



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 073

Wednesday, September 27, 2023

Chair: Mr. Ron McKinnon



Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security

Wednesday, September 27, 2023

• (1630)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Ron McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Lib.)): I call this meeting to order.

Yes, Mr. Julian.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

To start, it's great to see everybody again, as well as the new members of our committee.

As you know, we've gone through a number of bills. This is the first time we've dealt with such a constricted space for clause-by-clause. I want to formally raise that when we do clause-by-clause, we take it very seriously. We deal with amendments, with the bill itself, with justifications and with the actual vote. Having such a constricted space makes that impossible. I don't want to push over into Madame Michaud's space. I really believe that for subsequent meetings, we need to have a space that is large enough for us to properly do our work.

The Chair: I appreciate and acknowledge those remarks. We've actually abbreviated the witness table here to give you more room, and they could, conceivably, move down more if you need more space. I take your point, though, so we will ask the clerk to see if we can address this problem going forward.

Mr. Shipley, you can go ahead on a point of order.

Mr. Doug Shipley (Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte, CPC): Just to show how great this committee is going to work this time to get a lot of good work done, I'm going to agree with my friend from the NDP. This is not what we're used to having. I have three binders here. There's no way I'm going to be able to open them all. I'm going to agree with my friend down at the end that if something could be done for the next meeting, it would be nice and we'd all probably appreciate it. Thank you for bringing that up.

The Chair: The usually neutral chair also agrees.

Mr. Motz, go ahead, please.

Mr. Glen Motz (Medicine Hat—Cardston—Warner, CPC): I would just add to that. For today's meeting, I would invite Mr. Julian to maybe take up space in the back somewhere if he needs more room. I just want to help you out.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Chair: The generosity of this committee knows no bounds.

Thank you, Mr. Julian and others, for intervening. We will do what we can. When I came into this room, I found it was very fore-shortened. It's very strange. We're used to having a lot more room to spread out and wave our hands and stuff. Anyway, we shall continue with convening the meeting.

Welcome to meeting number 73 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security. We will start by acknowledging that we are meeting on the traditional unceded territory of the Algonquin people.

Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format, pursuant to the House order of June 23, 2022. Therefore, members are attending in person in the room and remotely by using the Zoom application.

I'm going to skip over some of this because we've all heard it before.

I remind members that all comments should be addressed through the chair.

Welcome to all the new people on the committee. I would like to thank all the people who are no longer on the committee for their service. This leaves us an opening for the Conservative vice-chair. We need to proceed to electing the Conservative vice-chair.

Mr. Shipley, do you wish to speak before that?

Mr. Doug Shipley: No, but I will just after, briefly.

The Chair: Campaigning is allowed.

Mr. Doug Shipley: No, I'm good. I hope I don't need to campaign much.

The Chair: I'll pass it over to our esteemed clerk, and he will conduct the vote.

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Simon Larouche): Pursuant to Standing Order 106(2), the first vice-chair must be a member of the official opposition. I am now prepared to receive motions for the first vice-chair.

Yes, Mr. Lloyd.

Mr. Dane Lloyd (Sturgeon River—Parkland, CPC): I nominate Doug Shipley.

[Translation]

The Clerk: It has been moved by Mr. Lloyd that Doug Shipley be elected first vice-chair of the committee.

[English]

Are there any other motions?

Yes, Mr. Julian.

Mr. Peter Julian: I would like to second the nomination of Doug Shipley.

The Clerk: Are there any other motions? I don't see any.

Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

(Motion agreed to)

The Clerk: Mr. Doug Shipley is duly elected first vice-chair of the committee.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

The Chair: Welcome to our new vice-chair, and be careful what you ask for.

Do you wish to speak?

Mr. Doug Shipley: Yes, I'll speak very briefly, but not really about that. You know I'm not usually one to speak and waste a lot of time, so I will just say thank you to everyone. Thank you for nominating me.

I would like to publicly thank our past vice-chair, Raquel Dancho, who is going to be leaving, obviously. Tomorrow is her last day for a while. It's no secret anymore as to why she's heading out. I want to wish her the best of luck with her future endeavour of having a plus-one in the family. Actually, I don't know; it could be plus-two or plus-three. Who knows? She never told me. Maybe she won't be happy with what I just said. I want to congratulate her and wish her the best of luck while she's gone, and to thank her for all the great work she did here and for her mentorship. I hope we'll do as good a job in her absence.

The Chair: Thank you.

Members, your subcommittee met on Monday to consider the business of the committee and agreed on a number of items. You've all received by email a copy of the fifth report of the subcommittee on agenda and procedure. Does the committee wish to adopt the report?

I do have a copy if you need me to read it.

• (1635)

Mr. Doug Shipley: Can we speak to the report?

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Pickering—Uxbridge, Lib.): I'll move it.

The Chair: The motion is on the floor, so you can speak to that.

Mr. Doug Shipley: This is about the subcommittee report. Is that correct?

The Chair: Yes.

Mr. Doug Shipley: Briefly, I was unable to make it to the subcommittee meeting. Mr. Lloyd was there in my absence. There are just a couple of things I wanted to mention.

First of all, Bill C-26 is a rather large, very in-depth bill, and there is going to be a long list of witnesses. We actually don't have

our side's list completely formalized yet. We're working on that as we're transitioning through the offices.

I have a serious concern that five meetings are not going to be enough. This is a very serious bill—just look at what took place this week with our own systems being down—that I think is going to take extra time. I'm concerned that having five meetings is too tight. Perhaps we can check the will of the table to see if we're going to have that set in stone or if we can be more flexible about having five, knowing there could be so many....

The Chair: It doesn't say so in this report, but there was discussion around the number of meetings. We felt this would be a good place to start, but it's certainly within the purview of the committee to extend that if it is the will of the committee to do so.

What I'm asking for at this point is ratification of the decision.

I have Ms. O'Connell next, followed by Mr. Julian.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I certainly don't want to speak for everyone, but I think the position was that we would look at Bill C-20 today. I know, from the previous committee meeting, that there are motions and studies that members are interested in. For the sake of trying to establish a calendar, it's not the best decision to just leave it open.

There will be four meetings, plus one with the minister. At the time we've exhausted that, the committee or subcommittee can come back and have this conversation. We were certainly not trying to shut that down. We just felt that, for the sake of the calendar, we needed some planning parameters and this would be fairly reasonable. We're certainly open to the conversation, but leaving it open-ended, I think, is just not useful in planning our agenda and other studies.

The Chair: Yes, Mr. Julian.

[Translation]

Mr. Peter Julian: I support the subcommittee's report. If we need more meetings, the committee can decide.

We could adopt the report today, and then we'll see how many witnesses we have and how we feel about the bill.

I realize that it could take more than five meetings, but we can start with that. Personally, I'm more than willing to add more meetings if necessary.

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Motz, go ahead.

Mr. Glen Motz: I agree it's important that we at least have a placeholder for what we anticipate will be, but it would be naive to think we're going to get anything through or review this thoroughly in five meetings, one of them being with the minister.

We should ensure that we have it identified somewhere that... This is an important bill. We've all been anticipating this study significantly. It overlaps with a lot of different areas. Let's not pigeon-hole ourselves, and even if we say we need to add one or two extra meetings, let's not do that. Let's figure out our witness list. Once we have our witness list, let's determine how much time we think we might need, and let's be generous with it. This legislation is going to impact governments and national security for a decade or more, so we need to ensure we do it right.

The Chair: That brings us to one of the points in the report. We agreed in subcommittee that the preliminary witness list, people's nominations for witnesses, should be done by the end of next week.

I bring everyone's attention to the analysts' report, which is a quick summary of Bill C-26, with suggested witnesses. I suggest that as a good starting point. Of course, the clerk will sort out the witnesses according to party standing and the number of meetings, but if we need to extend that, it's open for the committee to do so.

Are we ready to vote? No.

Mr. Shipley, go ahead.

• (1640)

Mr. Doug Shipley: I'm sorry, but there's one other thing. I agree with everything that's been said, and yes, if we're willing to amend that... I like what Mr. Motz said. Once we have our list of witnesses, it will probably be a little easier, but if we already have some agreement that the number five is not set in stone, we'll adjust that as we go forward.

I thought this would also be a good place, since we're talking about the subcommittee on agenda.... I did put forward a notice of motion. It would be nice to move this now and see if we can get this—

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Mr. Chair, on a point of order, there is a motion on the floor.

Mr. Doug Shipley: Oh, your motion is on the floor.

The Chair: Yes, we're on the motion.

Mr. Glen Motz: I have one more point on the agenda of the committee moving forward, if I may.

The Chair: Yes, Mr. Motz.

Mr. Glen Motz: Another thing we have to be mindful of is that NSICOP, as I understand, has sent the RCMP mandate study back to the Prime Minister. It's in the PM's office and he has 30 days to respond. I anticipate it will be a study that will be front and centre for this committee in the very near future, so we should probably identify that as something we're going to have to look at as a committee.

The Chair: In that regard, a review of NSICOP every five years is mandated, I believe, but the legislation is somewhat vague.

