



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 036

Tuesday, June 2, 2026

Chair: Chris Bittle



Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs

Tuesday, June 2, 2026

• (1005)

[English]

The Chair (Chris Bittle (St. Catharines, Lib.)): I call this meeting to order.

Welcome to meeting number 36 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(3), the committee is meeting to continue its clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-25, an act to amend the Canada Elections Act and to enact an act to change the names of certain electoral districts, 2026. The short title is the strong and free elections act.

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

Before I continue, I would ask all in-person participants to consult the guidelines written on the cards on the tables. These measures are in place to help prevent audio feedback incidents and to protect the health and safety of everyone in the room, especially our interpreters.

I'd like to remind witnesses that committee members may ask questions in either French or English. If you need interpretation, please take a moment now to prepare your earpiece and select the listening channel you need in advance, in order to take full advantage of the time allotted for questions and answers.

I have a few comments for the benefit of members. I remind you that all comments should be addressed through the chair. For members in the room, if you wish to speak, raise your hand. For members on Zoom, use the "raise hand" feature. The clerk and I will do our best to keep a list.

I would like to welcome back our officials. I won't go through the introductions, but welcome back.

We will continue with clause-by-clause consideration.

We voted on CPC-6. It was defeated.

(Clauses 36 to 38 agreed to)

(On clause 39)

The Chair: We're on clause 39, amendment G-1.

Ms. Vandenberg, go ahead, please.

Anita Vandenberg (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.): Thank you.

Amendment G-1 also addresses the recommendations by the committee on the unduly long ballots. It did say that we would have a unique official agent for each candidate in each district, but it didn't really clarify that it was in a particular election. What this amendment does, for that ambiguity, is make sure that in the next election an official agent can be an official agent for a different candidate. They just can't do it in the same, current election. It's just a clarification.

The Chair: Is there any further debate?

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

(Clause 39 as amended agreed to)

(Clauses 40 to 42 agreed to)

(On clause 43)

The Chair: We're on clause 43, amendment G-2.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Brière, you have the floor.

Hon. Élisabeth Brière (Sherbrooke, Lib.): We just need to add a zero to the amount. It says 325 instead of 3,250.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you so much.

Is there any debate?

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

(Clause 43 as amended agreed to)

(Clauses 44 to 47 agreed to)

(On clause 48)

The Chair: On clause 48, we have amendment CPC-7.

Go ahead, Mr. Cooper.

Michael Cooper (St. Albert—Sturgeon River, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This amendment would include a reference to audio recordings, in the English version, of the parody and satire defence to the offence, which is proposed to be extended by this clause. This was further to a recommendation offered by the Canadian Civil Liberties Association.

The Chair: Thank you so much, Mr. Cooper.

Mr. Louis.

Tim Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga, Lib.): I appreciate the nod to the audio industry. As someone who made a living from the audio industry, I'm going to support this one, obviously.

The Chair: Can we agree on that one?

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

(Clause 48 as amended agreed to)

(Clauses 49 and 50 agreed to)

(On clause 51)

The Chair: We have CPC-7.1 and Mr. Cooper.

We're going to suspend for a minute.

• (1010) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1010)

The Chair: We're back.

I'll turn to Mr. Cooper.

Michael Cooper: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

This amendment relates to proposed section 482.01, which is the false statements offence. There are a number of examples of an offence that could be established in respect of a false statement or in respect of a number of things that are enumerated in the clause.

This amendment would remove paragraph 482.01(g) of proposed section 482.01, which is “the preliminary, validated or official results of an election.”

There are a few reasons that I have put forward this amendment. The first is that, as we heard from Gerald Chipeur, a long-standing, respected constitutional lawyer, there are free speech implications at play.

Second, it seems that this paragraph is a solution in search of a problem that doesn't exist. Third, it could have a chilling effect in respect of questions that often occur in elections when there are questions about the outcome or the results of an election, such as what happened in Terrebonne. For those reasons, I would encourage the committee to support the amendment.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Go ahead, Madam Kayabaga.

Hon. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.): Thank you, Chair.

