



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Board of Internal Economy

TRANSCRIPT

NUMBER 027

Thursday, February 29, 2024



Board of Internal Economy

Thursday, February 29, 2024

• (1105)

[*Translation*]

Hon. Greg Fergus (Speaker of the House of Commons): Colleagues, I see that all official political parties recognized in the House of Commons are represented here and we have the quorum required to start the meeting.

Welcome to meeting number 27 of the Board of Internal Economy.

Today, the agenda is a bit peculiar: the meeting will start in public, continue in camera, then conclude in public.

[*English*]

Colleagues, we have minutes from the previous meeting to approve.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. DeBellefeuille, you have the floor.

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille (Whip of the Bloc Québécois): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would like to propose a little change to the previous meeting's minutes.

On page 2 of the French version of the minutes, it refers to an update from the working group for the long-term vision and plan, or LTVP. Given the discussions and presentations we have had, I consider this item incomplete. We approved the working group's recommendations, except for one, which we did not discuss for reasons explained by the working group's chair. It is the recommendation regarding the designation and use of the room for indigenous ceremonies.

Therefore, this is the first proposal I would make, and I am sure that my colleagues, who are listening attentively to me, will agree: The minutes should specify that this recommendation was not discussed and will be brought forward for discussion during another Board of Internal Economy meeting.

Hon. Greg Fergus: Mrs. DeBellefeuille, I see that on page 2, it reads: "Further discussions are required at the LTVP working group regarding the designation and intended use of the space in the fourth-floor central courtyard infill." Isn't that consistent with what you're proposing?

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Indeed, Mr. Chair, I carefully read the documents before every meeting of the Board of Internal Economy. In this case, I wanted the minutes to better reflect what happened during the last meeting. That is my point.

The chair of the LTVP working group, Mr. Chris d'Entremont, read his presentation while it was projected to a screen. The interpreters received a text ahead of time. At one point during his presentation, however, Mr. d'Entremont wasn't following his text anymore. The interpretation provided at that time did not allow me to intervene right away. I consider it a lack of respect for the interpreters. The chair of the LTVP working group knew that he was going to make changes to his presentation, but he did not inform the interpreters. It actually prevented me from working and accurately understanding what was going on.

I would like the minutes to reflect the fact that the recommendation about the indigenous room was included in those recommendations and will be subject to further discussions later. The subject itself is what will be discussed, of course. That said, a recommendation on the matter was submitted to the Board of Internal Economy, but the chair of the working group decided to withdraw it from the list and not discuss it right away. So, there is a little nuance to add here, if my colleagues don't mind too much. This recommendation was in fact mentioned by the chair of the working group in his oral presentation, and it was part of the presentation projected onscreen, but it was not submitted to the Board of Internal Economy.

I am sure the clerk can find the right wording to include what I want to say.

Mr. Eric Janse: I'd like to ask you for some clarification, Mrs. DeBellefeuille. Do you want your recommendation to replace the sentence the chair just read, or would you prefer adding something else to that sentence?

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: I propose wording the sentence in a way that says the LTVP working group's recommendation on the intended designation and use of that room was presented, but not discussed, and the Board of Internal Economy will continue that discussion during another meeting. That is what I understood. It would be more in line with what happened at the last meeting of the Board of Internal Economy.

Hon. Greg Fergus: Does anyone want to comment on Mrs. DeBellefeuille's suggestion? If not, the proposed changes will be made to the minutes.

Mr. Scheer, you have the floor.

[*English*]

Hon. Andrew Scheer (House leader of the official opposition): To clarify, could you repeat how this would read now? I have only the English in front of me.

Mr. Eric Janse: It would be something to the effect of "the working group's recommendation on the topic of the designated intended use of the space in the fourth floor central courtyard was not presented for consideration, but will be at a future meeting."

[*Translation*]

Hon. Greg Fergus: Mrs. DeBellefeuille, does that work for you?

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Yes.

Hon. Greg Fergus: Very well, it's noted.

Mrs. DeBellefeuille, you have the floor once again.

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: I'd like to make another comment.

I've been a member of the Board of Internal Economy for four years, and I think I'm respectful. During the last meeting of the Board of Internal Economy, I was rather surprised that a presentation included on the agenda, given by the entire government team, was almost entirely in English. I had to follow the whole presentation by using interpretation.