Oh, is it something else?

Mr. Glen Motz: This is different, yes.

The Chair: Okay, then I will backtrack. We'll have to see where that goes.

Can we have a vote on the motion? Is it the will of the committee to accept the report of the subcommittee on agenda and procedure?

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: Yes, Mr. Shipley.

Mr. Doug Shipley: I circulated a motion, in both official languages, which I'd like to put on the floor right now, please.

It is:

That the committee hold no less than five meetings to undertake a study on Paul Bernardo's transfer from a maximum-security prison to a medium-security prison.

That the committee invite the former Minister of Public Safety, Marco Mendicino, to appear alone for no less than two hours, to explain the transfer;

The committee invite Commissioner Anne Kelly and Deputy Minister Shawn Tupper to appear for no less than one hour to explain the transfer;

The committee invite the current Minister of Public Safety to appear alone, for no less than two hours, to discuss what the government plans are to prevent transfers of dangerous offenders to a medium security prison in the future, and that the Committee report their findings to the House.

The Chair: Thank you.

I acknowledge receiving the notice of motion. The motion is in order at this time. I hate to take up the witnesses' time for this, but it is in order.

I have Mr. Baldinelli, followed by Mr. Motz.

Mr. Tony Baldinelli (Niagara Falls, CPC): Thank you, Chair.

Thank you for this opportunity to appear and to speak to this motion. I asked to appear because of the importance of this motion and the importance of this motion to my community. The name Paul Bernardo is synonymous with evil in my community. The horrific crimes that were committed against Leslie Mahaffy, who was only 14, and Kristen French, who was only 15, resonate and still impact my community today.

It was the transfer decision that brought forward a number of community concerns. I was approached by friends of the victims who asked us what they could do to ensure that this type of activity or this type of transfer never happens again.

At that time, I worked with my colleagues in the leader's office, as well as the public security and justice departments, and I came forward with my private member's bill, Bill C-342, which would require all court-ordered dangerous offenders and mass murderers to be permanently assigned a maximum security classification. It would also repeal the Liberals' "least restrictive environment" standard for assigning inmates to prisons and restore the language of "necessary restrictions" that the previous government put in place.

Because my private member's bill is low in the priority list, I have also worked with my colleagues here to look at this and see that it doesn't happen again. In fact, I was contacted by the friends of Kristen French. They asked what they could do. They came forward with a letter to this committee, and I believe many of you have received that letter.

I'm going to quote from the letter:

As childhood best friends of Kristen French, one of the victims of these horrendous crimes, we call on the Standing Committee of Public Safety to immediately initiate a study to investigate this matter further, to answer many of the questions concerned Canadians' have.

Even in Niagara, the City of Thorold and the City of St. Catharines—where these horrendous crimes were committed—are looking for answers and assurances, and they have expressed their desire to keep Paul Bernardo in a maximum-security placement.

They ask us to see the additional resolutions that were passed by both of those communities. It is my understanding that the City of Niagara Falls and the Town of Niagara-on-the-Lake are also undertaking resolutions in support of that.

Mr. Chair, I believe it's incumbent upon us, in memory of those victims and because of the actions and the concerns that have been expressed by my constituents and other Canadians, to look at this issue, bring forward the ministers responsible and find out exactly why this was allowed to happen.

Thank you.

• (1645)

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Motz, go ahead.

Mr. Glen Motz: Thank you, Chair.

Thank you to my colleagues for bringing this forward.

While the events that brought us to this conversation did not occur in my riding, I certainly have many people asking about this, who have asked me personally about this response and the government's decision.

I just want to go through two things. One is that there was an Order Paper question placed to government in June by our colleague Mr. Caputo. The reason I bring this up today is that it asks how often this happens. We've heard this in the House. Is this something that's happening regularly? That was the question that was asked. The answer came back from Correctional Service Canada.

The question that was asked was this:

With regard to Corrections Services Canada: (a) how many dangerous offenders are currently housed in (i) minimum, (2) medium, security prisons; and (b) how many offenders convicted of multiple murders are currently in medium security prisons?

Correctional Service Canada came back and said:

This report is based on information entered into the Offender Management System and its accuracy depends upon the timeliness and accuracy of the data entered in the system.

In the 1940s, the Criminal Code was amended to include provisions that gave the courts the authority to designate certain repeat offenders as "Habitual Criminals", and offenders convicted of certain sexual offences as "Dangerous Sexual Offenders". These provisions allowed for an indeterminate or life sentence. Dangerous Offender legislation came into effect in Canada on October 15, 1977, replacing the Habitual Offender and Dangerous Sexual Offender provisions that were abolished. A Dangerous Offender is an individual given an indeterminate or a determinate sentence on the basis of a particularly violent crime or pattern of serious violent offences where it is judged that the offender's behaviour is unlikely to be inhibited by normal standards of behavioural restraint (see section 753 of the Criminal Code).

Note that all in-custody Dangerous Offenders, Dangerous Sexual Offenders and Habitual Criminals were included in the response.

In Custody includes all active offenders incarcerated in a CSC facility, offenders on temporary absence from a CSC facility, offenders who are temporarily detained in a CSC facility and offenders on remand in a CSC facility.

Now, the stats are to the end of 2022-23 fiscal year, so that's as of March 31, 2023. Here is the number of offenders with "dangerous offender" designation in custody at the end of March 2023, by offender security level: in maximum security, there were 99 in-custody dangerous offenders; in medium security, there were 580 dangerous offenders; and in minimum security, there were 57, for a total of 736.

There is a table below that, which I'm about to provide. The document says:

The table below presents the number of offenders with at least two counts of murder on their current sentence who were in custody at the end of fiscal year 2022-2023 with a Medium Offender Security Level (OSL).

The following offences are included: First Degree Murder, Second Degree Murder, Capital Murder, Capital Murder of Person Less than 18 Years Old, and Non-Capital Murder as well as any break and enter offences where one of the murder offences listed previously was committed during the break and enter.

There were 239 offenders listed with at least two counts of murder on their current sentence in custody at the end of March in medium-security prisons. Now, that is a bit of a concern. It should be a serious concern for Canadians.

I guess the point I want to make in this.... I have some notes prepared and I want to stick to them, because I think it's important for those of us in this committee, as well as Canadians, to understand.

The Liberal government made a decision with Paul Bernardo that actually shocked and dismayed Canadians. He is potentially one of the most notorious serial killers and rapists in our history and was transferred out of maximum security to a medium-security facility. It's their decision to do nothing about it that has caused concern for Canadians.

The decision has ignited outrage, and rightfully so, despite what Anne Kelly, the commissioner of Correctional Services, has said, which was that the decision to transfer Bernardo was "sound". She said, "The review committee concluded that the decisions to reclassify Paul Bernardo to medium and transfer him...followed all applicable laws and policies." Bernardo's heinous crimes are etched in the memories of those who, as Mr. Baldinelli said, lived through the darkness of his actions. The pain he inflicted on the victims and their families is immeasurable.

• (1650)

The Canadian government needs to ensure that crimes—especially the most heinous crimes—have real consequences. The Conservatives and our leader, Mr. Poilievre, have been saying to the media that we agree that CSC followed the law in transferring Bernardo. However, we also said that the law must be changed, specifically a 2018 Criminal Code amendment that requires inmates to be held in the least restrictive environment possible while in custody. Whose job is it to do that? It's ours. I would beseech this committee to understand that this job now rests with this committee. We shouldn't be passing that responsibility on or ignoring it; the duty lies with us.

Local communities that were most affected by Bernardo's monstrous acts have spoken out. They are calling for actions, as we heard Mr. Baldinelli speak about. The cities of Thorold and St. Catharines have taken a courageous stand, expressing their grave concerns about Mr. Bernardo's transfer and demanding that he be sent back to a maximum-security prison, where he belongs.

If the Liberals are willing to let the most notorious serial killers and rapists in our Canadian history out of maximum security, then what purpose do maximum-security prisons have? Alternatively, Mr. Poilievre has called on the Prime Minister to issue a directive to require that all mass murderers remain in maximum-security prisons for the entirety of their sentences, or for Parliament to pass a Conservative bill, as Mr. Baldinelli has spoken to, with the same requirement.

Our Conservative leader speaks for all of us when he says that Bernardo “should never be out of a maximum security [prison]. To allow it is an injustice to victims and their families, on whom he exacted his terrible outrages.”

Our Conservative demands, however, seem to have fallen on deaf ears. They have been sent to the Prime Minister, to the previous minister and the new Minister of Public Safety, and to local MPs Mr. Bittle and Vance Badawey. Sadly, they've gone—

Mr. Chris Bittle (St. Catharines, Lib.): I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Glen Motz: Welcome to our committee, Chris.

The Chair: Mr. Bittle, you have a point of order.

Mr. Chris Bittle: This pain in my community, Mr. Chair, is real. This is being used as a partisan attack and as a filibuster to prevent us from debating legislation. This is disgusting, Mr. Chair.

You should all be ashamed of yourselves.

Mr. Dane Lloyd: This is not a point of order.

