable information to give people some sense of the road that lies ahead.

I think it's a good amendment. It's an amendment that would give the NCC better marching orders for what is expected of them when they put pen to paper.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (1745)

[*Translation*]

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

Mr. Richards.

[*English*]

After him it will be Mr. Paul-Hus.

**Mr. Blake Richards:** Listening to the Liberals talk about wanting to assure veterans that there are no delays and about wondering whether there have been delays really makes me think it's pretty obvious to everybody why nothing ever gets done when they're in government. Do we really need to debate whether there have been delays or try to assure someone there haven't been delays? I don't think there's a veteran out there who would say there hasn't been a delay.

We have passed the 10-year anniversary of the end of this mission already. This monument was announced almost 10 years ago. This government has been in power for nine years, and nothing has happened. Zero has happened in that entire nine years. To even have any doubt about whether there have been delays or to try to assure veterans that we don't want to see any further delays, I don't think is even credible at this point. Clearly there's a delay, and the whole point of this motion is to try to get to the bottom of why the Prime Minister's Office interfered to cause those delays.

What we're seeing, in trying to deal with that and to get the documents that are required in order to determine what actually happened here, which is what we're trying to do as a committee, are endless numbers of amendments, subamendments and filibustering tactics. It seems like it's going to be never-ending. This has gone on for months, just trying to pass a simple motion to ask for some documents and to try to find out what happened here. We even had the Minister of Veterans Affairs come to this committee not that long ago and say, "Yes, we'll be happy to provide the documents," so I don't really understand why the Liberal members of this committee are still trying to cover up for the Prime Minister when the veterans affairs minister herself said she'd be happy to let them provide the documents.

Why don't we just make a separate motion if they want to deal with some of these other things? These are not really all that relevant to the motion. I'm not uncomfortable at all with the idea of any of that happening. What we need here are the documents to figure out why the Prime Minister's Office interfered to delay this thing and let this thing get built so that veterans can finally have what they deserve for the mission that they served in. Why don't we just pass the motion and get the documents dealt with? If there are other things that they want to study related to the monument we can always deal with that.

This has gone on for months and veterans are sick and tired of it, Chair, so let's get on with it. Let's get the vote done and get these documents produced.

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Mr. Paul-Hus, you have the floor.

**Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I was present at the meeting during which this motion was moved and a request was made to shed light on the matter of the National Monument to Canada's Mission in Afghanistan. Since then, for months and months, we've been using veterans.

As a veteran myself, I see that veterans are always used to justify that we want to move things forward in their favour.

Right now, however, we're doing a disservice to the memory of veterans. Based on the way things are going, it's clear that this file has been the subject of political interference, otherwise there wouldn't have been so much obstruction by the Liberals from the start.

About two weeks ago, I was surprised to hear the Minister of Veterans Affairs was willing to provide information. Why then, as my colleague said, is Mr. Casey now trying to have us adopt an amendment that seeks to add timelines, when they're saying that the matter should be settled in court?

So is there political interference? Has there been any criminal action or action against the Labour Code, or anything else? Has any action been taken that has created such a serious problem that the government is doing everything it can to withdraw from the file?

Right now, the excuse is that things are urgent. Yet veterans can wait. The monument will be erected in memory of the mission in Afghanistan.

In my opinion, there are games and political decisions behind erecting this monument. What kind of attachment will veterans have to their monument if it's erected not as a memory of a mission, but as a result of purely political decisions made by the Liberal government?

The government was unable to provide any explanation other than the bogus survey of veterans, when it's been shown that it was nonsense. We know that a political decision is involved, but we've never been able to find out why.

As my colleague Mr. Richards told you, the basic motion is simple. That's why it's important for the Minister of Veterans Affairs to agree to co-operate. All that is needed is for the Department of

Canadian Heritage, the Privy Council Office and the Prime Minister's Office to do the same so that we can get to the bottom of this.

If there's nothing to hide, it'll be simple, and we can move on. However, we now seem to be seeing that there is something to hide. That's why we're continuing to exert pressure with our colleagues from the Bloc Québécois and the NDP, who seem to agree with our approach.