Mr. Chair, I would like you to make sure that in the future, those who make presentations to the Board of Internal Economy will do so in French as much as they do in English, as is usually the case. I say quite sincerely that the appearance of the RCMP commissioner was only the second time in four years that, as a francophone, I had to follow a presentation made almost entirely in English. I asked a single question, a rather simple one, and was unable to get an answer in French.

I wanted to bring it to your attention, Mr. Chair, when it comes to important presentations by officials. Given the positions these people occupy within the public service, I would assume they are able to give presentations and answer questions in both languages. I would like us to be aware of this, Mr. Chair.

Hon. Greg Fergus: It's on the record. Thank you very much, Mrs. DeBellefeuille.

Mr. Gerretson, you have the floor.

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Deputy House leader of the government): No, I'm good. Thank you.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Greg Fergus: Do we agree to adopt the minutes of the previous meeting, including the suggested changes?

(The motion carries.)

Hon. Greg Fergus: We will now move on to business arising from the previous meeting.

Is there any other business to raise that is not already included in today's agenda?

• (1110)

[*English*]

Go ahead, Mr. Scheer.

Hon. Andrew Scheer: We wanted to bring up an issue around translation. We know that we've had several meetings over the course of the last couple of years, but we're finding it difficult to

find meeting spaces that can accommodate simultaneous translation. As we carry out our parliamentary duties to examine legislation and have shadow cabinet meetings and things like that, it's incredibly important that we, and I believe all parties, have access to spaces that can accommodate simultaneous translation as well as the translators themselves.

There's a particular room on the fourth floor, room 435, that I understand has been designated to PCO. They get first crack at it. We're told that it's never used on Tuesdays, I think from 10 o'clock until noon. I wanted to bring it up here just to have a point of discussion, either today or at a future meeting, to talk about spaces for other parties.

The government has, of course, many places where they have rooms designed to accommodate simultaneous translation, but parliamentarians don't. We have these buildings. We have meetings in both official languages, and many of our shadow ministers and many of our MPs are francophones. We're finding inadequate space and inadequate resources to provide that translation. As my colleague from the Bloc just pointed out, when you have a presentation that's done entirely in one language, at least here we have simultaneous translation, but in some of these meetings that we must have to carry out our parliamentary functions, we just don't have it. Some of our members are severely disadvantaged when that happens.

I just wanted to bring that up. I know that there are some challenges with human resources, and obviously there's always a challenge with space, but I do think it's important that we either find a way to allocate more resources or find that available space.

Hon. Greg Fergus: Thank you, Mr. Scheer, for bringing up this issue. Of course, having access to service in both languages is of primary importance for the functioning of this place.

Just for a little more precision, is it specific to finding a room in this building or is it in the parliamentary precinct overall?

Hon. Andrew Scheer: The other parties may have other needs, but for our purposes, that particular room, room 435 in the West Block, would be adequate. It has the booths. There was a problem this week, but I understand that it was a technical problem that was temporary in nature and that it's either been fixed or it's going to be fixed. That would certainly solve our problems most of the time, but that is only one room we know of that is free for that particular time.

We do also have important meetings that require simultaneous translation at other times of the day, so I guess it's a two-part ask. One would be whether we can find a way to formally free that up from PCO in that one time slot to accommodate the official opposition's shadow cabinet meeting. That would be a specific request. The second request would be that we have a more general conversation about other rooms that might be available that have the capacity to accommodate not just our party but I'm sure other parties as well to have their meetings at various points in the day and throughout the week.

Hon. Greg Fergus: Thank you for bringing that up.

We can work this two ways.

We can clearly address the particular concern and we'll be happy to work with you on that one to ensure that you'll be able to have room to conduct your business properly. As for the larger issue in terms of space allocation, is there a desire among the members for us to bring this back at a subsequent meeting?

I see a bit of a split, so we'll bring this back up in a general way and hopefully in some of our pre-briefs we might be able to address some of these issues as well.

Thank you, Mr. Scheer.

Are there any other issues arising from the minutes?

• (1115)

[*Translation*]

There is none.

We will now take a short break and continue the meeting in camera to discuss the next item on the agenda.

