



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

---

# Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food

EVIDENCE

**NUMBER 100**

Thursday, April 18, 2024

---

Chair: Mr. Kody Blois





# Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food

Thursday, April 18, 2024

• (1105)

[English]

**The Chair (Mr. Kody Blois (Kings—Hants, Lib.)):** I call this meeting to order.

Welcome to meeting number 100 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-food.

I have a few reminders, colleagues. We know that this meeting is taking place in a hybrid format. As you know, during the proceedings, those who are speaking will be the ones who are broadcast.

Pursuant to the order of reference of Wednesday, January 31, 2024, and the motion adopted by the committee on Thursday, February 8, 2024, the committee is proceeding with its clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-355, an act to prohibit the export by air of horses for slaughter and to make related amendments to certain acts.

We have a number of witnesses here today who can be called upon if needed. From the Canada Border Services Agency, we have Graeme Hamilton, acting director general of the traveller, commercial and trade policy directorate, and Cathy Toxopeus, director general of the commercial programs, commercial and trade branch.

From the CFIA, we have Dr. Mary Jane Ireland, who is no stranger to the committee and is the executive director of the animal health directorate and the chief veterinary officer for Canada.

From the Department of Agriculture and Agri-Food, we have Marie-Noëlle Desrochers, executive director, supply management and livestock policy division, and from the Department of Justice, we have Guilton Pierre-Jean, senior counsel in legal services, and Shela Larmour, who is counsel in legal services.

There are a number of people you can call upon, colleagues, if needed.

I'll turn to my annotated agenda. I've already introduced our expert witnesses, the folks who can help. We do have our procedural and legal folks here as well.

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

Shall clause 2 carry?

(Clause 2 agreed to on division)

**The Chair:** Shall clause 3 carry?

(Clause 3 agreed to on division)

(On clause 4)

**The Chair:** That's ultimately something that has to be called. I have amendment CPC-1, if you'd like to call it, Mr. Barlow.

**Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We do have an amendment on clause 4. I think everybody has the amendment in front of them.

It was quite clear from the testimony of most of the witnesses who spoke as part of the study for this proposed legislation that the end use of the animals going to Japan wasn't their concern; their concern was animal welfare during the transportation of those horses to Japan. When witnesses were questioned by members of this committee about their concerns with horse slaughter in Canada or for horses being food in other parts of the world, that didn't seem to be a concern. Our questions were around why the focus of this legislation isn't more on transportation and on improving the regulations around the transportation of those horses.

If the impetus of this bill is to improve the health and safety of animals in transportation, which I think all of us would agree should be paramount, we should have animal welfare top of mind when we're doing regulations. This should be for all horses that are being transported by air. Dr. Ireland, who is here, was quite clear in her testimony that:

The rules for horses with respect to their movement, their transport, are the same regardless of whether the horses are destined for another country for whatever purpose. Whether it's for show purposes, a competition or a feedlot, the same rules apply.

That is a quote from Dr. Ireland's testimony.

I know that there were comments in the preamble, which we will get to, about being cramped, which I don't feel is wording that should be used in legislation, but there has been no alternative proposed in this legislation as to what exactly should be used.

If indeed the focus of this legislation for Mr. Louis is to address animal welfare and the transportation of horses to Japan or any other destination, the focus should be on all horses, not just horses for slaughter, although I think that is a misdirection. I think that if that's indeed the focus, then it should apply to all horses being transported by air, not just for slaughter.

• (1110)

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

As all colleagues around the table would know, as part of our due diligence—I say “our” as the chair—I am guided by our legislative clerk and our deputy legislative clerk to see whether or not the scope of the amendment is in order.

Mr. Barlow, you talked about the “impetus” of the bill. Again, I’m actually quite sympathetic to the argument you’re making around trying to “improve” the situation, but I have had to rule on this bill. I have taken some guidance from the legislative clerk.

Ultimately, Bill C-355 provides for the ban of the exportation by air of live horses for the purpose of being slaughtered. The amendment proposes to allow for the exportation to happen under certain conditions, which is contrary to the principle of the bill as adopted at second reading at the House. *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, states the following on page 770: “An amendment to a bill that was referred to a committee after second reading is out of order if it is beyond the scope and principle of the bill.”

I’m of the opinion that for the aforementioned reasons, the amendment is contrary to the principle of the bill and is therefore inadmissible. I can be challenged on my ruling.

Again, I want to make sure that the record shows, Mr. Barlow, that I’m actually quite sympathetic to the suggestion you’re putting forward, but I am guided by what has to happen procedurally in this place. I have been advised by our legislative clerk that it is inadmissible.

There is some flexibility for a chair. On Bill C-234, for example, I did not take the advice, but I think this is too far outside the scope of the advice I have been given, so I have to rule that this amendment is inadmissible.

As I would say, colleagues, I am subject to be challenged, but that is the advice I have been given and that’s the ruling I have made thus far.

Go ahead, Mr. MacGregor.

**Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP):** I have a question, Chair. Maybe the clerk can help answer this.

Just hypothetically, if a committee ever did challenge a chair who had made a ruling on the admissibility of an amendment because it was outside the scope, and then that bill was reported back to the House, would the Speaker then be compelled to intervene, ruling that the committee had strayed past its mandate and had ignored the second reading will of the House?

**The Chair:** Mr. MacGregor, this committee is well within its right to challenge the procedural ruling that has been made thus far. The only way in which a Speaker would then intervene would be subject to a member of Parliament raising a point of privilege and suggesting that the committee had gone outside its scope. The Speaker then would seek procedural counsel, wherein what I’m ruling right now would probably be upheld. I think that would be the case.

It really depends on whether any member of the House would choose to use parliamentary privilege if I were successfully challenged.

Go ahead, Mr. Steinley.

**Mr. Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC):** As we saw on Bill C-234, we can challenge the chair’s ruling. Let’s put it to a vote so that we can have it on record that we have had a common-sense amendment put forward. I think you’re right; it is appropriate to have this conversation. I would like to have a vote on the ruling and see where it lands.

Thank you very much for your comments. They’re appreciated.

Mr. Barlow has a comment as well.

**The Chair:** I have Mr. Drouin first, and then I will go to Mr. Barlow.

**Mr. Francis Drouin (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.):** I’m just saying that we can vote, but the outcome will be the same in the House. Even though we challenge it, the Speaker will uphold the ruling anyway.

I understand where you’re coming from, but the outcome would be the same. The amendment would be ruled inadmissible in the House of Commons by the Speaker, I think, from what I understand, but we can vote on it.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Barlow.

• (1115)

**Mr. John Barlow:** I have a procedural question. I’m looking at Monsieur Perron’s amendments, BQ-4 and BQ-5, which also make some changes in terms of adding to the scope of the bill with regard to feeding and watering horses during transportation as well as having an attendant on the flight.

Chair, if those two amendments were passed, changing the scope of the bill because they are specifically on those points, would that change the position of our amendment? Do you understand what I’m saying?

**The Chair:** Without giving out future surprises down the line, basically the way it was framed to me from a procedural side—and, again, I’m sympathetic to the idea of trying to allow the transportation under certain conditions—was that the scope of the bill, in the way it is drafted, is that it’s all or nothing. This bill is to prevent horses from being exported for slaughter for any reason. The amendments that are being considered in the package allow that to happen under certain conditions.

You mentioned in your remarks, Mr. Barlow, that the impetus of the bill is to try to improve their travel. The bill is not drafted in a way that allows for any provision of travel, so it’s quite black and white.

As I said with regard to Mr. Steinley’s point, in other times that I’ve chaired there has been a bit more discretion, but in this case the legislative counsel has been quite clear that this would be outside the scope of the bill. I would be really stretching the bounds of my procedural authority in this committee.

Although I am sympathetic, a number of amendments that talk about having adjustments and conditions attached, including Mr. Perron's proposed amendments, are ultimately going to be ruled outside of procedural order.

Some of what you have put forward, Mr. Barlow, will be in order, particularly the adoption of when this would come into force. However, with regard to the elements around trying to allow horses to still be exported with certain conditions or further parameters, the advice I've been given is that it is outside the scope of what is contemplated by the bill.

**Mr. John Barlow:** I appreciate your diligence, Mr. Chair, but I still want to challenge your decision on this, just as a matter of principle.

Clearly the witnesses who were brought forward by the proponent of this legislation were very adamant that this was not about the end use of the horses but about the safety and welfare of the animals. I think the misdirection of this legislation is what frustrates us.

For that reason alone, I want to challenge the decision and put it to a vote.

**The Chair:** Yes, it is well within the right of every member of this committee.

Again, Mr. Steinley talked about Bill C-234 and others for which I've been allowed some discretion where it's been a bit more grey. This one is a bit more cut and dried, based on what has been said by the procedural experts who have advised me.