As a veteran myself, it's mainly using veterans as an excuse that I don't accept.

Thank you.

• (1750)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Paul-Hus.

We'll now go to Mr. May.

[*English*]

**Mr. Bryan May:** Thank you kindly, Mr. Chair.

I'm not entirely sure where to start with all of that.

First and foremost, this process we're undergoing right now is committee business. I think it needs to be stated that this should be in camera so we can have this conversation and hammer these things out. I think it's incredibly inappropriate that we're doing this not in camera, but the committee has spoken.

That said, Mr. Richards talked about the time and the delay of this monument. I think if you reached across the floor and you asked that we would disagree that this monument has taken far too long to be completed, but I think it's very disingenuous to suggest that it is entirely the current government that has caused this delay. Mr. Richards knows well that the—

**Ms. Lisa Hepfner:** I have a point of order, Chair.

I can't hear Mr. May because the Conservatives across the way are having so much fun giggling, making fun and talking over everyone else.

It's really loud in this room, guys. Have some respect. Have some civility, please.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Please keep it quiet.

Let's go back to Mr. May. We want to listen to Mr. May.

Please go ahead.

**Mr. Bryan May:** I thank my honourable colleague for that intervention. To be honest, the advantage of being virtual is that I don't have to hear that nonsense, so thank you. It didn't disrupt me one little bit.



I think it's important to get back to the facts. The fact is that when we were elected, this plan was flawed. It had to be started all over again. The chosen location was flawed, and I don't think anybody disagrees with that. I've not heard Conservatives stand up and say that it should have been built where they said. I think everybody agrees that process was flawed, that it was a mistake and that we needed to start over.

However, this has become a challenge in terms of our time on this committee. I've said a number of times publicly that the mission creep on this study is significant. We've now had several meetings on this. We even brought in Daoust to discuss their side of this. The opposition didn't get the scandal they wanted to find and so they're trying to dig deeper.

I think it's incredibly inappropriate to accuse us, on the government side, of using veterans as a pretext, when that's exactly what the Conservatives are doing right now and what they continue to do. We know that this kind of tactic to delay any kind of feasible study is happening across committees.

Again, I want to point out Mr. Richards' hypocrisy in his statement just now when, in fact, as we speak, he is promoting a petition to take us all the way back to the beginning of this process and to start over.

I think it's important to recognize that the subamendment and the amendment that Mr. Casey put forward are to ensure that we, the government, and Veterans Affairs and commemoration can demonstrate that all this political nonsense happening in this committee right now, and has been for months, is not impacting the actual construction of this monument. That's the point. When we're talking about wanting to bring assurances to veterans, that's what we're talking about.

For Mr. Richards to suggest that nothing has happened, that nothing is happening, shows why we need to bring those officials in. Mr. Casey's original motion was to have them stand as witnesses to answer his questions. That was amended to a letter, which will hopefully answer the questions that this committee has, but I think we really need to look hard and fast at what is really important to veterans right now. I've met with dozens of veterans, just in the last week, to talk about a number of different issues, and not one talked about this monument or talked about the delays in this monument.

We know there are really big issues. I have two motions. One has been agreed to by this committee, and I'm not sure we're ever going to actually get to it at this rate. I've tabled another motion that I'd like to discuss at this committee, which actually impacts veterans, in real time, and impacts their careers after the military.

You would think that members of this committee would want to talk about those issues, would want to try to find options and solutions for those issues, but instead, we are going to continue to re-hash something that we've already talked about and already met about. We've already brought the minister and officials in to talk to, and we continue to waste the time of this committee.

I appreciated the pause that was offered to get us through the women's study. I want to acknowledge that. The Conservatives paused this to allow us to move that forward, and I want to thank them publicly for the ability to do that.

• (1755)

It doesn't change the fact that we have a laundry list of motions to tackle on this committee that deserve our attention and require urgency on our behalf if we're going to bring recommendations forward for the government to consider.

If we don't think any of those motions that we've already voted in favour of in this committee are worth discussing, so be it. If we think this is the biggest issue for veterans out there right now, so be it. I, personally, do not think that's the case, and I'm quite certain that veterans would agree.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

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

Ms. Hepfner, you have the floor.

