



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on Indigenous and Northern Affairs

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 038

Monday, November 14, 2022

Chair: The Honourable Marc Garneau



Standing Committee on Indigenous and Northern Affairs

Monday, November 14, 2022

• (1100)

[*Translation*]

The Chair (Hon. Marc Garneau (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Westmount, Lib.)): I call the meeting to order.

[*English*]

Good morning. Welcome to meeting number 38 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Indigenous and Northern Affairs.

As you know, we are meeting on the unceded territory of the Algonquin Anishinabe peoples.

Pursuant to the House order of reference adopted on Thursday, September 29, 2022, and pursuant to the motion adopted that same day by the committee, we are meeting to proceed with the clause-by-clause review of Bill C-29, an act to provide for the establishment of a national council for reconciliation.

[*Translation*]

Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format, pursuant to the House order of June 23, 2022.

[*English*]

I would now like to make a few comments for the benefit of all.

Please wait until I recognize you by name before speaking.

For those participating by video conference, click on the microphone icon to activate your microphone and please mute yourself when you're not speaking.

[*Translation*]

For interpretation services, those participating via Zoom have the choice, at the bottom of their screen, of either floor, English or French. Those participating in person, in the room, can select the appropriate channel and use their earpiece.

[*English*]

As a reminder, all comments should be addressed through the chair.

For members in the room, if you wish to speak, please raise your hand. For members on Zoom, please use the “raise hand” function. The clerk and I will do our best to manage the speaking order as best we can, and we appreciate your patience and understanding in this regard.

First of all, I'd like to welcome some witnesses who are with us this morning to help us if we have any technical questions.

From the Department of Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs, we have Mr. Andy Garrow, who is the director, policy and strategic direction, reconciliation secretariat, planning and partnerships. We also have Kate Ledgerwood, director general, policy and strategic direction, reconciliation secretariat.

As well, from the Department of Justice, we have Dr. Seetal Sanga, who is a senior counsel.

I'd also like to point out that we have with us experts on the legislative process associated with clause-by-clause study, Madame Thivierge and Mr. Pagé. Don't hesitate to use the resources that we have available if there are any questions.

As we begin clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-29, I'd like to provide members of the committee with some instructions and a few comments on how the committee will proceed.

As the name indicates, this is an examination of all the clauses in the order in which they appear in the bill. I will call each clause successively, and each clause is subject to debate and a vote. If there are amendments to the clause in question, I will recognize the member proposing the amendment, who may explain it. The amendment will then be open for debate. When no further members wish to intervene, the amendment will be voted on.

Amendments will be considered in the order in which they appear in the bill or in the package each member received from the clerk.

Members should note that new amendments or subamendments must be submitted in writing to the clerk of the committee.

We may have to pause briefly if some amendments or subamendments are introduced today.

The chair will go slowly. This is not a speed trial. We are going to go as slowly as we need to get this right. I will admit that this is my first time going through a bill.

Amendments have been given an alphanumeric number in the top right corner to indicate which party submitted the amendment. There is no need for a seconder to move an amendment. Once it is moved, you will need unanimous consent to withdraw it.

• (1105)

[*Translation*]

When an amendment is being debated, members may propose subamendments, which must be submitted in writing. The permission of the mover of the amendment is not required. The committee can have only one subamendment before it at a time, and that subamendment cannot be amended. When a subamendment is moved, it is voted on first. Then, another subamendment may be moved, or the committee may consider the main amendment and vote on it.

Once all the clauses have been put to a vote, the committee will vote on the short title of the bill—in other words, clause 1—the preamble, the long title and the bill as a whole. If amendments are adopted, it will be necessary to order a reprint of the bill as a working copy for House use at report stage. Lastly, the committee shall direct the chair to report the bill to the House. The report will indicate only the amendments that were made and any clauses that were removed.

[*English*]

Now we will begin the process.

Pursuant to Standing Order 75(1), consideration of clause 1, which is the short title, and of the preamble are postponed until the end.

I will now call clause 2.

In some cases no amendments have been proposed. I will ask whether the clause shall carry.

On the first one, I'm going to ask for a recorded vote just to get us into the rhythm of this process. I won't do that for every clause when there's unanimous consent.

When we do get to the amendments, if it is you who are proposing the amendment, you will be asked to move it; then, if you wish to explain it, you will have a chance to explain it. Then we go to debate. I hope that's fairly clear.

Is that clear, Mr. Vidal?

Mr. Gary Vidal (Desnethé—Mississippi—Churchill River, CPC): Can we move the reference number, or do you need us to actually read the whole amendment?

The Chair: That's a good question. It's just the reference number.

Mr. Gary Vidal: That's adequate? Thank you.

The Chair: That's adequate. Everybody is expected to have read the amendments that are planned today.

I'm going to start the process.

Shall clause 2 carry? I'm going to ask for a recorded division on clause 2.

(Clause 2 agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0)

• (1110)

The Chair: Shall clause 3 carry?

Clause 3 carries on division.

(Clause 3 agreed to)

The Chair: We're on clause 4.

[*Translation*]

Shall clause 4 carry?

(Clause 4 agreed to)

The Chair: Shall clause 5 carry?

I see we have unanimous agreement.

(Clause 5 agreed to)

(On clause 6)

[*English*]

The Chair: On clause 6, Mr. Vidal, you have amendment CPC-1. At this point you are asked to move that amendment. If you wish to discuss it and explain your reasons for it, that's fine. Then we proceed to debate and then we vote.

Mr. Gary Vidal: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I do move an amendment. It identifies as reference number 11957596 from the package. The purpose of this amendment is to actually amend the purpose of the council, the statement of purpose, to simply remove the words "efforts for" to change the purpose to be "The purpose of the Council is to advance" reconciliation with indigenous peoples.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Vidal.

Is there debate on this?

Not seeing any debate, shall CPC-1 carry?