• (1220)

The meeting is suspended.

[*Proceedings continue in camera*]

• (1115)

(Pause)

• (1223)

[*Public proceedings resume*]

Hon. Greg Fergus: Colleagues, we are back in public.

Before we begin discussions on this item, I would like to note that I have sent a letter to you, the members of the board, as well as to the Office of the Conflict of Interest and Ethics Commissioner, stating that I'm recusing myself. Accordingly, I will not participate in the proceedings of the board on this matter.

During my absence, during the consideration at this time, it is my understanding that Mr. Scheer will be presiding for the rest of this meeting. I thank members for that.

Mr. Scheer, I invite you to take the chair.

• (1220)

(Pause)

•

[*English*]

The Acting Chair (Hon. Andrew Scheer): Thank you.

We'll start with Michel.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Bédard (Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel, House of Commons): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We are addressing the Board of Internal Economy to obtain its instructions regarding the use of House of Commons resources, by the Speaker of the House of Commons, to produce and distribute a

video. The video was released during a provincial political party convention and paid tribute to the former interim party leader.

Last December, the Clerk of the House of Commons, in the role of Secretary of the Board of Internal Economy, received correspondence indicating that this use of House of Commons resources ran counter to the Members By-Law.

The Speaker confirmed that House resources were used to create and release the video.

I also note that the 55th report of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, adopted by the House of Commons, asked that the Speaker undertake the appropriate steps to reimburse a suitable amount for the use of parliamentary resources that were not related to the performance of parliamentary functions.

[*English*]

The Board of Internal Economy has the exclusive authority to determine whether any use of parliamentary resources is proper. If the board finds that the bylaw has been breached, it may impose remedies, such as reimbursement.

Mr. Paul St George (Chief Financial Officer, House of Commons): To assist the board in its consideration of the matter, the administration has assessed the value of the House resources. These values and ranges are included in your package.

The board may also wish to consider two precedents in which it received the assessment methodology used today and approved a reimbursement of \$500 in both cases. This amount was deemed an appropriate remedy for the use of parliamentary office space that was not compliant with the Members By-law. In both cases, no parliamentary resources were used other than office spaces.

[*Translation*]

This concludes our presentation.

We are available to answer your questions.

[*English*]

The Acting Chair (Hon. Andrew Scheer): I think I saw Mr. MacKinnon's hand go up first. Mr. Julian will be next.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon (Leader of the Government in the House of Commons): Thank you, Mr. Chair. I thank you for taking on this role.

We believe there is precedent, as Mr. St George has said, and that a penalty of \$500, which is consistent with past practice, should be applied in this case.

The Acting Chair (Hon. Andrew Scheer): Go ahead, Mr. Julian.

Mr. Peter Julian (House Leader of the New Democratic Party): Thank you, Mr. Chair. You're back in the chair. It brings back memories of a few years ago.

We went through this process at the procedure and House affairs committee, as you know, Mr. Chair, and worked through a number of remedies or consequences, most of which have already been put in place. In this case, I think this is the last step, which is evaluating the payment back to the House of Commons.

I would suggest that it's a bit different in the case of the Speaker than it might be in other cases, or in the use of the Speaker's office. I would suggest a remedy, looking at the grid that was provided to us, of \$1,000. I think that would be setting a clear message and precedent. I think it would be appropriate.

The Acting Chair (Hon. Andrew Scheer): Go ahead, Madame DeBellefeuille.

[Translation]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Thank you.

I think the comparables used in the analysis by the House of Commons Administration are not adequate. One cannot compare the Speaker's office to an MP's office. One cannot compare the cost of using a conference room to the cost of using the Speaker's office. There is only one Speaker. It's one of the highest functions of the Parliament of Canada. In that sense, I think the comparables are not adequate. Others must be found.

We're talking here about the institution of Parliament. Yes, there are precedents, but what is at issue here is a precedent created by the Speaker, who wears the distinctive robes associated with this function. The office of the Speaker is unique. It is the highest function in the House.

The comparables submitted to us by the administration are inadequate and inexact, in my opinion, and they don't allow us to correctly assess the corresponding cost of using the Speaker's office, his robes, and so on. It's as though we're considering that it compares with using the resources of a regular MP's office. That is not the way that I see the role of the Speaker and his office.