**Ms. Lisa Hepfner:** Thank you, Chair.

I also wanted to point out the hypocrisy in the statements we heard from Mr. Richards a moment ago.

First of all, he's always trying to take the floor away from everybody else who has it. When he's speaking, he wants to make sure everyone is paying close attention to what he's saying. Otherwise, he wants to make sure that his voice is always heard.

Chair, do I have the floor?

• (1800)

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Ms. Lisa Hepfner:** Thank you.

What we heard from Mr. Richards, who's still having a conversation on the other side, is that it's the Prime Minister's fault we had a delay in this Afghan monument. In fact, as we've already heard today, it was the Conservatives who initially chose the wrong spot for this monument. The veterans were enraged with the location the Conservatives decided to put this monument on 10 years ago. You couldn't walk there in the winter. It was flooded in the spring. Now he wants to take us back to the beginning of the process and start it all over again.

Mr. Richards is really enjoying this, laughing and talking to his friends, while we're trying to have a conversation.

There's no delay to the monument, while we have these conversations. Just because there's a delay at the committee to get documents that you want to unearth, it doesn't mean there's a delay in actually building the monument for veterans, which is what veterans really want.

We've heard the Conservatives say that the Prime Minister was responsible for starting the fires in B.C.; that he's responsible for global inflation; that he's responsible for the delay in this monument. It's a witch hunt. It's not creating the delay in building this monument. The delay was caused when the Conservatives didn't consult with veterans before they decided where they were going to build this monument.

The monument is getting built. Veterans should be assured of that.

I'm a recent addition to this committee, and I have to say that I was blown away by the women veterans study. I want to thank MP Blaney for bringing that forward. I learned so much from that study. I think the public will want to read that to understand what's in it. This committee can accomplish really good work.

Right now it's just partisan games. We're not doing anything to build the monument by completing this study. The monument is getting built. It's just a witch hunt.

This is supposed to be a planning meeting. It's supposed to be in camera so that we can set out what our next study is going to be. I believe Ms. Blaney has another great idea for a study that we can follow...the experience of veterans. I can't remember exactly what it was. Why don't we get onto that page? Why are we rehashing old stuff that's not having any effect on veterans today?

We should be trying to make a difference for veterans today. We should be trying to improve their lives. We should be making sure they get health care, for example, when they leave the service.

Anyway, this is just partisan games, and I hope people who are watching understand that. It's not causing any delay in this monument. We believe it should be built quickly and properly, and that's going to happen regardless of what happens at this committee.

Thank you, Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Ms. Hepfner.

Let's start with Mr. Miao and then go to Mr. Paul-Hus.

Mr. Miao.

**Mr. Wilson Miao:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Coming back to this motion and amendment, I have to say that before some of the new members joined this committee I think we were all at the War Museum to celebrate and congratulate team Stimson on the design they proposed. I think we all had a great time at that opening ceremony at the War Museum. Some of us actually walked across the street to where the potential monument will be built.

In listening to the opposition saying that we are trying to delay this process, I hope this motion doesn't go through, for the fact that the construction process is still ongoing. In listening to some of the veterans I have met through this opportunity as a member of this committee, a lot of the Afghan veterans have stated that they don't want to wait any longer. If we are going to go back and fight against which team has a better design, I think we have heard clearly from our veterans that they feel the team Stimson design best reflects the Afghan war that happened to them. It's interesting to hear

also how some of us don't want to delay this process, but it is still ongoing, and I think it is important to continue to carry out the work without going back.

I do understand that there was a study on the Afghan monument previously. Our minister was also present in the committee to speak about that. As much as we can go back and forth on this, I think it's important to really listen to our veterans, to be that representation and to take on that responsibility as members in this standing committee to really interpret the willingness of what the veterans want.

As much as there are other conflicts happening around the world right now, I think it's important for us to reflect that we don't want to see these conflicts happening, and it's unfortunate that at the same time we are trying to get this monument built. Now that we have a location set and a design set, if there are any consequences to what the jury has decided, I think that will go into a legal process like my colleague, MP Sean Casey, mentioned earlier. It's really important that we move on and continue to represent the veterans that we are representing and to reflect on what is more important than going back and forth with the partisanship game.