Mr. Chris Bittle: Mr. Baldinelli comes with this, I believe, with true intention, but the rest of them.... It is disgusting. Shake your heads.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Bittle.

It is not a point of order, but I appreciate the sentiment. Emotions run high on this matter, as well they should.

Mr. Motz, please carry on.

• (1655)

Mr. Glen Motz: Thank you very much, sir.

Rather than addressing the issue head-on, my colleague who has just spoken, when this was brought up in the House, has chosen to deflect blame, accusing those proposing solutions—

Mr. Chris Bittle: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Glen Motz: —and expressing concern about playing politics.

The Chair: Mr. Bittle has a point of order, please.

Mr. Chris Bittle: I have not deflected any blame, Mr. Chair.

The member is, unfortunately, misleading this committee. Again, I don't know why this is being used as a filibuster to prevent us from actually debating legislation on this.

Mr. Glen Motz: It's not a filibuster.

Mr. Dane Lloyd: This is not a point of order, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Chris Bittle: It's shocking to use a serial killer in a horrific incident in St. Catharines, in Niagara, to engage in a political filibuster.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Bittle.

The member is correct that this is not a point of order, but I will make that decision. Thank you.

Carry on, Mr. Motz.

Mr. Glen Motz: Thank you, Chair.

Once again, we see a pattern of division and blame-shifting, even from the deepest backbenches of the Liberal government, rather than taking responsibility and rectifying the problems that they themselves have created.

The majority Liberal government paved the way for the transfer of Mr. Bernardo by passing Bill C-83 back in the day, which was supported only by the Liberals and disgraced Liberal Raj Grewal. This bill prioritized the “least restrictive environment” for prisoners, effectively reversing a policy established by the previous Conservative government that imposed a tougher standard on dangerous offenders. This reversal was cited by Correctional Service Canada to justify Bernardo's transfer.

Now, months after this shocking transfer, the government continues to let down the families of victims and the communities forever scarred by Bernardo's crimes. Despite our new public safety minister, we are witnessing the same kind of refusal to use legal authority to direct Correctional Service Canada to ensure that every mass murderer serves their time in a maximum-security facility.

With a level of ineffectiveness that ministers can deem appropriate, the former minister of public safety issued a directive to Correctional Service Canada. Unfortunately, he missed the point. He missed it entirely. The directive covered only the way victims are notified about transfers and their classifications, not a reversal, which is what should have been done with this transfer.

Conservatives will not stand idly by and let this injustice persist. That is why we've introduced the legislation that has been mentioned, which mandates that multiple murderers and dangerous offenders like Bernardo serve their entire sentences behind the walls of a maximum-security prison. We will bring justice and safety back to our communities.

On the issue of public safety, we have seen a government that has admitted its failure to protect Canadians from foreign interference, and we witnessed the replacement of, arguably, an unfit public safety minister with a new one, who seems to follow the orders of his predecessor. Yet, Mr. Bernardo remains in minimum security, outside of where he should be, and violent crime continues to rise in our streets.

To those Canadians who are watching today, Conservatives know that this situation is unacceptable, and we have the desire to do something about it. Victims' rights should never come second to those of dangerous and violent offenders. We must take a stand and rectify the mistakes of the Liberal government. Mr. Bernardo's transfer should never have occurred and it should not stand. He belongs in a maximum-security prison for the rest of his life.

To prevent further transfers like this and to ensure that victims' rights are upheld, Conservatives have introduced Mr. Baldinelli's private member's bill, Bill C-342. This legislation would permanently assign a maximum-security classification to multiple murderers and court-ordered dangerous offenders. It will repeal the Liberals' "least restrictive environment" standard and restore the language of "necessary restrictions" that the previous Conservative government had in place.

Mr. Chair, it's about time.

We call on the minister to issue a directive today and reverse the transfer of Mr. Bernardo. We will continue to champion the rights of victims, and a common-sense Conservative government will bring about safer streets and prioritize victims' rights by reversing this flawed legislation. We will ensure that people like Paul Bernardo remain where they belong.

My colleagues and I have a commitment to justice, public safety and the rights of victims. We will fight to ensure that our communities are safe, that justice is served and that the voices of victims and their families are heard.

If colleagues across the way are not able to ensure this, or Liberal ministers aren't able to ensure this, it will become the work of this committee to do that. It's not simply passing on a responsibility. The duty lies with us, and I ask you to consider the magnitude of our responsibility today and do what's right. Let's reverse this transfer and ensure that it never happens again.

Thank you.

• (1700)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Motz.

I have Mr. Shipley, followed by Mr. Lloyd.

I'm wondering if there is a sense of how long this matter will take today, because if we're going to take very long, I would recommend that we excuse the witnesses, which would allow us to carry on in the fullness of this.

Mr. Shipley, go ahead.

Mr. Doug Shipley: Thank you, Chair.

I'm going to start off by indicating that this is not a filibuster. This is—

Mr. Chris Bittle: [*Inaudible—Editor*]

Mr. Doug Shipley: I've been in meetings and heard you filibuster. I know what a filibuster is, Mr. Bittle, and this is not a filibuster. We will get around to a vote on this.

The Chair: Can we speak through the chair, please?

Mr. Doug Shipley: Is he allowed to just yell out comments?

The Chair: Well, no.

Mr. Doug Shipley: Well, there you go. I'm going to respond to them if someone—

The Chair: Even so, it doesn't make it better if we all break the rules.

Mr. Doug Shipley: I agree.

The Chair: Everyone, please address members through the chair.

Mr. Doug Shipley: I assure the committee that this is not a filibuster. We are concerned MPs raising our voices, and we want to get around to voting on this today.

I'm sure many members on both sides have had many emails, many calls, many comments and many questions about Paul Bernardo. Quite frankly, even saying his name doesn't come easy.

Mr. Chris Bittle: It comes pretty easy over there.

Mr. Doug Shipley: Are we going to allow this or not?

The Chair: I didn't hear anything. I'm sorry.

Mr. Doug Shipley: Well, I certainly did.

The Chair: I was focused on something else. If I missed something, I apologize.

Mr. Doug Shipley: On June 1, Canadians learned that Correctional Service Canada was transferring a mass killer, serial rapist and torturer, Paul Bernardo, from a maximum-security prison to a medium-security prison.

This was brought up at subcommittee, Chair. We tried to put it in there and it didn't get put in. We decided to bring this up today to see if we could somehow get this in as a study. If it had been approved on Monday, we would not be having this discussion here today.

I have pages and pages of what I could be discussing and reading, but I don't want to be accused of being partisan whatsoever. I'm going to use other people's words. They're not my words.

First, I have a letter from Thorold city council, dated June 20, 2023, regarding Paul Bernardo:

Thorold City Council, at its meeting held on June 20, 2023, passed the following resolution:

That the Mayor BE REQUESTED to prepare and send a letter to Corrections Canada, local area Members of Parliament, expressing support for keeping Paul Bernardo in a maximum security placement.

A copy of the letter sent to Commissioner Anne Kelly is attached herein.

I was on city council for many years. When we'd send these letters, I'd sometimes wonder if anybody here actually read them. I'm going to make sure that this one gets in the record. It's not very long. I'm just going to read it, as follows:

Dear Commissioner,

Re: Support for Keeping Paul Bernardo in Maximum Security Placement

I am writing to express the unwavering support of the City of Thorold in favor of keeping Paul Bernardo in a maximum-security placement within the Correctional Service Canada system. As the Mayor of the City of Thorold, I represent a community deeply affected by the heinous crimes committed by Mr. Bernardo and remain committed to advocating for the safety and well-being of our residents.

The gravity of Mr. Bernardo's crimes, and the devastating impact they had on the lives of innocent individuals and their families, cannot be understated. Our community, along with the wider Niagara region, continues to bear the scars left by these reprehensible actions. It is of utmost importance that we prioritize public safety and ensure that those who pose a significant risk to society are appropriately confined and monitored.

We acknowledge that decisions regarding the placement of individuals within the correctional system require a comprehensive evaluation of various factors, including the level of risk they present and the potential for harm to others. In the case of Paul Bernardo, his past actions and the severity of his offenses demand the highest level of security to safeguard our community from any potential danger.

Furthermore, we are aware that public safety is a shared responsibility among different levels of government and local communities. To that end, I am copying Niagara's local area municipalities on this letter to ensure that they are aware of our stance and, should they feel inclined, join us in expressing their support for keeping Mr. Bernardo in a maximum-security placement.

The residents of the City of Thorold and the Niagara Region deserve to live in an environment where they feel safe and secure. We trust that you will carefully consider the concerns of our community, along with the collective voices of others within the Niagara Region, when making any decisions regarding the placement and management of Paul Bernardo.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. We look forward to a response and remain committed to working with you to ensure the safety and well-being not only of our community, but all communities across Canada.

Sincerely,

Terry Ugolini

Mayor, City of Thorold

Again, those are not my words.