I think that the administration should review its comparables and submit a new proposal to us. That is my position.

• (1230)

[English]

The Acting Chair (Hon. Andrew Scheer): Just so I'm clear, you're not proposing a different amount; you're asking House administration to re-evaluate—

[Translation]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: I'm sorry, but I'm not getting the interpretation.

The Acting Chair (Hon. Andrew Scheer): Let's see if you are getting it now.

[English]

What you're proposing is not a specific monetary value.

[Translation]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: I'm still not getting the interpretation.

Hon. Andrew Scheer: Very well, I will try to say it in French, although I am a bit rusty.

You're proposing that the Administration provide a different comparison between the office...

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Actually, maybe it's because you don't have your earpiece on. I can repeat what I said.

[English]

The Acting Chair (Hon. Andrew Scheer): No, I just want to make sure. Is everybody clear with that?

Okay.

I have Mr. Gerretsen next.

[Translation]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Actually, Mr. Chair, what I'm saying is that the comparables used are neither adequate nor relevant. Indeed, we're not talking about a regular MP's office here.

I'm not telling you anything new when I say I am a separatist. However, I do have respect for the institution that is the House of Commons, and I find it insulting that the Speaker's office is being compared with a regular MP's office. The Speaker occupies the highest function of the House.

I would therefore ask the House Administration to review its comparables and submit new ones to us.

[English]

The Acting Chair (Hon. Andrew Scheer): Thank you.

Mr. Gerretsen, go ahead.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: I think I will start by testing your chairship with respect to the way BOIE operates. BOIE operates on consensus. How will we get to the bottom of this if it's one amount here and one amount there? Do we keep talking about it until we come to a consensus?

I'm asking because I genuinely don't know. I want to understand the rules of engagement.

The Acting Chair (Hon. Andrew Scheer): You are right. The convention is that this body operates on consensus. At various times that has been tested, and it has always been difficult and challenging for whoever the chair happens to be at the time to try to navigate through that.

Sometimes if there isn't consensus, one member of the board could effectively be getting a decision in their favour because they withhold consent or agreement with respect to where the rest of the board is going. I think it's early for conjecture as to how we might resolve that.

Hopefully we won't get there. This is the first time this item has been dealt with. Hopefully, there can be conversations and discussions through which we can find that common ground.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: That's fair.

To address the points that were raised by Madame DeBellefeuille, my understanding is that what we're trying to evaluate here is the cost of the resources that were utilized in order to create this video and possibly distribute it by email, or however it was sent. That should be completely independent of any value that is placed on a particular office. We might hold offices to higher regard, and that's understandable and acceptable. However, I understand that the task we have been given is to determine what the value was for the production and distribution of this particular video and for sending it out.

I respectfully disagree with the position that I'm hearing from Madame DeBellefeuille on this, specifically because I don't think that we should be weighing the fact that it's the Speaker's office versus another office. The point is that we've come to the determination that particular resources should not have been used, and I don't think it should matter who was using the resources. What is important is that compensation is sought for the usage of those resources, and it shouldn't particularly matter who it was.

I think we should come to a conclusion. For the sake of precedent and following precedent, \$500 makes the most sense. I realize that both \$5,000 and \$1,000 are within the range that was presented, so I'm not going to die on this hill, for lack of a better expression, but I think the precedent that has been set dictates this. If we go with Mr. Julian's suggestion of \$1,000, I guess we're setting a new precedent in the event that this were to occur again, in which case, if that's what we're doing, then I understand it.

A voice: It's \$228 to \$1700.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Then both \$500 and \$1,000 are within the range.

I'm not in disagreement with the amount, but I just want to understand why we're departing from a precedent in order to create a new precedent.

● (1235)

The Acting Chair (Hon. Andrew Scheer): I have Mr. Julian and then Ms. Findlay.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: If I said \$5,000, I apologize. I meant \$500 or \$1,000.

[Translation]

Mr. Peter Julian: I'll ask Mr. St George a question.

Did the previous cases involve backbenchers or rather official representatives of a recognized party, leaders or ministers?

Mr. Paul St George: I'll let Mr. Bédard answer.

Mr. Michel Bédard: As noted, two relevant precedents set the reimbursement amount at \$500.