(Amendment agreed to on division [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall clause 6 carry?

It's agreed to on division.

(Clause 6 agreed to)

(On clause 7)

The Chair: On clause 7, Mr. Vidal, you propose CPC-2.

Go ahead, Mr. McLeod.

Mr. Michael McLeod (Northwest Territories, Lib.): Mr. Chairman, I have a question regarding your comment. I see that everybody voted in favour, but you said "on division". I'm not following what that means.

The Chair: Okay. I should be clearer and say that it's voted unanimously. It's carried.

I apologize. That's a good catch.

Mr. Vidal, you have amendment CPC-2. Would you move that amendment? You can explain it if you wish.

Mr. Gary Vidal: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would move the amendment identified as reference number 12004667.

The purpose of this amendment is very similar to the one prior. It removes the language “efforts for” from the function section of the bill in a number of those places. I can go through each one, but I think everybody has had the opportunity to look at that. I probably do not need to explain any further.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Vidal.

Is there any debate on this?

Mr. Gary Vidal: That was my mistake, Mr. Chair: I was instructed to identify that there is a change in the French translation of paragraph 7(e). There's a change in the third-last line from “*du*” to “*au*”. I'm not going to try to show my French skills here. There is a change. It just changes the one word in the third-last line of paragraph 7(e).

The Chair: Is that where it's written “*fassent*”? Instead of “*du*”, it's “*au*”?

Mr. Gary Vidal: Yes. If that's acceptable, that change needs to be part of my motion with this reference number. I should have caught that. I'm sorry.

The Chair: That's very good.

Is there debate? Seeing no desire to debate and that everyone is in agreement, CPC-2 is carried.

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

The Chair: Now we'll go to NDP-1.

Ms. Idlout, would you like to move NDP-1 and, if you would like, explain it?

Ms. Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): Yes. *Qujannamiik*, Chairman.

I would like to move that reference number 12027471. I'm sorry; I wasn't paying attention to the wording. It reads as follows:

ensure that reconciliation is consistent with the protection and promotion of the rights of Indigenous peoples, including by advancing a rights-based approach to self-determination;

• (1115)

The Chair: Thank you. Shall NDP-1 carry? I see agreement.

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

The Chair: We'll now go to CPC-3.

Go ahead, Mr. Vidal.

Mr. Gary Vidal: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would move that the amendment identified as reference number 12008743 be considered. I think we heard testimony throughout the hearings from witnesses on the fact that there should be some measurable outcomes. In fact, we talked about the measurable outcomes in call to action number 55.

This would be an amendment to clause 7. It would add paragraph 7(h), which would ensure that we include some of those measurable actions that are identified in call to action 55, but doesn't limit it to just those measurable outcomes. It opens the door for other measurable outcomes as well, and that would be the purpose of my suggestion here.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Vidal.

Do any members want to debate this? Shall CPC-3 carry?

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

The Chair: We'll now go to NDP-2.

Go ahead, Ms. Idlout.

Ms. Lori Idlout: *Qujannamiik, Iksivautaq*. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have reference number 12043369 amend this.

The Chair: Is there a desire to debate this proposed amendment?

Mr. Jaime Battiste (Sydney—Victoria, Lib.): I understand that this is about the promotion and support of indigenous languages as part of the council's functions, I believe. It is? Okay.

We're in agreement—

The Chair: It's to protect indigenous language rights.

[*Translation*]

Does the committee wish to debate the amendment?

[*English*]

Not seeing any debate, shall NDP-2 carry? I see agreement.

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

The Chair: We now come to PV-1, which is Ms. May's, who I'm afraid is not here at this point. There is no need to move it on her part. That's pursuant to a routine motion adopted by the committee in December 2021.

Is there a desire to debate PV-1?

Go ahead, Mr. Schmale.

Mr. Jamie Schmale (Haliburton—Kawartha Lakes—Brock, CPC): Could we have a recorded vote on this one?

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Battiste, do you have a comment?

Mr. Jaime Battiste: We have actually some alternative language that we would like to propose to the committee. It is that Bill C-29, in clause 7, be amended by adding after line 9 on page 4 the following: “The Council must constitute a national reconciliation trust to advance the cause of reconciliation; the Council must develop a multi-year funding plan that ensures adequate funding of the Council national reconciliation trust; the Council must inform the Minister of any initial funding gaps in relation to item 3.”

That is the amended wording.

Are we sure? It sounds like the exact same thing.

A voice: [*Inaudible—Editor*]

Mr. Jaime Battiste: Are we okay with that?

Could we have a time out, Mr. Chair?

The Chair: Do you want a time out? Of course, if you are proposing it, this constitutes a subamendment, and it would need to be provided in writing.

Mr. Jaime Battiste: It feels like I amended something that's already the same as what's written, so I'm trying to get a quick time out to understand what I changed—

The Chair: Do you want a time out? Yes.

Okay. We will suspend momentarily.

• (1115) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1120)

Mr. Jaime Battiste: Let's try that again, Marc. Omit what I just said and we'll go to a vote.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

An hon. member: That was easy.

The Chair: Okay, very good.

[*Translation*]

Does anyone else wish to comment on PV-1?

It doesn't look like it.

[*English*]

In accordance with two requesters, we will go to a recorded division on PV-1.

(Amendment negated: nays 11; yeas 0 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Shall clause 7, with amendments CPC-2, NDP-1, CPC-3 and NDP-2, carry?

(Clause 7 as amended agreed to [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(On clause 8)

The Chair: Before we get into clause 8, I have to point out one thing. If CPC-4 is adopted, then G-1 cannot be moved, as they amend the same line.

I'm going to reference *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, which states on page 769:

Once a line of a clause has been amended by the committee, it cannot be further amended by a subsequent amendment as a given line may be amended only once.

I hope that's clear to everyone.

