



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 064

Tuesday, April 25, 2023



Chair: Mr. Robert Morrissey

Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities

Tuesday, April 25, 2023

• (1545)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Robert Morrissey (Egmont, Lib.)): I call the meeting to order.

I want to welcome and recognize Mr. Godin, who will be replacing Mr. Aitchison for today's meeting.

Welcome to meeting number 64 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities.

Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format. All the committee members are appearing in person in the room today. Nobody is appearing virtually.

To ensure an orderly meeting, before speaking, wait until I recognize you by name. You can choose to speak in the official language of your choice by using one of the headsets in the room. If there is an issue with translation, please let me know and I'll suspend while it's being corrected. As well, I want to remind members and those witnesses who may be speaking to speak slowly in order to give the interpreters the opportunity to translate.

As well, screenshots of today's meeting are not allowed. If any technical issues come up during the meeting, please get my attention and we'll suspend while they're being corrected.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2) and the motion adopted by the committee on Friday, February 3, 2023, the committee will continue its study of Bill C-35, an act respecting early learning and child care in Canada.

Today we are proceeding with clause-by-clause consideration. I would like to provide members of the committee with some instructions and a few comments on how the committee will proceed with the clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-35.

As the name indicates, this is an examination of all the clauses in the order in which they appear in the bill. I will call each clause successively, and each clause is subject to debate and a vote. If there are amendments to the clause in question, I will recognize the member proposing the amendment, who may explain it. The amendment will then be open for debate. When no further members wish to intervene, the amendment will be voted on. Amendments will be considered in the order in which they appear in the bill or in the package each member has received from the clerk. Members should note that the amendments must be submitted in writing to the clerk of the committee.

As the chair, I will go slowly to allow all members to follow the proceedings properly. If at any time you are unsure, please, you can always call for a suspension while you get a chance to establish where we're at.

Amendments have been given an alphanumeric number in the top right corner to indicate which party submitted them. There is no need for a seconder to move an amendment. Once it is moved, you will need unanimous consent to withdraw it.

During debate on an amendment, members are permitted to move subamendments. These subamendments must be submitted in writing. They do not require the approval of the mover of the amendment. Only one subamendment may be considered at a time, and that subamendment cannot be amended. When a subamendment is moved to an amendment, it is voted on first. Then another subamendment may be moved, or the committee may consider the main amendment and vote on it.

Once every clause has been voted on, the committee will vote on the title and the bill itself. An order to reprint the bill may be required if amendments are adopted so that the House has a proper copy for use at report stage. Finally, the committee will have to order the chair to report the bill to the House. That report contains only the text of any adopted amendments as well as an indication of any deleted clauses.

I would like to welcome representatives from the Department of Employment and Social Development, who are available to answer technical questions related to the bill: Michelle Lattimore, director general, federal secretariat on early learning and child care; Cheri Reddin, director general, indigenous early learning and child care; Jill Henry, director, policy, indigenous early learning; Kelly Nares, director, federal secretariat on early learning; and Christian Paradis, director, federal secretariat on early learning and child care.

Again, welcome to the committee.

We will now proceed with clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-35, which you have before you.

My understanding is that there are no amendments to clauses 2 through 4.

(Clauses 2 to 4 inclusive agreed to)

(On clause 5)

The Chair: I understand that there is an amendment on clause 5.

Mr. Godin.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Joël Godin (Portneuf—Jacques-Cartier, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I am here to show the importance that we in the Conservative Party of Canada place on the two official languages. I think it is important that this be reflected in all our legislation.

We have studied Bill C-13, which we will probably be debating tomorrow in the House of Commons. I am not revealing anything that is not already public. I think the importance of the two official languages needs to be specified in all future legislation, and for that reason I am proposing amendment CPC-0.1. I am going to read it.

