



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 118

Thursday, May 16, 2024

Chair: Mr. John Brassard



Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics

Thursday, May 16, 2024

• (1305)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. John Brassard (Barrie—Innisfil, CPC)): I call the meeting to order.

[Translation]

Welcome to the 118th meeting of the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics.

[English]

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(3)(h) and the motion adopted by the committee on Tuesday, April 9, 2024, the committee is commencing today its study on access to documents of the national microbiology laboratory in Winnipeg.

I will just remind everyone, without going through the lengthy note about the earpieces, that we want to make sure we avoid injury to our interpreters. For those who are appearing in person, including you, Ms. Maynard, when you're not talking, please put the earpiece aside. The same goes for members who are here.

Without further ado, I am going to—

Mr. Matthew Green (Hamilton Centre, NDP): I have a point of order.

The Chair: I have Mr. Green and Monsieur Villemure on points of order before we begin.

Go ahead, Mr. Green.

Mr. Matthew Green: You referenced a motion. Will you read the motion pertaining to today's meeting?

The Chair: I can. The motion adopted, as amended, reads:

That, in light of the February 28, 2024, tabling of the Winnipeg lab documents which contained the government's own findings concluding that the People's Republic of China and its entities infiltrated Canada's top microbiology lab, a national security breach representing a very serious and credible threat to Canada, and given that access to this information had been denied to Parliament and all Canadians by the government for several years, the committee undertake a study, for three meetings, pursuant to Standing Orders 108(3)(h)(vi) and (vii), of the government's reasons to deny access to it by Parliament and Canadians, provided that the committee report its findings to the House and request, pursuant to Standing Order 109, a comprehensive response from the government, and call the following witnesses to appear for one hour per witness:

- (a) Anthony Rota, former Speaker of the House of Commons;
- (b) Philippe Dufresne, former Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel of the House of Commons;
- (c) Iain Stewart, former President of the Public Health Agency of Canada;
- (d) the Minister of Health, the Honourable Mark Holland;
- (e) the Minister of Public Safety, Democratic Institutions and Intergovernmental Affairs, the Honourable Dominic LeBlanc; and

(f) any other witness that the committee deems necessary.

Before I go back to you on that, Mr. Green, I just want to inform the committee that when the clerk and I were dealing with the Office of the Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel, they were the ones who suggested that we invite Michel Bédard and not Philippe. Michel was already working for the Office of the Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel and would probably have better answers. In the event that the committee is not satisfied with the meeting today, Mr. Dufresne can still be invited.

I did invite Canada's Information Commissioner at the chair's prerogative. We have three hours today. Unfortunately, from May 17 to June 10, the commissioner will be out of the country, so I thought it would be a good idea to have Canada's Information Commissioner here at least to fill one hour.

I know the invitation talked about Mr. Stewart, who was the president of the Public Health Agency of Canada. He's no longer in that position, as committee members are aware, so we can only invite him if we find him, and we're working on that.

Anthony Rota and the two ministers have been invited to the committee, and we are waiting for confirmation on potential dates. As members of the committee know, booking ministers usually results in a lot of back-and-forth.

That being said, two out of the three witnesses who have been asked by the committee to be here for the departments they serve, including the president of the Public Health Agency, are going to be appearing with us in the third hour. The Office of the Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel has sent Mr. Michel Bédard to address the committee's concerns.

I'm going to remind the committee, too, that the motion that was passed called for up to three meetings. This is meeting number one.

• (1310)

Mr. Matthew Green: Mr. Chair, I haven't stated my point of order. I simply asked you to read the motion.

The Chair: That's okay.

Mr. Matthew Green: Yes, but—

The Chair: I'm just explaining, Mr. Green, from my perspective as chair, the reasons and rationale for where we're at. If you'll let me finish, I'll get to your point of order.

The last point I'll make is that we have up to three meetings with respect to the Winnipeg lab issue. As I mentioned, we invited the ministers to come, as well as Mr. Rota. I suspect and hope that we will be able to fill those meetings.

I just wanted to provide clarity to the committee as to where we're at today, the witnesses appearing before us and the rationale.

Go ahead, please, Mr. Green, with your point of order.

Mr. Matthew Green: Thank you very much.