With that, Mr. Vidal, would you like to move CPC-4 and present it?

Mr. Gary Vidal: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm just making sure that I have all my notes coordinated and I'm on the right page.

I move that we consider the amendment with the reference number of 12004717. The purpose of this amendment to clause 8 is to change the language to suggest that the directors be “jointly selected” by the minister and the transitional committee rather than “in

collaboration with”. The purpose of this suggested amendment would be to truly honour the Truth and Reconciliation Commission's call to action number 53, which calls on that language of “jointly” selected rather than “in collaboration with”.

I think this is a little bit stronger language. We heard testimony from a number of witnesses who would support this amendment. I move it accordingly.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Vidal.

Is there any desire for debate?

Not seeing any, is CPC-4 carried?

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

The Chair: Because CPC-4 was carried, G-1 cannot be presented as an amendment.

• (1125)

[*Translation*]

We're moving on to BQ-1.

This is just a heads-up that BQ-1 and BQ-5 are consequential. If BQ-1 is adopted, BQ-5 is automatically adopted, but if BQ-1 is not adopted, BQ-5 can still be moved later.

Also, if BQ-1 is adopted, CPC-5 can't be moved because both amendments change the same line in the bill.

[*English*]

There are a couple of things to remember here. Is it clear to everyone? If BQ-1 is adopted, then CPC-5 cannot be proposed, because it changes the same line. That's the same rule I explained a minute ago.

Mr. Gary Vidal: Could we have a minute?

The Chair: Yes. We'll suspend for a minute here.

• (1125) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1130)

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Are you ready to move BQ-1, Mrs. Gill?

You can speak to it, if you wish, before the committee debates it.

Mrs. Marilène Gill (Manicouagan, BQ): Actually, Mr. Chair, the purpose of the amendment is simply to ensure that the clause also takes into account equal representation of women and men, as new subsection 12(2) would mention.

The purpose of CPC-5 is to ensure that the clause takes into account section 12 in its entirety. I don't want to limit the scope of my amendment, so I could move a subamendment to my own amendment to include CPC-5. I would have absolutely no problem doing that, but I'm not sure whether it's allowed, procedurally speaking, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: It's been discussed, Mrs. Gill, and if you want the clause to take into account other factors, instead of referring to subsection 12(2), you can refer simply to section 12. When we get to that clause and BQ-5, other amendments may come up.

Mrs. Marilène Gill: I think it's in keeping with what our amendment is trying to do, so that's what I'm proposing, and we can discuss it when we get to BQ-5. The door is open.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: From what I gather, you are proposing that BQ-1 refer to section 12, instead of subsection 12(2).

Mrs. Marilène Gill: Yes, exactly. That reflects CPC-5. It would actually be the same amendment.

The Chair: Very well.

[*English*]

Is there debate on the latest version of BQ-1?

• (1135)

Mr. Jaime Battiste: Mr. Chair, I think the intent is to ensure that we're moving forward within language that includes men and women and gender inclusion as part of this discussion. I understand you're saying that we can vote on BQ-1, which is now very similar to CPC-5. Is that what we're doing in terms of being able to move that now, vote on that now, and then have the discussion around the subsequent bill afterwards?

The Chair: Yes.

Mr. Jaime Battiste: Okay, we're fine with that. Thank you.

The Chair: Is there any more debate?

Mr. Gary Vidal: Just for clarity, I believe what Madame Gill has proposed is exactly what our next amendment would entail. She has actually changed the language to be exactly what our amendment would be. Just for clarity, is that right? That's what I understood. I just wanted to make sure.

The Chair: Not seeing any more debate, shall BQ-1, as amended, carry?

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

The Chair: As you know, Mr. Vidal, just to remind you, CPC-5 is no longer presentable at this point.

With that, shall clause 8 carry with the following amendments that were approved: CPC-4 and modified BQ-1?

(Clause 8 as amended agreed to [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: We are now on clause 9.

[*Translation*]

Shall clause 9 carry?

[*English*]

I am not seeing any desire to debate and I see approval.

(Clause 9 agreed to)

(On clause 10)

The Chair: We'll start with NDP-3, but I need to remind everybody on the panel here that if NDP-3 is adopted or defeated, then amendments CPC-6 and LIB-1 cannot be moved, as they are identical.

With that, Ms. Idlout, would you like to move and present NDP-3?

Ms. Lori Idlout: *Qujannamiik, Iksivautaq.*

I move that reference number 12027229 be considered. The purpose of this amendment is to add a nomination by the Native Women's Association of Canada to this board.

Qujannamiik.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Idlout.

Is there a desire to debate? I suspect not. Very good.

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

The Chair: With that, CPC-6 will not be presented, nor will LIB-1.

We'll now go to CPC-7 and Mr. Vidal.

Mr. Gary Vidal: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would move that the amendment identified by reference number 12023193 be considered. The purpose of this amendment is very similar to the last one by Ms. Idlout. In this case, we are suggesting that one member would be elected after having been nominated by the Congress of Aboriginal Peoples.

The purpose of this amendment would be to ensure that we have urban indigenous people represented at this table consistently and by that group.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Vidal. Is there debate on this?

Go ahead, Mr. Battiste.

Mr. Jaime Battiste: We understand that first nations, Métis and Inuit are recognized within the Constitution. Those are the three groups that we typically have given spots to, and it's consistent with the Constitution Act of Canada. In the age of murdered and missing indigenous women, we feel that adding gender parity and a spot for NWAC is important. However, our government will be opposing a CAP seat for various reasons.

• (1140)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Battiste.

Are there further inputs?

Mr. Jamie Schmale: Can we have a recorded vote, Chair?

The Chair: Mr. Schmale is calling for a recorded vote. Does anybody else wish to debate CPC-7?

Not seeing any further—

Go ahead, Madame Gill.