We oppose this amendment, because Bill C-25 requires that the statement made be fraudulent and made with the intent to affect results or disrupt the conduct of an election, leadership contest or nomination contest. This measure does not restrict genuine debate, opinions, satire or parody. The goal is not to limit free expression but to stop those who intend to deliberately mislead Canadians, sow confusion or affect the conduct of or outcome of our elections.

Given these important guardrails and the fact that the spread of disinformation has become one of the greatest threats to our democratic processes, we won't be supporting this amendment.

The Chair: Thank you so much.

Madame DeBellefeuille.

[*Translation*]

Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon, BQ): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would be quite curious to know the officials' position on the impact of the amendment introduced by Mr. Cooper. Would it have any effect? What would it change?

[*English*]

Rachel Pereira (Director, Democratic Institutions, Privy Council Office): Thank you for the question.

The act currently doesn't capture opinions, good faith statements or honest mistakes, and these new prohibitions wouldn't change that. These are for statements an individual knows to be incorrect or false, and for when they have the intent to disrupt the conduct or results of an election.

Paragraph 482.01(g)... In fact, all seven statements here have been scoped and integrated in order to protect the legitimacy of the electoral process while respecting freedom of speech. They are also, again, designed to capture intentional bad actions in a narrow set of circumstances that are very specific to the electoral context.

Any of these statements could be removed, but it would leave a gap in terms of potential statements that could be made. For example, say an election result isn't ready. The ballots still need to be counted overnight and news outlets have agreed that election results won't be ready until the next morning. A candidate could potentially go on social media and say, “I have won the election.” That is something paragraph 482.01(g) would capture.

Again, I will stress that it's for when a person knows a statement is false and they have the intent to disrupt the conduct or results of an election.

• (1015)

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Jackson.

Grant Jackson (Brandon—Souris, CPC): Thanks, Chair.

Following on that, I understand this would apply to the federal situation, but we had a provincial leadership race in Manitoba a number of years ago. The candidate who lost the election went on the media the next day—even though her campaign team in the ballot room had scrutinized the ballots and knew the result—and publicly said, “I won the election.” That was fraudulent. It was handled badly. Even though it wasn't...and she had sworn witnesses.

How would this bill, if implemented, impact that situation?

Rachel Pereira: The commissioner of Canada elections would have the opportunity, if there is merit, to investigate if someone suggests that a false statement was made. They've been designed to be relatively easily verifiable. Something did or didn't happen.

However, the act and the commissioner are not there to be punitive. She's there to act in the public interest. If there is something that is known to be false by an individual who had the intent to disrupt.... The bar would be pretty high. It would be an offence under the act, but it would really depend on each particular circumstance. Each instance would potentially be investigated, or not, as an offence.

The Chair: Mr. Cooper.

Michael Cooper: Certainly, the bar would be high. The standard is intent. That is an important safeguard.

Nonetheless, I emphasize that it could have unintended consequences—a chilling effect—when there are legitimate questions about elections. I can recall, for example, a friend of mine who's now a minister in the province of Saskatchewan. He lost his seat in 2006 by 53 votes. There were all kinds of irregularities in that particular riding, including the winning candidate holding raffles and auctioning off TVs, among other allegations. When the result came down to one vote in Terrebonne, there were questions in that case too.

That is my primary concern—the unintended consequences this might have. It's not about persons going out and wilfully spreading misinformation or disinformation about legitimate election results. In every election, there are one or two ridings where it's a close race, where irregularities may happen or where there are allegations and close outcomes. That is what I'm concerned about.

The Chair: Seeing no further debate, we will call the vote on CPC-7.1.

(Amendment negated: nays 7; yeas 4)

(Clauses 51 and 52 agreed to)

(On clause 53)

The Chair: CPC-8 would create an incoherence if it is moved.

• (1020)

Michael Cooper: Because of previous amendments, I will withdraw this amendment.

The Chair: Wonderful. Thank you.

(Clauses 53 and 54 agreed to)

(On clause 55)

The Chair: Madame DeBellefeuille, go ahead.

[*Translation*]

Claude DeBellefeuille: I have a quick question regarding clause 55 of Bill C-25, actually. I would like to take this opportunity to ask the officials here what they mean by “foreign entity”.