Mr. Chair, I find your actions in unilaterally using what you have determined to be the chair's prerogative rather unusual when indeed it is the custom that committees are the masters of their own domain. You, sir, are simply there to chair the processes and procedures within the course of due planning. Planning has to come from the direction of the committee, sir. You have unilaterally taken this opportunity to call a meeting without any consideration of the other parties involved.

You'll recall that in a motion from our first meeting, dated December 13, 2021, and moved by Ms. Hepfner, who's back with us today, you were authorized, under the accorded Standing Orders, to hold meetings and to receive evidence and have it published when a quorum is not present. As to holding meetings and calling meetings, it has been my experience in my time in the House that sub-committees plan the work. What I'm particularly agitated by is the fact that, even in the course of this term, as you can reflect back on, there have been times when members have used Standing Order 106 to have an emergency meeting.

I feel that your actions today have been used to surreptitiously avoid having to negotiate with any of the other parties present to call a meeting down the final stretch. I should note for the record, for the media watching and everybody else, that every single Conservative-led committee is doing the same thing, without the ability to have, which I think is common courtesy, a planning committee—

Mr. Larry Brock (Brantford—Brant, CPC): I have a point of order, Chair.

The Chair: Hold on—

Mr. Matthew Green: On my point of order, Mr. Chair, you'll note that the Standing Orders, as noted on the same day, December 13, require having an in camera meeting to allow the witnesses to be determined prior to the commencement of a study. You've not done that. You've effectively blocked out the Bloc, the Liberals and the NDP from determining the course of action of this study without any conversation about or consideration for scheduling. I find that to be an authoritarian use of your position and highly problematic.

The Chair: Thank you for that, Mr. Green.

I did explain earlier where we were with respect to the witnesses. I will reiterate that we have two more meetings that we can call, and invitations have been sent.

I took it upon myself to ask Ms. Maynard to be here knowing that she was going to be out of the country until June 10. We had an extra hour today to deal with her. I thought Ms. Maynard added to the discussion. That's my rationale.

Mr. Matthew Green: It's not your position to take these types of liberties—

The Chair: The other thing—

Mr. Matthew Green: —and decide on behalf of the committee who and when we meet.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Green.

The other thing I will say is that, as you may or may not recall, on May 7, I indicated to the committee that I asked for deviation time, because we're running out of time very quickly. I sent you an email. I sent that to all members, including the vice-chairs—Mr. Villemure was included, and you were as well—indicating—

Mr. Matthew Green: That's not factual, sir. Deviation in time means extended time. Not once did you ever bring out in any of your testimony—you can reflect on Hansard—meeting during the course of our constituency weeks. All of us, I'm sure, have very busy schedules and have commitments in our communities. You arbitrarily took your power as the chair to circumvent—

The Chair: To call a meeting...

Mr. Matthew Green: —any kind of committee discussion in a way that I think is an abuse of your power, sir.

• (1315)

Mr. Damien Kurek (Battle River—Crowfoot, CPC): I have a point of order, Chair.

The Chair: Hang on, Mr. Kurek.

Mr. Matthew Green: It's an absolute abuse of your power. It turns committees like this into absolute chaos when there isn't a modicum of decorum—

Mr. Michael Barrett (Leeds—Grenville—Thousand Islands and Rideau Lakes, CPC): I have a point of order.

Mr. Matthew Green: —and when there isn't a modicum of courtesy paid at the outset of these studies. You do not have the power, sir.

Mr. Michael Barrett: This isn't a point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Green, we're—

Mr. Matthew Green: It's a scheduling question. Of course it's a point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Green, I got your point.

Mr. Matthew Green: It's absolutely a point of order.

The Chair: I appreciate your point, Mr. Green.

I'm going to move on because I have Monsieur Villemure on a point of order.

Go ahead, Monsieur Villemure.

[Translation]

Mr. René Villemure (Trois-Rivières, BQ): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

It's not quite the same thing, but one thing intrigues me a great deal. We have three scheduled meetings, of which this is the first, and none of the witnesses who have been called are on the list we established at the outset.

As much as I love hearing from Ms. Maynard, I'm concerned that we're not going to be able to get our work done on time. I understand that Ms. Jeffrey is replacing Mr. Stewart, but we had called Mr. Stewart. It's the same thing with Mr. Dufresne.