[Translation]

Mrs. Marilène Gill: I need some clarification, Mr. Chair. Mr. Battiste mentioned gender parity, but I don't understand how that relates to CPC-7, which refers to the Congress of Aboriginal Peoples.

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Battiste, do you want to expand a little bit for Madame Gill?

Mr. Jaime Battiste: I just wanted to make sure that when we're talking about why we've consistently gone with the Assembly of First Nations, MNC, and ITK, there's a reason for that. It's because they have constitutional status and we know their definitions.

With the Congress of Aboriginal Peoples, there is no real definition for whom they represent. We don't know who we're giving a seat to. In terms of the witness testimony that we heard, they said they represented non-status Indians in Canada. That could be just about anyone. Without further definition as to whom they represent, I feel that giving them a seat with the other constitutionally recognized groups is inconsistent.

I only brought up the gender balance and NWAC to explain why we supported the Native Women's Association of Canada's seat, but not the Congress of Aboriginal Peoples, just because there are too many questions as to who they could represent. With that in mind, that's why we're opposing.

[Translation]

The Chair: I think that answers Mrs. Gill's question.

Does anyone else wish to debate the amendment?

Go ahead, Mr. Schmale.

[English]

Mr. Jamie Schmale: Thank you, Chair.

I just want to point out to the committee, as we consider our voting, that a couple of times during the testimony we heard from the Athabasca Tribal Council in their written brief and CAP in their written brief talk about more inclusive representation. If we look at off-reserve representation, I think this organization is very vocal and very supportive of the needs of those people, and I think it would be a shame if they weren't included.

Thanks, Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Schmale.

Are there other points to be raised?

With that, I will ask for a recorded vote, please.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5 [See Minutes of Proceedings])

The Chair: Thank you, Madam Clerk. With that, I declare that CPC-7 is carried.

Shall clause 10 carry? Clause 10, of course, is amended by NDP-3 and CPC-7.

(Clause 10 as amended agreed to [See Minutes of Proceedings])

(On clause 11)

The Chair: That takes us to clause 11, and I will ask Mr. McLeod to present amendment LIB-2.

Mr. Michael McLeod: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Chair, I'm moving to amend clause 11 by adding after line 4 on page 5 the following:

(2) At least two of the directors must be residents of Yukon, the Northwest Territories or Nunavut.

The intention here is to ensure representation from the territories on the council, as some of the national organizations don't have a presence in the north.

• (1145)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. McLeod.

Is there debate?

Go ahead, Mr. Zimmer.

Mr. Bob Zimmer (Prince George—Peace River—Northern Rockies, CPC): Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair.

From our perspective, we would support your amendment. We also believe that representation should come from the three territories, at least in the numbers that you mentioned, so we are supportive of your amendment.

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Zimmer.

Are there others who wish to debate this?

If not, I will ask—

[Translation]

Mrs. Marilène Gill: I had my hand up, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: My apologies.

The floor is yours, Mrs. Gill.

Mrs. Marilène Gill: I have a question about the north.

As you know, Nunavik is in northern Quebec. It's not a territory strictly speaking, but the realities are similar whether it's the Yukon, the Northwest Territories or Nunavut, if we're talking about what needs changing. Why would we limit it to the territories? Why wouldn't we include northern ridings like the one that is home to the Inuit of Nunavik?

The Chair: Thank you, Mrs. Gill.

[English]

Mr. McLeod, do you wish to answer Madame Gill's question?

Mr. Michael McLeod: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that's the concern. There is the possibility for many of the regions in the north—for example, Labrador and northern Quebec—to be represented by ITK. However, if people from those regions are selected, then that leaves the Northwest Territories, Nunavut and the Yukon out, and also, for example, MNC has no presence in any of the three territories. AFN has no presence in the Yukon, so we could very well have selection from AFN from the south. We could have selection from ITK from Labrador, and that leaves us without anybody from the territories.

We're asking for consideration so that we have some representation on this body.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. McLeod.

[*Translation*]

Does that answer your question, Mrs. Gill?

Mrs. Marilène Gill: It partially answers my question.

I understand wanting to include the territories and ensuring that they are represented. You mentioned Labrador as an example, but you could also consider the riding of Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou or my riding. The same is true for all of them: they likely won't be represented on the board. I realize they aren't territories, strictly speaking, but the fact remains that a large part of the population in those ridings is indigenous.

I can, nevertheless, go along with the amendment to include the territories, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Mrs. Gill.

Does anyone else wish to comment on the amendment?

It doesn't look like it.

In that case, shall Liberal amendment 2 carry?

(Amendment agreed to)

[*English*]

The Chair: With that, shall clause 11, as amended by LIB-2, carry?

(Clause 11 as amended agreed to)

(On clause 12)

The Chair: There are quite a few things that we're going to be going through in clause 12, and I hope we can all keep it straight as we go through them.

We will start with amendment CPC-8. Mr. Vidal, do you wish to move it?

Mr. Gary Vidal: I do, Mr. Chair. Thank you. I move that the amendment identified by reference number 11961192 be considered by the committee.

My explanation is based on what we did in clause 8 earlier, where we added clause 12 into the reference in clause 8, which is around the first board of directors. What I'm proposing to do with this amendment is to remove the component that says, "Beginning on the fifth anniversary of the day on which the Council is incorporated" to suggest that the makeup that we agree to when we've done with clause 12—I understand there are a number of proposed amendments here—would be effective with the first board of directors, rather than just after five years. We heard that testimony on a number of occasions, so that would be the purpose of this amendment.

• (1150)

The Chair: Just to be sure I'm clear in my mind on CPC-8, what you're really doing here is removing the words "to the extent possible"?

Mr. Gary Vidal: No.

What I believe I'm doing, if I don't have my wires crossed on this, is removing the words "Beginning on the fifth anniversary of the day on which the Council is incorporated".