[*English*]

Rachel Pereira: A foreign entity is defined in the act as “an individual who is not a Canadian citizen or a permanent resident as defined in subsection 2(1) of the Immigration and Refugee Protec-

tion Act”. It can be “a corporation or entity incorporated, formed or otherwise organized outside Canada if it does not carry on business in Canada”. It could be “a trade union that does not hold bargaining rights for employees in Canada”. It could also be a foreign political party, a foreign government, or an agent or a mandatory of one.

The Chair: Thank you.

(Clauses 55 to 59 agreed to)

(On clause 60)

The Chair: Go ahead, Madam Kayabaga.

Hon. Arielle Kayabaga: Would you like me to read the full amendment that we're bringing in or just the rationale?

The Chair: Just state the rationale.

Hon. Arielle Kayabaga: This is a technical amendment that harmonizes a prohibition with the associated offence related to the new ban on accepting a contribution that is in the form of a crypto asset, money order or payment product.

The Chair: Is there any further debate?

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

(Clause 60 as amended agreed to)

(On clause 61)

The Chair: We have NDP-4. If NDP-4 is adopted, BQ-17.01 cannot be moved due to a line conflict.

It is deemed moved, but no one is here to speak to it.

Is there any debate on NDP-4?

• (1025)

Michael Cooper: Just give me a moment.

The Chair: Sure. No problem.

We'll suspend.

• (1025)

(Pause)

• (1025)

The Chair: Welcome back.

We're on NDP-4.

Is there any support for NDP-4?

Michael Cooper: I support it.

The Chair: Seeing no debate, let's call the vote on NDP-4.

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

The Chair: We will move to BQ-17.01.

Madame DeBellefeuille.

[Translation]

Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Chair, I gather that, if amendment BQ-15.01 wasn't adopted, then amendment BQ-17.01 is not in order. As a result, I won't be moving it.

[English]

The Chair: You choose not to move it. Excellent. They are independent, technically speaking, but if they're connected, I appreciate the withdrawal.

(Clauses 61 and 62 agreed to)

(On clause 63)

The Chair: We have G-4.

Ms. Fancy.

Jessica Fancy (South Shore—St. Margarets, Lib.): I'd like to just quickly speak with regard to this clause.

We want to amend clause 63 by replacing line 17 on page 30 with the following:

(h.001) being a nomination contestant, a leadership contestant or the financial agent of a nomination contestant or leadership

In terms of what we're hoping that does, the Canada Elections Act currently includes additional punishments for any offence designated as a "corrupt practice". As the name suggests, a corrupt practice is a serious offence that warrants extra scrutiny, especially when knowingly committed by somebody who should be deemed trustworthy.

Within the bill, it will also make it a corrupt practice for a nomination contestant or a leadership contestant to knowingly offer a bribe to influence whether, or how, someone votes at a nomination or leadership contest. As well, financial agents in this should likewise be held to what we feel is a higher standard if found guilty of a serious offence, given the importance of their role. This aligns with such prohibited behaviour and how it's treated elsewhere in this act as well. Therefore, this motion would make it a corrupt practice for the financial agent of contestants to knowingly offer a bribe.

Finally, we hope this motion is modelled after the existing punishments for candidates and their official agents who are found guilty of offering a bribe with respect to whether or not they vote at the election.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (1030)

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Fancy.

I see no further debate. Is there agreement?

(Amendment agreed to [See Minutes of Proceedings])

(Clause 63 as amended agreed to)

(Clauses 64 to 69 agreed to)

The Chair: Let's try this. Between clause 70 and clause 83 there are no amendments. Is there consent to carry those clauses?

(Clauses 70 to 83 agreed to)

The Chair: That's excellent. I appreciate the spirit of collaboration.

For potential new clause 83.1, we have amendment G-5.

Ms. Fancy.

Jessica Fancy: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

We're suggesting that Bill C-25 be amended by adding after line 28 on page 39 the following:

83.1 Subsection 541(1) of the Act is replaced by the following:

541(1) All documents referred to in section 359, 432, 437, 475.4, 476.75, 477.59 or 478.8, all other reports or statements, other than election documents received from election officers and reports provided under [the different subsections], all instructions issued by the Chief Electoral Officer under this Act and all decisions by the Chief Electoral Officer on points arising under this Act are public records and may be inspected by any person on request during business hours.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (1035)

The Chair: Thank you so much.