First, I propose that Bill C-35 be amended by replacing lines 23 and 24 on page 3 with the following:

child care system, including in both official languages, and its commitment to ongoing collaboration with the provinces, Indigenous peoples and official language minority communities

Second, I propose that it be amended by replacing, in the French version, line 24 on page 3 with the following:

nue avec les provinces, les peuples autochtones et les communautés de langue officielle en situation minoritaire afin

Third, I propose that it be amended by replacing lines 28 and 29 on page 3 with the following:

taining long-term funding for the provinces, Indigenous peoples and official language minority communities for the establishment and mainte-

In fact, what is important is that when we studied Bill C-13 on official languages, a number of organizations testified about the importance of making sure that our young people in official language minority communities have access to education in French so that our Canada will be bilingual in the future. I stress the fact that this bilingualism relates to French and English, because we have a Governor General who is bilingual but does not speak French. I think it is important to specify this in the bill and to make sure it is reflected in all of the laws of our country, Canada, which takes pride in being a bilingual country.

That is the purpose of the amendment I am proposing. If there are questions, I am available to answer them.

• (1550)

Ms. Sylvie Bérubé (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, BQ): So...

[*English*]

The Chair: Excuse me, Madam.

You all heard the amendment moved by Mr. Godin. Is there any discussion?

Madam Bérubé.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Sylvie Bérubé: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

It is important to amend amendment CPC-0.1 to replace "official language minority communities" with "francophone minority communities." The text of the amendment would then be:

taining long-term funding for the provinces, Indigenous peoples and francophone minority communities for the establishment and mainte-

I will explain. In Canada, the only minority official language is French.

In Quebec, anglophones have very easy access to the network of child care centres. We see the number of bilingual or anglophone centres constantly growing. The opposite is true for francophones outside Quebec, who have trouble getting services in their language. This subamendment would reinforce the importance of offering early childhood education services for francophone communities outside Quebec, the real minority language community in Canada.

As well, we know that Quebec sets an example to follow for child care services that allow for work/life balance and enable women to return to work. This learning program is very important for education and socialization.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thanks, Madam Bérubé.

Just so we're clear, you're moving a subamendment to the amendment.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Sylvie Bérubé: It is a subamendment, yes.

[*English*]

The Chair: Could you provide that in written form to the clerk so we have it?

Thank you, Madam Bérubé.

Is there discussion on the subamendment from Madam Bérubé?

Mr. Godin, go ahead on the subamendment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Joël Godin: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

My Bloc Québécois colleague is correct when it comes to Quebec. However, since Canada is a country, we have to take a comprehensive view of the country and protect both official languages. I understand that it may be problematic when we consider only Quebec, but we have to consider the country as a whole. Canada is bilingual and its two official languages are English and French, so I think we have to protect both official languages where they are in the minority. We must not diminish either language. We must work to protect both official languages. That is our philosophy in the Conservative Party.

[*English*]

The Chair: The legislative clerk has a quick question, Madam Bérubé.

Go ahead, Madam Clerk.

[Translation]

Ms. Marie-Hélène Sauvé (Legislative Clerk): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would just like to get a clarification, Ms. Bérubé. Your amendment applies only to point (c), the one that refers to lines 28 and 29 on page 3, is that right?

Ms. Sylvie Bérubé: It also applies to point (a).

Ms. Marie-Hélène Sauvé: What I have here applies only to point (c). So I understand that you want it to apply to points (a), (b) and (c). Thank you.

The Chair: Ms. Bérubé, you have the floor.

Ms. Sylvie Bérubé: I move this subamendment.

• (1555)

[English]

The Chair: Go ahead.

[Translation]

Ms. Marie-Hélène Sauvé: Do you have the written version, particularly for point (a)? Point (b) is okay, because we can see where the words "francophone minority communities" are to be inserted. However, I would like to clarify the wording for point (a), if possible, where it refers to "child care system, including in both official languages." I would like to know where to insert the term "francophone."

Ms. Sylvie Bérubé: I will remove point (a).

Ms. Marie-Hélène Sauvé: You want to remove point (a) entirely or just the reference to francophones?

[English]

The Chair: Excuse me, Madam Bérubé. I'll suspend for a moment while we get this clear.

Madam Bérubé, could you clarify with the clerk exactly...?

Are you clear, legislative clerk, on the subamendment?

[Translation]

Ms. Marie-Hélène Sauvé: I understand that point (a) of the amendment will remain unchanged. Point (b) would now say "communautés francophones en situation minoritaire," as well as point (c).

That's good, thank you.

[English]

The Chair: Fine.