Does that make sense? Basically, what it would do is say that the makeup of the board of directors as identified in clause 12 would be effective immediately, not in five years. It would be effective with the first board of directors.

The Chair: That's understood. Thank you, Mr. Vidal.

For debate, we have Mr. Battiste.

Mr. Jaime Battiste: We are okay to get rid of the wording "Beginning on the fifth anniversary of the day on which the Council is incorporated". However, we ask that we continue with "to the extent possible".

We've given a number of seats out for other people to fill. If one of those people should resign or if there are some kinds of difficulties, we wouldn't want to delay the start of the council to have everyone picked right away. We believe that if we keep "to the extent possible", we allow the committee to start the valuable work that they need to do without having to worry about any delays from not having full representation from all of the different folks that we've given seats to—if that's agreeable.

The Chair: Mr. Vidal, do you want to comment on that?

Mr. Gary Vidal: Can I take a minute to discuss this with my peers?

The Chair: Yes.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Marilène Gill: I have something to say, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Just a second, Mrs. Gill.

[*English*]

Go ahead, Mr. Vidal.

Mr. Gary Vidal: We are amenable to that suggestion. We're okay with leaving that part in, so what process do we need to do to get there?

The Chair: I just consulted the legislative clerk, and you will have to propose a subamendment to the CPC-8 amendment. It will have to be received in writing. We'll suspend briefly so that we can make sure everybody sees the right version of it in English and in French.

Mr. Gary Vidal: Wouldn't it be easier if we just did it?

The Chair: No, we want to stay away from friendly amendments because this is the law. We're getting into a very important piece of legislation. I brought that up myself.

Mr. Jaime Battiste: Mr. Chair, because the wording is already in there and the amendment is—

The Chair: You're subamending the amendment, which has removed the words. You're saying that you would like them back in.

Mr. Jaime Battiste: Do I have to do this in handwriting?

The Chair: It has to be in writing.

Mr. Jaime Battiste: Okay. What form would you like this in?

The Chair: Look to the legislative clerks. They will tell you what's acceptable. Somebody will have to translate it too, unless you do it.

[*Translation*]

You wanted to say something, Mrs. Gill.

The floors yours.

• (1155)

Mrs. Marilène Gill: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I realize there's some sort of hiccup, but I have to point out that the Conservatives' amendment would remove two components of clause 12, the beginning and another part—the part Mr. Battiste wants to keep in. I wanted to mention it because it wasn't clear to me. Even if we see the amended wording, it's important to keep in mind that the amendment seeks to remove two components from the clause.

The Chair: Yes, the amendment would make two changes to the same paragraph.

Mrs. Marilène Gill: That's right.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (1205)

[*English*]

The Chair: We will now resume. As I understand it, the subamendment proposed by Monsieur Battiste has been sent to all of the members, and I'll remind everybody that this is reinstating the words “to the extent possible”.

Is there any desire to debate the subamendment?

I see none. Shall the subamendment to the amendment CPC-8 carry?

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

The Chair: Does the subamendment have a number?

Shall amendment CPC-8, as amended by Mr. Battiste's subamendment, carry?

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

The Chair: We'll now go to amendment NDP-4.

Ms. Idlout, would you like to move amendment NDP-4 and explain it?

Ms. Lori Idlout: *Qujannamiik, Iksivautaq.*

I move that reference number 12026959 be considered. The purpose of this amendment is to add indigenous elders and survivors of the discriminatory and assimilationist policies of the Government of Canada to the list of representatives.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Idlout.

Is there debate?

[*Translation*]

Go ahead, Mrs. Gill.

Mrs. Marilène Gill: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Bloc Québécois is, of course, in favour of this amendment, which would ensure elders and survivors are represented, but I do have a question for Ms. Idlout.

We heard from witnesses that they weren't all that comfortable with the term “survivors”. I don't have anything else to suggest, but I did want to bring it up.

I think I know what the member will say, but since I don't want to assume anything, could Ms. Idlout tell us whether the “discriminatory and assimilationist policies” referred to go beyond the residential school system.

The Chair: Thank you, Mrs. Gill.

[*English*]

Ms. Idlout, would you like to comment on Madame Gill's questions?

Ms. Lori Idlout: I'm sorry; can she repeat her question?

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Could you please repeat your question, Mrs. Gill?

Mrs. Marilène Gill: Yes. I'm unfortunately always the one having to ask their questions twice.

First, I just made a comment about the use of the term “survivors”. In the course of meeting with witnesses, we heard that they didn't feel the term represented them. Some are okay with it, but not others. That said, I don't have an alternative in mind. I just wanted to point that out.

Second, I asked a question about the reference to “discriminatory and assimilationist policies”. In general, the witnesses talked about residential schools, but the term doesn't refer solely to that. I wanted to know which other policies Ms. Idlout was referring to in proposed subsection (a.2) of her amendment.

The Chair: The floor is yours, Ms. Idlout.

[*English*]

Ms. Lori Idlout: Thank you, Madame Gill, for clarifying.

The important thing for me is that we don't limit survivors only to residential schools. There are other survivors. There are the sixties scoop survivors as well as survivors of other government policies like those relocated from the high Arctic and northern Quebec to Resolute. They are survivors of these policies as well.

The discriminatory policies substantiate what I'm saying about not limiting survivors to only residential schools. Those other examples of those policies are well known, and I didn't want to limit what those kinds of policies are by saying just that we are talking about government policies to take the Indian out of the child. Those kinds of things continue to impact indigenous peoples in Canada.

I hope that responds to your question.

• (1210)

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Idlout.

Did you have anything to add, Mrs. Gill?

Mrs. Marilène Gill: No, that's exactly what I wanted to hear, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Very good.

Over to you, Mr. Battiste.