[Translation]

Mrs. DeBellefeuille, you have the floor.

Claude DeBellefeuille: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The people keeping up with our work may not have fully understood the spirit of amendment G-5. I can see that the reports will no longer be made public. I don't really understand this amendment. It removes transparency. The government isn't keen on making fundraising reports available to the public.

Could Ms. Fancy further explain this amendment so that I understand its intent?

[English]

Jessica Fancy: Within our rationale, what we're hoping is that Bill C-25 includes a requirement that Elections Canada redact the exact location of a regulated fundraising event, only publishing the municipality and province or territory where the event took place, to address these safety concerns.

However, Elections Canada also has a general obligation to allow public inspection of all reports in its possession upon request, unless otherwise exempted. Consequently, we're hoping an additional amendment is needed to exempt the RFE reports that I mentioned before, received by Elections Canada in their original unredacted form, from public inspection.

Lastly, for the regulated fundraising event, or RFE, after-event reports are published online by Elections Canada. They're identical to the documents that the public may inspect at an RO's office, and we're proposing that Bill C-25 keep this requirement for the CEO to publish these reports, minus the precise address.

The Chair: Please go ahead.

[*Translation*]

Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Chair, I would like to hear the officials' opinion.

By amending the legislation in order to prevent the identical publication and public release of the reports, doesn't this amendment undermine transparency and accountability and doesn't it remove important information for the public?

[*English*]

Rachel Pereira: The regulated fundraising event reports will still be made public. They will still be published online, minus the specific location and address of the event, which is consistent.

This is a consequential amendment to that. If someone were to go to a returning office and ask to see the document, they could see it unredacted. This is just exempting the specific details in that report. They wouldn't be provided, but they are provided online. The same information is currently provided online.

[*Translation*]

Claude DeBellefeuille: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I understand that the intention is nonetheless to avoid transparency regarding the location of the fundraising activity. I think that this important information should be available to the public.

I'll be voting against this amendment.

[*English*]

The Chair: Is there any further debate?

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 10; nays 1)

• (1040)

(Clause 84 as amended agreed to)

(Clauses 85 and 86 agreed to)

(On clause 87)

The Chair: On clause 87, we have G-6.

Go ahead, Ms. Brière.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Élisabeth Brière: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This is simply a consequential amendment concerning the coming into force. Clause 87 specifies the clauses of Bill C-25 that will come into force after royal assent and the clauses subject to subsection 554(1), which gives the Chief Electoral Officer up to six months before the coming into force.

To ensure that all changes related to fundraising activities come into force upon royal assent, this proposed amendment is necessary.

[*English*]

The Chair: All those in favour?

(Amendment agreed to)

(Clause 87 as amended agreed to)

(On clause 88)

The Chair: On CPC-9, we have Mr. Cooper.

Michael Cooper: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

This is an amendment that was requested by Member of Parliament Shelby Kramp-Neuman, which is simply to remove the proposed riding name change. As a result, the riding would remain as is in terms of its name.

The Chair: Mr. Louis, go ahead.

Tim Louis: Thank you, Chair.

Just for clarification on what Mr. Cooper is saying, I think we're saying we're going to defer to the local MPs who are asking for the responsibility to make that change.

Can I get clarification from Ms. Pereira on that? Is that what these amendments are doing, putting the onus on the local MP to ask for that change?

Rachel Pereira: Yes, that's correct. In part 2 of the bill, there is a preamble that states that these are changes proposed to the electoral districts they represent.

Tim Louis: Thank you.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Mrs. DeBellefeuille, you have the floor.

Claude DeBellefeuille: Mr. Chair, I would like to understand the reasons for the name change. Are there any historical reasons? Can we have a clearer explanation?

[*English*]

Michael Cooper: Ms. Kramp-Neuman initially sought to remove...and it's incorporated in the bill because the approach the government took was that, for various members of Parliament who had requested name changes, it was taken at face value that those changes were appropriate. It appears the government deferred to each member of Parliament who requested a name change.

Ms. Kramp-Neuman requested that one of the names, Tyendinaga, be removed from the riding name so that it would revert to the name that has historically been the case, Hastings—Lennox and Addington. However, Ms. Kramp-Neuman is now content to leave the name as it is. This amendment would simply remove the proposed name change and leave the name of the riding as it is currently, which is Hastings—Lennox and Addington—Tyendinaga.