I will go to Mr. MacGregor.

There is not usually much room for debate, but this committee does operate quite well, and we will go to a vote afterwards.

Go ahead, Mr. MacGregor.

**Mr. Alistair MacGregor:** I have a question, because sometimes the wording of what we're voting on can be confusing.

Is this voting to uphold the chair's ruling? Can the clerk just explain what a yea or a nay vote is in this case?

**The Chair:** This is on whether the decision of the chair shall carry. Mr. Barlow would like to challenge the chair.

As I understand it, if you're voting in favour, it's to maintain the decision of the chair. If you're voting against, it's to overrule the procedural decision that I've given and to move on in a different direction.

Madam Clerk, I'll have you call the vote in favour of the chair or not.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 6; nays 5)

**The Chair:** Ultimately, the chair's ruling is upheld by the committee.

Unfortunately, Mr. Barlow, your first amendment is inadmissible.

Colleagues, now that CPC-1 is ultimately defeated, CPC-4, CPC-5, CPC-6, CPC-8 and CPC-9 cannot be moved, as they are consequential to CPC-1. They are inadmissible.

Go ahead, Mr. Perron.

• (1120)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ):** Regarding amendment CPC-9, you are saying it is not admissible. If however we adopt the new Bloc Québécois amendment that you received this morning and that replaces amendments BQ-4 and BQ-5, I think amendment CPC-9 would once again be relevant.

Is that correct?

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Yes.

Okay. I believe it's in our package. We'll now move to the first amendment from the Bloc Québécois, numbered 13016781.

Colleagues, I can repeat the ruling, but it's very similar. As I've already outlined—

I'm sorry, Mr. Perron. Would you like to move your amendment?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yves Perron:** Yes, if I understand correctly, you want to discuss amendment BQ-1.

Amendment BQ-1 would amend clause 4 of Bill C-355 by deleting line 12 on page 2.

Line 12 on page 2 refers to the pilot....

I'm sorry, I don't seem to have the right amendment.

Let me start over. I am talking about amendment number 13016781, which was provided at the last minute this morning. It replaces amendments BQ-4 and BQ-5, which become moot.

Apologies for submitting the amendment late, but we think it is more likely to be admissible in this form and at this place.

I propose that Bill C-355, in clause 4, be amended by replacing lines 5 to 12 on page 2 with the following:

4 (1) It is prohibited to export a horse from Canada by air unless the exporter has, in the form and manner specified by the Minister, provided the Minister with a written declaration that, as the case may be,

(a) attests that, to the best of their knowledge, the horse is not being exported for the purpose of being slaughtered or fattened for slaughter;

(b) if the horse is being exported for the purpose of being slaughtered or fattened for slaughter,

(i) attests that the horse will be accompanied on board the aircraft by a person who is trained to, among other things, feed, water and provide care to it during transport, and

(ii) includes a detailed plan for the care to be provided to the horse during transport.

...

This amendment will address the problem relating to transport conditions, which differ according to the ultimate purpose of the animal's transport. This is in keeping with the concerns and testimony the committee has heard.

**The Chair:** You have the floor, Mr. Drouin. Please be brief.

**Mr. Francis Drouin:** I have just one question and it is for the clerk.

If Mr. Perron's amendment is carried, and please correct me if I am wrong, wouldn't that make my colleague's amendment, which would amend lines 13 to 27, inadmissible? Would it mean we would be amending a line more than once?

[*English*]

**The Chair:** You just have to let me get there, Mr. Drouin. Yes, just in terms of...

First of all, I will rule on the admissibility, which is going to be a problem, but yes, if this were to be adopted, LIB-0.1 could not be moved as a result of the line conflict.

[*Translation*]

Thank you very much for your amendment, Mr. Perron.

As with Mr. Barlow's amendment, your amendment would make it possible to include a provision regarding the export of horses, with conditions.

The opinion from the procedural clerks is very clear: The amendment exceeds the scope of Bill C-355.

• (1125)

[*English*]

As I said to Mr. Barlow, I'm sympathetic, Monsieur Perron, to what you're saying about trying to have further conditions to make sure there is adequate care for the horses, but on the similar principle that I just read out for Mr. Barlow, the advice I'm being given by the procedural clerks is that this is outside the scope, because the bill was very narrow in the way it was drafted, and it is black and white. Either you allow the export of the horses for slaughter...

I'm sorry, but there is no room for conditions. There is no room for improving the way in which the horses.... It is a very clear legislative bill that says this activity just cannot happen, regardless of whether or not there are other measures that can be taken.

Unfortunately, this amendment—I'm going to rule in the same manner—is inadmissible. I can read the text, but it follows the exact same procedural elements that Mr. Barlow's amendment had.

I can be challenged, and I invite you to do so if you'd like. I don't know if it will change based on the last vote, but you can challenge it if you like.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yves Perron:** I do not want us to vote three times on the same thing, but I have a question for legislative counsel.

According to our analysis, since we wish to retain the provisions that prohibit the transport of horses for slaughter in the first subsection, we thought this might strengthen the bill.

Perhaps I am a bit naive since I am not a lawyer, but I thought the amendment would be much more admissible since it would strengthen the bill rather than contradict it.

Was I mistaken? Perhaps you can convince me not to challenge the chair's decision.

**The Chair:** The principle and first clause of the bill are very clear. They completely prohibit the export of horses for slaughter.

Unfortunately, based on the advice of the procedural clerks, I think the amendment exceeds the principle of the bill.

[*English*]

That's the advice.

I was asking similar questions. As the chair of the committee, yesterday I asked about a number of different ways, but I have to be guided in part. No matter how sympathetic I might be to the amendment that's being moved, I have an obligation to follow the procedural elements of this House and follow parliamentary procedure.

The advice I'm getting is quite clear. There are other times when I've had a bit more discretion—when it's been a little less black and white—but unfortunately, this is the one that I'm being told would be precedent-setting.

I am willing to be challenged based on the advice I'm given, but I don't know if the vote will be any different.

What would you like to do next, Monsieur Perron?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yves Perron:** I will not make you vote on the same thing two or three times.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Then we'll move forward to LIB-0.1.

That's you, Mr. Louis. Would you like to move that amendment that you have put forward?

**Mr. Tim Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga, Lib.):** Thank you, Chair. Thank you to everyone for being here.

This is LIB-0.1 It's a very small change, but it's something that we heard from a number of stakeholders.

It just adds the phrase, “or any other document that is satisfactory to the minister”.

It's a small change, but it amounts to a policy difference and it's going to give flexibility. We heard of the need for that kind of flexibility.

Horses being transported by air for racing or equestrian events or recreation reasons already have documentation that could be supplemented easily. This, in effect, will help reduce red tape and any unintended consequences.

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

Go ahead, Mr. Steinley.

**Mr. Warren Steinley:** I have a couple of questions, Mr. Louis.

One is this: What do you mean by “any other document”?

We showed cattle our whole lives and we had registration forms and things like that. Would a registration form from the breeder showing that it's going to a show...?

Could you give some examples of some of the documentation? It's pretty vague, and I think if we're going to put this in legislation, it has to be a bit more clear.

That would be a question I have off the top of my head. A couple of examples would be helpful to see where we're at.

• (1130)

**Mr. Tim Louis:** Thank you. That's a valid question and that's why I left the flexibility of anything that is “satisfactory to the Minister”.

When we talk about horse racing, the horses actually have passports that can be somehow amended.

When we talked to Equestrian Canada—I've had many meetings with them—they have a lot of documents, and it would simply add another box to it. Instead of a declaration, it's just adding a box to an existing document or something down the road. I didn't want to pigeonhole it into a specific document.

**Mr. Warren Steinley:** Would that be a list in the regulations afterward? A person is not going to send the registration or the document to the minister, and then the minister says, “Yes, okay”, and sends it back. That's a lot of red tape. Are you thinking there'll be a list in the regulations of what would be acceptable?

I'm just saying that you're not going to make it so that basically the minister has to see the documentation first and then approve it. Would there be a list of things that would be approved, and then they could show it at the airport?

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Louis.

For what it's worth, I'm not in a position to fully satisfy that question, but usually when the minister... We're contemplating, obviously, public officials and what that would....

I think you're right, Mr. Steinley, that it would follow some type of regulatory authority under the legislation that would allow....

We do have officials here from Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada. Would that question be better directed to the officials?

**Mr. Warren Steinley:** Yes. Perhaps we could have a couple of examples of what the minister would consider official documentation so that the transportation documentation is not more burdensome on the breeders or on the officials at the airports. We heard from the pilots that it will be much more strenuous for them and

will give them more roles and responsibilities—roles and responsibilities that they don't want, I might add.

What would that type of documentation look like?