I have one more letter. It won't take long. This one is from St. Catharines, as follows:

Dear Prime Minister Trudeau,

At its meeting held on July 24, 2023, St. Catharines City Council approved the following motion:

WHEREAS the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) has published their report regarding the transfer of an inmate from maximum security Millhaven Institution to medium security La Macaza Institution; and

WHEREAS Timothy Danson, counsel for the French and Mahaffy Families, has released preliminary observations on the Report; and

WHEREAS Timothy Danson's observations include that nothing has changed with the inmate in the past 30 years—the parole board has found twice that the inmate has no remorse, empathy or insight into his crimes; that the requirement that the choice of penitentiary must be the least restrictive for the offender cannot be applied mechanically to all offenders; the punishment aspect of this inmate's sentence does not appear to have been factored into the transfer and that the privacy of the offender was put ahead of the victims, their families and the public;

THEREFORE BE IS RESOLVED that St. Catharines City Council request that the Government of Canada review and consider legislation changes to ensure transparency in the corrections and parole system and examine the guidelines around moving dangerous offenders and sadistic psychopaths who have not exhibited any remorse, empathy or insight into their crimes into medium security prisons; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution be circulation to the Minister of Public Safety, the Honourable Marco Mendicino; the Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada, the Honourable David Lametti; MP Chris Bittle; MP Vance Badawey; MP Dean Allison; MP Tony Baldinelli; and Prime Minister Trudeau.

● (1705)

If you have any questions, please contact the Office of the City Clerk, at extension 1524.

Kristen Sullivan, City Clerk

As I said, Mr. Chair, I just want to put those on the record. Those aren't my words. Those are from two city councils that lived through this.

I think that maybe one of the issues with this is... I am 57 years old; I remember Paul Bernardo. It was 30 years ago. I would imagine that most people under 45 years old, roughly, don't have as clear a recollection of just how vile this individual was. This man caused havoc around the city. I was living in downtown Toronto at the time, at Yonge and St. Clair, with my then fiancée. She and many women like her were afraid to go out. He was referred to as the "Scarborough rapist".

I did print off a sheet that has all of his heinous actions. I'm not going to read them all. My original intention was to read them all, just to show people just how nasty and vile this guy is.

Mr. Chris Bittle: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

This was promised not to be a filibuster, but we're going to read the horrific details—

Mr. Doug Shipley: No, I actually said that I wasn't going to read it. Well, I can now.

Mr. Chris Bittle: —of this person's crimes when all of us acknowledge how terrible this is. This is being used for partisan gain, and it is disgusting, Mr. Chair. These members should know better. They're making witnesses wait. This is just a filibuster. The glee with which they drop the name, which I won't even use because it causes so much pain in my community—

Mr. Dane Lloyd: It's not a point of order, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Chris Bittle: I am under 45 years old, Mr. Shipley. I do understand how significant this is. You don't. Perhaps we should move on and stop using this as a filibuster.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Bittle.

It's not a point of order; that's true.

As I said, I know that emotions are high—and well they should be—so we'll try to keep this under control.

If we're going to continue for very long, it would be nice to be able to release the witnesses and bring them back next time.

• (1710)

Mr. Doug Shipley: I'm wrapping it up, Mr. Chair.

I actually said that I wasn't going to read it. My intention was to read it. If Mr. Bittle was listening to what I was saying.... I said that I wasn't going to read the list. He made me rethink that. However, I won't read it.

What I'm trying to say is that I've had people who were younger approach me and say that they didn't know, that they had never heard of Paul Bernardo. They don't know who he is.

The Chair: I can't limit your time anyway. As long as you're on topic, you have it.

Mr. Doug Shipley: I'm wrapping it up right now—reluctantly, because I think people need to know just who this vile human being is. He has caused tremendous hurt throughout the country, definitely throughout certain areas.

Basically, what we're looking for, on our side, is a study to discuss how this happened and how we can make sure that this never happens again. There is no partisanship in my words. Every single word I read is from two city councils that are not even in my area.

I'll leave it at that and see what my colleagues have to say.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Shipley.

We have Mr. Lloyd, followed by Ms. O'Connell, followed by Madame Michaud.

Go ahead, Mr. Lloyd.

Mr. Dane Lloyd: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Yes, this is definitely a tough issue, and for me personally. My family was a victim. My cousins were murdered just a few short years ago, an entire family wiped out by a mass killer. As somebody who has family who have gone through this—in that case, the

killer did not live—I would want to know, if the killer were alive, that I would be consulted by Correctional Service Canada before any decisions were made on a transfer.

That's the thing about bureaucracies. Bureaucracies left unchecked have a tendency to become unemotional and legalistic, and sometimes the rights of victims and their families aren't put as the highest priority. It's our job, as parliamentarians who represent the people, who represent these victims' families, to make sure that the Government of Canada always puts the rights of victims and their families first. That's why I believe it is an essential role of this committee to review this.

There might be some arguments made that this committee might not have time to do something like this. Those are wrong. Judging by the schedule that we discussed in subcommittee, we have at least eight meetings potentially available before Christmas. I believe that we're being very reasonable in proposing five meetings on this subject. If there's an issue with five meetings, I know that we would be open to further discussion on that matter.

With that, I'll cede the floor.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Lloyd.

We're going now to Ms. O'Connell.

Go ahead, please.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm going to move an amendment, and then I'd like to speak to it.

The motion says, “That the committee hold”, and that's where my amendment starts. I move that the committee hold a meeting on the rights of victims of crime and the security reclassification and transfer of offenders within Correctional Services Canada, and that the committee invite the commissioner of corrections, Anne Kelly; Deputy Minister Shawn Tupper; and officials from the Department of Justice and the Department of Public Safety.

The Chair: Basically, you're replacing—

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: It's everything following “That the committee hold”. My amendment replaces the rest of the motion.

The Chair: Thank you.

The amendment appears to be in order, so go ahead if you wish to speak to it.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Where do I even start with this? To sit here during a filibuster from the Conservatives using Paul Bernardo and the horrific crimes and the situation that these families have been put through, to suggest that anyone needs to relive that.... Try being a woman in this country. I don't care what your age is. Try being a woman learning about those stories and hearing those stories. To come back here as a filibuster against going through legislation is truly horrific.

If this is really about.... I will try to give my colleagues the benefit of the doubt, despite the fact that I would be embarrassed for my colleagues opposite—and I'm going to say this so that you think when you come back to this committee—to take a subject like victims' rights on horrific crimes and read a canned speech that has been used on radio ads and campaign whistle stops by your leader. To use canned campaign speeches on a topic like this is truly terrible.

I am going to try to take the benefit of the doubt that my honourable colleagues across the way do not understand the magnitude of hurt that making this situation political brings to women all across this country, but make no mistake: If you're truly serious about this not being partisan, you will support this amendment in its entirety. If you're truly serious about rights of victims and understanding security reclassification, then you will support the amendment to have officials come here and explain the situation. If this is partisan, you're going to behave differently, and Canadians will be watching. Victims will be watching and women will be watching, because women across this country will not tolerate using crime against women as a partisan manoeuvre. We have proposed a very meaningful amendment to come here and hear from Public Safety and Justice officials about how this actually happened.

I want to correct the record, Mr. Chair, on a couple of things.

First, on Bill C-83, which is the clause in question that the Conservatives continuously raise, guess what: The Conservatives supported it. In addition to that, Public Safety Canada officials have actually already confirmed about the transfer in question—but we'll do it again here in a meeting if needed—that the wording that under the law allowed it to happen existed under the Conservative government too.

If you want to talk about how to put victims' rights forward and take a victim forward-facing approach, I am all for it, but if we are going to revictimize Canadian women and women around the world who have had to suffer, then be prepared, because I am going to show that the Conservatives are the biggest hypocrites on this issue. If you want to have a legitimate conversation about how this happened, how we can improve victims' rights and how we can make women safer in this country, I am all for it and I will be an advocate at this table, but if you make this political....

I'm sorry, Mr. Chair.

Through the chair, if some parties make this political, then we will expose the hypocrisy and the lows that some members will go to for what they perceive is partisan gain, and I promise you that it will be a miscalculation.

• (1715)

I'm proposing that we bring officials and talk about how transfers happen in this country, because they are independent; that we hear from the commissioner of Correctional Services Canada and from the Department of Justice; and that we have these conversations. Opposition members, and it's mainly Conservatives who have spoken so far, have a choice to make in this moment. Are you going to be partisan on such horrific acts—

The Chair: Through the chair.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I'm sorry.

Through the chair, if some members of the opposition decide that they want this to be a partisan issue to avoid getting through Bill C-20, women will remember. Victims will remember. We will show Canadians the lows that some members will go to for the sake of personal political gain.

If we want to talk about victims' rights, if we want to talk about how transfers in this country happen, if we want to talk about reclassification and if we want to talk about safety, then let's have that conversation.

We'll see, Mr. Chair. I would request a recorded vote on my amendment.

• (1720)

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. O'Connell.

The clerk has asked if you would read that amendment. You wouldn't have it in hard copy, would you, at this point?

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I just made it. I didn't know when the member would bring it to the floor.

