



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 032

Wednesday, June 8, 2022

Chair: The Honourable Hedy Fry



Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage

Wednesday, June 8, 2022

• (1635)

[English]

The Chair (Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.)): Good morning, everyone.

This is a business meeting, as we well know, but I suppose the same things apply. Remember that, pursuant to the House order of November 25, we are in a hybrid meeting. There are some people remote and some people on the floor. As per the directive of the Board of Internal Economy on March 10, all those attending the meeting in person must wear a mask, except for members who are at their place during the proceedings.

I'd like to make a few comments. We adjourned the last meeting, so this is a business meeting, and, as you can see, the order of notice on the business meeting is to continue on Bill C-11 and to go to clause-by-clause.

The first thing we do is—

I think Mr. Bittle's hand is up.

Mr. John Nater (Perth—Wellington, CPC): So is Mr. Uppal's. I think Mr. Uppal's hand was up first.

The Chair: I'm sorry, Mr. Bittle.

Mr. Uppal.

Mr. Anthony Housefather (Mount Royal, Lib.): Madam Chair, Mr. Julian's hand was up first.

The Chair: Was it before Mr. Uppal's?

Clerk, can you tell me who...? Is it Mr. Uppal, Mr. Julian and then Mr. Bittle? Is that it?

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Aimée Belmore): The order that I saw, Dr. Fry, is the order in which you saw the hands. I saw Mr. Bittle, Mr. Nater, Ms. Ferreri, Mr. Waugh, Mr. Uppal and Mr. Julian.

The Chair: You did not see Mr. Uppal first.

I will go with your list because I saw Mr. Uppal because he was virtual. Please go over that list again.

The Clerk: Absolutely. It's Mr. Bittle, Mr. Nater, Ms. Ferreri, Mr. Waugh, Mr. Uppal and Mr. Julian.

The Chair: Mr. Bittle, please begin.

Mr. Chris Bittle (St. Catharines, Lib.): Thank you so much, Madam Chair.

I guess it's been a little troubling to watch. For those watching at home, we've been in the midst of a filibuster. I expect this will become hour six and hour seven of filibuster through this timeline.

The Conservatives told us at the beginning of this that they wanted 20 hours of study. They said that was a fair and reasonable amount of time to study the bill before it would go to clause-by-clause. We've exceeded that. They filibustered through the CRTC chair. They filibustered through an appearance by the minister—

Mr. John Nater: I have a point of order. There's just a technical issue, Madam Chair.

I continue to hear Kevin Lamoureux in my ear. I have nothing against Mr. Lamoureux, but he's coming in through my ear. I hope I'm not going crazy, but that's a challenge I'm facing right now.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): On a point of order, Madam Chair, that is an urgent health and safety issue that we must address immediately. I feel very sorry for Mr. Nater.

The Chair: All right. We will suspend while the technical people make sure you don't have your ears inflamed and you're not going crazy, Mr. Nater.

We will check it out, and the clerk will let me know when we think it's resolved.

• (1635)

(Pause)

• (1645)

The Chair: I was told it's okay for us to resume, so we will go back to Mr. Bittle, who was speaking before we suspended.

Go ahead, Chris.

Mr. Chris Bittle: Thank you so much, Madam Chair.

As I was discussing before we were rudely interrupted by Kevin Lamoureux, unintentionally... We were discussing how we are well into a filibuster. It's clear we really should move forward on this bill. There's another study. We can quickly deal with Bill C-11, have a proper debate on C-11, and then get to Hockey Canada before the House rises.

It worried me a bit last night that members of this committee were using this case to filibuster. I know—there's intent from all sides—that we want to hear from Hockey Canada, but I think people have gone a bit too far in the filibuster. We should use this time, while we study Bill C-11, to think about the legal aspects of the case, because a lot of things were said that were a little troubling to me. They may lead to the disclosure of names—which I don't think anyone wants—or negative statements about the non-disclosure agreement, which may be protecting the plaintiff in the case. As a civil litigator myself, I think the opposition needs to take some time to look at things like solicitor-client privileges and NDAs, so we can get to this as quickly as possible.

In the meantime, I know everyone likes to say that the House gave us the Hockey Canada study, but it also gave us Bill C-11. I think this is fundamental and important, and it's something we need to see through. The Liberals are ready to work. I've spoken to our Bloc colleagues, and I'm sure Mr. Julian is always ready to work, and perhaps we can find.... We're ready to work extra hours to see Bill C-11 through to the end, but we're also ready to hear from Hockey Canada, as well, and get to the bottom of that.

I think, perhaps, the opposition needs to take some time to speak with the lawyers in the caucus or with counsel at the House of Commons, in order to understand where we're going, because some dangerous things may happen, even though they're well intentioned. I don't think any of us want that.

That's all to preface my motion, which has been handed out in both official languages. I move:

That the committee commence its clause-by-clause study of the Online Streaming Act no later than Monday, June 13 at 3:30 p.m. EDT.

It's quite basic. This gives us lots of time to start next week. In speaking with the Bloc...we should have a discussion about setting a deadline for amendments, perhaps this Friday, so that we can really get things moving. I think that's fair and reasonable, but I wanted to put this on the table. We can vote on this quickly and then talk about the study right away, because this will take a minute or two. There are a couple of people on the list. We can get to talking about Hockey Canada right away. I think that's important.

Thank you so much.

● (1650)

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

I know there was a deadline set for amendments, which we were still debating and had not agreed or voted on. However, I happen to know that the Bloc Québécois, the NDP and the Liberals submitted their amendments to the clerk last week before 4 p.m. on Friday, which was the third. Amendments have already been sent. I want to flag that bit of information for everyone.

Now, we have a motion on the floor. I'm obviously going to have to get a list of people speaking to or against the motion, so I will look at the order of the people I now have and make sure they are speaking to Mr. Bittle's motion one way or the other.