**Mr. Graeme Hamilton (Acting Director General, Traveller, Commercial and Trade Policy Directorate, Strategic Policy Branch, Canada Border Services Agency):** Mr. Chair, the CBSA is responsible for administering over 100 acts at the border. Many of them include very similar vague language. For example, under IRPA, which allows Canadians and foreign nationals to enter Canada, people with the right of entry into Canada do not need to show a passport. What they need to be able to do is establish their right of entry into Canada. They give you that through a variety of different ways. Obviously, the one that is most familiar to everyone is to just show your passport, but perhaps you lost your passport while you were travelling in the States. If you can satisfy a border services officer that you are in fact Canadian by showing a driver's licence or some other type of documentation, they will then rule on your admissibility into Canada.

Similarly, in the amendment that's being advanced now, the CBSA would be looking at the different documentation that's being provided. We would probably lean in to our CFIA counterparts to ask them to help us determine whether the documentation that's being provided is in fact satisfying the requirements under the legislation that we're enforcing at the border. We would call over to our CFIA colleagues.

As we heard in the previous testimony, as live horses are exported from Canada, they are accompanied by inspectors from the CFIA. We would engage with them in order to make a determination about whether or not the documentation that's being provided satisfies the requirement in the legislation.

I hope that's clear. I'm happy to answer any other questions you may have.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Barlow.

**Mr. John Barlow:** Chair, I just want to make sure I'm clear on this.

Mr. Louis, the concern that folks raised on this additional step was that there would have to be a declaration to the minister. In my opinion, you're making this more vague rather than more specific. I would have preferred that you got rid of this additional step entirely. We certainly heard, from our conversations with the Calgary Stampede, Spruce Meadows and groups like them that this will be an onerous process for them to go through. Now it seems to be more vague.

I'll ask you this, Mr. Louis. Let's say this amendment passes and then we go to LIB-1. If you're removing the whole declaration of detention clauses on the pilots, why aren't you doing the same thing with the steps you're asking the exporters to take on the declaration in this one? Is that a fair question?

We certainly heard from the pilots about the onerous step or the onerous responsibility that you're going to remove, and I think that's a good decision, but we heard similar concerns from those organizations that are transporting horses not for slaughter. You're not giving them the same respect, for lack of a better word, that you are to the Air Line Pilots Association, who talked about their responsibility with this being imposed on them. You're still imposing similar responsibilities and red tape on the transporters who are not moving horses for slaughter. They're still having to go through this declaration process.

I would prefer if we just got rid of that entirely, rather than adding to it.

• (1135)

**The Chair:** It's over to you, if you'd like, Mr. Louis.

**Mr. Tim Louis:** I know that we have some experts here. We just want to make sure that there's basically a tracking of horses, which exists already. There needs to be a process in place. This offers flexibility down the road. I think if we vote on this, when we get to LIB-1, those two will work together.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Steinley.

**Mr. Warren Steinley:** I appreciate the conversation back and forth, respectfully, but the question is this, Mr. Louis: If we're going to ban the export of horses for slaughter, and there are already processes in place for other transportation of horses, and that part is gone already, why the extra step? That's what I'm saying.

As Mr. Barlow said, you're taking away the need for the pilots to do extra documentation. If the ban on horses for slaughter goes through, there are already processes in place for horses that are being shipped for other reasons. Why the extra step? Shipping horses for slaughter is already done, then, and that process is there. I don't think we need it. It's just adding to a process that's already in place. Do I have that correct?

**Mr. Tim Louis:** It's just to say that this is there for enforcement and tracking.

**The Chair:** Okay, so assuming there are no other comments, I'm happy to ask the question of whether or not LIB-0.1 shall carry, and we can have a recorded vote.

Go ahead, Madam Clerk.

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

**The Chair:** Thank you.

We now turn to LIB-1. Would you like to move that, Mr. Louis?

**Mr. Tim Louis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

LIB-0.1 and LIB-1 work together. LIB-1 will change the declaration from a requirement—which we heard concerns about, tying things up for any horse shipped by air—to a reporting mechanism,

so LIB-0.1 and LIB-1 work together. It's a reporting mechanism that can be followed up for enforcement and tracking reasons. It's what the pilots, Equestrian Canada, Racetracks of Canada and many of these organizations were asking for, so I believe this solves a lot of the problems on which we heard good testimony from many stakeholders and good questions from our panel.

**The Chair:** Colleagues, for your benefit, if this amendment is adopted, then BQ-1 and BQ-2 will become moot and will not be able to be moved and G-1 will not be able to be moved because of a line conflict.

Go ahead, Monsieur Perron.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yves Perron:** As long as we achieve the desired result, we don't mind if our amendments disappear. I would however ask the legislative counsel to guarantee that we have achieved our purpose, which was to free the pilot from responsibility for the paperwork.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I think that question on whether that obligation is removed would be for some of our experts here. This is more procedural.

To your question, Monsieur Perron, about whether or not, if LIB-1 is successful, it satisfies the concerns about eliminating the obligation to pilots, I'll maybe let one of our...

Do you have a question directed at any particular agency there?

• (1140)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yves Perron:** In my opinion, yes, because the amendment removes the same lines. So it should work.

**Mr. Guilton Pierre-Jean (Senior Counsel, Legal Services, Department of Agriculture and Agri-Food and Canadian Food Inspection Agency, Department of Justice):** Mr. Chair, thank you for the question, but I would like to see a copy of the amendments before I answer.

**The Chair:** Do you think that is necessary, Mr. Perron?

**Mr. Yves Perron:** It's not necessary. The goals of my amendments are included in lines 11 to 22. I was asking as a precaution, but we can go ahead and vote.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I don't think it's necessary. Monsieur Perron is satisfied. He was asking the question, of course, because Monsieur Perron also has similar amendments to try to remove the obligation to pilots. That will be satisfied by Mr. Louis's amendment, so that's why yours, BQ-1 and BQ-2, will not be necessary. It's because of this.



Also, G-1 cannot be moved because of a line conflict.

Seeing no debate, shall amendment LIB-1 carry? We can ask for a recorded vote, or would you like to do it on division?

**An hon. member:** On division.

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

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Monsieur Perron.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yves Perron:** I would like to go back to amendment G-1. I had not understood that the proposal would eliminate this amendment. If you are amenable to that, it is fine with me.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Mr. Drouin, would you like to speak on G-1 and whether or not there's a necessity to move that? Obviously there is a line conflict.

**Mr. Francis Drouin:** I'm not moving G-1, so I'm not going to speak to it.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Unfortunately, Mr. Perron, it can't be moved, because there's a line conflict.

What I heard was “on division”, and we always work quite well in this committee on consensus, so we'll move forward. LIB-1 has carried.

We will now go to BQ-3.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Perron, you have the floor.

**Mr. Yves Perron:** My earlier doubt has just been confirmed.

Amendment BQ-3 is essentially designed to further free the pilot from responsibility.

I propose therefore that Bill C-355, in clause 4, be amended by adding after line 27 on page 2 the following:

(5) A pilot in command of an aircraft with a horse on board in respect of which the chief officer of customs did not receive a copy of the declaration is not liable if they were authorized to take the aircraft on its flight.

According to the testimony we heard during our study on this subject, primarily from people representing pilots, the pilot is first responsible for safety and the schedule, among other things. We do not want to also make them responsible for checking documents.

That is the reason we are putting forward this amendment. A pilot who has been cleared for takeoff could not be held responsible if it were proven that a prohibited export of a horse for slaughter had occurred. It is a kind of insurance policy to free the pilot of responsibility.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Mr. MacGregor, please go ahead.

**Mr. Alistair MacGregor:** First, my assumption is that since we have removed subclauses 4(2), 4(3) and 4(4), this would be renumbered as subclause 4(2), if adopted.

Second, if we were to adopt this, would it make sense to add it to the bill if none of the other stuff is still in there? Would it just be floating by itself? That's my question, from a legal standpoint, to a jurilinguist. Does it make sense to add this section if we've removed the preceding three subclauses?

• (1145)

**The Chair:** Mr. MacGregor, what this contemplates is the declaration, which still does exist in 4.1. You're correct that it would now become 4.2 in a logical sequencing, if you follow me.

There's 4.1 in the bill...

Go ahead, Mr. MacGregor.

**Mr. Alistair MacGregor:** I'm sorry. You said “4.1”. We're still on clause 4.

**The Chair:** I meant subclause 4(1).

**Mr. Alistair MacGregor:** This would be subclause 4(2).

**The Chair:** Are you satisfied?

**Mr. Alistair MacGregor:** I'm satisfied, but because we have deleted the previously existing subclauses 4(2), 4(3) and 4(4), my question is this: If we were to add this and if it were renumbered as subclause 4(2), would that make sense, given that we have deleted the preceding sections, or would it just float there on its own because we have removed references to pilots?

That's what my question is.