The committee's motion was clear. We want to talk about why the government denied members of Parliament access to the Winnipeg lab documents. However, neither Ms. Jeffrey nor Ms. Huggins were with the government when this refusal happened.

Since the substance of the motion is to analyze the government's concealment of documents, it worries me that we can't receive the individuals who were identified at the outset.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Villemure.

I've already explained how we ended up in this situation. We've called other witnesses to appear before the committee.

[*English*]

It's a work in progress right now, Monsieur Villemure, so with the meetings we have scheduled, we are going to attempt to get the witnesses here, including the ministers, whose invitations have already been sent out.

I'd like to go to Ms. Maynard, but Larry, are you still up on a point of order? You had your hand up.

Mr. Larry Brock: My point of order was articulated by Mr. Barrett.

The Chair: Thank you so much.

Ms. Hefpner, do you have a point of order?

Ms. Lisa Hefpner (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.): Yes. It's just to support my colleague Matthew Green's point of order. I think everything he said is completely in line. I find that the way this committee has been called is completely bizarre. I don't find that the rationale is there, from what you've just described to us, Mr. Chair. It's not like this study is actually—

The Chair: Lisa, we're getting into debate here.

Ms. Lisa Hefpner: —pressing. It's been studied in another committee.

Matthew is absolutely right, and I want to echo his outrage that this should not be happening. You should not be able to circumvent—

The Chair: We're getting into debate.

Mr. Damien Kurek: I have a point of order.

Mr. Matthew Green: Mr. Chair, my hand is up next.

The Chair: On a point of order—

Mr. Matthew Green: You made a decision. I'm now challenging the chair.

The Chair: Okay, and what are you challenging the chair on, Mr. Green, just so that I'm clear?

Mr. Matthew Green: It's on your ability to arbitrarily set the course of this committee without consulting with us on the witness list.

The Chair: Just hang on a second. We're still on a point of order, Mr. Green.

Mr. Matthew Green: You said you made a decision, so now I'm challenging your decision.

The Chair: Just hang on a second, Mr. Green.

Mr. Green, you can challenge me all you want. The authority that I have as a chair to call a meeting, which I've done and given my reasons for, cannot be challenged. There is nothing to challenge, so I leave it to you. If you want to have a procedural motion a bit later on, or a dilatory motion, that's perfectly your right, but there is effectively nothing to challenge at this point because I've called the meeting. The meeting is going to proceed—unless there are other points of order—and I am going to get Ms. Maynard to speak to the committee and start the process of having our meeting today.

I see that Ms. Khalid has her hand up. Is it on a point of order, Ms. Khalid? I see your head nodding. Go ahead, please.

• (1320)

Mr. Damien Kurek: Chair, I believe I asked for a point of order before Ms. Khalid.

The Chair: I'm sorry, but Mr. Kurek did.

Go ahead, Mr. Kurek, and then I'll come to Ms. Khalid.

Mr. Damien Kurek: Thanks, Chair.

I just want to say that we're now 21 minutes into our meeting and we should be hearing from the commissioner, so let's get to work.

The Chair: I don't want to get into debate.

Ms. Khalid, go ahead. This is on a point of order. There's no debate.

Ms. Iqra Khalid (Mississauga—Erin Mills, Lib.): Absolutely, Chair.

Just to give my two cents on your ruling and statement on the point of order raised by Mr. Green, I believe the intent and spirit of the motion we originally passed on this specific issue have not been kept with what has ensued in today's meeting. I want to register that you've not done right by what this committee has been trying to do over the past number of weeks and months on this specific issue, and I—

The Chair: We're now getting into debate, Ms. Khalid.

Ms. Iqra Khalid: —would really encourage you, Chair, to take into account what our committee members have to say.

The Chair: I appreciate that. I feel that I am acting within my authority as chair.

We have, as I said earlier, two more meetings. Two of the witnesses here today are representing agencies that are part of that motion. We will work toward getting everybody to appear before this committee within those two meetings.

Ms. Maynard, I appreciate that you've been waiting patiently, and I appreciate that you are here today to provide testimony to this committee in relation to the study on the Winnipeg lab.