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

The Chair: On G-6.1, Madam Kayabaga, go ahead.

• (1045)

Hon. Arielle Kayabaga: Thank you, Chair.

I'll read the amendment:

That Bill C-25, in clause 88, be amended by deleting lines 21 to 24 on page 43.

As per the letter received by the members of this committee, MP Gladu has asked to repeal the process change of the name of the electoral district. It's going to remain Sarnia—Lambton but with the extra word on it, leaving the name as it is: Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong.

The Chair: Thank you so much.

Is there any further debate on this?

(Amendment agreed to)

The Chair: We now move to BQ-19.

Grant Jackson: Was the Bloc's amendment in first?

The Chair: I don't think it was in first. It deals with different lines.

Madam DeBellefeuille, go ahead.

[*Translation*]

Claude DeBellefeuille: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We discussed it and, as a matter of courtesy, I would let the member for Longueuil—Charles-LeMoyne move her amendment. I would be prepared, as a matter of courtesy, to not move ours and to let Mrs. Romanado move hers.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you so much.

We will now go to LIB-1.

I believe Ms. Romanado will go ahead.

[*Translation*]

Sherry Romanado (Longueuil—Charles-LeMoyne, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

As part of Bill C-25, I proposed to change the name of my electoral district from Longueuil—Charles-LeMoyne to Longueuil—Greenfield Park in order to better align it with the naming conventions of neighbouring districts. This would more accurately reflect the geographic identity of the district and the Longueuil boroughs within it, as well as recognize the exceptional contribution of the Greenfield Park community to Canada's military history.

As a member of Parliament, and like all members of Parliament, I have always been committed to listening to the people in my constituency and to taking their views into account. The comments that I received from the residents of Longueuil—Charles-LeMoyne on this proposal revealed a certain consensus. While they agree with the addition of Greenfield Park to the name of our electoral district, they want the name Charles-LeMoyne, a key figure in the history of Longueuil and New France, to remain. Based on this feedback from residents, I propose to change the initial proposal to rename the constituency of Longueuil-Greenfield-Park. I move that it be renamed Longueuil—Charles-LeMoyne—Greenfield Park.

[*English*]

The Chair: Is there any debate on the issue?

(Amendment agreed to)

The Chair: LIB-1 is carried.

I'll speak slowly as we move to CPC-10.

Do you need me to suspend?

Michael Cooper: This is an amendment requested by the member to simply remove “Val-des-Sources” so that it would read “Richmond-Arthabaska-des-Sources”. He felt that “Val” should not be included, upon reflection.

The Chair: Thank you so much. Is there any dissent?

(Amendment agreed to)

(Clause 88 as amended agreed to)

The Chair: On potential new clause 88.1, we have CPC-11.

Go ahead, Mr. Cooper.

• (1050)

Michael Cooper: This is a proposal by member of Parliament Todd Doherty to change the name of Cariboo—Prince George by the riding's inclusion in schedule 3 of the Canada Elections Act, which is consistent with a recommendation by the Chief Electoral Officer. It would make it a schedule 3 riding, and it would just add Omineca.

The Chair: Thank you so much.

I'll go to you, Mr. Fanjoy, in one second.

I'll let you know that CPC-11 and G-7 introduce a similar amendment to schedule 3 of the Canada Elections Act. If both amendments are adopted, it could create a redundancy.

Go ahead, Mr. Fanjoy.

Bruce Fanjoy (Carleton, Lib.): Amendment G-7 deals with this in a manner that's aligned with how names appear in schedule 3 and is also consistent with other name changes to the schedule in G-8, so we will be opposing this amendment.

The Chair: Mr. Cooper, go ahead.

Michael Cooper: I'm sorry; I was not fully clear. This is a coordinating amendment. He proposed a name change. His riding is listed in schedule 3 of the Canada Elections Act. That was omitted from the bill. All this amendment does is add that name change to schedule 3 of the act.

The Chair: Madame DeBellefeuille.

[*Translation*]

Claude DeBellefeuille: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Could the officials explain whether this constitutes a consequential amendment? Is Mr. Cooper moving a consequential amendment that makes sense? Isn't the amendment consequential to amendment G-9? I'm wondering about this.