**The Chair:** Yes, there has absolutely been a removal. That's probably a question for some of our experts in the department.

I'll let you speak, Mr. Barlow, before we go there.

Ultimately, it's a discussion we can have among lawmakers at the committee. If we're removing the obligations for the pilot, we don't have to contemplate the pilot's liability, because nowhere else does it say that a pilot would actually necessarily be involved in this process.

I'm going to go to Mr. Barlow first, and then I'll come to you, Mr. Perron.

**Mr. John Barlow:** Thanks.

Maybe this is for some of our experts here. I'm not a transportation expert, but because we are leaving in the declaration subclause—“No departure without declaration”—and we removed the reference to pilots, I would like to ask a question of our clerk.

Does any liability remain with the air traffic controller or the marshaller, or does that have to be specified? If that “No departure without declaration” subclause remains, and because an air traffic controller or an air marshaller would technically be giving permission for that flight to leave, is there any liability on them, and does that have to be specified in here?

**The Chair:** I'm going to let our witnesses contemplate Mr. Barlow's question.

I am going to go to Monsieur Perron. I think it's an important point, because it says "a person" is prohibited. The question becomes if "a person" includes some of those officials you mentioned, Mr. Barlow?

Monsieur Perron, please go ahead.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yves Perron:** That is very similar to what Mr. Barlow said. Since we kept subclause 4(1), which says that a horse may not be exported without a written declaration, in view of the concerns stated by pilots association representatives, I think that is a necessary clarification.

A law can never be too clear. If it is not specified, I think a pilot could still ultimately be affected as a representative of the airport or any other entity. The amendment must be retained, unless I receive an opinion to the contrary.

**Mr. Guilton Pierre-Jean:** Further to the amendments put forward by Mr. Louis, subclause 4(1) reads as follows:

4 (1) It is prohibited for a person to export a horse from Canada by air unless they have, in the form and manner specified by the Minister, provided the Minister with a written declaration attesting that, to the best of their knowledge, the horse is not being exported for the purpose of being slaughtered or fattened for slaughter as well as with any other documentation that the Minister may require.

My understanding is that the new subsection formally prohibits the export of a horse for slaughter unless the minister receives a written declaration or other satisfactory document.

By eliminating subsections 4(2), 4(3) and 4(4), there is no longer any reference to the pilot or any other person. In my opinion, however, the formal prohibition applies to the exporter. So it is the exporter who would be in violation of the law if he exported a horse for purposes of slaughter. It does not create an obligation for anyone else.

• (1150)

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Monsieur Perron, and then I have some thoughts.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yves Perron:** Thank you for your reply, Mr. Pierre-Jean. It is clear.

I just want to make sure I understand this correctly. Are you saying that amendment BQ-3 is entirely unnecessary and that pilots would not be affected by the act, or should we change the way the amendment is worded?

I'll read it out again.

(5) A pilot in command of an aircraft with a horse on board in respect of which the chief officer of customs did not receive a copy of the declaration is not liable if they were authorized to take the aircraft on its flight.

Would it be wise to include this for the sake of clarity or do you think it is entirely unnecessary?

**Mr. Guilton Pierre-Jean:** Thank you for the question.

The way I see it, since subclause 4(2) has been deleted and the pilot is not mentioned, the exporter is the only one who has an obligation: He must provide a written declaration that the horse is not

being exported for slaughter or another document satisfactory to the minister.

The pilot is no longer mentioned. Previously, subclause 4(2) made the pilot responsible for receiving a copy of the declaration. Since that subclause has been deleted, the pilot's obligation has disappeared.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** The way I look at it, colleagues—and I will go to you, Mr. Drouin—is that including Yves' proposed amendment would actually open the door to contemplating people beyond the persons responsible for exporting who would be required to get a permit or authorization or to submit something to the ministry. If you leave that part in about the pilot, it opens up the door to who else could be potentially liable.

I would agree with Mr. Pierre-Jean's proposition that if you read subclause 4(1), it is the person who is expected to export the horse who would have to get permission. Essentially, the person would have to provide it in a form or manner specified by the minister. However, if we leave in the piece on the pilots, it opens up, to Mr. Barlow's point, other elements of people who are involved in allowing the plane to take off, which is far beyond the scope of what we intend to do.

You guys ultimately have the vote, but my advice as your chair is that you should just keep subclause 4(1).

Perhaps we should drop the amendment, Mr. Perron.

Obviously, in all the blues and the testimony of this committee, if there were ever a challenge on the legality of this part, it would be very clear that we were intending not to include other elements of the air travel supply chain, so to speak, in permitting the plane to take off otherwise.

Go ahead, Mr. Drouin.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Francis Drouin:** I would suggest that my esteemed friend withdraw amendment BQ-3 since we do not have to vote on that.

Since we know the result of the previous amendment and since, in light of the testimony we have heard, amendment BQ-3 is not necessary, that would be a possibility.

**Mr. Yves Perron:** That's fine, Mr. Chair.

If we are guaranteed that amendment BQ-3 is not necessary and that pilots will not be held responsible, I do not see a problem. We will withdraw it.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I just need unanimous consent on withdrawing it. I don't see any issue on that from this committee.

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

(Amendment withdrawn)

**The Chair:** I do see your hand, Mr. MacGregor, but let me go back to my procedural sheet here.

That takes us to the end of clause 4 in terms of amendments.

(Clause 4 as amended agreed to on division [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** For a new clause 4.1, this is amendment BQ-4.

Without going into further detail, I will just reiterate that it's the same principle that has applied on the last two rulings. The advice I'm being given on BQ-4 is that it is adding conditions.

However, go ahead, Monsieur Perron, if you want to explain.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yves Perron:** I'm sorry. Perhaps I was not very clear earlier, but the amendment submitted at the last minute was intended to replace amendments BQ-4 and BQ-5. The goal was to suggest a better way of doing it or doing it in a way that we thought might be more admissible. If that had not been accepted, we would have voted twice on the same content. That was our intention earlier. The goal was to save time.

You may disregard amendments BQ-4 and BQ-5, if everyone is in agreement.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** You didn't actually move it yet, so that's fine. We don't need unanimous consent. I was just pre-emptively saying where we would be if you did choose to move it.

(On clause 5)

**The Chair:** The next amendment would be CPC-2, which is admissible.

Mr. Barlow, if you or whoever would like to speak on that amendment would like to move it, go ahead. It is over to you.

• (1155)

**Mr. John Barlow:** Thanks.

Because that declaration clause was removed, we just want to make sure that there is no false or misleading information, so "It is prohibited for a person to provide false or misleading" information or make a false or misleading statement in "respect of any [other] matter related to the export by air of a live horse."

That's really the focus of our amendment here.

**The Chair:** That was premised on the idea that there would be an ability for the horse to move under conditions, which we've ruled out of order.

Would you still like to move that, or do you feel that it's...?

**Mr. John Barlow:** Yes.

**The Chair:** As it was explained to me by the procedural clerk, this would apply to any horse being moved by air, outside of those being moved for export, because the bill is very strict on that.

It would talk about—as you can see from Mr. Barlow's amendment—anything that's misleading with regard to any horse being moved in that context.

I'll leave it for any debate or open conversation, or we can call a vote.

Shall CPC-2 carry?

(Amendment negated on division)

(Clause 5 agreed to on division)

(On clause 6)

**The Chair:** CPC-3 is admissible, based on other elements.

Go ahead, Mr. Barlow.

**Mr. John Barlow:** We definitely heard about the onerous responsibility that this legislation puts on exporters, pilots and those who are associated with the industry. I certainly appreciate my colleague's putting in some very stiff penalties, but again, this has now been banned. I don't think it's going to be any breeders now in operation, which is going to be another consequence of this legislation. The government's now taking on a multi-million-dollar liability here.

This amendment is to lower the penalties for the offence under this act, from \$250,000 on a conviction on indictment to \$100,000, and from \$50,000 on summary conviction to \$25,000. Again, the feedback we had from testimony was that this is very onerous legislation, and I don't think such high penalties are necessary. We just want to reduce those fines to something a little more commensurate with what's going on.

**The Chair:** Colleagues, is there any discussion?

**Mr. John Barlow:** I will add that these fines are in line with what the Liberals put forward on Bill C-275. They're in line with what they supported in previous legislation.

**The Chair:** If there's no other discussion, I will ask whether CPC-3 shall carry.

(Amendment negated on division)

(Clauses 6 and 7 agreed to on division)

(On clause 8)

**The Chair:** On clause 8, we ruled that CPC-4 was inadmissible. That's part of the original decision, Mr. Barlow.

Go ahead, Mr. Drouin.