Thank you, Madam Bérubé.

Go ahead, Mr. Godin.

[Translation]

Mr. Joël Godin: Mr. Chair, I understand that we are just beginning the clause-by-clause consideration of this bill. The members of the Standing Committee on Official Languages have just completed clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-13 and I know that a member may not amend their own subamendment.

Since this is the first time, I think this committee can be indulgent. However, I would like to have the definitive version of the Bloc's subamendment. As well, as procedure provides, I think a member should not be able to amend their own subamendment from now on.

The Chair: Madam Clerk, I believe you want to say something.

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Émilie Thivierge): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

What Ms. Bérubé wanted to do was not clear, and she simply amended her subamendment to clarify the situation.

[English]

The Chair: Is there any further discussion on the subamendment?

Go ahead, Mr. Godin.

[Translation]

Mr. Joël Godin: Mr. Chair, I just wanted us to state the subamendment clearly so we could discuss it or make a decision. What we received does not correspond to what we are discussing.

The Clerk: If I may, Mr. Chair, I will clarify the wording of the proposed subamendment.

In point (c) of the amendment, which refers to lines 28 and 29 on page 3 of the bill, rather than saying "taining long-term funding for the provinces, Indigenous peoples and official language minority communities for the establishment and mainte-," it would say "taining long-term funding for the provinces, Indigenous peoples and francophone minority communities for the establishment and mainte-."

The same thing would be done in the French version of point (b). It would now say "nue avec les provinces, les peuples autochtones et les communautés francophones en situation minoritaire" rather than "communautés de langue officielle."

[English]

The Chair: Do all committee members understand the subamendment that's been circulated and proposed by Madam Bérubé?

I believe I have Ms. Gray next and then Madam Gazan.

Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The subamendment is talking about clause 11, but I believe we're on clause 5, are we not? The subamendment isn't matching what we're referencing here and what our amendment was with CPC-0.1. It's not aligning. I'm very confused about what the discussion is.

Thank you.

The Chair: That's why I requested a brief suspension while we clarified exactly what—

Ms. Ya'ara Saks (York Centre, Lib.): Mr. Chair, can we suspend, please?

The Chair: Yes. We'll suspend while we get this corrected.

You're correct, Madam Gray.

We'll suspend for a couple of minutes.

• (1555) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1605)

The Chair: We will resume the meeting.

Madam Bérubé, we need a clarification on your subamendment.

Committee members, I've been advised by the clerk that we need to suspend for at least four more minutes while the subamendment is being redrafted.

I would urge all members of the committee, when you're preparing amendments or subamendments, to have them prepared accurately so they're in on time. We had adequate time to prepare for this meeting.

We'll suspend for four more minutes while it is being drafted correctly.

• (1605) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1610)

The Chair: We will resume.

It's my understanding that all members should have a copy or you will be getting it shortly. You will have a copy of the subamendment by Madam Bérubé.

As soon as we have it, if there's no further discussion on it, then we will go to a vote.

Does everybody have it?

Madam Bérubé's subamendment is to the amendment by Mr. Godin on clause 5.

Madam Gazan.

• (1615)

Ms. Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): I just have the old one.

No. It's in my emails. I'm sorry.

The Chair: Let's focus, committee members. I want to give everyone the opportunity to see the subamendment being proposed by Madam Bérubé.

Madam Gazan...?

Ms. Leah Gazan: I have it now.

The Chair: Is there any discussion on this subamendment of Madam Bérubé?

Mr. Godin.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Joël Godin: In fact, Mr. Chair, I simply want to reiterate what I said earlier. I think we have to take both official languages into consideration. I understand that the Bloc Québécois is concerned about Quebec, but we think that considering that we are members of the Parliament of Canada, we have to take both official

languages into consideration. I think it is important to make this distinction.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Godin.

Seeing no other discussion, I'll ask the clerk to call a recorded vote on the subamendment of Madam Bérubé.

(Subamendment negatived: nays 10; yeas 1 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: We'll move to the amendment of Mr. Godin.

Is there any further discussion?

Ms. Saks.

Ms. Ya'ara Saks: Just to clarify, we're now voting on the original amendment submitted by Mr. Godin.

The Chair: Yes. To be clear, it's the amendment of Mr. Godin.