I think that with this amendment, going back to it, it's important that we get the full answer, of course, but without disrupting the current process of the construction, because it's important that we can see this built soon.

With that, Chair, I would think it's important that we also continue to listen to the voice of our veterans, making sure that there's no blame that we're making to our government to delay this whole process.

That's all I'd like to share. Thank you.

• (1805)

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

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul-Hus, you now have the floor.

**Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm listening to my Liberal colleagues trying to justify everything they're doing right now, and most notably, I heard Mr. May say earlier that none of the many veterans he meets talk about the monument and that they have other priorities.

Mr. May's words warrant a pause. Political interference was detected before it was too late. Everything that's going on right now confirms that there has been political interference in a formal government process. This is the first time in history that a political decision has changed the outcome of a process conducted by a jury of experts who did their work and selected a proposal.

We want to consult the documents and hear the explanations—that's why the motion is simple—so that the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs can know, in an official and detailed manner, why such a political decision was made and how it could be justified. That said, a government process was not followed. All the witnesses who appeared before the committee confirmed that.

We tried to tinker with the choice of location in 2014. Again, that was a political decision. At the time, Mr. O'Toole, who was the minister, proposed a piece of land. Some refused. That's why a formal process was put in place to select the monument and what needed to be done. That's why we had to rely on these experts and not engage in political interference.

We simply want to know what led to this political interference in such a process. This undermines the credibility of all government processes in the coming years. There could be other government projects. If there's political interference every time, professionals will no longer want to bid or invest money in these programs. What if a political decision were to interfere with their work? They will no longer want to commit to projects, fearing that someone will make another decision by saying whatever they want.

Stop telling us that we're holding up the project. That's not what we're looking for. There hasn't been a shovel in the ground yet, and a major breach of process has already occurred. Could we just settle this matter and get the documents? Then we can decide to continue or stop and go back to the original choice, depending on the decision that's made.

All Mr. Casey is saying is that if the group feels aggrieved, all they have to do is file a lawsuit. Once again, the burden is being placed on the shoulders of the group that won the competition. It's being suggested that they go to court against the Government of Canada, which has overridden a government process. Does it make sense to force a company that has done everything by the book to fight the federal government for its rights? We have the opportunity to find out what happened, and that's all we're asking for.

Let's stop playing games. Let's stop using all kinds of excuses. Let's vote on the motion. Let's have the documents that will allow us to move forward. Everyone will have clear information and the memory of the 158 soldiers who died in Afghanistan will be kept alive.

Thank you.

• (1810)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Paul-Hus.

[*English*]

We'll now go to Ms. Blaney.

**Ms. Rachel Blaney (North Island—Powell River, NDP):** Thank you, Chair.

I have to say that I am feeling concerned. It does feel like we're stuck on this issue, and the debate just keeps happening and happening. I want to put on the record that I'm concerned, because I do feel quite passionately.... One study in particular that I really want to get to is regarding the Persian Gulf veterans. Some of their challenges are top of mind for me and are growing more concerning.

I'm encouraging everyone to just get to a place that we can get through this and get to the other side.

I agree there must be a process, and I don't want to focus again on who is doing the monument. The problem for me, and I've been consistent on this, is that the process wasn't clear. There was no verification in the process to make sure that the people who were responding were veterans. My VAC Account is not the best way to connect with veterans. That's been said in this committee numerous times.

There's something there that really concerns me. I appreciate what Mr. Casey said. I don't think we should be adjudicating it in our place. It is not our job in committee to do that. Our job is to look at process and figure out how we can fix the process moving forward. To me, that's the heart of the issue.

I hope we can get to a place so we can move forward. If we can't, I'm going to have to have some serious inner dialogue, because I am the one representative of my caucus here, about what's more important to veterans. I need to figure this out, and I hope to see a commitment to fix a process that is obviously flawed and concerning, or to work on things that really matter to veterans like the Persian Gulf veterans.