Madam Clerk, can you give me a list of people for the motion?

The Clerk: It's Mr. Nater, Ms. Ferreri, Mr. Lemire, Mr. Julian and Mr. Bittle.

The Chair: Thank you.

I shall move forward, then.

Go ahead, John.

Mr. John Nater: Thank you, Madam Chair.

It's a pleasure to take the floor and say a few words about the motion before us. I'll offer a few observations off the bat.

First of all, obviously we've been looking at Bill C-11 for a period of time. We've heard from some witnesses. I know that our witness list isn't exhausted yet. We have at least 20 people on our list who haven't had the chance to come here yet. We'll put that aside for a second.

I want to talk about the gravity of the situation that is potentially before us, and I do accept Mr. Bittle's comments about certain issues involving the victims. We did have a motion that was passed by this committee earlier this year to look at online harm caused by access, and there was the opportunity there—and that meeting never happened—to hear from organizations that deal with trauma-informed testimony. I think if we go ahead with a study on the events regarding Hockey Canada, it would be important that we have that conversation before we hear from any witnesses.

Obviously, as a committee, we have the opportunity to go in camera for certain testimony, for certain issues, whether it's about identifiable people, whether it's with victims or whether there are issues from a legal perspective. There are always those opportunities.

When it comes to this particular motion at hand, we're talking about a Monday deadline to do this. This is a complex bill, and it will take a significant amount of time to go through clause-by-clause. I'm very concerned that, if we begin clause-by-clause on Monday, June 13 at 3:30, we will not have a chance to take up the House order that was made on June 2 regarding the troubling allegations.

I'd remind the committee that it wasn't a partisan motion to the House. It was a unanimous motion endorsed by all parties and frankly endorsed by the Minister of Sport herself, who made comments about the troubling possibility that public funds may have been used in this case, and I think that should be troubling for anyone and everyone here in Canada.

At the end of the day, we need to be sure that we, as a country, stand up for victims and victims' rights, and I think this is one situation where we need more information. Whether that's done through a committee process.... A forensic audit has been suggested within the organization itself, but there are people who must account for what has happened. There are organizations that must account for the situation that unfolded, so I think that should be the priority of this committee going forward.

That's not to say that Bill C-11 will never pass. I think that Bill C-11 will obviously pass through this committee when the time comes. It will go through clause-by-clause, but I think for now the priority of this committee should be the House order of June 2, 2022.

I would amend the motion by deleting all the words after "act" and inserting, "following the completion of the committee's study pursuant to House Order made June 2, 2022."

Just for clarity, the House order of June 2, 2022 is the motion regarding Hockey Canada.

That's the amendment, Madam Chair. I'm happy to reread it if it's needed, but that's my amendment.

• (1655)

Mr. Peter Julian: I have a point of order, Madam Chair. Through you, I want to ask Mr. Nater if he could read the June 2 motion. He has it in front of him, I believe.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): If I may, I will read the motion, as it is mine:

That this House call Hockey Canada before the Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage to shed light on its involvement in a case of alleged sexual assault committed in 2018.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you.

Peter, did that satisfy you? Were you able to hear it fully?

Mr. Peter Julian: Yes. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Now I'll go to Ms. Ferreri.

Ms. Michelle Ferreri (Peterborough—Kawartha, CPC): Thank you, Madam Chair.

Thank you to the heritage committee for having me sit in here today. It's nice to see everyone.

Definitely two topics that connect for me personally are Bill C-11—very important, as a former journalist and online content creator—and obviously the investigation into Hockey Canada. I was able to take part last week. My colleague Kevin Waugh made some very impactful statements. I want to touch on that, as I also sit on another committee, FEWO, which is status of women. Right now we're tabling a study on intimate partner violence.

As I lean into this role as a member of Parliament, what we do here first, or what our priorities are, speaks to Canadians deeply. Absolutely, I think every member at this committee and also in the House, quite frankly, knows that Bill C-11 is important, but I also

think we all know how important it is to change the toxic culture of all institutions, whether it's the Canadian Forces, sports, politics or whatever it may be.

I want to give a bit of a trigger warning. I was thinking about this when I was here on Wednesday, about some of the content that is coming out. I am very aware of how delicate this conversation is for people who may be watching.

Support is available for anyone who has been sexually assaulted. You can access crisis lines and local support services through the Government of Canada website or the Ending Violence Association of Canada's database. If you're in immediate danger or fear for your safety or that of others around you, please call 911.

I actually pulled that trigger warning from an article that was released by CBC on June 5, 2022, where the headline reads, "Former Hedley frontman Jacob Hoggard found guilty of sexually assaulting Ottawa woman". In a time where we have headline after headline that are really revictimizing victims, I can't stress enough how important it is to prioritize this study into Hockey Canada. I think it really sets a precedent of what we're doing and where we're sitting.

The Supreme Court ruling of extreme intoxication as an excuse for sexual assault crimes is.... I've had countless messages, and people personally in my life who have been revictimized by this. I think there's an opportunity for us here to set the tone of what the priorities are, and because this is imminent, I think it's really important. On what you guys are going to do, I think there is a consensus of what needs to be done here.

I want to talk a little bit about what the Minister of Sport, Madam St-Onge, said in a scrum with reporters before Thursday's question period in Ottawa. She said she wants a forensic audit of the settlement to ensure that Hockey Canada didn't use taxpayer dollars to settle the case. She said, "What I want to know and what I think all Canadians want to know is, was there any public funds used to cover up that horrible story of collective rape?"

This is just so much bigger than this Hockey Canada.... If we're the leaders of this country, what are we saying to victims if we're not prioritizing this? I think there's an opportunity for all parties to work together, because I think everybody wants to solve this. I think every member wants this to end.