• (1200)

**Mr. Francis Drouin:** Before we get into clause 8, I will ask about the rationale on whether we need clause 8 and whether we need to modify paragraph 107(3)(c) of the Customs Act. I ask folks from the CBSA to speak to that. I'm just getting a signal that it may be redundant. I propose that we strike clause 8, but I will speak to the officials first and ask the question as to whether or not this has any impact. If we do remove this clause, is there an impact to the Customs Act?

**Mr. Graeme Hamilton:** Mr. Chair, because the information under this bill is not collected under the authorities of the Customs Act, by definition it's not considered customs information.

Section 107 is specific to the authorities that the CBSA has to release customs information to other parties, including other government departments, and because the information collected would not be collected under that authority, it does not need to be in section 107.

If there is other information that is collected upon export that the CFIA would like to access, there are existing provisions within section 107 that do allow us to provide that information to another government department upon request, so removing the reference to Bill C-355 in section 107 would have no impact on the CBSA's ability to share information with the CFIA.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Drouin, I guess what I'm hearing from you is that you may not be in favour of moving clause 8 as is, and perhaps you're trying to strike it down.

**Mr. Francis Drouin:** Well, we can vote on.... In terms of procedure, can I move an amendment to strike clause 8, or do we just not carry clause 8?

**The Chair:** It just doesn't carry.

(Clause 8 negatived)

(Clause 9 agreed to on division)

**The Chair: The Chair:** We're at clause 10 and CPC-6. I believe that was deemed inadmissible as well.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yves Perron:** What about clause 8, which is not necessary?

I apologize, Mr. Chair. I have just been informed that it was withdrawn.

Thank you.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Shall clause 10 carry?

(Clause 10 agreed to on division)

(On clause 11)

**The Chair:** I'm now at clause 11 and CPC-7. I believe this amendment is in order. I'm going to turn it over to you, Mr. Barlow.

**Mr. John Barlow:** It's Mr. Steinley.

**Mr. Warren Steinley:** This is an amendment to delay the coming into force of the bill from 18 months after receiving royal assent to five years.

Many stakeholders have told us how long it was going to take to have this.... If this does come into effect, they told us about the effects it can have on their livelihood, given the gestation period of horses and animal health consequences, and the fact that it will destroy people's livelihoods, forcing them to find other means to make a living, which could include retraining in other education for themselves.

When the stakeholders who actually raise these horses were here, no questions were asked of them by any of the opposition parties. I think it is incumbent upon us to think about the people who have put their heart and soul into raising these animals. It is their livelihood. It is part of their past and their present, but obviously it is not in their future if this bill does come into force. I think delaying this so that we give the proper amount of time for people to figure out how it's going to affect their lives from here on would be compassionate and something that this committee should take seriously. It's going to affect the lives of lots of people, and we should give them time to rebuild those lives.

• (1205)

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

Is there any debate or comment on the amendment proposed by Mr. Steinley?

Seeing none, shall the amendment carry?

Would you like a recorded vote?

**Mr. Warren Steinley:** I would love a recorded vote, Mr. Chair.

(Amendment negatived: nays 6; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** Colleagues, that brings us to clause 11.

Shall clause 11 carry? I assume it's on division, given our precedent.

(Clause 11 agreed to on division)

**The Chair:** On the short title and the title, CPC-8 and CPC-9 were proposing changes. They ultimately didn't come into force. They're inadmissible.

Shall the short title carry?

**Some hon. members:** On division.

**The Chair:** Shall the preamble carry?

**Some hon. members:** On division.

**The Chair:** Shall the title carry?

**Some hon. members:** On division.

**The Chair:** Shall the bill as amended carry?

**Some hon. members:** On division.

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

**Some hon. members:** On division.

**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:** On division.

**The Chair:** Colleagues, let me first, on your behalf, thank the officials for being here today and for their work in their respective portfolios.

Colleagues, I appreciate your work on this committee and the witnesses who have come before the House on this bill.

We don't have anything else scheduled today.

Go ahead, Mr. Barlow, very quickly.

**Mr. John Barlow:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

With the committee's indulgence—and I have spoken to the clerk about this—this bill was something I have never before experienced at this committee. Perhaps it's happened at other committees.

I don't mean this about the members of this committee. I think we all get along very well. However, when we were trying to work with potential witnesses and have them speak on this bill and tell their stories about why this industry is important to them and how long they've been....

I'm sure all of you had emails in your offices that your staff had to deal with. It was quite disgusting, in my opinion, how some of the activists pushing for this legislation were treating not only members of Parliament but also the witnesses we had. We had a number of witnesses who eventually decided not to appear at committee because of the intimidation and reaction they were getting in phone calls. A couple of witnesses had to call the RCMP on multiple occasions as a result of protests or intimidation at their farms or businesses.

I want to mention to the committee that this was unlike anything I've seen—having witnesses refuse to attend because of threats being thrown at them and the harassment they were having to endure from animal activists. This is very unfortunate. I think that no matter where you stand on an issue, you should have your voice heard and feel free to have that voice heard.

*House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, in chapter 20, “Committees”, in the subsection related to witnesses, states:

Witnesses appearing before committees enjoy the same freedom of speech and protection from arrest and molestation as do Members of Parliament. At the committee's discretion, witnesses may be allowed to testify in camera when dealing with confidential matters of state or sensitive commercial...information. Under special circumstances, witnesses have been permitted to appear anonymously

Thanks to the clerk, we were able to do that.

Tampering with a witness or in any way attempting to deter a witness from giving evidence [at a committee meeting] may constitute a breach of...privilege. Similarly, any interference with or threats against witnesses who have already testified may be treated as a breach of privilege by the House.

Committee, I think we need to set a bit of a precedent here. We always talk, out in public, about how well we work together. I think we should be sending a message to those who are involved in this industry or may have an opportunity to appear at committee that we

are going to have their backs and won't tolerate that kind of harassment and intimidation, regardless of where we stand on an issue.

Therefore, Mr. Chair, I would like to table a notice of motion:

That the clerk and analysts be instructed to prepare a brief report outlining the material facts of a potential breach of privilege related to the reports of threats, harassment and intimidation against, and the efforts to deter the appearances of, potential witnesses and witnesses in relation to the committee study of Bill C-355, an act to prohibit the export by air of horses for slaughter and to make related amendments to certain acts, and that the chair be instructed to present this report to the House forthwith.

Again, colleagues, I was very disappointed to see how other Canadians were treating their friends and neighbours and certainly our agriculture sector simply because they didn't support what they were doing for their livelihood. I wish that was something we would never have to deal with, but it was a matter of fact in this case. I can honestly tell you that we had a number of witnesses who were scared, period, and did not want to appear at this committee to testify about this issue. I think that's not right.

If we truly want to go out there in public all the time and say how well we get along.... This committee does not have the shenanigans that other committees do. Again, I'm not saying anybody around this table was instigating this type of behaviour, because I know that's not true. However, I think we should send a message that this is not going to be tolerated and that we will back up anyone who feels they have a position so that they feel welcome at this committee.

• (1210)

I would like to move this motion and have it discussed today, while we have an opportunity.

Thank you for your indulgence.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Drouin.

**Mr. Francis Drouin:** Obviously, no witnesses should be bullied, whether it's on this issue or any other issue, so I support what you're saying, Mr. Barlow.

We know that debates sometimes get passionate, but regardless, witnesses should not feel intimidated when they come before our committee—or don't come before committee because they are being intimidated. I don't want to specifically tie it to Bill C-355, though. There have been other studies in front of us, and as a member of an agriculture committee, I think all members of Parliament should encourage witnesses to come forward and that witnesses should feel free to express an opinion without being bullied.

If some witnesses had expressed something—I'm not aware—I hope we would have dealt with it right away. We had some discussions about a particular witness appearing and not showing their face on camera because they felt there could be some reprisals against them because of the opinion they had.

I'm not sure what the report would say, other than saying that all members of Parliament obviously condemn bullying tactics used by anyone. I think all sides would agree. I would challenge us as well, as members of Parliament, to not bully other members of Parliament when we have certain opinions.

I don't know what the consequences of that would be.

**The Chair:** I'll let the clerk contemplate that.

I see Mr. MacGregor's hand, and then I'll see Monsieur Perron. We'll let them weigh in so that we can get a sense of where this may go.

Go ahead.

• (1215)

**Mr. Alistair MacGregor:** Thank you, Chair.

Since this committee meeting is happening in public, it's really important for everyone to understand what privilege is.

Privilege in a parliamentary context does not mean what many people think it means. Privilege is what allows members to be able to do their job on behalf of the people they serve, but it also extends like a cone—a very important cone—that extends to the witnesses who come before us here, as was demonstrated yesterday in the House when the Speaker was instructing Mr. Firth when he appeared before the bar and told him that anything he said while presenting to the House could not be used against him in a court of law or in anything else. That's the power of parliamentary privilege. Even though these proceedings are held in public, nothing on this record could ever be used against someone. We do that so that we can hear the unvarnished truth from witnesses, who can give us their view on sometimes difficult subjects without fear of reprisal.