I want to put on the record that I'm in that place of indecisiveness. I'm encouraging everybody to please stop the games and just get to the point where we find a way to work together to redirect the process. Having a debate about what government was better for veterans is pointless.

We've seen terrible things from all sides in this place, so I would just encourage that we get there, and if not, we need to adjourn this debate and move on to what's next, because we're obviously not getting anywhere. We should perhaps examine other ways we can do that. I'm not moving that. I just want to be clear, but we need to discuss this, because how many committee meetings have we spent doing this? It's getting too long.

I'm disappointed in both sides, because it feels like the Liberals aren't saying, "Yes, the process is flawed. There should be a better process. Here's our commitment to make a better process." They're saying, "We didn't do anything wrong. We don't want to talk about it anymore." There was something wrong with that process. It wasn't a clear process, and it left us in a position where we were made to feel as a committee that we had to choose a side.

We should be able to say, "This is the process. The process was clearly followed, and let's move on." We couldn't say that in this situation, so let's get somewhere, please.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Blaney.

Next, I have Mr. Ste-Marie and Mr. May.

Before we adjourn a little bit later, we have to discuss our agenda and what we're going to do next week and the week after, because we still have six studies pending and more than 30 motions to discuss. Please have that in mind before we adjourn.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Ste-Marie, the floor is yours.

• (1815)

**Mr. Gabriel Ste-Marie:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Indeed, the firm that feels wronged can take legal action against the government, if it wishes, but I want to remind my colleagues on the committee that the role of elected officials on committees is to audit the work of the government.

We have a situation here that seems very concerning. There was a process in place. A jury was set up and submitted its official report, in which it designated the chosen firm, but the government subsequently reversed that decision on the basis of a survey that was not very objective or very scientific, I might add. So it raises questions.

The role of elected officials is really to shed light on this situation. Of course, legal action can be taken, at the private level, but the role of elected officials and a committee such as this one is really to examine what happened. Did the government live up to it? Has it risen to the occasion? Are the reasons it gives to elected officials valid? We are, collectively, in a way, the bosses of the government. We have to ask ourselves whether we trust its actions. Has the government shown itself to be worthy? Why didn't the government follow the process and respect the jury's decision?

So there are still a lot of questions to be asked on this subject, hence the motion, which I support, obviously. Some people say that this is a partisan motion. In my opinion, the great partisanship in all of this is that of a government that chooses not to respect the jury's official report. I think this is a fundamental issue, even though there seems to be no consensus in this regard around the table, and the elected members of the government party obviously want to defend the government's position. I think it's very important that we, as elected officials, be able to shed light on this situation and get to the bottom of things so that, as my colleague Mr. Paul-Hus said, this kind of process doesn't happen again. We aren't in a banana republic, where the government invalidates the entire process it has put in place. We have to respect the partners who are investing time and effort. The government's word and respectability depend on it. So I think that's a critical question.

I also agree with Ms. Blaney, who says that there are many other topics of great importance. We know the difficulties that veterans are experiencing, and we know that there's a lot to do. I therefore hope that we'll be able to move on to other issues of great concern, but without minimizing what needs to be done here. It's important to understand why the government didn't respect the process and demonstrate that it was worthy of the trust of its partners.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mr. Ste-Marie.

[*English*]

We'll now go back to Mr. Bryan May on Zoom.

**Mr. Bryan May:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to thank MP Blaney for her intervention. I understand her frustration well, and I share it.

I want to go back to what the Conservatives just said, though. We'll just pass this, and then it will be done. That's what was said in November, and we did. We passed the motion of our colleague Mr. Desilets, and we produced the documents. We've had the minister here, and we expanded that. Remember that it was only going to be the one meeting, and then we expanded it, and we brought in Daoust, and now we have a Conservative motion to do essentially the same thing.

This is why I do not support this motion. This is no longer about veterans, and this is no longer even about the monument. As my colleague MP Hepfner mentioned, this is becoming more of a political witch hunt. I won't drag this out, but I want to point out, for those colleagues who may not have been around this table at that time, that those documents were produced. The clerk can correct me, but I believe that at the beginning of November that motion was passed and by the end of November those documents were produced. There was nothing indicating any involvement by the Prime Minister's Office, and the opposition aren't happy with that. They wanted there to be a scandal that they could stick to the Prime Minister. That didn't happen, and that's why we are here today.