You have the floor. You have five minutes to address the committee. Go ahead. Thank you.

[Translation]

Ms. Caroline Maynard (Information Commissioner, Office of the Information Commissioner of Canada): Thank you.

I'm pleased to appear before the committee for the second time this spring. My last appearance was only a few weeks ago, but a lot has happened since then.

Before I take questions about the committee's study, I'd like to take a few moments to provide an update on the activities of the Office of the Information Commissioner.

[English]

On May 7, I tabled a special report on my systemic investigation into access to immigration-related information. Three years after my investigation into the dramatic increase in access to information requests at Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, or IRCC, requesters continue to use the access system to get information on their immigration files, for lack of a better alternative. This is now also impacting the Canada Border Services Agency, which has access to the same data and is now experiencing its own increase in requests.

This investigation allowed us to determine that the root cause of the problem was the lack of progress made by the IRCC in implementing a portal to provide the information that clients are seeking. I hope you will take the opportunity to read this report if you have not already done so.

[Translation]

As I mentioned last time I was here a month ago, in addition to not having received the additional temporary funding I requested, I'm now facing a structural deficit. This deficit is the result of rigid formulas used by the Treasury Board Secretariat to calculate the funding of salary increases resulting from new collective agreements.

[English]

The situation has evolved over the past few weeks. We are now looking at a total funding shortfall of \$700,000, which represents a reduction in my budget of approximately 5%. In concrete terms, this will represent a significant portion of my overall IT budget, money to cover the cost of defending my orders in court, or funding for a full team of investigators. Basically, this reduction in my budget will spell longer delays for complainants who are seeking information from government institutions.

This state of affairs would not arise if my office were subject to a different funding model that was more agile, more flexible and

more reflective of my independence as an agent of Parliament. Earlier this week, I sent a letter to the acting Treasury Board secretary to seek immediate redress of this unacceptable predicament, and it is my intention to keep this committee informed as things evolve.

My office has again made significant progress this year against our inventory of complaints, but more remains to be done. We need to continue to work through these complaints to avoid increasing our backlog. I also have multiple court cases to manage as a result of orders that I have issued against government institutions. Now is not the time for bureaucratic penny-pinching.

Let's now turn to the topic of the day.

As you know, the Access to Information Act provides that anyone in Canada, including members of Parliament, has the right to make an access to information request for records under the control of government institutions. If you are not satisfied with that response, you have the right to make a complaint to my office.

I can confirm that the topic covered by your study has indeed been the subject of access to information requests and complaints to my office. I can also confirm that I have investigated many of these complaints and that some of those investigations are still ongoing.

• (1325)

[Translation]

With respect to the parliamentary process that also allows members of Parliament to request information from institutions, it is completely separate from the access to information request process. The Law Clerk and Parliamentary Counsel of the House of Commons will be in a better position to discuss the details of this process when he appears.

[English]

With that, I am now happy to answer any of your questions.

[Translation]

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Maynard.

We will now begin the first round of questions. Each party will have six minutes.

[English]

Go ahead, Mr. Barrett.

Mr. Michael Barrett: Ms. Maynard, it's nice to see you.

Have you followed the treatment of the Winnipeg lab documents over the last several years and the lengths that the Trudeau government has gone to keep them behind closed doors? Is it your assessment that this treatment follows the usual pattern this government has undertaken when dealing with information?

Ms. Caroline Maynard: I cannot comment on the process by which you requested those documents and on the delays, but I can tell you that under the access to information regime, clearly we've been seeing increases in timelines to respond to access requests.

Mr. Michael Barrett: Through the regular course of individuals and parliamentarians attempting to use the access to information system to access information, you have had to take the government to court. Is that correct?

Ms. Caroline Maynard: In some cases, yes.

Mr. Michael Barrett: In this case, the full House of Commons has issued orders for the production of documents, and the government has used judicial means to try to block the release of those documents. Is that consistent with your experience?

Ms. Caroline Maynard: Again, I don't know what reasons are being used, under the privilege of Parliament, for not providing the information to parliamentary requests, but under the Access to Information Act, we see the use of different exemptions and we see delays in responding to access requests. Whether it's related to this particular topic or other topics, we know the system is overwhelmed right now.