[*English*]

Mr. Jaime Battiste: Yes, perhaps for greater clarity.... There have been a lot of assimilationist policies by the Government of Canada towards people other than indigenous people. I think for greater clarity in this bill, maybe “indigenous survivors” could clarify the scope a little more, in that that we're talking about survivors of residential schools and day schools. Those are the major ones that come to mind, but not limiting that.... I think what's meant here is for those indigenous survivors, so are we okay with amending that or are we agreeable to that?

Hopefully, I don't have to put that in handwriting again, but please let me know, Mr. Chair, if I do.

The Chair: Ms. Idlout, do you wish to comment on Mr. Battiste's point?

Ms. Lori Idlout: I am amenable to amendment, and I agree that adding “indigenous” in front of “survivors” would help to clarify that.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Schmale.

Mr. Jamie Schmale: I don't have a question on what Jaime said. I just have a general question for Ms. Idlout. Are we done with that before I—

The Chair: No, we're not quite done with that.

You may move to add the word “indigenous”, but we want to understand before we accept it what.... Let's agree on the French wording as well.

[*Translation*]

In French, it would read “survivants autochtones”.

[*English*]

Are we all agreed on that? I see agreement there.

Essentially, you are ready to put the word “indigenous” in front of “survivors”.

Go ahead, Mr. Schmale, on your point.

Mr. Jamie Schmale: My question is for Lori.

Could I have your thoughts or your comments on potentially adding the word “descendants”, rather than just “survivors”? Could it be “survivors and descendants”?

Ms. Lori Idlout: I take your point, and I do agree that we should add that. There are direct descendants who do suffer from intergenerational trauma, so I would be agreeable to adding “descendants”.

The Chair: That would require a subamendment.

Mr. Gary Vidal: Does it have to be written? Can't we do it the same as...?

The Chair: No. That was simple and straightforward. This has greater implications.

Are you preparing a subamendment? Okay. We'll therefore suspend.

• (1210)

(Pause)

• (1220)

The Chair: Resuming the committee, we have a subamendment proposed by Mr. Vidal that you should have all received.

Is there any debate on the subamendment from Mr. Vidal to NDP-4?

[*Translation*]

It looks like we have agreement.

[*English*]

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

The Chair: Is NDP-4 as amended by the subamendment and with the addition of the word “indigenous” carried?

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

The Chair: We now go to G-2, but just before I get into it, I have a comment.

Amendments G-2, BQ-2, and LIB-3 all seek to add representation of survivors of residential schools to the board of directors. When debating and voting on these amendments, members of the committee should bear that in mind in order to be coherent throughout the bill. We have to be coherent.

With that, I will ask Mr. Battiste if he wishes to move amendment G-2 and explain it.

• (1225)

Mr. Jaime Battiste: No, Mr. Chair, I wish to withdraw it since it was already covered in the previous amendments.

The Chair: Seeing no debate on that, amendment G-2 is withdrawn.

We'll now go to amendment LIB-2.1.

Mr. Weiler, would you care to move this amendment?

Mr. Patrick Weiler (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair. I gladly move this amendment, reference 12050033.

This amendment will amend paragraph 12(c) to read:

of the *Department of Indigenous Services Act*, to reflect the diversity of arrangements that govern relationships between Indigenous communities and the Government of Canada;

Just to give some background of why I believe this is important, indigenous governments are not homogeneous right across the country. I believe it's important to have this in there so that there are considerations to include indigenous governments that will reflect the diversity that we have across the country, whether that's self-governing nations, whether that's historical treaty first nations, whether that's modern treaty or whether there's no treaty at all.

Because the key part of reconciliation is the process to move ahead on self-determination, I think it's very important that the council have that broad diversity of indigenous government representation on it.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Weiler.

Is there a wish to debate this amendment?

As I am not seeing any, shall amendment LIB-2.1 carry?

(Amendment agreed to)

[*Translation*]

The Chair: We are moving on to BQ-2.

Would you like to move it, Mrs. Gill?

Mrs. Marilène Gill: Actually, Mr. Chair, I won't be moving that amendment since the reference to survivors was already covered by another amendment, which we adopted, NDP-4, if I'm not mistaken.

The Chair: Thank you, Mrs. Gill.

[*English*]

Ms. Gill is withdrawing BQ-2, stating that it really has been covered now by the amended NDP-4.

As I am not seeing any wish to debate or argue that, amendment BQ-2 is withdrawn.

[*Translation*]

That brings us to BQ-3.

Mrs. Marilène Gill: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The purpose of the amendment is merely to include indigenous people whose second language is French. After checking, we realized that the bill, in its current form, did not give indigenous people whose second language was French the ability to participate on the board in French.

The amendment refers to indigenous people who speak French as a second language, but come to think of it, French could just as easily be their mother tongue. I think others agree with me on that. Although we want to support the revitalization of indigenous languages, the first language spoken in some communities is French. For that reason, I propose an amendment to my own amendment to also refer to those whose mother tongue is French. Someone else could move it as well.

The Chair: Thank you, Mrs. Gill.

How would the new amendment be worded?

Mrs. Marilène Gill: It's quite simple. I would add the words "mother tongue or". It would read as follows:

(f) Indigenous persons whose mother tongue or second language is French.

The Chair: Thank you, Mrs. Gill.

I'm going to check with the clerks.

We're going to take a quick break, to make sure we have the right translation in English.

• (1230)

[*English*]

The Chair: We'll resume.

The change that has been made to BQ-3 by the mover of BQ-3 is to add "mother tongue", or "*langue maternelle*".

Is there any wish to debate that?

Seeing none, shall BQ-3 with that small amendment carry?

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

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Now we move on to BQ-4.

Go ahead, Mrs. Gill.

Mrs. Marilène Gill: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

As was the case with BQ-2, NDP amendment 4 has already added what BQ-4 would have added, so I won't be moving it.

The Chair: Thank you, Mrs. Gill.

[*English*]

Amendment BQ-4, because it's been covered by NDP-4, is withdrawn.