I hope we can adjourn this debate and move on to more productive and more substantial issues for veterans. I think we have to put this one to bed.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (1820)

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mr. May.

Now, Mr. Sean Casey, you have the floor.

**Mr. Sean Casey:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I think Ms. Blaney has offered an olive branch that I'd like to explore a little more. What I heard Ms. Blaney say is that she's concerned about process, and that's entirely valid. If there could be a discussion on process and how the process could be and should be improved, I think that's a discussion worth having.

She also said that we need to dispense with the political games. However, the last intervention from Mr. Richards started with him saying that we need to find out why the PMO interfered. That's what this is really about. Then he said that it's a simple request. Is it a simple request to send bureaucrats all over government combing through 10 years of documents to find every single text message, Microsoft Teams message, WhatsApp message, Signal message or any other electronic message between multiple departments, without regard for cabinet confidentiality or solicitor-client privilege?

This, in its present form, isn't about process. This is a fishing expedition that supports an obsession with attacking the Prime Minister. That's what this has descended into.

I'm entirely in agreement with Ms. Blaney that it would be appropriate for this committee to have a look at the process and suggest improvements. It is not appropriate for this committee to spend all kinds of resources, having people combing through documents and computer records, dating back 10 years, to see if we can stick it to the Prime Minister. That's what this is about.

Look, this is a bit about the boy who cried wolf. This is about the person who had multiple cases of veterans who were counselled to avail themselves of medical assistance in dying, but there was nothing established before the committee, except for the two cases acknowledged by the department. This is the boy who cried wolf when he said that the Prime Minister has outlawed prayer, and that fizzled.

Here we are again. The latest fishing expedition is to pin on the Prime Minister something that is, quite frankly, doing a disservice to veterans. What would do a service to veterans would be to have something as focused as what Ms. Blaney has suggested. I think that's an appropriate role for the committee to undertake.

The minute we can get back to that, we can move on. Let's take this out of the political smear and move it to the best interests of veterans. Then, I think we're doing what's expected of us and I'm sure you'd have agreement on this side of the table.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

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

[Translation]

Mr. Paul-Hus, you have the floor.

**Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus:** May I remind you that in the official notes, it should say that the Conservative motion requested the documents as of November 8, 2021. When we tabled the motion, we were asking for documents from the last two years. So it's not true that we were asking public servants for documents from the last 10 years. It was the Liberal amendment that brought us to 2014.

Our party had asked for documents from the last two years, during the monument tender procedure.

• (1825)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Paul-Hus.

Does anyone else wish to speak?

As I said, we'd like to know—the clerk, the analyst and I—what we're going to do next week, given the studies and motions we have on the table.

[English]

**Mr. Blake Richards:** Mr. Chair, if there are no other interventions, can we call the question?

[Translation]

**The Chair:** That's what I want to verify. Does anyone else wish to speak? If not, we'll move on to the vote.

[English]

**Mr. Blake Richards:** Can we call the question?

[Translation]

**The Chair:** First, we'll vote on the subamendments. I see that, for the moment, no one has asked for the floor.

When I say we're going to vote on the subamendment, I'm talking about the one on the table, which is the one from Ms. Hepfner, who has asked to add a number of conditions in the letter that is going to be sent to the NCC. Let's make sure we understand what we're voting on.

[English]

Is that clear?

[Translation]

It seems we do. We will therefore vote on the subamendment presented by Ms. Hepfner.

I would therefore ask the clerk to please proceed with the vote.

(Subamendment agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

[English]

**Mr. Blake Richards:** Can we call the question on the main motion, please?

**The Chair:** We have to go back to the motion by Mr. Casey, because there was an amendment to it.

**Mr. Blake Richards:** I ask that we call the question.

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Are there any comments on the amendment presented by Mr. Casey, as amended? If not, we'll proceed to the vote.

So, Mr. Clerk, please, let's proceed.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

[English]

**Mr. Blake Richards:** Can we call the question on the main motion, Mr. Chair?

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Ms. Hepfner, you have the floor.