Go ahead, Mr. Godin.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Joël Godin: Since I moved this amendment some time ago, I want to make sure that everyone clearly understands that the purpose is to take the official languages into consideration in this bill concerning child care programs.

I think it is important that young children in official language minority communities receive services in their own language. We have to make sure that access is protected. I think this should be apparent in all future bills, considering that this is what Bill C-13 seems to say.

I suggest that we be very careful from now on to make sure that the two official languages are considered when it comes to programs.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Godin.

Seeing no further discussion, there's a call for recorded vote on the amendment of Mr. Godin on clause 5.

(Amendment negatived: nays 6; yeas 5)

(Clause 5 agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0)

(On clause 6)

• (1620)

The Chair: Are there any amendments?

Go ahead, Madam Gazan.

Ms. Leah Gazan: Thank you, Chair.

I want to amend clause 6 by replacing lines 29 and 30 on page 4 with the following:

programs and services that are culturally appropriate, that are led by Indigenous peoples and that respect the right of Indigenous peoples to free, prior and informed consent in matters relating to children.

In the last session, we passed Bill C-15. Section 5 of that act states:

The Government of Canada must, in consultation and cooperation with Indigenous peoples, take all measures necessary to ensure that the laws of Canada are consistent with the Declaration.

This is the first occasion on which we can actually uphold the intent of that act and the legal obligations of that act.

It's my understanding that all members of Parliament have committed to reconciliation in this country, and at the very core of reconciliation is to give us back our rights of our children. That means that, in all matters respecting our children, indigenous people should have their free, prior and informed consent upheld.

Unfortunately, as we meet here today to discuss this bill, in real time that is not happening. I'll give you a couple of examples. At this moment in time, 2023, indigenous women continue to experience forced sterilization. That's an attack on our rights as mothers of our children. A second example is regarding reports of birth alerts, which still occur in this country—in real time.

I don't know where I would ever argue that any parent has the free, prior and informed consent over matters impacting their children. Unfortunately, for indigenous peoples in Canada, particularly mothers, that continues not to happen. I urge members of this committee, in an act of reconciliation, if we are to move forward in this country, we must first recognize the need to give indigenous people our children back.

I've had many good discussions with many of you around the room about the value of this bill, of this amendment, in terms of a real act of reconciliation in this country. I feel that we're ready for that. I certainly wouldn't debate any parental right to free, prior and informed consent, but unfortunately that's still not the case for indigenous people in this country.

I am looking forward to this moment, to working together to reconcile in this country in a real way.

I'll leave it there. Thank you.

• (1625)

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Gazan.

Is there discussion on the amendment by Ms. Gazan?

I had Ms. Saks and then.... Is there a point of order?

Mr. Michael Coteau (Don Valley East, Lib.): No. I just have a question for the mover of the amendment, so you can put me on the regular list.

The Chair: Okay.

Ms. Saks has the floor, and then we'll go to you, Mr. Coteau.

Ms. Saks.

Ms. Ya'ara Saks: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Through you, Mr. Chair, I'd like to acknowledge to my colleague from the NDP that I value her insights tremendously. She is a fierce fighter for indigenous rights in this country. She has moved me to tears many times in the chamber over her commitment to righting the wrongs in the history of this country and holding us, all of us

who work here, to account as we move down the path of reconciliation.

However, Mr. Chair, I just want to make sure that we're clear on what we're doing here today and what this is a part of in the bigger picture of children in this country and indigenous children. This is a chamber that committed to UNDRIP and committed to that process—the framework of UNDRIP and its implementation—in our negotiations and ongoing discussions with our indigenous leadership in this country. Talks continue, and they're not always easy. There are challenges. There are bumps in the road, but this is a government and there are many members here who have committed to that process, as hard as it may be.

I've been engaged in similar processes in other parts of the world. I know how painful they are and about the intergenerational trauma. Setting up a system that's built on trust.... We know, fundamentally, that's what we're hoping for in righting the wrongs that have been done to many indigenous children in this country over generations.