[*English*]

Rachel Pereira: This is a technical amendment that would update schedule 3, which is in the Canada Elections Act. The part 2 names are not in the Canada Elections Act, but this is a consequential amendment for those names that are in schedule 3—electoral districts that have limited or restricted communication and transportation facilities.

It's simply the names, that path, that need to be reflected in schedule 3, because the CEO is not able to amend those himself. He can do that only within seven days after a representation order is issued following a redistribution exercise. This amendment is needed.

It is identical to G-7 and G-8. I believe in CPC-11 there's a mention of the province as well. That is already in schedule 3. I believe G-7 makes the same amendment, but without adding "Province of British Columbia", because it's already in schedule 3. It accomplishes the same thing.

The Chair: Seeing no further debate, we'll call the vote on CPC-11.

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

The Chair: We'll go to G-7.

Madam Vandenberg.

• (1055)

Anita Vandenberg: Based on what we just heard from Ms. Pereira on the previous amendment with Mr. Cooper, I do believe this amendment does the exact same thing but in a cleaner way.

Michael Cooper: I'd like to get an understanding from the officials of how this amendment is different from the one they just voted against.

Rachel Pereira: It accomplishes the exact same thing. It's just that in the previous motion there was a reference in the amendment to British Columbia, which is already in schedule 3. All of the provinces are in schedule 3, so G-7 and G-8 just amend the name as proposed in the previous motion. It's just a drafting approach, so there's no redundancy to the province.

Michael Cooper: That was a previous amendment—"under the heading 'Province of British Columbia'." Can you still clarify?

Rachel Pereira: It's just that the words—the heading, of British Columbia—are already in the schedule. It's just that the way it was drafted would suggest that the bill would need to include British Columbia as well as the name change.

Michael Cooper: Just to clarify, it says, "replacing the name 'Cariboo—Prince George' with 'Cariboo—Prince George—Omineca'". There are quotations around it under the heading. It doesn't say to add the heading. It just recognizes that there is such a heading.

Rachel Pereira: Perhaps you're correct. It's just simply a drafting preference, where it's read as to include the heading, because it's in the motion but does the same thing.

Grant Jackson: Let's go, Chair.

The Chair: I don't think this is about wins and losses; I think this is just about standard drafting in a piece of legislation. That's what I'm hearing. I think we're arguing in favour of the exact same thing. Let's not get too far off. No one's winning votes when they go back to their constituents on this.

Shall G-7 carry?

(Amendment agreed to)

The Chair: This is on a potential new clause 88.2; it's G-8.

Mr. Lewis.

Tim Louis: It's the exact same thing as G-7, in the spirit of giving that responsibility for the name change of the riding to the member of Parliament from that riding. It accomplishes the same thing as CPC-11, for Mr. Doherty's sake. I just wanted that clarity.

The Chair: Is there any opposition to G-8?

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

(On clause 89)

The Chair: Before we move to clause 89, perhaps it's best that we suspend, as we're getting close to the hour.

Michael Cooper: On this one, I think we're dealing with the same situation as with the previous amendment. I won't move CPC-12, and I think we'll support the alternative amendment.

The Chair: Thank you.

I'm going to suspend for five minutes, just to give everyone a quick break at the top of the hour.

• (1055)

(Pause)

• (1105)

The Chair: Welcome back.

We will go to G-9.

Madame Brière, go ahead.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Élisabeth Brière: This technical amendment comes on the heels of what we adopted in amendments G-7 and G-8 to ensure that schedule 3 of the Canada Elections Act is revised to reflect new electoral district trends and that these changes come into force at the same time as the renaming of the districts.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you so much.

(Amendment agreed to)

(Clause 89 as amended agreed to)

The Chair: Shall the short title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Shall the title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Shall the bill as amended carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Shall the chair report the bill as amended to the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Once Christine gets here, things get done.

Voices: Oh, oh!

The Chair: Shall the committee order a reprint of the bill as amended for the use of the House at report stage?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: That's excellent.

I want to thank everyone for their work on this—members, staff, witnesses and the clerks who held my hand along the way.

This committee meeting stands 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>