I'll just read it in total: “That the committee hold a meeting on the rights of victims of crime and the security reclassification and transfer of offenders within Correctional Services Canada. That the committee invite the commissioner of corrections, Anne Kelly; Deputy Minister Shawn Tupper; and officials from the Department of Justice and Public Safety.”

The Chair: That amendment replaces the motion moved.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: That's correct.

The Chair: Next we have Madame Michaud, followed by Mr. Lloyd, Mr. Bittle and Mr. Motz.

[*Translation*]

Go ahead, Ms. Michaud.

Ms. Kristina Michaud (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, BQ): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm extremely sensitive to this situation and the pain it is causing the victims' families. With all due respect, as far as I know, the detainee transfer process is normally apolitical. So I agree with the government's amendment, which would have us hear from Correctional Service Canada officials, and we could ask them questions about this process. I think we have to make sure that it remains apolitical.

The victims' families certainly deserve answers to the questions that many of us would like to ask. Before we vote on this amendment, I would like to have a French version of the amendment, or of the new motion.

There you go. Thank you.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you. I believe our clerk is working on that.

By the way, the debate at this point is on the amendment.

Mr. Lloyd, please go ahead.

Mr. Dane Lloyd: I am pleased that the government has shown a willingness to have a meeting on this issue, but I don't think that's sufficient.

Our initial request was for five meetings. The government has put in a request for one meeting with Correctional Service Canada officials. However, I want to amend this amendment in a small way. I think it's important that we include some of the victims' families in this conversation, because it's important that we hear their perspective on how they felt, on the impact of this decision and on how, possibly, Correctional Service Canada or other levels of government may have failed Canadians—these victims' families—by improperly notifying them or notifying them on short notice. I think it's important that our committee hear from these families.

There's also an aspect in the minister's office, as well, that I think is important for us to explore. The minister's office was informed, but the previous minister said repeatedly in the House that he was unaware of this transfer. That raises some very serious questions about the communications between Correctional Service Canada and the minister's office. I would ask that we have representation from the minister's office—the political office—and the minister himself, likely, at a meeting so that we can explore that aspect.

Finally, so that this isn't just some exercise to say we listened to these officials who came to committee and that's it, I would request that this committee report recommendations to the House on how to prevent this incident from happening again.

That would be my proposed amendment. I would suggest probably two or three meetings. I would put that to the government.

I know my colleague Ms. O'Connell has laid a very stark.... We have to vote for her amendment or not, and we're going to be judged if we don't vote for it. However, I'd like to put forward another amendment. I think there are very good reasons for this amendment, as I laid out, and for having up to three meetings that include representation from victims' families, representation from the minister's office and the government officials who were previously cited in the original amendment. It's so that we can have a comprehensive overview of what failed in this situation and report any recommendations we have to the House so that the government can see these recommendations and, hopefully, make the necessary changes to ensure that this terrible incident does not happen again.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (1725)

The Chair: Thank you.

I think we're going to have to suspend to get caught up a bit.

You're moving a subamendment. We can't go any deeper than that. We've gone through an hour of our two hours. There's no way we're going to finish this today.

I'd ask for the committee's support to thank the witnesses and our legislative clerk for being here. We appreciate it. If we have the support of the committee, we'd like to excuse you as we carry on with this matter.

Mr. Chris Bittle: I have a point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Bittle is up on a point of order.

Mr. Chris Bittle: I have to go in a couple of minutes. I was hoping I could get my thoughts on the record for two minutes before I have to leave the room.

The Chair: Absolutely. You'll be speaking to Mr. Lloyd's subamendment.

We'll invite the witnesses and our legislative clerk to leave. Thank you, all.

Mr. Bittle, if you'd like to make your intervention, we'll then suspend and get caught up.

Please go ahead.

Mr. Chris Bittle: In reading letters from the local council and pretending to understand what Niagara went through at the time, Mr. Shipley was even going so far as to say that people my age wouldn't understand the significance of this.

Well, let me tell you, Mr. Shipley, that I remember the terror in my mom's eyes.

• (1730)

Mr. Dane Lloyd: Speak through the chair, please.

Mr. Chris Bittle: Through the chair to Mr. Shipley, I remember the terror in my mom's eyes. I remember the terror in our community. I grew up in Mr. Baldinelli's riding. I grew up in the city of Niagara Falls, which is next door to my community, where many of the crimes happened—for the individual I won't name.

Throughout this debate, from June, it has been clear that this has been a partisan exercise. If it were a matter of public safety, members of Parliament wouldn't be so gleeful to mention the name of the serial killer in this place. They wouldn't read canned speeches prepared by the 20-somethings sitting behind them who have no knowledge of this but are passing up notes. Their leader said they need to hit all the talking points.

Mr. Chair, real people have been hurt by this. There was even a suggestion by Mr. Lloyd that we should bring in the victims' families. Have they been asked? Have they been consulted? Or are we just going to ask them, without knowing, for partisan purposes?

We're supposed to be debating legislation. Instead of this being a quick motion, we're now an hour into this, just to try to pick at the scab of a hurt community.

I agree that we should look at this, Mr. Chair. I support Ms. O'Connell's amendment, because there's a lot of misinformation here. This is an independent process.

To my understanding, Mr. Motz was a police officer. The mayor's office didn't call him up and tell him which crimes to prosecute or which criminals to go after or which jails to put them in. That was his decision, within the Criminal Code. He had discretion. He was an official. And now, to make a partisan point, he's pretending that this doesn't exist and using the name of a serial killer who harmed my community.

I've said this publicly, Mr. Chair. I believe Mr. Baldinelli's actions are genuine. He is bringing forward the hurt of the community. But the rest of the members are, again, reading canned speeches and talking points. It's outrageous. Canadian people deserve better than this. Niagara deserves better. I hope we have a look at this to show Canadians that this is an apolitical exercise, that there is a rule of law in this country and that politicians don't interfere in this process.

I'm sure we could all say, in this case, "Wouldn't it be great if we could interfere just in this one case?" We'd probably get most Canadians lined up with that. But that sets a dangerous precedent. Or maybe we should pass knee-jerk, unconstitutional legislation. Wouldn't that be great? But that would drag the family through years of court proceedings at the Supreme Court, just to score a couple of cheap political points, and what would that do? Niagara deserves better. The families deserve better. I hope this motion passes.

I'm sorry, Mr. Chair. I have to leave for a community event, an organization in Mr. Baldinelli's riding that's here in Ottawa.

Canadians deserve better than this, Mr. Chair.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Bittle.

Mr. Motz will be next, but I'm proposing that we suspend and get caught up on the motions.

Mr. Glen Motz: First of all, I'd like to respond to a couple of errors from my colleagues across the way.

The Chair: Mr. Motz, do we want to suspend first?

Mr. Glen Motz: I think we need to respond while it's fresh.

The Chair: Okay. I'll let you do that, and then we'll suspend.

Mr. Glen Motz: Thank you, Chair.

My colleague across the way, Ms. O'Connell, suggested that the Conservatives supported Bill C-83. That is not what happened. Bill C-83 was voted down by the Conservatives and passed by the Liberals in 2019. To make this a partisan issue, that Conservatives are somehow complicit because the Liberals failed to do their job and the minister failed to do his job and reverse this transfer, and he could have.... Mr. Bittle obviously didn't listen to my comments in regard to the acknowledgement that CSC followed the law. The law is in error. The whole idea of Mr. Baldinelli's bill is to suggest that we need to correct the error. That's the whole point of our conversation today. We can't allow this to continue to happen, so we have to change the legislation. That's the whole purpose behind this.

Whether we have three meetings or five meetings, it doesn't matter. The idea is that, as a committee, we have a responsibility to ensure that this doesn't keep happening, that we don't have people who are a risk to public safety transferred again to minimum-security or medium-security facilities. You talk about the impact on families. During the transfer, the communities certainly spoke on what this did to those communities, something that happened years and years ago.

This is not a partisan issue. I have no intention of making it a partisan issue. However, the blame needs to be placed squarely where it is: The Minister of Public Safety, Marco Mendicino, failed to deal with this when he could have. Yes, CSC followed the law. That doesn't mean the law was perfect. It doesn't mean the law was right. It's flawed, which is why the Conservatives voted against it in 2019.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Motz.

We'll suspend for a few minutes while the clerk gets caught up with our motions.

Dane, can you get with the clerk to make sure he's captured your amendment?

We'll suspend for 10 minutes.

• (1730)

(Pause)

• (1755)

The Chair: I call this meeting back to order.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: May I be added to the list, please?

The Chair: Yes. We have Peter Julian and then you.

Mr. Dane Lloyd: I have a quick point of order.

The Chair: Yes, go ahead with your point of order.

Mr. Dane Lloyd: I know that the clerk did circulate my subamendment, but I just want to clarify for everyone at the committee that there were two key parts that were—

The Chair: I'll come back to you on that. I'm aware of them. If I forget, let me know.

Mr. Dane Lloyd: I just want to make sure that everyone is aware.

We're still discussing my subamendment, are we not?

The Chair: Yes.

To recapitulate, the main motion was moved by Mr. Shipley, and we all have copies of that.

Ms. O'Connell has proposed an amendment to that motion, which basically replaces it all with what you see on the paper that you've been given.