The process of UNDRIP and its implementation framework is something that is an ongoing process. We're still in that process with indigenous leadership to create the legal framework of which FPIC is a part. I would hate to see—as we are servants of the Crown here and we all represent servants of the Crown here—that we put the cart before the horse in determining what the legal framework of FPIC is, or UNDRIP, before those negotiations are completed.

I would never want a situation where legislation is put forward and then passed in the chamber that bypasses the very important dialogue that is happening right now to ensure indigenous-led processes, whether it is in education, whether it is in IELCC or whether it is in all aspects of implementing indigenous rights and future legislation in this country. I would never want a situation where the people sitting at the table have usurped that right or interceded on those negotiations in any way. That is my reservation.

That doesn't take us away from the principle and the important value that we have to place in educating our children and in recognizing that indigenous communities need to be in the driver's seat with regard to educating their children. That is a key part of reconciliation. That's why I asked my minister for the indigenous early learning file, understanding that it is a key component of reconciliation.

We're here today to talk about the nationwide system and the agreements that are in place. I hope that colleagues understand that I want to make sure we are moving through these two parallel processes in the right way, in a way that honours the negotiations that are going on with indigenous leadership.

• (1630)

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Saks.

Mr. Coteau.

Mr. Michael Coteau: Thank you so much.

First, I'd like to ask the mover of the amendment just to explain a little bit more about informed consent. Then I'd like to ask the officials to give their opinion and bring some clarity to the issue, if that's okay.

Ms. Leah Gazan: Thank you so much for that question.

Just so you know, there is an instrument that is used to determine FPIC. It's the UN expert mechanism, in fact.

What free, prior and informed consent means is free of coercion, prior to any decision being made and knowing what you're making a decision about. Unless you have those three things, you don't have consent. I know that we're talking about consultation processes with indigenous people. I don't know any parent in this country who would oppose having free, prior and informed consent about matters impacting their children. In fact, I would like you to find me one indigenous person, let alone political organization or political leadership, who would say, "No, we don't want to have rights. We don't want to have our self-determination respected over matters impacting our children." I don't think any parent, in fact, would fight against their self-determination to make decisions about their own children. That is simply what my amendment is proposing.

As a country, we have also signed on to international law. Part of that international law is the UN expert mechanism. As well as free, prior and informed consent, this already informs part of our law. I'm not proposing something that's outside of Canadian law. It's affirmed, once again, through Bill C-15.

In the spirit of reconciliation, in the spirit of healing in this country, we need to see this in a bill and a legal framework. I'm talking as an indigenous person. We need to know that Canada understands, in 2023, that indigenous people, even though we have Canadian Human Rights Tribunal battles going on still in the courts, forced sterilization and birth alerts, and no access to school, have, at the very least, in the spirit of reconciliation, in spite of all the constant human rights violations, free, prior and informed consent—free of coercion, prior to any decisions being made about our kids and informed, knowing what the decision is—before any decision is made. That's precisely what this amendment is for.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Gazan.

Officials can speak to the technical aspects of the bill but cannot provide an opinion.

Ms. Cheri Reddin (Director General, Indigenous Early Learning and Child Care Secretariat, Department of Employ-

ment and Social Development): Perhaps I can highlight a few things.

First, I'd like to highlight that Bill C-35 does include a strong commitment in paragraph 5(f) to contribute to the implementation of UNDRIP.

I'd also like to underscore that the indigenous-specific references in the bill are grounded in work that was codeveloped with indigenous peoples, including the codeveloped indigenous early learning and child care framework. That work continues through the codevelopment process that's being led through the Department of Justice with indigenous governments to give meaning to the United Nations declaration and its application in Canada, including consideration of FPIC in that context.

From a policy perspective, I would underscore the need to abide by that practice and to not use this legislation to get out ahead of it. I'd also like to underscore that the bill was drafted with the intention of being flexible and being able to catch up with that eventual outcome.

The last thing I would like to note from a policy perspective is that any decision to include FPIC at this time in the clause would essentially be baseless. As a federal official, I have no idea how we would implement that, what measures would apply or what test would apply to ensure that the government was adhering to FPIC obligations.

• (1635)

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Reddin.

Ms. Gazan, go ahead on your amendment.

Ms. Leah Gazan: Thank you so much, Chair.