I look at things like *Indian Horse*. I don't know if anyone's familiar with that movie. It was shot in my riding of Peterborough—Kawartha. It's a book that many kids have to read. It's a terrible story of sexual assault and abuse of power.

• (1700)

When you talk to people who work in shelters or who work with victims, they really go in thinking they're going to solve and fix it because they think, "Why is this even still happening? How does this even happen?"

As a parent, you think of this when you're raising your children. You think about what you are teaching your daughters and sons about consent. How do we even get to a point where we're still having this conversation?

As somebody who was raised as a Catholic, the whole Catholic church and *Indian Horse* coincides with reconciliation and abuse of power. To have this Hockey Canada scandal exposed.... We're not done. We're not done with setting a tone of what we accept. We're not done holding people to account. When you have the #MeToo movement.... What is still happening here that we're still having this conversation? I think it is critical that we have an opportunity and that this is the number one priority that needs to be served and paid attention to imminently.

I also want to talk a little bit about C-11 and the importance of it as well because I have had literally thousands of messages on this bill, both from my social media and the parliamentary email. Here's one email of thousands:

"Dear MP Ferreri, I'm writing to you to express my concerns about Bill C-11, the online streaming act that is currently under review in Canadian Parliament. As it's currently written, Bill C-11 gives the CRTC the authority to regulate user-generated content on open platforms, as it does for television and radio. In its current form, Bill C-11 means Canadians will no longer be in control of their viewing experience and puts creators' livelihoods at risk. The government has repeatedly said it doesn't intend to target user-generated content. If that's the case, why won't they fix Bill C-11 with specific language that excludes user-generated content from CRTC regulation?"

"Open platforms remove traditional media gatekeepers, which allows for the democratization of content and provides an opportunity for creators and users from diverse communities, walks of life and passions to express themselves, share their talent and build a business. As one of your constituents, I am counting on you to make my voice heard. Please help protect the digital creators and viewers in your community and tell Minister Rodriguez to remove section 4.2 from C-11 to ensure that the bill does not apply to online content that is uploaded by any individual user."

I won't share the name because I don't have the permission to do that.

It is absolutely imperative that this committee continue its work on C-11. It is a huge issue across the board, as somebody who worked in traditional media, went on to work in private media and who built a business off of social media as an online creator.

To circle back, when we look at what online content creation is, it is also fascinating when we look at abuse or sexual assault culture. For anybody who's a parent or caregiver, you know that what your kids are consuming has changed the culture of who we were. I was born in 1979 and I'm just so glad I wasn't born in the time of social media. I wouldn't want half of that out in the public; that's for sure.

It's also changed how boys see themselves, how girls see themselves and how people identify in their gender. It does come back to what my colleague Kevin Waugh said. It was extremely powerful and emotional to hear it. When you know something is wrong and you don't do anything.... If not you, then who?

If we are the leaders of the country, if we are the federal body that governs what is accepted, we should be prioritizing this and making a statement that says, "Hey, we've got you. We are studying this. We want to change culture. We want to investigate this."

• (1705)

What are we saying to every victim out there? Bringing these conversations up over and over again is so revictimizing for so many people, and it is such a challenge.

One of my favourite sayings is from Mr. Rogers, actually, who said that anything mentionable is manageable. If we don't address this, if we are not mentioning it, if we are not addressing that this is still happening, that there is still rape culture in sports and in this institution, that is saying, "Go ahead."

I would urge this committee, which has a lot of power and a lot of influence, to say to victims watching everywhere that that we do care, we do want to change the narrative, we do want to stand with you, we will do something about it, and we will get to the bottom of this, because without accountability, there is no change. If we just allow people to abuse power because we're afraid, the cycle will continue. The systemic trauma that is in place as a result of these stories is decades and decades long. It is so impossible.... You will be talking about a mental health crisis and a health care crisis and money spent on trauma counselling since this is so systemic. If you don't deal with it, then the victims go on and have their children and they carry their trauma with them and the only way to break the cycle is to address it. Anything mentionable is manageable.

What I would leave this committee with and urge this committee is that your actions speak louder than your words. What you prioritize tells the world what matters to this federal body of people who are here. I think right now between the Supreme Court ruling and the hurt that so many victims are feeling, we have an opportunity to study this now and to show victims that we have their backs, we're going to investigate this and we're going to make sure that we do everything we can to make sure that this never happens again.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

• (1710)

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Ferreri.

I will go to Mr. Lemire.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I thank the committee for having me.

I thank all the parliamentarians here who supported the motion I tabled in the House last week.

Like you, I was shocked by this news. We have a duty to shed light on the actions of Hockey Canada following the victim's revelations. Hockey Canada's involvement in this matter is unjustifiable and we must ensure that not one penny of taxpayers' money was used to cover up this story. I also include in that the salaries of the executives who may have committed acts to cover up the allegations.

We need to know what actions Hockey Canada took as a result of these allegations, which occurred four years ago, I remind you. This is 2022, and Hockey Canada needs to answer our questions.

The amendment that Mr. Nater sent to us earlier is an interesting one, in my view. What he suggests could be added to the motion proposed by Mr. Bittle.

For my part, I propose to add this, in relation to the study to be undertaken by the committee:

[...] that, to do so, the committee meet outside its usual time slots to begin this study [...]

I also add the following idea, which I like:

[...] that the committee invite the Minister of Sport to appear for at least one hour; and that the committee invite representatives from Hockey Canada to appear for at least two hours.

Committees determine their priorities. I, for one, am the vice-chair of the Standing Committee on Industry and Technology, and I can tell you that every week for the past two weeks, one of our meetings has been cancelled.

I think we are able to chew gum and walk at the same time. If we could arrange another meeting, for three hours, to have the Minister of Sport as well as representatives from Hockey Canada, I think that would address one of the concerns we have. It would respond to the will of Canadians who are outraged by what happened at Hockey Canada, who are listening to us and who want answers as quickly as possible. There is a way to do this without interfering with the work to pass Bill C-11, which is also an emergency.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you.