I'm inclined to support this motion because I think it's an important principle to stand for. However, I want us to be careful to not be selective in where we choose to direct our outrage as a committee.

One of my NDP colleagues had an axe thrown through his window during an “axe the tax” rally. That could be seen as a breach of his privilege, as it was intimidating a sitting member who is trying to do his job properly.

I think both instances need to be condemned. We as a committee have worked really well. I'm proud to have been a member of this committee for six years because of how well we work together, and we have dealt with some difficult subjects in the past.

I will be inclined to support this motion, but with a cautionary note that we not be selective in what we choose to investigate as a committee. Whenever there's been a breach of privilege, we have to be very vocal about it as a committee.

I'll leave it at that, Chair.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Monsieur Perron.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yves Perron:** I agree with a number of the comments that have been made.

We cannot of course disagree with the fundamental principle that people must be able to appear before the committee without fear of reprisal, just as it would be totally unacceptable for committee members to be intimidated.

As an aside, Mr. Chair, could we let the witnesses who are still here leave if they have finished their testimony?

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I'm sorry. I can relay to our good officials, who have good work to do on behalf of Canadians, that they are certainly released. I'm sorry if I didn't make that clear. That motion was moved, and I was focused on Mr. Barlow.

Thank you to our witnesses.

Go ahead, Mr. Perron.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yves Perron:** This is a very serious matter, Mr. Chair. It is unacceptable for people to be intimidated when they are here to inform the public and defend their rights and interests, no matter who they are. We live in a democratic society. We were sorry about the unfortunate incidents on social media before the holidays, and I think this is similar to that.

Before we talk about drafting the report that we will be presenting to the House, I would like the committee to look at what happened. For example, did the police get any complaints? For my part, I was not aware of it. Today I am informed of a motion that I did not receive in advance. I know you wanted to put it forward today, but it would have been helpful to distribute it to us before the meeting.

As I said, I don't think anyone would disagree with the basic principle. Witnesses do indeed have to be protected. We could gather more information, however. We could make a determination later on, before sending it to the House. If the information we have is not conclusive, I think we will have to approach this seriously and conscientiously and try to gather additional information.

That said, I can see that the intent of the motion is relevant, and I think it is an important motion.

For my part, I think we should take a step back to gather the missing information. We could then make a determination later on.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I have Mr. Steinley and then Mr. MacGregor.

Here's how I read the motion, colleagues. It asks, first and foremost, for the clerk and the analysts to be instructed to prepare a report outlining the material facts of what Mr. Barlow has raised. I presume that once that report and analysis are contemplated, if a majority of this committee want to instruct me, as the chair, to find that there has been a breach of parliamentary privilege, then I would report back to the House.

I don't read this motion as an absolute breach right away and that I would report back right away, because—to your point, Mr. Perron—it first instructs the clerk and the analysts to prepare a report that we would then have to contemplate once that report was done, along with the information that was pertinent to it.

I am cognizant that this is an important discussion. I also know that there's other business we have to do.

I have Mr. Steinley, Mr. MacGregor and Ms. Taylor Roy.

● (1220)

**Mr. Warren Steinley:** I would just say that I know we sometimes want to expand the scope of some things, but we have specific evidence with the clerk and the analysts dealing with the witnesses and conversations, so I think this can be something that could be done relatively quickly. There is documented proof. They have had these conversations, and witnesses have put forward their concerns, and there are examples of witnesses going to the RCMP. Quite a few of these are indigenous women as well, Mr. Chair.

This is something that we need to take seriously, but I would not want to see the scope expanded. There is documented proof with this specific bill. I think we have a duty to make sure that people know that we're going to have their backs, as Mr. Barlow said, but I would not want to see this expanded. There are things on the table that we can.... The clerk and the analysts can do their good work and produce a report, and we can look at it to see where we go from there.

I just worry that.... I wouldn't want to see growth in the scope. This is something that we can look at very seriously and in a timely way.

**The Chair:** Yes. I think it was just for the record that some of our colleagues were raising that concern. The motion is clear. However, again, I want to make it clear that the way I read the motion is that I'm not absolutely reporting back to the House. First and foremost, there has to be a contemplation of the brief that is submitted.

Go ahead, Mr. MacGregor.

**Mr. Alistair MacGregor:** Thanks, Mr. Chair.

I disagree with your reading, because I think the motion actually does instruct you to report it to the House.

I want to follow on Mr. Perron's suggestion. I do believe that it would be prudent for us, as a committee, to review this, so I would suggest an amendment to this motion.

I would suggest, in the first line, "That the clerk and analysts be instructed to prepare a brief report for the committee", and then it would continue on. The next part of my amendment would be to delete "and that the chair be instructed to present this report to the House forthwith."

I think we, as a committee, need to be presented with this analysis and evidence first, and then we can make a subsequent motion based on our review of those facts.

**The Chair:** I have Mr. Drouin and then Ms. Taylor Roy.

**Mr. Francis Drouin:** To that point, if we are to eventually report back to the House, then obviously, with regard to the folks who have made these statements to our clerk, I am interested in how we protect them as well. If we report publicly, we need to have a conversation about protecting those individuals who have made those particular statements.

I would be in line with supporting what Mr. MacGregor said. Then maybe we can have a longer-term conversation: If we are to report back to the House, how do we do that, and how do we protect the identity of those who made those statements?

**The Chair:** We're happy to contemplate that. We do have the amendment as moved, so we're on that.

Go ahead, Ms. Taylor Roy.

**Ms. Leah Taylor Roy (Aurora—Oak Ridges—Richmond Hill, Lib.):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I think this is a very serious issue. Obviously, we want to be sure that witnesses feel free to come and speak and testify. I think there are ways to protect witnesses already, through meeting in camera and other things, but certainly, if they have received threats....

I'm curious. Is this study specific to this bill, or will it also include other bills on which we feel people have been harassed or bullied, such as perhaps Bill C-234?

**The Chair:** The motion from Mr. Barlow, as presented right now, contemplates parliamentary privilege in relation to Bill C-355. The amendment that Mr. MacGregor has made is that the analysts and the clerk would prepare a report with the pertinent facts related to this particular study. Then, as Mr. MacGregor has also moved, he has cut off the portion of the chair being instructed to present back to the House forthwith. That will come subsequent to the report being prepared.

**Ms. Leah Taylor Roy:** I just think that since it's such a serious issue, perhaps we could look it under a broader basis. I think we've seen evidence of bullying in relation to other bills that we've considered as well, which we didn't study. I'm wondering if we should perhaps expand it, especially if we're going to make a recommendation to the House. I think we do want to protect witnesses and make sure that people aren't bullied.

● (1225)

**The Chair:** Okay. If you think, Ms. Taylor Roy, there's consensus in this committee to do that, you can move a subamendment to the amendment that Mr. MacGregor has moved. I don't know if that's the case.

Otherwise, where I'm at procedurally right now, assuming there's no more debate, is that we would vote on Mr. MacGregor's amendment. Depending on how that goes, we would then vote on the main motion that has been brought by Mr. Barlow.

I see Monsieur Perron's hand.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yves Perron:** My understanding is that Ms. Taylor Roy's amendment has not been moved.

We are talking about Bill C-355. We would have examples of that, but it is not restrictive. To reassure Ms. Taylor Roy, if we have specific examples, we can act accordingly.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** The motion is quite clear that it's in relation to Bill C-355.

Again, in the interest of time here, colleagues, if we are of the view that we let the clerk and the analysts prepare it, and we feel, to Ms. Taylor Roy's point, that there has to be an expanded element down the line to consider whether other types of parliamentary privilege have been breached at some point, this committee is well within its right to do so. My interest is in trying to litigate this so that we can move forward.

I will turn it over to you.

**Ms. Leah Taylor Roy:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I think that's a good point. I agree that we need to have specific instances. I'm just thinking that the clerk and analysts may have heard similar things from witnesses in other studies. If they have, I think that should be included, and not just on the one study. If the clerk and analysts know of other instances of either witnesses or members feeling that they've been bullied, and those instances have been brought to their attention, then I think we could include that in the report. I'd like to see, perhaps just in this session, broader indications that the clerk....

If it's agreeable to you, Mr. MacGregor, to make a subamendment to yours, I would just broaden this a little bit.

**The Chair:** Procedurally, it might be a different amendment altogether. Mr. MacGregor didn't contemplate in his amendment actually amending the scope of the report that would be prepared for the analysts.

Again, in the spirit of this committee, Ms. Taylor Roy, you can move an amendment once Mr. MacGregor's element is concluded. You can actually move another amendment to this motion, or this committee, which generally works pretty well in consensus, can contemplate what is before us. Once the clerk and analysts come back, if we feel that it has to be widened, we are well within our right to go further.