The government made a commitment in the last session—we voted on it in the House and it passed—to uphold the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Part of that is FPIC. That is part of the declaration itself. I'm calling on the government to uphold what it promised to do in terms of what's now a legal obligation, because it's now passed into law.

I also want to point to article 3 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which reads:

Indigenous peoples have the right to self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development.

Central to self-determination as affirmed in the framework is free, prior and informed consent. That is self-determination.

If the argument is that there's a commitment to uphold the UN declaration, there shouldn't be any issue with this amendment because, in fact, it supports that position of the folks who have joined us here today, including Cheri Reddin.

Thank you.

The Chair: Go ahead, Ms. Saks.

Ms. Ya'ara Saks: Thank you, Chair.

I want to thank officials for the clarification, and I thank my colleague.

Mr. Chair, I don't think anyone in this room disagrees with the importance of this. I think every single one of us has made that commitment. Over time, it's simply sitting in the House and learning more and more in the work that we do and understanding how important this path is, but I would like to update committee members a bit.

The Department of Justice is currently working with indigenous leadership on an action plan for UNDRIP. My concern, which I wish to share, is that I would hate to see this as a unilateral imposition on the work that's being done in a codeveloped manner. I want to be able to respect the indigenous leadership that is at the table, working with the Department of Justice on the commitment that was made by legislators to UNDRIP.

With that commitment comes a work process for implementation. I wouldn't disagree with my colleague that it's slow, that there are frustrations and that it's hard. It's hard work to do and the clock has run out for many families and for many communities.

That being said, I would hate to see a situation where we are taking a unilateral move against that very important work. I know that a draft action plan is proposed to be issued by the end of June of this year for it to be considered as codeveloped with indigenous leadership. I want to make sure that the work we do here is complementary to that work, so that we are not getting ahead of that work and it's not perceived that the people in this room are trying to impose a pathway that isn't agreed upon.

That is my only concern, and I feel that it should be put out there as we weigh in on how we do this right. There is a sense of urgency, and I appreciate that, but I want to make sure that we get this right and that it can be implemented.

Currently, the agreements are jurisdictional. If there's no framework to implement them to protect FPIC by provinces that are in that agreement because there isn't a framework currently, I would hate for everyone in this room to be accused of putting something in that is hollow when indigenous children deserve more that. They deserve better.

Thank you, Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Saks.

Go ahead, Madam Gazan.

• (1640)

Ms. Leah Gazan: Quite frankly, Mr. Chair, there is a framework that has been worked on. First nations leadership was quite clear

about it at the AFN actually and said that it was totally unacceptable and subpar.

I would challenge any sort of insinuation that first nations leadership will have difficulty with having free, prior and informed consent over matters impacting our children. That's bizarre. If you took the indigenous out of it and it was just a human being making decisions about their children, I don't think any parent in this country would fight against having self-determination to make decisions about their children. I think that first nations leadership will be shocked and disturbed that, in 2023, free, prior and informed consent over matters impacting indigenous children isn't just a set conclusion in this country and that we're still playing political games about the human rights of first nations children, indigenous kids, over self-determining the path for our children.

I think that argument is fairly weak. Certainly, I don't accept that argument. It is not a logical argument, and I'll just leave it there. I do feel that we're at a stage in this country where people really do want to move forward with reconciliation. I believe that, but if we can't start with children, given the kind of history in this country with residential schools and ongoing issues with child welfare and issues around the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal rulings and all of those things, with birth alerts and forced sterilization.... It is very disturbing to me, in fact, that we have to debate this, but I do accept that this is a democracy, and I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

The Chair: If there is no further discussion, I will call for a recorded vote on the amendment of Madam Gazan.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

(Clause 6 as amended agreed to: 11 yeas; 0 nays)

(On clause 7)

We'll now move to clause 7.

Madam Ferreri, go ahead.

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

We are putting forth an amendment to clause 7, and this is the most important amendment that we could put forward on this bill.

We have just heard a powerful exchange about parents having choice in caring for their children and flexible options for ensuring that everybody has access to quality affordable child care.