One case was in 2019. The Board of Internal Economy's minutes state that the Prime Minister was involved, but that the resources of the constituency office were used.

In the second case, the minutes of the Board of Internal Economy don't identify the member concerned. The briefing note was distributed to the Board of Internal Economy and the decision was made by resolution, on paper. Since the matter was urgent, a decision had to be made.

I can provide only the information in the minutes. In both cases, a member's parliamentary office was involved. In both cases, the only resources used were the parliamentary offices.

Mr. Peter Julian: I agree with Mrs. DeBellefeuille that this constitutes a precedent. The approach must send a clear message.

Since the Prime Minister was involved in the first case, the amount should be over \$500 in this case. In the Speaker's case, \$1,000 seems entirely appropriate.

Of course, this case is much broader in scope and sets a completely different precedent. I fully agree with Mr. Gerretsen on this point. However, this amount seems both logical and appropriate given that we never want this type of situation to happen again.

Mrs. DeBellefeuille asked whether we could review the elements of comparison and revisit this issue at a later date. Remember that the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs has already held meetings on this topic, over a number of days, and that solutions have been proposed. The only thing left is this final step. We have so many other issues to discuss at the Board of Internal Economy. It doesn't make sense to revisit this issue again and again.

In my opinion, it would make more sense to send a clear message. As a result, I'm proposing a higher amount than in past cases.

[English]

The Acting Chair (Hon. Andrew Scheer): Go ahead, Ms. Findlay.

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: Thank you.

My understanding is that in previous cases, there were offers made. In effect, an offer was made and then accepted at the \$500 level, and you could look at that in the form of a settlement offer, but in this situation, no offer has been made.

I think \$500 is too low. I think \$1,000 makes more sense.

I don't think we should continue to bring this back before the board. We know what happened. We know where we settled out in our opinions on it. I think it should send something of a message. I don't see the highest range being necessary to get the point across. From our point of view, \$1,000 is appropriate.

I'd like to see us bring this to a conclusion. I don't think we need to study it any more, frankly.

● (1240)

The Acting Chair (Hon. Andrew Scheer): I have Madame DeBellefeuille, and then I saw Mr. MacKinnon's hand up again. We'll see if we have a consensus after this round.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: Thank you.

First, I would like to remind our colleagues that this topic has been on the agenda a number of times. However, we're discussing the matter for the first time. We can't say that we've been talking about it for long.

It's our job to set the amount that reflects the use of resources. It isn't the procedure and house affairs committee's job. Even though the committee recommended an amount, this matter falls outside its purview. The committee may recommend an amount, but the Board of Internal Economy must set it.

I gather that we must first determine whether the Members By-law was violated. I think that you have the answer, Mr. Chair. By using resources in this manner, the Speaker violated the by-law.

We must now assess the amount that reflects the use of the resources. Based on its analysis and the elements of comparison used, the House of Commons administration is proposing between \$500 and \$1,500. That's the information that I have. When we read the administration's entire presentation, we see the elements of comparison used to set this amount. By comparison, the administration shows that renting a conference room in downtown Ottawa costs between \$500 and \$1,500, and that a hotel room costs between \$190 and \$370.

The elements of comparison aren't enough to assess the resources used by the Speaker. I believe that the use of the Speaker's office and robes sets a precedent. If we want to assess the resources properly, we must use other elements of comparison.

I agree with Mr. Julian. A proper assessment of the amount that reflects a Speaker's use of House resources for partisan purposes shows any other speaker who might want to do something similar how much it would cost.

I totally disagree with \$500. In my opinion, the use of the Speaker's office and robes and all these resources carries a much greater value and even a much higher value than \$1,000.

I don't want to get into a debate that would take up three meetings of the Board of Internal Economy. I'm just asking the administration to find other elements of comparison, so that the amount truly reflects the cost of using the resources of the Speaker's office, such as the robes and telephone. We aren't talking about a backbencher. We're talking about the Speaker of the House of Commons, the highest office in the House.

I think that the elements of comparison should be reviewed. For example, the cost of a large suite in a major hotel in downtown Ottawa could be assessed. It seems that comparing the Speaker's office to a mere conference room for a day undermines the significance of its use. The cost of a suite in a major hotel seems more comparable.