I don't want to take too much more time.

Go ahead, Mr. Barlow.

**Mr. John Barlow:** I feel I should comment, since this is something that I raised.

This is a result of information and personal anecdotes we've been sharing with the clerk throughout this entire process. I wasn't doing this to make this a fishing expedition for other issues. I've been here for a long time. I wanted us to deal with something that specifically happened at this committee. I certainly don't recall another instance of a study that we've been doing at this committee seeing this type of vitriol.

I certainly know all of us were getting emails and pictures and all those types of things from people. My worry is that if we don't make a statement here, this will continue to proliferate. The signal we'd then be giving is that this is okay, that you can treat people and potential witnesses like this. How are we supposed to invite witnesses to come here and testify when we have sensitive topics to discuss? Certainly animal agriculture is going to be one that is not going to end.

These witnesses, who have very important expertise to share with us, are not going to come here if they don't feel that their testi-

mony is going to be safe and they are going to be anonymous, or if they are otherwise going to be opening themselves to public harassment and intimidation.

That's really why I have us focused on this particular issue at committee in comparison to Bill C-234. We did not have that type of response from people at all. That's why I want this focused.

To Mr. MacGregor's proposal for an amendment, I'm totally fine with having the report come to committee. I still strongly believe that this should be reported to the House. It's quite clear with the information that I've presented to the clerk over the last several weeks that this is an issue that was clearly a breach of privilege. I don't want to make that judgment, I guess, before everyone has a chance to see it.

I'm totally supportive of having the report come to committee first, but I still believe the report should be tabled in the House.

• (1230)

**The Chair:** We can litigate that once the report is actually contemplated by the committee.

First I have Monsieur Perron, and then Monsieur Drouin.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yves Perron:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

My comments will be very brief. I agree with what Mr. Barlow said.

With all due respect, Ms. Taylor Roy, I do not think we should look for more information because that would require a significant amount of research by the analysts and the clerk. We cannot ask them now to look into previous studies to see if any evidence has been retained. Let's start with that.

It does not apply to the bill, but to the study we have just completed. This should not be interpreted negatively with regard to the bill, but I think it is important if we have testimony.

According to what Mr. Barlow said, there is evidence. We have concerns today because we have not seen it and we want to see it before sending it to the House. I propose that we vote on Mr. MacGregor's amendment, that we adopt the motion and resolve this matter.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Mr. Drouin is next.

**Mr. Francis Drouin:** On the amendment from Mr. MacGregor, I'm flying blind, so I'm not comfortable with it. I haven't seen anything. We have not seen anything except that particular side. I'm happy to have a report here. I want another vote to determine whether we report this back to the House.

Because I'm blind, I don't know what's happened.



**The Chair:** It was table-dropped. I can assure you, Mr. Drouin, that what Mr. MacGregor is moving would allow the clerk and analyst to prepare a report of the relevant facts and information. The committee would then further determine whether or not there was a breach of parliamentary privilege.

Go ahead, Ms. Taylor Roy.

**Ms. Leah Taylor Roy:** I haven't seen the amended motion either. My concern is that if this is a broader issue, I want to ensure that we look at the broader issue if that's established here.

Part of the problem with this conversation is that apparently members opposite are privy to information that wasn't shared with us earlier. We don't really know what they're talking about, or the extent of these threats and allegations.

I'm fine to have a report, but I want to ensure that if this is happening and if in fact the clerks and analysts have heard similar kinds of concerns from other witnesses or have heard from other people that they have been bullied, we do want to expand it.

I don't think we need to specify this bill in this motion in order to do that. There's a real concern about witnesses being free to testify. I don't like tying it to this particular bill, because that kind of makes it sound like this bill was the problem, whereas similar things have happened in connection with many other bills.

That's my objection.

**The Chair:** What I would say, having sat as the chair of this committee for two and a half years, is that I have never seen another instance of a witness asking to not be identified. We take pretty seriously our role, and if there is any type of harassment or what-not.... Neither the chair of the committee nor the clerk and staff can deal with the World Wide Web and what goes on outside the four walls of this committee. It doesn't happen often that witnesses want to speak without being identified.

I take your point, Ms. Taylor Roy. I don't know of any other instances, but I do want to allow us to ask the question about whether or not we want to move forward with Mr. MacGregor's amendment and I want to make sure that nothing is going to be reported back to the House at this point if Mr. MacGregor's amendment is ultimately agreed to.

If you guys want, we can stop the clocks, go print this and bring it back, if you feel it's necessary, so that you have the opportunity to see the amendment.

I'll look to Mr. Drouin. Is that necessary?

**Mr. John Barlow:** I'm fine with the amendment.

**The Chair:** I don't think—

**Mr. Francis Drouin:** If the other side agrees with Mr. MacGregor's amendment, then we're good to go.

**Mr. John Barlow:** Yes, I'm fine with Alistair's amendment. Let's approve Alistair's amendment that the report comes back here before going to the House.

• (1235)

**Mr. Francis Drouin:** I don't want to send a report to the House if I don't have knowledge about it, so I want committee—

**Mr. John Barlow:** Then we'll vote a second time.

**The Chair:** It is crystal clear to me as the chair. If we are okay to move Mr. MacGregor's amendment to Mr. Barlow's motion, what that would mean is that the clerk and the analysts will go do the work. We will contemplate this further down the road when they have the time to do it. If we feel that there's enough information and evidence provided that you want me to report back to the House that we feel as though parliamentary privilege has been.... I don't have the ability to do that; that's for the Speaker. I'm not sensing any concern.

We will come back to your point, Ms. Taylor Roy. If you want to amend the motion, you can do that today. I'm not sure that there is a majority that will support that, but there's nothing stopping us from contemplating that down the road when we hear.... Perhaps when we go in camera to hear the information, you can ask those same questions of the staff who advised me and ask about whether there is more that should be done and whether the scope should be widened.

Go ahead, Mr. Carr.

**Mr. Ben Carr (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.):** I just want clarity please, Mr. Chair, on something.

Let's assume for a moment that we adopt Mr. MacGregor's amendment. The clerk takes this away. A report is brought back, and we hypothetically, as a committee, vote down whatever comes from that and the prospect of reporting it to the House. That's the context.

My question within that context is this: Would the contents of the report, even without a submission to the House, be publicly available? That's my first question.

Question number two is this: Would it be available to the Senate committee, and if so, eligible to be discussed in the context of the bill when it comes to the Senate's consideration?

**The Chair:** On the first question, Mr. Carr, no, it is up to the majority of the committee, so it would not be shared publicly.

With regard to the Senate, I don't know if I have that answer at this point.

**Mr. Ben Carr:** I think that's an important question.

**The Chair:** I'd have to do research and report back.

Again, a committee is the master of its own domain. What I would say is that if we choose not to have any of that shared.... I'm quite confident on the public piece. I don't know about the Senate procedure, so I don't want to speak on that. However, generally, parliamentary committees are, with consensus, able to choose to do whatever the hell they want, within reason.

Go ahead, Ms. Taylor Roy.

**Ms. Leah Taylor Roy:** I think there's consensus that we move forward on what Mr. Barlow has put forward.

I do not feel comfortable voting on this when I don't have it in front of me with the amendments and when we don't know how this material will be used. However, I think we have consensus, so I suggest that if the Conservatives would like an official vote on this, we wait until the next meeting. We can have the amendment printed and put before us, and then I may make a subamendment to it at that point.

Right now, I think that if we want to just go ahead and proceed with this—as there's consensus in the committee—as we often do, then I think that's fine.

**The Chair:** The motion has been distributed to everyone's personal account now. We could just move the motion on division if you're not comfortable having a specific vote, Ms. Taylor Roy, but I do think that there's a consensus to move with what Mr. MacGregor has proposed.

Are we good?

In Mr. MacGregor's amendment, he has simply added “for the committee” and has scrapped the part at the end that says, “and that the chair be instructed to present this report to the House forthwith.”

Mr. MacGregor has rightly identified that he doesn't want to give the pretense that, absolutely, I'll report back without having had that report prepared and analyzed by this committee.

**Ms. Leah Taylor Roy:** Mr. Chair, where was the motion sent? I don't have it.

**The Chair:** The motion was sent to everyone's personal email account. If you would like to suspend, I can do so and we can... Everyone should have it in their email account as of about a minute ago.

**Ms. Leah Taylor Roy:** Do we also have Mr. MacGregor's amendments to this motion, the amended version?

**The Chair:** If you would like, we can suspend and we can make sure it gets translated and everything.

**Mr. Francis Drouin:** I have one quick question: The motion as it hasn't been modified yet with Mr. MacGregor's amendment.

**The Chair:** I will make this very clear for all my colleagues. I will read it out in English very slowly for everyone to understand.