We heard multiple testimonies from many witnesses about waitlists and parents who are left out in the cold and that there are still a lot of winners and losers in this bill. Therefore, I would propose the following amendment, which replaces lines 4 to 9 on page 5 with the following:

(a) facilitate access to all types of early learning and child care programs and services regardless of the provider—such as those that are provided through traditional daycare centres, centres with extended, part-time or overnight care, nurseries, flexible and drop-in care, before- and after-school care, preschools and co-op child care, faith-based care, unique programming to support children with disabilities, home-based child care, nannies and shared nannies, au pairs, stay-at-home parents or guardians who raise their own children, or family members, friends or neighbours who provide care—that meet or exceed standards set by provincial governments or Indigenous governing bodies and respond to the varying needs of children and families while respecting the jurisdiction and unique needs of the provinces and Indigenous peoples;

• (1645)

The Chair: Thank you, Madam Ferreri.

Before we open the floor to discussion, I want to make clear to the committee that, if amendment CPC-1 is adopted, amendment NDP-2 cannot be moved due to a line conflict. Both amendments seek to modify lines 4 and 8 on page 5.

As House of Commons Procedure and Practice, third edition, states on page 769:

Once a line of a clause has been amended by the committee, it cannot be further amended by a subsequent amendment as a given line may be amended only once.

Now I will open the floor to discussion on the amendment of Madam Ferreri.

Go ahead, Madam Saks.

Ms. Ya'ara Saks: Thank you, Chair.

I will just simply say that this clause was drafted to closely align with the current CWELCC system that prioritizes not-for-profit public child care, and that's simply because, as stewards of the public purse, we want to make sure that we are creating a system that is high quality, affordable, accessible, licensed and within the purview of standards that are set.

Every province and territory that signed on to CWELCC understood the parameters of not-for-profit and public priorities. They signed and are moving forward.

There was some private child care that was grandfathered. Ontario is a perfect example of that, but province by province, the agreements outlined who was coming into the system, who was signing on, how it would be managed and the priorities that they set, so I would say that, when we look at the evidence.... There was much evidence discussed here at this committee by many witnesses about the quality of care that is provided in the non-profit and public sector models. That is the model we are proud of. We have Quebec to look to for the success of that and also the hiccups that come along the way, which we know are there.

It is not an easy lift creating a nationwide system; nevertheless, it is a nationwide system that prioritizes not-for-profit care because care of children is the priority, and the evidence shows that strongly.

We've seen models such as Australia, where there was creep into the private sector that left a system that collapsed and parents without care as the quality plummeted. We don't want that for our children. We don't want that for our families across this country, and stewarding the public purse means that we prioritize the best quality care that evidence has shown us.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Saks.

Go ahead, Madam Ferreri.

Ms. Michelle Ferreri: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

There is nothing universal about the child care bill, and I think that is what we heard repeatedly from witnesses in their testimony. If I can go to a quote from briefs that were submitted to the committee, this is from Kathryn Babowal. She's with Les Petits Soleils Inc. She said:

CWELCC roll out has actually resulted in inequitable access and creation of extensive waitlists for parents. Expansion freezes have been placed upon private operators, which have created a lack of access for families in private centres and waitlists in the hundreds per centre. These expansion freezes are creating a two-tiered system: increased demand for childcare due to CWELCC has forced private programs to expand to meet need, despite having no access to grants for parents, which results in parents paying upwards of \$50 more per day for the same program, staff and venue.

I think it's just frustrating. Just own what it is, if I'm going to be so blunt, because we just went through and heard this from my colleague down the way, Ms. Gazan. Just own it. Either you're including everyone or you're not. I think it's unfortunate that you've pitted two systems against each other that need each other to meet the demand.

At the core of this discussion has to be the child. The nucleus of this discussion is the welfare of the child. There are countless testimonies that say there are winners and losers. I've said this repeatedly. I'm a mom. Affordable child care and quality child care is incredible, but if it's not accessible it doesn't exist. The only people who are winning—and we heard this repeatedly—are the people who already have a spot.

Therefore, either call it what it is or don't. It's not universal child care, Mr. Chair.

• (1650)

The Chair: Thank you, Madam Ferreri.

Mrs. Gray.

Mrs. Tracy Gray: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Adding this amendment is really important because we want to make sure that there is access for all parents and for all children. Really, parents are the best people to decide who cares for their children. Part of what's in this amendment is that it says, “that meet or exceed standards set by provincial governments or Indigenous governing bodies”. It's really important that this is in here because it is saying this would be child care that is meeting these standards.