A proper assessment of the real cost of using the House's resources as Speaker would make people think twice before doing it again. This use has a cost. However, that cost can't be compared to what I have in front of me.

I want to reassure my colleagues that I don't want to turn this into a debate. I want only a review of the amount that reflects the Speaker's use of the House's resources, such as the office and robes. I think that the amount established is insufficient.

The Acting Chair (Hon. Andrew Scheer): Mr. MacKinnon, you have the floor.

Hon. Steven MacKinnon: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I listened carefully to my colleagues from all parties.

With all due respect to Mrs. DeBellefeuille, I think that the analysis has already been done. I have spoken with the people who did the analysis. If they were asked to conduct another analysis, I don't know what grounds they would use to carry out the assessment. Furthermore, this analysis or assessment would cost much more than the individual could reasonably be required to pay.

I have a suggestion that I hope will bring this matter to a close.

I heard both Mr. Julian and Ms. Findlay talk about a higher amount than suggested. We have also seen the range of amounts proposed. To settle the matter, I would be prepared to accept the proposed amount or even any other amount within the range proposed by the administration, as long as it would set a precedent.

I agree with Mrs. DeBellefeuille that the Speaker's position is unique. That said, the previous cases weren't the focus of a study by the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, an apology before the members, or any testimony from either side in other parliamentary proceedings. I believe that, in this case, the penalty imposed, if we can call it that, is already much higher.

However, to settle everything without prejudice, I agree with any amount within the range proposed by the administration.

• (1245)

[*English*]

The Acting Chair (Hon. Andrew Scheer): I saw Mr. Julian's hand.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Peter Julian: Mr. Chair, I just want to say that, as you know, we operate by consensus. I think that all members of the Board of Internal Economy, except possibly one person, agree that the amount should be higher in this case. That includes the suggested amount of \$1,000.

I don't agree with asking the administration to redo its analysis. Mr. St George did a great job. He provided specific figures. He couldn't be faulted in any way for that. The figures are accurate. I want to thank him for his work. I don't agree with asking the administration to continue the work, come up with other figures and then return to the Board of Internal Economy to discuss them.

The idea is to ask Mr. St George to continue the work and use other elements of comparison to assess the amount. He has many other things to do. The proposed amount is \$1,000. If we can't reach a consensus on either proposal, we'll end the meeting without having decided on a penalty.

I think that most members around the table more or less agreed on \$1,000. I gather that some think that it's too much and others think that it isn't enough. In any case, I think that the best approach would be to send a clear message that the Board of Internal Economy agrees that the fine will be higher than usual. I think that this would be the best approach in the last few minutes of the meeting, rather than putting all these issues off indefinitely.

[*English*]

The Acting Chair (Hon. Andrew Scheer): Madame DeBellefeuille, go ahead.

[*Translation*]

Mrs. Claude DeBellefeuille: As you know, I'm a principled person. I'm not playing politics here. I'm fulfilling the role assigned to members of the Board of Internal Economy, which is to assess resources.

I understand that we operate by consensus. I don't want to force a vote. However, I disagree with the \$1,000. I think that the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons showed openness. If my other colleagues' positions are firm and no one wants to ask for

a review of the proposed amount based on other elements of comparison, I propose that we agree on the highest amount suggested, meaning \$1,500.

[*English*]

The Acting Chair (Hon. Andrew Scheer): Okay. Well, why don't we do this?

We have two—

[*Translation*]

Mr. Peter Julian: That seems reasonable.

[*English*]

Hon. Kerry-Lynne Findlay: I agree.

The Acting Chair (Hon. Andrew Scheer): Is everyone okay?

All right. We'll consider that matter concluded, then.

Is there any other business, or should we adjourn right now?

Hon. Mona Fortier (Deputy government whip): There's a vote.

The Acting Chair (Hon. Andrew Scheer): There's a vote right now, but I mean for this meeting, because technically I would have to call the Speaker in to adjourn the meeting unless we all want to adjourn right now.

Hon. Mona Fortier: There are no more items on the agenda, so you can adjourn.

A voice: Your reign was short-lived.

Voices: Oh, oh!

The Acting Chair (Hon. Andrew Scheer): The meeting is adjourned.

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

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

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

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

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

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

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

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

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

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

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

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

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

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