That the clerk and the analysts be instructed to prepare a brief report—

—and this is where it has been amended—

—for the committee outlining the material facts of a potential breach of privilege related to the reports of threats, harassment and intimidation against, and efforts to deter the appearances of, potential witnesses and witnesses in relation to the committee study of Bill C-355, an act to prohibit the export by air of horses for slaughter and to make related amendments to certain acts.

It stops there.

To Mr. Drouin's point, Mr. Barlow's original motion contemplated this motion passing right away: “and that the chair be instructed to present the report to the House forthwith.” That has since been amended by Mr. MacGregor to say that we will consider the report that has been prepared and then make the decision on whether or not you would instruct me to go to the House after that.

• (1240)

**Mr. Francis Drouin:** On that, I will just note that yesterday, whether we agreed or not, it was a form of bullying of private citizens that happened in the House of Commons. We're dealing with this today, but regarding what happened yesterday, I wasn't in the House. I want no part of it, because we have authorities that deal with this kind of stuff.

Again, when we're going to have to rule on whether harassment was committed or not, are we going to invite an HR expert or something to determine that?

**The Chair:** Mr. Drouin, the instruction is that the clerk and analysts will prepare a brief report outlining the facts and the material elements of what is being alleged in the motion that has been presented by Mr. Barlow.

We will be free to ask questions. We will be free to bring in other individuals as we see fit, because this committee is master of its own domain. How to handle what would then be subsequently prepared by the analysts will be completely up to you and anyone else on this committee.

If we choose to find that parliamentary privilege has been breached, based on the definition, you can then instruct me as the chair to go back to the House on that, or you can choose not to. That will be up to this committee to decide, and it will be up to this committee to decide the parameters of how we determine that, which will be, I presume, in an in camera setting. Again, it is something I would do.

I want to deal with what's here. It seems as though a majority agree with the approach that has been proposed, and I don't want to spend too much more time, because we are coming to a close.

I know, Mr. Louis, that you want to move something as well.

Go ahead, Ms. Taylor Roy.

**Ms. Leah Taylor Roy:** I will just repeat that I think this is a very important issue.

I agree with you, Mr. Barlow, that witnesses should not be intimidated. We don't want to see bullying at all. I think the problem with this motion, though, is that we have in here a potential breach of privilege. I don't think we have even established... You said you thought the privilege of members of Parliament extended to witnesses, but it wasn't very clear on how it extends to them.

I think there are a lot of things involved around this. What are the reports of threats, harassment and intimidation? Again, how are we defining those? What do we think those are?

I'm all for doing some kind of an investigation into this, but I don't know that it's committee business and I don't know that it should be related to the study of Bill C-355. I think it should be broader if this is happening.

When the witness asked to come to committee and have their identity protected, we were told that this type of procedure had been done in other committees before. Certainly there are other examples in other committees of instances of people feeling that they needed to be protected before coming as a witness, and the ability to appear in camera is provided. I'm presuming that is also because of those same considerations of privacy or perhaps of fear of intimidation.

I feel this is an attempt to link this to Bill C-355 in particular, and I don't believe it is an issue that is specific to Bill C-355. I think this has the potential to undermine the bill in some ways.

If you would like to remove the reference to Bill C-355 and make this broader, which I think would address your concerns, I'm more than willing to do that. I just do not want to see this in any way targeting this specific bill.

**The Chair:** Colleagues, I take the points that have been raised.

Ultimately, unless there is another subamendment to what Mr. MacGregor has moved, I would like to call the question on whether or not.... If we need a vote, we can do that, or if people need more time to contemplate it, I can suspend, but otherwise I would like to just call the question.

To your point, Ms. Taylor Roy, if we do this study, which Mr. MacGregor's amended motion would contemplate, and if we feel there are other instances, we are well within our right to report back in a way that includes those elements that you mentioned.

I'm going to go to Mr. Lehoux.

If you guys want to continue to consult, go ahead.

• (1245)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Richard Lehoux (Beauce, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I think we have discussed the proposed amendment and Mr. MacGregor's amended motion sufficiently. I would like a vote.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I think that was a dilatory motion. Is that correct? I think you just moved a motion to go directly to a vote.

Ms. Taylor Roy, I'm going to give you just a few minutes to get back to your seat so that we can allow the vote to be called.

Ms. Taylor Roy, there has been a motion moved. I have limits on how long I can delay a vote.

**An hon. member:** Can you repeat the motion?

**The Chair:** I will repeat the motion, yes.

Colleagues, there will be a vote, and it is on the amendment to the motion from Mr. Barlow, which reads:

That the clerk and the analysts be instructed to prepare a brief report for the committee outlining the material facts of the potential breach of privilege related to the reports of threats, harassment and intimidation against, and efforts to deter the appearances of, potential witnesses and witnesses in relation to the committee's study of Bill C-355, an act to prohibit the export by air of horses for slaughter, and to make related amendments to certain acts.

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

**The Chair:** Colleagues, that's unanimous.

The motion by Mr. Barlow is now amended with Mr. MacGregor's element, so now, technically, assuming we need it, I can call the vote on the main motion.

(Motion as amended agreed to: yeas 10; nays 1 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** Mr. Louis, you have the floor, very quickly.

**Mr. Tim Louis:** Thank you, Chair.

I want to thank everyone, and yes, this committee does work well together.

I tabled a notice of motion the other day and I hope everyone got it. I'd like to table that motion. It's about protecting farmland, and I think this is the perfect spot to do that.

Many of the members here are from Ontario. We know that in Ontario we're losing about 319 acres of farmland every day, and only about 5% of Ontario's land mass is suitable for agriculture.

My riding of Kitchener—Conestoga is at the heart of Ontario's agricultural land, and we're facing farmland loss right now. As Canada grows, we have to do things and do them while protecting prime agricultural land. I believe that all levels of government can collaborate in a non-partisan manner to preserve farmland for today and for future generations.

I am going to table this motion. It says:

That, pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the committee undertake a study on the protection of prime agricultural areas for their long-term agricultural use; the use and/or development of agricultural land as defined by Canada Land Inventory for non-agricultural development; that no fewer than four meetings are set aside to hear from witnesses, that the committee report its findings to the House and that, pursuant to Standing Order 109, the government table a comprehensive response to the report.

In the interest of time, perhaps we can talk about the details of how many meetings and when that happens in the subcommittee, but I think it is important to table this now.

**The Chair:** Yes, we are getting tight on time.

By the way, we didn't have the opportunity to say congratulations, because the bill did pass in your name.

We move to a point of privilege. I hear you moving it, but you are okay for us to wait another day to determine whether or not we want to move forward.

Mr. Perron, I saw your hand, but perhaps if Mr. Louis is willing to engage on this topic on another day, we can go then.

Go ahead.

• (1250)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yves Perron:** That is a good idea, Mr. Chair. I was just about to ask whether we could discuss it another day.

Protecting farmland is of the utmost importance; it is fundamental. That is nonetheless entirely under the jurisdiction of the provinces and of Quebec.

If we were to vote on your motion today, Mr. Louis, I would have to vote against it. So I would suggest that you talk to the committee members to find a more acceptable way of wording it. Given the subject, however, that will be difficult for us.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. MacGregor, and then we're going to let people go to question period.

**Mr. Alistair MacGregor:** Similarly, I think the idea has merit. I would vote to adjourn the debate on this motion because I need more time to contemplate it.

In British Columbia, we have the Agricultural Land Reserve. I don't know of any opportunity for the federal government to get involved in the Province of British Columbia. It is entirely under the province to protect our land. It's under our legislation. It has been since the 1970s.

I think it's a good idea, but there are a number of motions on notice right now. Ultimately, Chair, I think we need to have a subcommittee meeting to try to do some air traffic control on this.

**The Chair:** Okay, colleagues, we will do that.

As you know, now that we have finished clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-355, my intention is to move to finishing the

study on food price stabilization when we come back from the break week, as you instructed the other day in camera. That will be on Tuesday. We will get that report done. I will happily work with my two vice-chairs and Mr. MacGregor and Mr. Drouin to identify where you might want to go next.

We are running out of time. Assuming there are not any other urgent elements, I'm happy to go to you, Yves, very quickly, and then I'm going to hit the hammer and we're getting out of here.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Yves Perron:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

You mentioned the study on food price inflation. So we will go ahead and invite the members of the grocery code of conduct steering committee.

Is that correct?

[*English*]

**The Chair:** That hasn't yet been scheduled. That motion has been moved. We were a little bit dependent on what was going to happen today. We now have a clear line of sight as to what the next couple of weeks look like.

As I just mentioned, I will work with you, John, Francis and Alistair, and we can figure out what the schedule looks like for the next couple of weeks. I know that's a priority for you and this committee.

Thank you.

Colleagues, 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>