We'll now go to CPC-9. Mr. Vidal, it's over to you.

Mr. Gary Vidal: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I move that the amendment identified by reference number 12004940 be considered by the committee.

The purpose in adding this proposed amendment to the representatives of the council would very simply be to address the very fundamental cause of many of the issues, that being poverty. In acknowledging that poverty needs to be reduced and that poverty is a root cause of many of the issues, we think it's very important that we include representation on a national council for reconciliation that includes economic reconciliation.

We heard in the committee testimony—in meetings 33, 34, 35 and 36—from a number of people, including Mr. Calla, Mr. Ross, Ms. Restoule, Mr. Jules, Mr. Bailey, Ms. Mbarki and Mr. Sellars, on how important economic reconciliation is going to be to the future relationship between indigenous peoples and non-indigenous peoples in our country. We think representation on this committee by somebody who brings that voice to the table is imperative.

That's the reason for moving this addition.

• (1235)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Vidal.

Is there a wish to debate this?

Go ahead, Mr. Battiste.

Mr. Jaime Battiste: We will be opposing this amendment.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Battiste.

[Translation]

Does anyone else want to debate the amendment?

The floor is yours, Mr. Schmale.

[English]

Mr. Jamie Schmale: Thank you very much, Chair.

Unfortunately, I'm saddened to learn of the government's position on this amendment. I think, as pointed out by Gary Vidal, we have had numerous witnesses at numerous meetings talk about the need for economic reconciliation, about how it's an important part of the whole process. To leave something like this out when some people who had very strong voices and very good ideas when we were talking about the future in this bill.... Bill C-29 is about the future and how we move forward, so taking out that important piece, ignoring our expert witnesses who were advocating for such a voice on this committee, is disappointing. I hope the government reconsiders. I think not doing so is very short-sighted. Hopefully, this passes. It would be sad if it didn't.

Thanks.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Schmale.

Go ahead, Madame Idlout.

Ms. Lori Idlout: *Qujannamiik, Iksivautaq.*

I find the reasoning that Gary just mentioned quite different from the actual text of the amendment. If the Conservatives really are concerned about addressing poverty, why wouldn't they suggest organizations addressing poverty specifically?

When they provided information about witnesses talking about economic reconciliation, I'm pretty sure if we looked back to the transcripts, we would see it was because they were responding to questions on economic reconciliation as questioned by the Conservatives. As of yet, I don't know what "economic reconciliation" means, so it's a strange concept, and I'm struggling to support this amendment as well.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Idlout.

Would anybody care to make a comment?

[Translation]

Go ahead, Mrs. Gill.

Mrs. Marilène Gill: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to comment on something I heard. A number of witnesses told us that they didn't want reconciliation to be divided into categories for a variety of reasons. In particular, they didn't want the board to be bogged down with representatives from different sectors. Instead, they recommended creating subcommittees, and I imagine the idea was to make sure there was a quorum.

I also have a question. Is there an organization recognized by all indigenous communities that could represent their economic interests Canada-wide?

The Chair: Thank you, Mrs. Gill.

[English]

Mr. Vidal, do you wish to respond to that?

Mr. Gary Vidal: Absolutely.

First, as far as the idea of the organizations is concerned, we didn't want to get prescriptive by listing different organizations, but there are many organizations that could be included in this consideration. Many of them, such as the First Nations Financial Management Board or the different organizations that operate under the First Nations Fiscal Management Act would be examples. There would be organizations like NACCA or CCAB. The list would go on and on, and that's why we didn't get prescriptive.

Many of these organizations are doing very good work, and the work has a sole purpose and mandate of eradicating poverty by including good business practices, by including good procurement practices on behalf of the government. CCAB has been an advocate for procurement targets and many of these things. I guess it's our opinion that economic reconciliation or the concept of reconciliation in the context of addressing poverty is a very big factor in the context of reconciliation overall.

I would probably leave my comments there. I think that addresses both Ms. Idlout's and Madame Gill's comments, unless they want to come back to me to ask something further.

• (1240)

The Chair: Thank you.

Go ahead, Mr. Zimmer.

Mr. Bob Zimmer: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

One witness, as an example, was Ellis Ross, who spoke about economic reconciliation and said there was a dark past, but here was the way to a bright future. I think there was a contrast in time to deal with that very negative situation of what's happened to indigenous peoples in Canada, but again, it was to set the stage for a new reality for first nations where there's a prosperous future.

I think it's very fitting that it would be included. It was mentioned by many of our witnesses in speaking to Bill C-29. I was actually surprised there were that many. Witness after witness brought it up—that it needed to be part of reconciliation, that economic reconciliation needed to be a part of this piece of legislation.

I think the amendment is quite fitting. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Zimmer.

Does anybody else wish to comment?

Go ahead, Ms. Atwin.

Mrs. Jenica Atwin: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'd just like to add that I can certainly see the merit in the arguments that are being made by our Conservative colleagues. I understand why they see this as important, but I'd just like to reiterate that it does kind of compartmentalize reconciliation.

It's too prescriptive. The council is going to have to be able to do its own work. There are going to be differences of opinion depending on territory as well, so I think we should just leave it as it is and not be too prescriptive, because it's really about them being at arm's length and independent.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Atwin.

Are there any other comments?

[Translation]

I see you have your hand up, Mrs. Gill, but I think it's from earlier.

[English]

Not seeing any further debate, I'm going to ask for a recorded vote on this one. Shall amendment CPC-9 carry?

(Amendment negatived: nays 6; yeas 5 [See Minutes of Proceedings])

The Chair: Thank you, Madam Clerk. I declare amendment CPC-9 defeated.

We'll now go to amendment LIB-3 and Mr. McLeod.

• (1245)

Mr. Michael McLeod: Mr. Chair, I want to bring the amendment forward to add, after line 16 on page 5, the following:

(f) survivors of Canadian residential schools or their descendants.