Mr. Lloyd has proposed a subamendment to that, which is as you see it on the paper, with two things missing: One is that we also request the findings of the study to be reported to the House, and the other is that we also invite officials from Public Safety.

Is that correct?

Mr. Dane Lloyd: It's the Minister of Public Safety's political office or the minister.

The Chair: Okay. Are we all clear on this?

Mr. Peter Julian: No, I'm not.

The Chair: It's the political officials from the ministry of public safety.

Is that correct?

Mr. Dane Lloyd: To clarify for Mr. Julian, my intention—because it's well known that there was a breakdown in communication between the bureaucracy and the minister's office—is to have a representative from the Minister of Public Safety's office, and it could be the minister himself, to answer to why there was this breakdown in communication between Correctional Service Canada and the public safety minister's office.

As the previous public safety minister testified, he wasn't aware of this transfer until right when it happened. I think victims would like to know why the Minister of Public Safety was not informed of this transfer when CSC originally raised it with his office.

The Chair: Let's not argue the point yet.

Are we clear about the change? Okay.

The debate continues on Mr. Lloyd's subamendment.

I have Mr. Julian, followed by Ms. O'Connell, followed by Mr. Lloyd.

Mr. Julian, please go ahead.

Mr. Peter Julian: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We have the responsibility of public safety. We've always worked together, I think, effectively. This is an important issue. I support the amendment that Ms. O'Connell just offered in terms of bringing forward the commissioner of Correctional Service Canada, the deputy minister, and officials from Justice and Public Safety to appear.

I would suggest, as well, in a separate motion, that we really need to request that the new Minister of Public Safety come here. This is on a mandate that obviously touches this issue. It would give us a couple of hours with officials. I would go beyond the officials and say that the minister himself, as the new Minister of Public Safety, would understand the importance of coming before this committee to be questioned on a number of issues.

• (1800)

[*Translation*]

Since I can't move an amendment, Mr. Chair, I'd like to suggest that we drop Mr. Lloyd's subamendment and revert to Ms. O'Connell's amendment. Immediately thereafter, I would be prepared to move another motion inviting the Minister of Public Safety to appear before the committee as soon as possible to answer all our

questions on his mandate, which will also include this very important issue.

[*English*]

The Chair: I think your points are well taken.

A motion of that kind would be useful, although we can't make it at this point. We can't just drop Mr. Lloyd's subamendment; we have to vote on it.

If everyone is ready to vote on it, we can do so. Otherwise, we have Ms. O'Connell, followed by Mr. Lloyd to speak. If they want to speak to Mr. Lloyd's subamendment, then we need to go ahead. If they don't, and if they wish to speak on the main motion, maybe we could vote on Mr. Lloyd's subamendment.

Do you want to speak to the subamendment?

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I can wait, Mr. Chair. I can remove my name, but I'd like it put back on for the main motion. However, if this does turn into a filibuster.... If Mr. Lloyd wants to speak to his subamendment and we can get to a vote, I'm fine with that. Otherwise, if this is turning into a filibuster further, then I'd like to make sure my name is back on that list.

The Chair: I've put your name next, after Mr. Lloyd.

Mr. Lloyd, did you wish to speak to your subamendment?

Mr. Dane Lloyd: Yes. I'll just try to reiterate the subamendment.

I believe we should have three meetings. I believe that these meetings should include representatives from Correctional Service Canada and Public Safety Canada, as Ms. O'Connell said. I believe that we need to have some sort of representation from victims to illustrate the impact this had on victims. I understand people's feelings. Of course, we want to protect victims, but it's important for victims' rights for victims to have a voice—an appropriate voice. I'm sure this committee could find an appropriate voice to pass on their concerns over what happened in this case and in other cases that may be related to this.

I believe we need to have representation from the Minister of Public Safety's office to illustrate what happened with this breakdown in communication between Correctional Service Canada, Public Safety Canada and the minister's office. The committee should report to the House, because I believe that if we don't collect our observations and our conclusions and make recommendations, then we're really failing in our duty to try to improve this situation so that these things don't happen again.

With that, I'd be happy to move the subamendment to a vote, so we can move it along, but I think there are others who wish to speak.

The Chair: Mr. Julian, did you wish to speak to the subamendment?

Mr. Peter Julian: Yes, I want to raise just one point.

In terms of the findings going to the House, this is a committee decision that I'm open to, but it's not one we would normally make at this point. A motion to refer something to the House is normally either the content of the motion itself or after, when we have a report or recommendations.

I guess I wanted to reassure Mr. Lloyd that ultimately the committee can decide to forward recommendations to the House, but it's not really germane to the motion that is before us.

The Chair: We can certainly decide to send it to the House later on if we wish, but it is common procedure, when we pass a motion for a study, that we report our results to the House. I think it's pretty standard language.

Are there any further comments on the subamendment?

Mr. Shipley, go ahead, please.

Mr. Doug Shipley: Briefly, this is all a matter of trying to negotiate the right situation to make sure everybody is heard here. We started off at zero. We were asking for five, we went down to one and now we're up to three. I think, in good faith, we're somewhere in the middle.

We didn't meet last week. We could have had a couple of meetings, so we can't talk about not having enough time. I really think that three is a good compromise. I think we'd do good work at three. I'm hoping that the rest of the committee can see that we don't want to be rushed. As Mr. Lloyd said, if they're willing to come, if we can get some representation of the victims, they need to be heard and not rushed.

I think three is a good compromise. Let's see who is willing to compromise in our first meeting.

• (1805)

The Chair: Thank you.

Madame Michaud, do you wish to speak to the amendment?

[*Translation*]

Ms. Kristina Michaud: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair.

There were discussions between the vice-chairs earlier, when the meeting was suspended, and I thought we had already reached a compromise. Mr. Julian alluded to this earlier, saying that, in any event, all members of the committee had agreed in private to invite the new Minister of Public Safety to come and talk about his mandate in general.

So we could hold a meeting on that particular situation, as proposed in Ms. O'Connell's amendment, and then hold a meeting to hear from the minister as soon as possible, or as soon as his schedule permits. That would allow members of the Conservative Party to ask the minister questions about this situation.

So I don't know why we're going back to this compromise of three meetings.

I therefore ask that we proceed with the vote.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you.

Is there any more debate on the subamendment?

Go ahead, Mr. Lloyd.

Mr. Dane Lloyd: I'll be brief.

Just to address the comments made there, my concern is that if we don't have the minister participate or have some participation from his office in this study, and if it's just having the minister come and speak about his new role, we won't be able to include any testimony from the minister in that study.

Maybe the clerk can tell me. If the minister comes for another reason and we ask him questions about this study, can we include his responses in that study if he has not been invited specifically as a witness for that study? If I know the answer to that, then we can be more clear about which direction we're going in.

The Chair: I'll ask the clerk.

I believe we can decide to incorporate results of other studies if we wish, Mr. Clerk.

The Clerk: Yes, we can.

The Chair: Yes, we can.

Ms. O'Connell, do you want to speak to the subamendment?

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Yes. I have a couple of questions about clarification.

The Chair: Okay. Go ahead.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I'm just trying to keep up with this. The subamendment moved by Mr. Lloyd does not include language—and this is to Mr. Julian's point—about a study. My amendment says that we're holding a meeting, so I would need clarification on how a meeting automatically becomes a study. If you could quote the exact reference.... I've sat on many committees, and there have been meetings on topics of particular interest, but it does not automatically mean it's a study unless you include specific text in your motion, which is not on the floor as I understand it.

I want clarification from the clerk. Was there an amendment moved or another subamendment moved to make this a study?

The Chair: Mr. Lloyd's subamendment changes it from one meeting to three meetings. It adds inviting the members of the families and asking for representatives from the minister's office, and that we report our findings to the House.

In my understanding, everything we do is a study, whether we call it a study or not. We can report whatever we like. I'll defer to the clerk, who can advise us with great wisdom.

The Clerk: Procedurally, whether or not we include a study in the motion, if we have a meeting it becomes a study by itself and it's written like that on the website.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Okay. That's fair enough.

Because that's not said in the paper that was passed around, I just want to be very clear on what we would be voting on first. The subamendment would be no less than three meetings, representatives from victims' families and that the report be reported back to the House. That's all as one. Is that correct?

• (1810)

The Chair: Yes, and it's also that we include an invitation to representatives from the Minister of Public Safety.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Okay. With that clarification, I want to speak to a couple of items. Then, I hope we can get to a vote on the subamendment, and then on my amendment.

In terms of having three meetings, as my colleagues have pointed out, we were trying to come to a compromise. What is at the three meetings? Why is it the number three, instead of just agreeing to the content and the need for the meetings? This is turning into something partisan. It's some sort of compromise, but it's not about making our work here better.

In terms of representatives from victims' families, if we are truly trying to talk about legislation and the facts.... I'm not going to reiterate how hurtful this is.

Lastly, there is the suggestion to bring representatives from the minister's office. There's ministerial accountability. We don't drag ministers' staff in front of committees. If that's the practice the Conservatives want to get into, I think it's completely wrong.