Mr. Michael Barrett: The Trudeau government has claimed that it's open by default. That was a promise when it took office. Is it your experience that this government is open by default?

Ms. Caroline Maynard: My experience is that there's a lot more that can be done with respect to transparency.

Mr. Michael Barrett: How many complaints about access to information or the management of files has your office received?

Ms. Caroline Maynard: I'm sorry, but about what topic?

Mr. Michael Barrett: First, I mean just generally, and then on the specific topic of these documents.

Ms. Caroline Maynard: With respect to your study, we received 14 complaints, and with respect to management.... So far, with respect to all complaints, we've received over 4,000 complaints in the last year.

• (1330)

Mr. Michael Barrett: In one case, there was an ATIP filed for information regarding the management of these files. One department, the Department of Justice, said they could have the information, but they would release the information in 13 years. Is that acceptable?

Ms. Caroline Maynard: I can't comment about specific complaints that we would be investigating at my office right now.

Mr. Michael Barrett: Is a delay of 13 years, hypothetically speaking, an acceptable amount of time for the government to respond to an access to information request?

Ms. Caroline Maynard: I've seen cases where extensions have been found reasonable because of the number of documents that people asked for, but I don't know about specific cases. Really, it's on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Michael Barrett: On how many occasions have you found yourself, acting on behalf of your office, in court with the federal government? How many times?

Ms. Caroline Maynard: I think right now we have 11 cases that are active.

Mr. Michael Barrett: You have 11 that are active. Do you know how many you've had since taking your post as commissioner?

Ms. Caroline Maynard: No, but I can come back to you with the information.

Mr. Michael Barrett: Is it your belief that Canadians have a quasi-constitutional right to access information and that the government has a legal obligation to provide that information?

Ms. Caroline Maynard: The Supreme Court recognized that the right of access is a quasi-constitutional right, and yes, government information belongs to Canadians, so unless there are limitations, exemptions or exclusions, that information should be provided to Canadians.

Mr. Michael Barrett: We have a situation here where your office has multiple complaints. We know there were lawful orders of committee and lawful orders of the House of Commons, and that the Trudeau government refused those lawful orders.

Can we infer from this that the government broke the quasi-constitutional right that Canadians have, since even their elected representatives are being refused information that they have lawful authority to order?

Ms. Caroline Maynard: I've seen cases where the information should have been provided and other cases where the information was properly redacted. It really, again, depends on the case.

Mr. Michael Barrett: Is it your experience, Commissioner, that access to information is a priority of the Trudeau government?

Ms. Caroline Maynard: At this point, I don't see it as a priority. We are asking for legislative changes. We are asking for changes within the system. There hasn't been a lot of improvement.

Mr. Michael Barrett: I will just say in closing, Commissioner, that I appreciate the work you do. Canadians share in your frustration, having had their elected representatives order the government, on more than one occasion, to produce this information and the government illegally refusing a lawful order of Parliament. We share your frustration and the work you do to get answers.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Barrett.

For the next six-minute intervention, I'm not sure who we're going to.

Mr. Darren Fisher (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, Lib.): It's me, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Mr. Fisher, go ahead. You have six minutes.

Mr. Darren Fisher: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I didn't make a point of order, but I have to chime in. I'm joining the others who are disappointed in this meeting being called with little notice and totally at the discretion of the chair. This was during a very rare constituency week, when all of our schedules were completely full and jam-packed. We should be spending the last week before the summer break engaging with our constituents.

All of this was to start a study that we could have easily started in Ottawa. The committee agreed to study this, even though it was already studied at the Canada-China committee, which in fact just wrapped up.

Why today? Why during a constituency week? I share those frustrations. Sure, I've seen meetings called during non-sitting weeks before. Standing Order 106(4) meetings happen all the time. They're emergency meetings for current topics that just can't wait. This study today is based on something that happened in 2020. It was just studied by another committee, and we're committing to studying it as well.

My personal opinion is that what's more pressing might be the recent news story about Conservatives spending over \$400,000 in taxpayer money during their political conventions. Maybe that's the emergency that we should be talking about today. Maybe we should be seeking unanimous consent today—

Mr. Larry Brock: I have a point of order, Chair.

Mr. Darren Fisher: —to have a study on that.