Are you now tabling a subamendment to Mr. Nater's amendment? We are speaking to Mr. Nater's amendment to Mr. Bittle's motion. If you're tabling a subamendment, can that be formally done, please?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire: This does take the form of a subamendment, Madam Chair.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you.

Perhaps you could share it with the committee. Do you have it in writing in both languages? If you can please share that with the clerk, she can send it to the committee so that everyone knows exactly what that subamendment is.

I will suspend while you do that.

• (1715)

(Pause)

• (1745)

The Chair: While we took a fairly long time to suspend the meeting, it turns out that it's not going to be possible to get everything in English and French because of translation issues, etc.

We have a subamendment on the floor from Mr. Lemire. I would ask him to read it in French. The interpreters will be interpreting it, so make sure you have your headsets on for interpretation. Then I will rule whether that subamendment is admissible or not.

Mr. Lemire, could you please—

• (1750)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I would like to make a recommendation. I would like us to be able to vote on the Conservative amendment. Then, depending on whether it is rejected or not, I can incorporate what my subamendment proposes back into the wording. My proposal would fit well with Mr. Bittle's motion, but it would indeed be more difficult to insert it after the Conservative amendment.

Is it possible to proceed in this way, if all my colleagues agree?

[*English*]

The Chair: If you were going to use the subamendment you brought up, it would not be admissible because it expands too much on Mr. Nater's amendment. I would not have been able to rule it admissible.

You're saying that you're withdrawing it.

(Subamendment withdrawn)

The Chair: Because you withdrew it, I will go to those who wished to speak to Mr. Nater's amendment.

The next person would be Mr. Julian.

Mr. Peter Julian: Thank you, Madam Chair.

The Chair: This is speaking to the amendment by Mr. Nater.

Mr. Peter Julian: No. I will offer another amendment, and then I will speak to it after that, Madam Chair.

The Chair: Go ahead.

Mr. Peter Julian: I would take Mr. Nater's motion, which he generously shared with me in his impeccable writing. He must have been a doctor.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Peter Julian: I believe the amendment would read as follows: "That the committee commence its clause-by-clause study of the Online Streaming Act at the same time as it undertakes the committee's study". Mr. Nater has the rest of the wording on the study that was mandated by the House on June 2. I would then add "that the committee hold hearings into the allegations around Hockey Canada on Monday, June 13, and Wednesday, June 15; and that remaining amendments for Bill C-11 be tabled by 12 noon, Friday, June 10."

I'm very flexible in terms of wording and friendly amendments.

The Chair: Could someone please read that out for me?

Can you go really slowly? Make sure that you are moving a sub-amendment to Mr. Nater's amendment.

Let's go slowly here.

Mr. Peter Julian: It reads, "That the committee commence its clause-by-clause study on the Online Streaming Act at the same time as it undertakes". Then there's Mr. Nater's wording.

If you don't mind helping me, Mr. Nater...

Mr. John Nater: It's "the committee's study pursuant to House Order made on June 2, 2022".

Mr. Peter Julian: Furthermore, it continues, "that the committee hold hearings into the allegations around Hockey Canada on Monday, June 13, and Wednesday, June 15; and that remaining amendments to Bill C-11 be tabled by 12 noon, Friday, June 10."

The Chair: All right. I presume that the committee has that.

I will have to get a new list of people to speak to—

Mr. Peter Julian: I'd like to speak to it myself, of course.

The Chair: Yes, of course, but I will move away from the list of who was speaking to Mr. Nater's amendment to those speaking now to the subamendment.

From what you're saying, it seems to be in order, and I would admit it. You spoke to both Mr. Bittle and Mr. Nater, and you're trying to pull them together. You didn't expand it as much as the Bloc's amendment would have.

Mr. Peter Julian: May I speak to the amendment then?

● (1755)

The Chair: Yes, Peter.

I'm creating a list on this as well for after Peter. By the way, I just want the committee to know that we have a hard stop at 6:34.

Go ahead, Peter.

Mr. Peter Julian: Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

I think the allegations surrounding Hockey Canada are serious. I think we all share that view, and it is something that we need to respond to and can do as early as next week. I think we all agree that has to be a priority. I think we all agree as well, or most of us agree, that Bill C-11 has to be a priority also.

For the last couple of weeks, we've had some legitimate filibusters around important issues and some that I do not feel have been useful expenditures of the committee's time. Most parties have already filed their amendments with the clerk and are waiting for the improvements that we want to bring to Bill C-11.

We've held far more than the 20 hours of the original hearings, although some of those were disrupted by the filibusters, I would admit. Now is the time for us to actually look at the bill and improve it, and we can do that at the same time as we look into Hockey Canada.

What I'm endeavouring to do is to have Hockey Canada hearings and have the deadline for amendments. As I say, three of the four parties have already submitted, so there's only one party that would need to submit its amendments. Even then, Madam Chair, as we know from the legislative clerk, amendments can be submitted up until the time we actually have consideration of clause-by-clause, and even then it's not a hard stop. However, I think the principle of having all parties submit their amendments so that they can be produced and translated and circulated is important for preparation.

This would allow us to do both important things at the same time, to move them forward at the same time, and I hope that my Conservative colleagues will agree that, given that we're responding as well to an important issue they've raised, we can do both and we should proceed that way.

We've had a couple of weeks in which I don't think our time has served as well as it could have, so now next week let's get to work and fully use the time we have available to us to look into Bill C-11 in terms of clause-by-clause and improvements to the bill and to look at these allegations that surround Hockey Canada, which are disturbing and which I think we would all agree need to be investigated as well.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

The Chair: Clerk, do I have a speakers list?