There have been notices of motions. I know we can't get into the details until they're on the floor. However, there have already been comments today about inviting the minister on his overall mandate, which is completely reasonable and fair. I'm sure the minister has no issues with that. If there are questions for the minister in terms of staff in the former or current office, then direct those questions to the minister. I think it is completely inappropriate to try to drag staff to committee as a way for the Conservatives to try to use this as some sort of political advantage. We need to get back to the work of this committee. There have been many compromises proposed. Let's bring in the commissioner of Correctional Services, the deputy minister, and officials from Justice and Public Safety, and let's have that conversation.

With that, Mr. Chair, I won't be supporting the subamendment.

I hope we can get to the amendment and move on with what I thought was a very reasonable compromise. I will personally, certainly, relay the message back to Minister LeBlanc that the committee would like to see him on his mandate. If there's a formal motion presented, that's great. If not, I will also relay that sentiment.

The Chair: Thank you.

We have Mr. Lloyd, followed by Mr. Shipley.

We have 15 minutes left to get through all of this.

Mr. Dane Lloyd: My subamendment was based upon the belief that if we don't have the minister come in to testify on what happened—for these three meetings—we won't be able to include that in the study. Based upon clarification from the clerk, we can ask the minister about this in a separate meeting. Those findings can then be included in any report to the House that we propose.

I want to be clear that there has been a changeover in the minister's office, so we're certainly not picking and choosing to drag staff to committee. We're leaving it to the minister's office to decide. If it's the minister himself—I believe, yes, ministerial accountability is key—that would be our ideal solution for this.

With that being said, I'm willing to drop having the minister, because, as we said, we are having him come to another meeting and we can ask him questions on this.

The key thing is that we would like to include representation from victims talking about their side of the story and how they feel about processes that can be improved to ensure that victims' rights are being respected. Then we'd have the officials who were listed by Ms. O'Connell, so we would cover all the bases I'm asking for.

I've asked for three bases to be covered: the victims' point of view through their representation, however appropriate that may be; a political office point of view through the minister when he comes on a separate matter; and the government point of view through the professional civil service. If we cover all three of those bases, we could have two meetings on this and accomplish this.

• (1815)

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: It was signed on the back of a napkin. Come on.

The Chair: I've written a lot of software that way, by the way. Some of it actually worked.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: This isn't serious.

The Chair: Okay. I'm in a bit of a procedural bind here because we have a subamendment. We can't change the subamendment, but I appreciate your changes. Another subamendment could be moved after this one is dealt with.

Now we'll vote on the subamendment.

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

The Chair: We are back to Ms. O'Connell's amendment. Is there any further discussion on Ms. O'Connell's amendment?

Mr. Lloyd, go ahead.

Mr. Dane Lloyd: I'll just move another subamendment, then, to reflect the changes that I discussed before the vote.

I guess it's unnecessary to say “report to the House”, because we've already discussed that these things are always considered a study, generally.

I move that the committee hold two meetings on the rights of crime victims and the security reclassification and transfer of offenders within federal corrections, and that the committee invite the commissioner of Correctional Service Canada, Anne Kelly; Deputy Minister Shawn Tupper; and officials of Justice and Public Safety Canada to appear.

The committee would also—and this would be the amendment—request that.... How would I word this?

The Chair: Representatives from victims' families—

Mr. Dane Lloyd: The committee would request representatives from victims' families, as appropriate, to discuss their perspective.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

I would suggest that this motion is out of order as we've already voted on it, and it lost.

Mr. Dane Lloyd: It's a different amendment.

The Chair: I think there are significant differences. Mr. Lloyd is moving to replace one meeting with two meetings, and he is adding that representatives from victims' families be invited to participate.

Is there any discussion?

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Mr. Chair, I think that, once again, it's incredibly disappointing that this is proving that the Conservatives are using this as a partisan filibuster, a horrific topic as a partisan filibuster, because it is very clear to anybody watching that they are making amendments and decisions on the back of a napkin.

If they were serious about victims' rights, they would have come prepared with something that isn't piecemeal: "I meant to add this", "I meant to say this", "Now I'm saying this, but no, wait, did I not say that? How do I word this?" Come on, Mr. Chair. We are trying to do real work on this committee about protecting victims, and I think the members opposite should quit while they are very clearly not ahead and they are embarrassing themselves. When it comes to an issue as serious and sensitive as this, we shouldn't conduct ourselves in this manner.

I think we've come to a reasonable compromise about having a very real conversation about a very real and serious topic, and if they want to continue in this manner, Canadians will be judging. As I said, women will see that an issue like this is being used in such a flippant way.

I will not be supporting this subamendment attempt, and I hope we can get to the amendment.

• (1820)

The Chair: Mr. Shipley, go ahead.

Mr. Doug Shipley: Thank you, Chair.

I take a little exception to saying we've come here to make decisions on the back of a napkin. We came here with a motion in both official languages, ready to go. Everything that's been done after our motion has been flippant, on the fly and on the back of a napkin, so it's actually completely backwards. We submitted ours properly through the clerk in advance, in both official languages. There's been nothing done willy-nilly here. It's been done properly from the beginning.

Ms. O'Connell mentioned a couple of times that this is a serious and sensitive issue. Yes, it's very serious and very sensitive. It's so serious that we need more than one meeting on it. If it's so serious, let's get serious. Let's get into this and figure things out. One meeting isn't serious. I don't know any issue that we've solved in one meeting. We need more time than that.

We heard earlier some very sensitive and very emotional discussions. Let's not rush through this. Let's do it properly. Let's all come to a consensus that we need more than one meeting. I don't know how anybody can think that we can do a serious and sensitive hearing in one meeting. That's not serious to me. Let's get serious. Let's do three meetings. Let's get to the bottom of this. Let's move forward.

Let the representatives of the victims be heard. We can't force them to come. The ones who are going to come are the ones who want to come and be heard. I heard Mr. Bittle say earlier that it was shameful that we were asking them to be heard. They don't have to come, but the ones who want to be heard will show up. Let's let them be heard. Let them speak about what they've been through and what happened to them back on June 1, when the heinous Mr. Bernardo was moved from maximum security to medium. I'm sure it caused them great stress and hardship. Let's get serious. Let's hear about it.

I can't support one meeting. One meeting is not serious. If we're going to talk about being serious, let's get serious. We wanted five. We'll go down to three. Let's do three meetings.

The Chair: Having three meetings is not on the table. It's two.

Mr. Doug Shipley: I'm sorry. It's two, plus the minister.

The Chair: We're running out of time here. Can we vote on Mr. Lloyd's subamendment?

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

The Chair: Are we ready to vote on Ms. O'Connell's amendment?

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I asked for a recorded vote.

The Chair: Mr. Clerk, would you conduct a recorded vote, please?

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: We still have the main motion. We have one more vote to do.

It's essentially the same. Do we need more discussion?

Mr. Lloyd, go ahead.

Mr. Dane Lloyd: Thank you.

I'm disappointed that we've had to get to this point. I believe the Conservatives have been completely reasonable. We were initially asking for five meetings, which we felt would be appropriate to meet the requirements for coming up with serious recommendations that could help prevent situations like this from happening again.

I think we showed a willingness when the government came forward with an amendment to suggest that we have one meeting. We could not in good conscience support one meeting with just Correctional Service Canada officials. We feel that this is a multi-dimensional situation involving victims' rights, involving practices of our civil service and involving the practices that go on inside ministers' offices.

By moving this amendment, the government has basically prevented us from hearing the very important perspectives of victims—how they feel about these practices being carried out by Correctional Service Canada and how they feel about what happened with the minister's office. We couldn't in good conscience vote for having only one meeting on this matter. We showed our willingness to compromise. We were pushing for two meetings on this matter, plus an additional meeting with the minister, which would have been a meeting that we were already planning with the minister, and seeking to include any testimony that we might ask for—taking away from our time as the opposition to ask him about many important issues related to public safety. We were going to sacrifice our time to ask those very important questions so that we could ask him specifically about these matters.

I think our side has shown Canadians that we are willing to work with all parties in order to get a result that is acceptable to Canadians. I think moving forward with just one meeting is insufficient. It's completely insufficient to give Canadians and victims' families the assurance that this government is doing everything it can to ensure that this situation doesn't happen again.

We were asking for two meetings, Mr. Chair, including a meeting where we would hear from representatives of victims to talk about their perspective. This committee voted to not hear from victims. I think that's wrong. I think it's unfortunate. That's why we couldn't in good conscience vote for this.

I think I've been clear that the Conservatives have shown a willingness to be very flexible on our initial motion, but we will not budge when it comes to supporting the rights of inclusion for victims and their families so that their perspectives can be heard. This is not just about hearing from civil servants and bureaucrats from their perspective, although that will be an important perspective to hear in order to make recommendations. This is about hearing from Canadians about how they felt these decisions impacted them. I think it's completely wrong that this committee voted not to include those perspectives in that.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (1825)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Lloyd.

Mr. Julian, go ahead.