The Chair: Hang on, Mr. Fisher. We have a point of order from Mr. Brock. I did stop your time.

Mr. Larry Brock: The purpose of this committee, and all committees that I have the privilege of sitting on, is not an open licence to just rant and express your frustration.

Does he have a question? Does he actually want to utilize the time with—

• (1335)

Mr. Matthew Green: That's a wild statement coming from you, Larry.

The Chair: Mr. Brock—

Ms. Iqra Khalid: Are you being serious right now?

Mr. Matthew Green: I have a point of order.

Mr. Larry Brock: Yes, Ms. Khalid, I am being serious.

The Chair: Listen, we're going to stop—

Ms. Iqra Khalid: I would encourage you to also do the same.

The Chair: Ms. Khalid, go through the chair, please.

Mr. Brock, I appreciate your point of order. As you know, I do give a lot of latitude on this committee for discussion. I expect that Mr. Fisher will bring it back to the topic at hand, as I expect all members to.

I'm going to stop everybody right here. We talked earlier about the issue with the interpreters. When everybody is screaming over Zoom, that doesn't help to prevent injury to the interpreters. I'm going to ask, if there's any respect at all, that you at least have some for the interpreters, because I will work with the audio people to cut off members to avoid injury to the interpreters.

Mr. Fisher, you have four minutes and 43 seconds. Go ahead, sir.

Mr. Darren Fisher: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This isn't how a well-functioning committee should work. You've told members in the past that you would consult and discuss with them before doing things like this and moving in this direction.

Mr. Chair, I would strongly and respectfully suggest that you find some time on Tuesday to allow the committee to come up with and decide on a work plan for the rest of the year. I think that would be very beneficial for us.

For those reasons and more, I move that the meeting be now adjourned.

Mr. Michael Barrett: Team cover-up, here they come.

Mr. Larry Brock: Yes. Brilliant.

The Chair: I missed that. What did he do?

Mr. Michael Barrett: He moved to adjourn. He moved to cover up the failure to release the Winnipeg lab documents.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Barrett. That's enough.

Mr. Fisher has moved to adjourn the meeting. He's asked that this meeting not continue, in spite of the fact that we have witnesses here. It's a non—

Ms. Iqra Khalid: Mr. Chair, I don't think a commentary on your part is appropriate.

The Chair: I'm explaining again, Ms. Khalid. We went through this the last time this happened.

For those who are watching, Mr. Fisher has moved to adjourn this meeting, to stop the meeting from proceeding. It is a dilatory motion, which means it is non-debatable. I have an obligation as the chair to go to the clerk—I don't think we have consensus—to ask for a recorded division.

Madam Clerk, please, let's have a recorded division.

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Nancy Vohl): Mr. Villemure appears to be frozen on Zoom.

I can try again. I don't know if Mr. Villemure can hear me or not. If not, the—

The Chair: I would prefer that we wait for Mr. Villemure to reconnect. It may not make a difference on the vote, but it's out of respect for Mr. Villemure.

• (1340)

Mr. Larry Brock: What's René's vote?

The Chair: We don't know because he's frozen on Zoom.

Now he's disappeared from the screen. I believe he's trying to reconnect. I'm going to suspend for a minute until we get back.

Mr. Darren Fisher: With all due respect, Mr. Chair, you can't suspend for a minute if a member is out of the room. It's exactly the same if he's off-line.

The Chair: I'm not so sure about that.

Mr. Damien Kurek: I have a point of order.

The Chair: I'm going to consult the clerk on that because it's the first time I've dealt with anything like it, Mr. Fisher. Stand by.

For the record, we're not suspended at this point.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Mr. Villemure, we're waiting for your vote.

Madam Clerk, the floor is yours.

Mr. René Villemure: Mr. Chair, I'm back.

The Clerk: Mr. Villemure, I'm going to give you the context.

The vote is on Mr. Fisher's motion to adjourn the meeting. Everyone voted except you, since you were having technical difficulties.

Mr. René Villemure: I vote against the motion.

(Motion agreed to: yeas 6; nays 4)

[*English*]

The Chair: The motion to adjourn the meeting has been approved. I have no other obligation as the chair but to adjourn the meeting.

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>