[English]

**Ms. Lisa Hepfner:** Thank you, Chair.

I have another amendment to the main motion, which I think will help us co-operate, although it looks like Mr. Richards doesn't want to co-operate with other people around the table.

**The Chair:** Excuse me, Ms. Hepfner. It's 6:30. I have to ask members of the committee if we'd like to continue, even though we started a bit later—

• (1830)

**Mr. Blake Richards:** I move that we use all of the resources available to the committee and stay as long as needed to get to a vote.

**Mr. Sean Casey:** You don't have the floor to be able to move a motion.

**The Chair:** Excuse me.

[*Translation*]

First of all, I'd like to begin by asking the members of the committee if they wish to continue this meeting for the next half hour, or if we adjourn it now.

[*English*]

**Mr. Blake Richards:** Yes.

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Wait. First, do the members of the committee wish to continue for half an hour?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** All right. Then we'll continue for another half hour.

[*English*]

Ms. Hepfner, the floor is yours.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Lisa Hepfner:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

[*English*]

In this amendment—we'll send a copy to the clerk so it's more clear—part (i) of paragraph (b) is asking for electronic communications between the Department of Veterans Affairs and the office of the Minister of Veterans Affairs. Part (ii) is asking for communications between the Department of Canadian Heritage and the office of the Minister of Canadian Heritage. Those stay as is, but the following five lines are deleted.

At the very end of the motion, after paragraph (e), we add, “That once the Committee receives the aforementioned information”—the Veterans Affairs and Heritage Canada information—“from the bodies outlined in point (b) and (d) and receives testimony from the witnesses identified in point (a) and (c), the committee discuss whether to request such information between (i) the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Privy Council Office, (ii) the Department of Canadian Heritage and the Privy Council Office, (iii) the Privy Council Office and the Office of the Prime Minister, (iv) the office of the Minister of Veterans Affairs and the Office of the Prime Minister, and (v) the office of the Minister of Canadian Heritage and the Office of the Prime Minister.”

The amendment would change this motion so we get the preliminary information. If the committee decides that it needs further information and that it would truly be valuable to go after the Prime Minister's Office, for example, we can continue. At least it gets us to a place where we can start to look at how this process was conducted.

I hope that's clear, Chair. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Ms. Hepfner.

I have Monsieur Paul-Hus and Ms. Blaney on the list.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Paul-Hus, you have the floor.

**Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus:** I didn't raise my hand.

**The Chair:** Oh, you didn't? All right.

[*English*]

Ms. Blaney, please go ahead.

**Ms. Rachel Blaney:** I haven't received it yet, so I'm just checking in to see if we can receive it. What I understand is that you've taken parts of the top and moved it to the bottom, but I want to make sure I see it.

**Ms. Lisa Hepfner:** Perhaps we can suspend for a minute if needed, Chair, while we send around that amendment.

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** I am therefore suspending the meeting for a while, so that the clerk can email all this to us.

• (1830)

(Pause)

• (1930)

**The Chair:** We are resuming the meeting.

Earlier, I had unanimous consent to continue for half an hour. At that point, it was 6:30 p.m. We had planned to finish at 7 p.m. and, at around 6:45 p.m., we had to suspend the meeting, because there was a vote.

I want to know if the members of the committee agree to extend the meeting by about fifteen minutes, as we had agreed.

[*English*]

I'm going to ask the members of the committee if I have unanimous consent to go until eight o'clock. This is the maximum time we will have resources available.

**Mr. Blake Richards:** Yes.

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** That's great. We agree.

[*English*]

Members of the committee, I'd like to be sure. There could be a vote at eight o'clock. They can call for a vote at eight o'clock, so two minutes before eight o'clock, I will adjourn the meeting.

Do we agree on that?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

• (1940)

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** We won't have any more resources available anyway.

I hear the bell ringing. Just a minute, please.

• (1940) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

• (1940)  
**The Chair:** Since we have taken no action to suspend the meeting, and in view of the circumstances, would it please the members of the committee to adjourn the meeting?

**The Chair:** Thank you.

The meeting is adjourned.

---







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>