Mr. Peter Julian: I wish that we'd move to the vote on the main motion, because as I mentioned, and we've had discussions among all four parties, I would like to move that we bring the minister here. I think it's a bit of a contradiction that we have the Conservatives filibustering the motion that I want to bring forward to bring the minister here. It doesn't make a lot of sense.

If we're concerned about the issue, why don't we invite the minister? The Conservatives are filibustering, so I'm not able to do that. Quite frankly, I'm a bit confused by their strategy. It seems to me that having a meeting with the minister makes a lot of sense, and yet Conservatives seem to be blocking the opportunity to do that.

I understand that we're very close now to adjournment time. I'm very confused about their strategy. I'm a little perplexed, when we

have discussions among all four parties, that this doesn't carry through to actually getting the committee business done.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Julian.

I have Mr. Motz on the list. However, I would encourage us to get to a vote on the main motion. Then we can entertain other motions, if we wish.

Mr. Motz, did you wish to speak?

Mr. Glen Motz: Yes, briefly.

I just want to bring this back to why this motion was brought forward in the first place. Canadians were shocked and outraged at the transfer. That was it. The families and the communities that were impacted by these tragedies were outraged. Across the country, people were outraged.

Here is an example. We realized that there is a deficiency in the legislation. The intent of having a study is to show that the deficiency exists and that Bill C-83 needs to be amended. To put pressure on government to do so was the intent behind this, to actually have a positive impact on victims, not only now but moving forward, so that they feel heard.

While I agree that there have been discussions among the parties here, I don't feel that brushing this off by having one meeting actually serves the purpose of what we're trying to accomplish.

I can't support one meeting. I'm sorry.

• (1830)

The Chair: Thank you.

Is there further discussion on the main motion?

Mr. Shipley, go ahead.

Mr. Doug Shipley: I just want to add to what my colleagues are saying. I understand that my friend from the NDP wants to get his motion on the floor, but let's do things right. Let's make sure that we have the right number of meetings in place. Let's not rush it through. We want to make sure that nothing is rushed with this.

When you're talking about bringing the minister... I know it was a different minister, but we have been asking for the minister to come to this committee. I wish the clerk could tell us how long it's been since the last minister came. We have been asking for that repeatedly, many times, and we couldn't get a response. We're all for the minister coming. It's just that it didn't happen. We're not holding up your motion. We'd like to get him here as much as you do, if not more. That's not an issue.

We just want to make sure that things are done properly here and that we have the right number of meetings. This is a very delicate topic, a very sensitive topic and a very in-depth topic. Let's give it the right time it deserves and let's make sure we do this with a full-some review. One meeting, to me, is just not enough. We've seen what we can do in a meeting here. Sometimes we don't get a lot resolved in a meeting—case in point.

I don't know what our timing is tonight. We talked just before this, Chair, and we said that we would have a hard stop at 6:30. Are we still—

The Chair: We suspended for 23 minutes, so we can actually extend it that far.

However, I would encourage us to have this vote, and if there's any time left, we can maybe hear from Mr. Julian and hear his motion.

I have Mr. Melillo.

Mr. Eric Melillo (Kenora, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Just briefly, obviously I've been quiet this meeting. It's my first intervention as a member of this committee, and it's good to be here.

Folks around the table have been part of this work a lot longer, obviously, but in coming into this with fresh eyes as a new member of the committee, I think that from my perspective I don't want to repeat what was being said but just reiterate how important it is to have more of a discussion about such an important and sensitive topic. When we talk about public safety, I think this is an issue that obviously has to be right at the forefront of it.

I don't know if it will be a lost cause or not, but I wanted to continue to implore my colleagues around the table to reconsider having only one meeting on this topic, just given the gravity of it and given the importance. Again, as a new member, I don't have all the experience that some of the other folks around here have, but I definitely think this is something that we have to reconsider. I urge everyone to do so.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Melillo.

Is there anything further?

I have Mr. Motz.

Mr. Glen Motz: I guess there's a bigger picture here that we need to look at.

There's a view on the other side that this is a filibuster process. I think the government has some legislation that they are pretty anxious to get through this committee. We came here with hat in hand, with great intentions of saying, "You know what, let's have a few meetings." We started with five. We can settle on two plus the minister when he comes, as per Mr. Julian's anticipated motion. I think that's reasonable. If we don't, I will tell you that I think there is a very strong probability that the government getting its legislation through in a timely way may not happen, and that's unfortunate.

There's some important legislation that needs to get through. We've been working on this for a while, and there are other ones coming up that are important, but this is something that we feel... We've been asked by Canadians to take a stand on this. We will, and we are. It's absolutely critical that the government representatives here at this committee understand that we're willing to work with them to pass government legislation, but to do so, we also require some concessions on things that have come to our attention from the Canadian people on matters that are important to them.

Hearing from victims and victims' groups is one of those issues, as well as the impact this has on the justice system and on what Canadians think of the justice system. We have an opportunity to meet and have Canadians be heard. I guess the ball is in the govern-

ment's court. If they want legislation passed in a timely way, then let's—

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: You're using victims to hold up government legislation.

Mr. Glen Motz: No. You are.

• (1835)

The Chair: Let's not have any crosstalk, please. Let's get to this vote.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: If the list has been exhausted, can we please vote?

The Chair: Actually, Mr. Julian was next.

Go ahead.

Mr. Peter Julian: I'm a bit concerned. Here we have the public complaints commission that the public has been calling for. We have legislation that we have to go through. It is an important issue that was raised today and I certainly agree that it merits the committee's time, which is why the rights of crime victims are now on the table. We are trying to vote on that to establish that. We are trying to vote to get the minister to come in to speak to the issue of the rights of crime victims and also to speak to other public safety issues.

I understand now that this is a filibuster where the Conservatives are saying that it's not enough and that we need another meeting. They haven't actually made the case in a very comprehensive way.

I would suggest to my Conservative colleagues... This is a minority Parliament, so no one party can impose its will. We have to work together. We should work together. That's certainly what Canadians expect of us. On issues like the rights of crime victims, for Public Safety to undertake that... We are trying to have that vote so we can actually move forward with this. We are trying to allow me to move the motion, so that the Minister of Public Safety comes here. Conservatives are saying that they're not going to permit either of those votes because they want another meeting.

They can always move that motion at another time. We can always have those discussions. We can have those discussions offline. If they make a compelling case, I'm certainly prepared to listen to it, but when a party or members say that they really believe this issue is important, yet they're not going to have any votes to have those meetings, I can see the contradiction. It's a bit hypocritical, quite frankly, Mr. Chair, to say that this is an important issue but they're going to block a consideration and a vote to actually have those issues investigated thoroughly at the public safety committee. I find that contradiction surprising.

I find that the issue itself is extremely important. The rights of crime victims are fundamental, yet I'm surprised that, rather than coming to a conclusion tonight, the Conservatives MPs on this committee are withholding the ability of this committee to make those decisions and have those issues investigated on behalf of Canadians. I can see the contradiction. I think Canadians can see the contradiction.

I would ask, Mr. Chair, that they stop the filibuster and allow the two votes. One is to have the meeting on the rights of crime victims thoroughly investigated with the commissioner of Correctional Service Canada. That's extremely important. The second is to have the Minister of Public Safety come here so that the Conservatives can ask those questions, I can ask those questions and all members of the committee can ask those questions, so that we come out of this meeting with a plan.

If they want to add to it later, I am fully willing to listen to them on their case, but I find the contradiction of not allowing the votes and not allowing us to proceed when they say that this is an important issue quite clear. I would ask, Mr. Chair, that they stop the contradiction and allow the votes to be held, so we can get going on this issue.

Thank you.

• (1840)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Julian.

Mr. Shipley, go ahead.

Mr. Doug Shipley: Thank you, Chair.

I agree that we have some important legislation ahead of us. I do want to remind my colleague that Bill C-20 has twice now died on the Order Paper and has not been brought through. This is the third time we've tried to get that through. It's unfortunate that we're even discussing that again.

I would like to propose a subamendment if I could, Chair, please.

The Chair: You wish to amend the motion as amended by Ms. O'Connell.

Mr. Doug Shipley: Yes.

The Chair: It's in order.

Mr. Doug Shipley: Thank you.

I would like to add a couple of subsections and a couple of people who would be important to come to this meeting. Now, if we add this, it will be a very busy meeting. We might have to go late that night, too.

I would like to add to the motion that we invite the Office of the Correctional Investigator and the Office of the Federal Ombudsman for Victims of Crime. I'll speak to that.

Do we need to get that in writing, as we did with Ms. O'Connell's?

The Chair: Let's get the amendment clear, and then we'll see whether we need to write it out.

Mr. Doug Shipley: We need to get that in the motion.

The Chair: We're going to have to close up shop right now. We've run out of time.

We're not going to be able to finish this motion today, it looks like.

Mr. Doug Shipley: We can continue with this one next Wednesday.

The Chair: That's what we're probably going to have to do, unless we can vote on what we have now.

I think we have to adjourn. We will resume at this point in the debate and begin again on this matter when we resume on Wednesday.

With that understanding, we are 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>