The Clerk: Yes, Dr. Fry, you have Ms. Thomas, Mr. Bittle, Mr. Waugh, Ms. Goodridge and Mr. Lemire.

The Chair: All right. Thank you very much.

Ms. Thomas, you are next.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas (Lethbridge, CPC): Thank you, Chair.

I believe I was able to capture most of the subamendment. However, I may have missed a few points.

I believe the bottom line is that Mr. Julian is proposing that we simultaneously study Bill C-11 in clause-by-clause, while also taking on the study with regard to Hockey Canada. Is that correct?

The Chair: That seems to be what he is suggesting.

Mr. Julian, would you like to respond to Ms. Thomas to clarify, please?

Mr. Peter Julian: Yes, it's exactly that. Three of the four parties tabled amendments last week. This will be asking all of the parties to table their amendments by noon this week, and at the same time we would be starting that study next week in the regularly scheduled Monday and Wednesday meetings.

Yes, we would be moving forward in both ways, and I think it will take extra work, but I think that Canadians would expect us to tackle both important issues.

The Chair: Thank you.

Ms. Thomas, you may continue. Did that clarify things for you?

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Yes, Madam Chair, thank you. I appreciate that.

I have some concerns about this subamendment because, in the last meeting, we discussed the importance of the motion with regard to Hockey Canada and having them come forward, along with other witnesses. Ultimately, at the end of the day, our objective within this committee is to stay true to the unanimous consent motion passed in the House of Commons, which called for a study on the sexual assault allegations put forward by an unnamed woman. Then, of course, the Minister of Sport responded by saying that a financial audit was needed of any federal funding that may or may not have been used to cover up the story of gang rape.

It was determined, by unanimous consent in the House, that this study is very important to get to the bottom of. All MPs have agreed with this, and the sport minister has agreed on the importance behind it, so it is incumbent upon this committee to give it its full attention.

My concern is that, if we try to simultaneously carry out responsibility on clause-by-clause for Bill C-11, the governing party would ensure that limited or finite resources, which already exist within the House of Commons, be put toward Bill C-11, because that is a government piece of legislation. Meanwhile, attention on the Hockey Canada study would only be granted if resources happen to be available. It would not be given the priority it deserves. That is—

• (1800)

Mr. Peter Julian: I have a point of order, Madam Chair.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Julian.

Mr. Peter Julian: Thank you.

These are the two regularly scheduled meetings to which we already have resources allocated. I want to question Mrs. Thomas on

relevance, when the two meetings we already have scheduled have resources devoted to them and this study.

The Chair: Mrs. Thomas, Mr. Julian interrupted, but I don't know whether it really was a point of order.

Please continue with your debate.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Thank you.

For previous motions moved at this committee, I've seen that, even when dates, hours or allotted time are listed, they somehow seem to be optional. For example, the last motion moved at this committee stated that we would hear from witnesses with regard to Bill C-11 and that we would hear from them for four meetings of five hours each. That's not what happened. We were told there would be a minimum of 20 hours of committee testimony. When there was a proposal put on the table about hearing from more witnesses, it was given no attention.

I don't have any good faith remaining with regard to Mr. Julian and his motion, or to the members around this table. I don't trust that Bill C-11 and the Hockey Canada study would simultaneously—

The Chair: Mrs. Thomas, may I remind you, please, that, in fact, that was not a minimum in the motion passed unanimously by this committee. It did give the times, days and dates for the 20 meetings. In fact, if I do my counting correctly, we had 22 hours of debate.

I would also remind the committee that one does not only get testimony from witnesses who appear before the committee in person. One receives briefs. We have been receiving briefs from a lot of people, and reading those briefs is part of the testimony.

I want to remind everyone that this is actually how our hearings work, with regard to witnesses. We have fulfilled everything with regard to the unanimous consent motion passed many weeks ago.

Go ahead, Mrs. Thomas. Please continue.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Madam Chair, I understand your disruption, because you wanted to correct the record.

I'm just curious whether that's a point of order or the chair's prerogative?

The Chair: You made a statement that was not quite true. You talked about a minimum of 20 hours, and there was no such motion that stated a minimum. The word "minimum" was never used, so I was correcting you, yes, as you were giving information that was not true.

• (1805)

Mr. John Nater: On a point of order, Madam Chair, it's John Nater. I don't think this is a point that really needs to be bludgeoned too badly, but I want to clarify this. I have the minutes of that meeting in front of me and just wanted to clarify that the words "minimum" and "maximum" aren't in the motion. It was never—

The Chair: I'm certain the clerk—

Mr. John Nater: It was never in the.... The maximum of 20 hours was never there, and it never—

The Chair: That is noted.

Mr. John Nater: —said minimum either, for that matter. It was simply stating the hours. I do have the motion in front of me from that meeting.

The Chair: Yes, I have the motion as well.

Mr. John Nater: I wanted to clarify that.

The Chair: Indeed, I have the same motion in front of me. It was very clear, not only the date for the five-hour meeting, but that, the following week of May 30, one would have another 15 hours of hearings. That was completed. There was no word “minimum” and no word “maximum” in that unanimous decision done in good faith by this committee.

Mr. John Nater: Yes, Madam Chair, I agree. That was the motion at the committee and we've achieved that, but that doesn't preclude any additional motions from this committee. The committee did fulfill that motion, but that doesn't automatically mean that we do anything after that. Presumptions and assumptions always get us into trouble, but we're now at the point where we're doing the next thing.

The motion is what the motion is. There was never a maximum or minimum included in it. It was simply that we would hear 20 hours' worth of witnesses. Now we are moving on to next steps. I wanted to clarify that for the sake of the committee.

The Chair: Absolutely. There's no motion that's come up asking for more witnesses to be seen or listened to or any such thing. There's no motion. We have completed our task, and the motion on the floor by Mr. Bittle is to move to clause-by-clause. We are discussing Mr. Julian's subamendment to your amendment to that motion.