It is important that we have people who have gone through the residential school system or their descendants as part of the discussion. A big part of reconciliation includes the residential schools.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. McLeod.

Is there a wish to debate this?

Not seeing any, I will go for a vote. Shall amendment LIB-3 carry?

(Amendment agreed to)

The Chair: Amendment LIB-3 is carried.

[Translation]

That brings us to BQ-5.

Go ahead, Mrs. Gill.

Mrs. Marilène Gill: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We just want to make sure the board of directors has equal representation of women and men. That's the purpose of BQ-5.

Again, I'm open to changing the amendment given the representation issues we discussed at the beginning of the meeting.

The Chair: Thank you, Mrs. Gill.

[English]

Is there a wish to debate this amendment?

I see that Ms. Atwin has her hand up.

Mrs. Jenica Atwin: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

There has been some discussion specifically just about the wording, and we would like to be sure that it's less about men and women and more about gender inclusiveness, so it's that gender parity piece rather than men and women specifically. We have circulated the wording, I believe, but we can check on that.

The Chair: Very good.

Have we received the wording in writing?

[Translation]

You have a few options, Mrs. Gill. An upcoming amendment, LIB-4, uses wording that is slightly different, so you can opt to support LIB-4, if you wish. If you want to stick with BQ-5, as it currently stands, Mrs. Atwin has the ability to move a subamendment.

Mrs. Marilène Gill: Mr. Chair, I am in favour of ensuring parity between women and men and referring to gender inclusiveness. Keep in mind that the scientific literature in French distinguishes between a person's biological sex and gender, whereas, in English, the term "gender studies" covers it all.

Of course, I think both are important. It's fine to have the wording cover both gender and sex, so I encourage Mrs. Atwin to move a subamendment to BQ-5.

The Chair: Thank you, Mrs. Gill.

[English]

Ms. Atwin, you probably caught that. Are you wishing to propose a subamendment to BQ-5?

Mrs. Jenica Atwin: Yes. I would like to propose a subamendment.

I'll need just one minute. I'm just looking for the correct language.

The subamendment would be as follows: "That the composition of the board of directors must also, to the extent possible, ensure and equitably reflect gender diversity".

• (1250)

The Chair: Thank you very much. We will have to translate that at this end before we resume.

• (1250)

(Pause)

• (1250)

The Chair: We are resuming.

I just need to make a point here.

Ms. Atwin, what you essentially read verbatim was LIB-4. That was your amendment. It was not quite what Madame Gill was prepared to look at as a subamendment to her amendment.

That said, the two amendments are receivable. We can vote separately on the two. They would both be, if adopted, in the legislation. I'm just leaving that with you for a second.

Go ahead, Mr. Battiste.

Mr. Jaime Battiste: Mr. Chair, just for clarity, are you saying that if we vote in the affirmative for BQ-5, we can also vote for LIB-4?

• (1255)

The Chair: Yes, that's what I'm saying.

Mr. Jaime Battiste: Okay.

I'm prepared to vote.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Vidal.

Mr. Gary Vidal: I'm sorry. I'm not understanding the process.

Earlier in the process, we were not allowed to consider amendments that reflected the same line. This is exactly the same line. It's line 16 on page 5 of clause 12. How can we do two amendments now, but we couldn't earlier? What am I missing?

The Chair: It's a good point; however, in this particular case, it is not substituting. If you look at BQ-5, it's not substituting. If we look at LIB-4 and we also adopt that, that would become subclause 12(3). Subclause 12(2) is as written in BQ-5, and then you would add an additional subclause 12(3). You're adding, as opposed to just substituting. That's the point.

If you look at BQ-5 and (2), if that's adopted, that's as written there, and, if LIB-4 is also adopted, that (2) becomes a (3).

Do you understand what I'm saying? There are two subclauses that are both in there if they're both adopted.

Mr. Gary Vidal: I understand where you're coming from. I have to go back and try to figure out how that relates to what we couldn't do earlier. I get where you're coming from now, so that's fine.

The Chair: Okay.

I'll just remind everybody that we're at four minutes to one, so we're obviously not going to finish everything today. We will stop at one o'clock, wherever we are.

[*Translation*]

Now we are back on BQ-5, as moved by Mrs. Gill.

Does anyone else wish to comment on the amendment?

It doesn't look like it.

Shall BQ-5 carry?

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

[*English*]

The Chair: We'll now go to LIB-4. We've already begun to speak about it.

Ms. Atwin, you are allowed to move this as a separate amendment.

Mrs. Jenica Atwin: This is referenced under 12053674. I move that Bill C-29 in clause 12 be amended by adding after line 16 on page 5 the following: "(2) The composition of the board of directors must also, to the extent possible, ensure and equitably reflect gender diversity."

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Atwin.

Is there debate on this?

Mr. Eric Melillo (Kenora, CPC): I have a small technical question. You said earlier that this (2) will now become a (3), so would it be (3) instead of (2) as Ms. Atwin read it?

The Chair: Yes, it will be at the reprint, which is at the end of this whole exercise.

Shall LIB-4 carry?

(Amendment agreed to)

The Chair: Shall clause 12 carry with the following amendments: amendment CPC-8 with the subamendment from Mr. Battiste, amendment NDP-4 with the subamendment by Mr. Vidal, amendment LIB-2.1, amendment BQ-3, amendment LIB-3, amendment BQ-5 and amendment LIB-4?

Mr. Jamie Schmale: On division.

(Clause 12 as amended agreed to on division [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: I think that it's a little bit too late for us to start clause 13, so we will resume on Thursday at 3:30.

This committee is adjourned.

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

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

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

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the Copyright Act. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the Copyright Act.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

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

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

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

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

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la Loi sur le droit d'auteur. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre des communes.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la Loi sur le droit d'auteur.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante :
<https://www.noscommunes.ca>