Let us stick to the discussion, please, on Mr. Julian's subamendment. Thank you.

Continue, Ms. Thomas, please.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I think you've made my point quite handily for me, and that is that there's really not a lot of good faith at this committee. You'll note that in that motion “maximum” and “minimum” were not used, which means that there is an opportunity there that a subsequent motion or amendment—

I'm sorry, Madam Chair, I'm actually going to pause here for two seconds. The members to my left, Mr. Julian and Mr. Lemire, are talking right now. It's quite loud and quite distracting, so perhaps they could take that conversation outside or perhaps you could ask them to bring their volume down.

The Chair: Thank you for bringing that to my notice.

Mr. Julian and Mr. Lemire, could you keep your volume down, please? Thank you.

Continue, Ms. Thomas, speaking to the subamendment by Mr. Julian.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Thank you.

On the subamendment that was brought forward by Mr. Julian, what I am stating is that there is not a lot of good faith left around this table because, as you noted, in the original motion with regard to Bill C-11 and hearing from witnesses, there was no maximum and no minimum discussed, which then leaves an opportunity for us as members around this table to bring forward another motion or amendment to a motion that would call for more witnesses.

Madam Chair, there have been several attempts to do that. Unfortunately, those have been turned down, or there's no willingness to even consider them. What I'm saying is that this starts to chip away, then, at any sort of good faith that might exist here, when we're not able to have those conversations or pursue things that may be beneficial to the process in front of us.

When the motion is moved to ask for a study of Bill C-11 at the same time as the study concerning Hockey Canada, it doesn't leave a good taste in my mouth or give me any confidence that we are in fact going to do those two studies simultaneously and give the Hockey Canada study the attention that it requires in order to do it justice.

All that is to say that I raise that as a red flag and wish to communicate my concerns and my dissent.

• (1810)

The Chair: Have you ceded the floor?

Mrs. Rachel Thomas: Yes.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

The next person is Mr. Bittle.

Mr. Chris Bittle: Thank you so much, Madam Chair.

I have to agree that there isn't a lot of good faith at the table. We heard a filibuster through the CRTC. We heard a filibuster through the minister. This is, I believe, our seventh or eighth filibuster. We could have been through clause-by-clause at this point.

Mr. Julian proposes a reasonable motion to bring in Hockey Canada, and we just hear more of the same, more filibuster. We agree with Mr. Julian in terms of moving this forward, but we can do it at the same time. This committee has done it before, going between studies, hearing different witnesses, pausing one study and picking up another. It's something that we can do. It's something that we've done. Let's get going on this. There is a unanimous consent motion, but there is also a motion from the House that we continue and proceed with Bill C-11.

I don't need to remind the members that legislation typically takes priority in parliamentary committees. The opposition is right that this is an important issue. Let's do this simultaneously. The Liberals are ready to get to work. The Liberals are ready to do this. I know the NDP are, and the Bloc are ready to get to work. It's just the Conservatives who want to filibuster, and that's really disappointing. It really just shows that sexual assault is just being used as a filibuster tactic, which is truly shocking.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Bittle.

We now go to Mr. Waugh.

Mr. Kevin Waugh (Saskatoon—Grasswood, CPC): Thank you, Madam Chair.

Lots has been said here today dealing with Bill C-11 and with Hockey Canada. I spoke quite a bit on Monday on Hockey Canada and have received a lot of feedback since the Monday motion that was put forward.

I've looked into the organization and who is still there and who has left.

What's up for Hockey Canada? We have the Memorial Cup coming around the corner. For those watching, the Memorial Cup pits the best hockey teams in Canada. You would have the Quebec junior hockey league champions and the Ontario Hockey League champions. You would have the host team, and you would have the Western Hockey League champions. The four best teams in the country meet, and it's interesting, because the Memorial Cup is emblematic of the best hockey players meeting for the tier one hockey championship, if you wish, in the country.

That's how Team Canada usually gets formed. In the case of the Edmonton Oil Kings, a number of their players were, in fact, selected for the Canadian junior hockey championship. That was to be held in Red Deer and Edmonton, but because of COVID and the financial restraints of the organization, they lost a lot of money in the year before when they started the tournament. Then COVID came. The Russian hockey club and other European hockey clubs in Red Deer contracted COVID through a wedding, and the tournament had to be cancelled.

It wasn't an ideal situation in Edmonton and Red Deer, because they limited the number of seats that could be sold, and they lost a lot of money. This year, if you recall, in Edmonton and Red Deer they just at the last moment decided to cancel it and reschedule it, I might add, for August, which is not ideal because the property—

• (1815)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire: I have a point of order, Madam Chair.

[*English*]

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Lemire.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire: I think we are outside the scope of the discussion. The interventions should be about having a side meeting, outside of the normal hours of the committee, where Hockey Canada representatives could be called in. The committee would continue its work on Bill C-11 at the same time next week. It is

possible to do both. Right now, however, there is a lot of nonsense going on, which may well prevent things from happening. Yet Canadians are watching and waiting for us to act.

[*English*]

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: It's debate.

The Chair: Thank you.

Continue, Mr. Waugh, please.

Mr. Waugh has the floor, and Mr. Waugh can speak to the issue. I think he's talking about the amendment.

I hope, Mr. Waugh, that you would not stray too far from that.

Mr. Kevin Waugh: So far, I didn't think I did.

The Chair: Go ahead.

Mr. Kevin Waugh: I'd like to thank the Bloc member for bringing the unanimous motion forward to the House on June 2. Since then, Madam Chair, those around this table have probably seen comments by the sports minister, me and others in the country who are really horrified with the situation with Hockey Canada. It's not only the alleged rape, but I think Canadians also want to know if any taxpayer money was involved in the paying-off situation that happened in 2018.

Here's the other thing, Madam Chair. When we do bring Hockey Canada officials in, hopefully they do come. We've already lost a number from Hockey Canada over this. It was interesting because, when this was filed on April 20, one senior member of Hockey Canada stepped down. Since then, another has stepped down. When we get around to witnesses, hopefully these two people will come.

I am a little concerned about how we get them here if they don't want to come. Is there any way around this? Procedurally, two senior people obviously knew a lot. I have a list, Madam Chair, that I have given to our team that I can lay down at any time, with permission, when we need to bring these officials here. However, both are no longer with Hockey Canada and that concerns me a little bit. They don't want to be tarnished, I would imagine, yet both were long-term members of Hockey Canada and both had, obviously, considerable knowledge of what happened in 2018.

If you don't mind, I'm going to move on a little bit, Madam Chair. I just want everyone to know that this incident happened at the Hockey Canada gala in June of 2018. This had nothing to do with the World Junior Championship that was played in January. This actually deals a little bit with the Hockey Canada Foundation, unfortunately, which is a fundraising organization of Hockey Canada.

When we do submit a list of guests that we would like Hockey Canada and others to bring, just remember that this incident took place at the gala portion of it.

Now, let me continue with Bill C-11. It's interesting, Madam Chair, because yesterday I received 20 submissions on Bill C-11. That's a lot of submissions. That tells me that on Bill C-11 we haven't done our due diligence. That we all got emailed about these organization yesterday—thank you, Clerk, for doing that—tells me that, as an organization around this table, we haven't done our due diligence.

I have Friends here, who used to be “Friends of Media”. They sent in a submission.

Music Canada has been very critical of Bill C-11 and we haven't heard from them.

Mr. John Nater: On a point of order, have we lost the chair?

I think she's back now.

Mr. Kevin Waugh: Can I go on now, Madam Chair?

Anyway, the clerk sent all of us 20 submissions yesterday alone. We cut down a forest here just to see who is interested in coming to committee.

Are you okay, Madam Chair? You're not hearing me, obviously.

• (1820)

The Clerk: Dr. Fry, can you suspend, please?

Mr. Kevin Waugh: I guess it's a moment of silence.

Voices: Oh, oh!

Mr. Kevin Waugh: Let me continue.

I'm not going to go back three or four minutes, Madam Chair, when you obviously couldn't hear what was going on.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Waugh.

Mr. Kevin Waugh: That was an Internet issue.

Anyway, just to wrap up on Bill C-11 here, we did get a huge amount from the clerk. We got 20 submissions yesterday alone. That seems to me....

I mean, we have ACTRA. We have APFC—you name it. As I said, Blue Ant Media and many of these organizations were on our list. They were on the list of not only the Conservatives but also the Liberals, the Bloc and the NDP.

The Chair: Mr. Waugh, could you please stick to your debate on Mr. Julian's subamendment?

Mr. Kevin Waugh: I do.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Kevin Waugh: If you don't mind, Madam Chair, my concern is this. With Bill C-11 and Hockey Canada, if we continue with Bill C-11, I am fearful that we will not have time to hear from Hockey Canada properly before we rise on, say, June 23, but—

Mr. Peter Julian: I have a point of order, Madam Chair. I would question Mr. Waugh on relevance. The motion clearly states next Monday and next Wednesday, which are the two regularly scheduled meetings of this committee.

I would question his comments on relevance.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Julian.

Mr. Waugh, please be relevant. You are speaking to Mr. Julian's subamendment.

Mr. Kevin Waugh: Do we have a Tuesday meeting already? Who set that up?

You said Monday and Tuesday, Mr. Julian.

Mr. Peter Julian: I said Monday and Wednesday.

Mr. Kevin Waugh: Oh, it's Monday and Wednesday.

Madam Chair, if I moved a subamendment on Mr. Julian's motion stating that all meetings be designated for Hockey Canada's study until the study is complete, and only then, when the clerk cannot fill a meeting witness, do we start with Bill C-11....

Part of this is that as I was talking about, Madam Chair, I got 20 submissions yesterday alone. We had the minister here on Monday, who made some comments on the \$1 billion, all of a sudden, that he thinks Bill C-11 is going to produce, and he made some other statements that I think we're going to get some more submissions on in the next couple of days. I know we are.

My question for Mr. Julian is this. Can we first just set aside and do Hockey Canada on Monday and Wednesday? Then, and after that see what has come in, since we did have the minister here and he made some comments that I think some organizations.... For example, he made a comment on commercial content here on Monday. I am getting a ton of emails on commercial content. It's not in the bill. They're wondering where he's coming from on commercial content. He never explained it.

I never got an explanation, Madam Chair, on the \$1 billion. He actually turned to Owen Ripley, the associate minister. We went from \$830 million to \$1 billion. There are a couple of things the Minister of Heritage said on Monday that I think we're going to see in our submissions this week. They want some clarification. We've had 20 in the last two days. I'm scared to know how many more we're going to get.

Here's what I would like to see. Let's do Hockey Canada solely on Monday and Wednesday, if you wish. Bring in the Minister of Sport, who is, like all of us, very concerned with this. She's been quoted in many articles, and not only about using Canadian funds. What about Hockey Canada? Have they learned anything from the past? Where are they going? As I just mentioned, many have left that organization since this story broke.

Let's deal with that on Monday. Let's deal with Hockey Canada again on Wednesday. For everybody, we can have our witness lists in before Friday on Hockey Canada. We don't need to identify anyone. I think the reporters in this country have identified John Does 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8. They haven't identified the person. We don't need to, but we do need to hear from officials from Hockey Canada gala, where the event was held, the foundation, and we need to hear from Hockey Canada itself.

Of course, we also need to hear from the Minister of Sport, because she's concerned that maybe Hockey Canada, who receives 6% funding from the Government of Canada.... That's 6% each year. Did they use a portion of that 6% to pay the \$3.55 million that has been alleged in some of the reports?

I would like—

● (1825)

The Chair: Mr. Waugh, you are straying again. Are you asking Mr. Julian a question because—

Mr. Kevin Waugh: I am.

The Chair:—you know that you cannot move a subamendment because you can't have more than one subamendment on the floor at one time.

Mr. Kevin Waugh: Thank you.

I would like to do the Hockey Canada Monday and I'd like to do it Wednesday.

Mr. Peter Julian: Then vote yes.

Mr. Kevin Waugh: I'd like to jump on that, but because I'm seeing so much paper come in in the last two days, it tells me, around this table, we haven't done a very good job on Bill C-11 and that disturbs me.

I still haven't heard from APTN and diverse voices. We've heard from how many groups on diverse voices on Bill C-11 that will be affected? We've heard from two. We haven't heard from the national carrier for the indigenous. They haven't submitted anything. You've had it on your witness list. I think we even had it on our witness list.

I think we need to hear from the diverse voices around Bill C-11. That would give us some time to look through the 20 submissions in the last two days and see if we have any others because of commercial content, because of the billion dollars. Then we can come back next week and we can submit our amendments to Bill C-11. How's that?

We need time because here are 20...and I've had commercial content, which is not in the bill. People are wondering what that's all about and I can't answer them on that. The minister couldn't really answer it. He talked about commercial content. We've asked him

about it, but the minister couldn't identify what commercial content is when it doesn't even show up in the bill.

If we're going to do both of these.... I think we have two weeks left, Madam Chair, until the 23rd, and we can get it in. We can have Hockey Canada Monday and Wednesday and have our submissions after that. We can put it in on Wednesday or Thursday next week, and we can move ahead and do Bill C-11 properly. We've been here for four or five months now dealing with it. I think the government would agree we should not proceed with Bill C-18 at this point because we've not even done Bill C-11 right now. I say Bill C-18 because I thought the minister in his testimony on Monday got both bills confused. I just felt that we needed to buckle down.

Thank you, Mr. Julian, for all your support on Hockey Canada. I think it's much needed in this country for everybody who wants to play for Team Canada, men and women. I think we need to go ahead with that.

I agree one hundred per cent but at the same time, because we're dealing with Bill C-11 and so many submissions, I would like to have a little more time to get the submissions from people who have reached out to my office, in particular about commercial content. I can't answer them on that and I'm not sure you can answer them, Madam Chair, or anyone around here, because commercial content does not appear in Bill C-11.

How do I answer that when the minister couldn't answer that on Monday? That's why I'm a little reluctant to move on with Bill C-11, when I heard some stories coming out of Monday's meeting from the Minister of Canadian Heritage and his official Mr. Ripley.... In moving from \$830 million to \$1 billion, where does that come from? He mentioned YouTube once, so I'd like to know where the extra \$170 million is coming from. Bill C-10 had \$830 million and we've gone to \$1 billion.

When I asked that question on Monday it was like, where did that number come from? I'm not sure we got the answer for that. I am hearing from stakeholders who want to know a little more information on the commercial content and I'm hearing about the \$1 billion, about how the government is going to get a billion dollars out of Bill C-11 and what they are going to do with that. I think we need a little more time to flesh that out, if you don't mind, in the committee. I'm not filibustering here—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

● (1830)

Mr. Peter Julian: You're filibustering your own proposal. Seriously, it's Hockey Canada and you're filibustering it. It's unbelievable.

Mr. Kevin Waugh: Listen, we all want to do the Hockey Canada story. We all think it's important. I told you why we needed to do that before—

Mr. Anthony Housefather: I have a point of clarification, Madam Chair, on the subamendment offered by Mr. Julian.

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: A point of clarification, that's not a thing.

The Chair: Order, please.

Mr. Housefather raised his hand on a point of order. I could not hear a word he said because someone was yelling.

Now I would like to hear Mr. Housefather's point of order, please.

Mr. Anthony Housefather: Thank you very much, Madam Chair. Can you hear me now?

The Chair: Yes, I can.

Mr. Anthony Housefather: It was, Madam Chair, a point of clarification to you. I was wondering if you would be able to—

Mrs. Rachael Thomas: Madam Chair, there is no such thing as a point of clarification.

Mr. Anthony Housefather: —clarify that Mr. Julian's subamendment means that Hockey Canada would be appearing Monday and Wednesday if this subamendment were adopted and then the motion was adopted.

Mr. Peter Julian: Yes, it would.

The Chair: Yes, that is my understanding of Mr. Julian's subamendment.

Now, go ahead, Mr. Waugh.

Mr. Kevin Waugh: Let me wrap up by asking the clerk if you have heard from the Minister of Sport. Do you think we could get

officials from Hockey Canada—some of whom have left the organization and some of whom are there, plus the Hockey Canada gala foundation, because that's where this incident occurred—here for Monday at 3:30?

The Chair: I don't know that we can make that decision. The clerk will tell me if she thinks she can get them here.

That's a question that is hypothetical, because nobody has called anybody and asked them if they can come, Kevin. I think that's really getting a crystal ball out here for the clerk. We have to first pass the subamendment or vote it down or whatever we see. You can't ask her to do something until we have passed Mr. Julian's subamendment, if you so wish.

There are no instructions either to me or to the clerk.

Mr. Kevin Waugh: I'm done, Madam Chair. I just wanted to know if we could get these people in by Monday. We can get a list—

• (1835)

The Chair: Thank you.

I would entertain a motion to adjourn, because we have now reached our hard-stop time of 6:34.

Mr. Chris Bittle: I move a motion to adjourn.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Sébastien Lemire: Madam Chair, I move that we continue the meeting until we find a consensus.

[*English*]

The Chair: 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>