Therefore, if the provincial standards are acceptable, then it should be acceptable for that child to be in whatever format that might look like. Right now, the way this bill is—really, it's coming after the agreements have been made with the provinces—it touts being accessible and inclusive when in fact it's leaving out a number of children who really need access to this.

During the time when we were having witnesses and doing questioning, I did quote a couple of child care providers from my riding, but there are many others. I've had many parents reach out to me as they have seen this program roll out and have seen how it's leaving people behind. I have visited child care facilities in my riding as well.

I think this is one of the most important pieces we can add to this legislation, so that there is access for everyone and so that everyone is covered. The government is prioritizing government and not-for-profit facilities. However, they will not be able to be the sole organizations in order to expand the number of child care spaces that are needed. We have numbers that are in the tens of thousands of children who need placement, and actually, we need over 40,000 workers as well.

There are a lot of private facilities that have opened. We heard testimony about how they've taken on personal debt. They do this for the love of what they do. It's their passion. They are not similar to a lot of the organizations that other members might quote, which are the huge, corporate, national organizations. A lot of these organizations are private, but they're in our communities. They're serving maybe between 10 to 50 children. They're not a huge size, but they're serving our communities all over this country. It's really important that we capture all of them because right now there are children being left behind.

I think this is one of the most important pieces we can add to this legislation to make it stronger and to make it better. There's overwhelming support for having more accessibility for families who really need access to this program.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (1655)

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Gray.

Next is Ms. Ferreri.

Ms. Michelle Ferreri: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I just want to put into the record that these were submitted testimony to the committee. I think it's really important to have them on the record. I think these voices are really important.

Do we know the number, if I can ask, of how many submissions we had submitted for this bill?

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. David Chandonnet): There were 58 or perhaps a few more that we received lately.

Ms. Michelle Ferreri: What would be the normal submissions for a committee, do you know, on average?

The Clerk: I'm not sure. It would depend.

Ms. Michelle Ferreri: You can see that this impacts a lot of people. I want to read a couple of things that I think are really important to have on the record:

To meet the current and expanding demand, Canadian families need all forms of child care to be affordable and accessible. Limiting parental choice to one type of care conflicts with the notion of a universal plan and hinders access. To improve access, the plan must acknowledge home child care, both licensed and unlicensed, as a valuable component of the child care system. Not only does home child care impact expansion, as it is faster and less costly to open, but [home child care] also meets the unique needs of Canadian families by allowing them to choose a caregiver with similar values, a shared language or a shared culture. In partnership with their caregiver, a strong bond is established, resulting in a mutually cohesive relationship focused on the needs of the child.

Ms. Ya'ara Saks: I have a point of order, Chair.

I just think that when we're talking about unlicensed or care that is not within the scope of the agreements of which this legislation speaks, it's out of scope for the discussion as we move through amendments to the legislation.

The Chair: Ms. Ferreri, if you could, please keep your comments to the amendment you moved.

Ms. Michelle Ferreri: Just to follow up on the rest of that quote, it states, "We know that family engagement is essential to each child's development." That is from Julie Bisnath. She's the program coordinator of the Child Care Providers Resource Network.

There's one more here that I think is really important to read into the record. It says that "ELCC programs", which stands for "early learning and child care":

...to be inclusive of and responsive to the rights and needs of children with disabilities and their parents/caregivers. Implementing such a mandate can address exclusive and harmful practices and advance a fundamental shift in how children with disabilities are viewed in our society and how [early learning and child care] providers are trained and supported. We also recommend that active measures be taken to alleviate the burden on parents to advocate for their individual child's inclusion and navigate a complex bureaucratic system....

That was from Dr. Alison Gerlach and Dr. Janet Newbury, school of child and youth care, University of Victoria.

Again, I just want some of these on record for people at home to know that there has been this attempt by the Liberals to paint the Conservatives as anti-child care people. Nothing could be further from the truth. What we're trying to do is ensure that everyone is included.

I know that I've had very passionate discussions, and I hope you know where we come from. It is my job as the critic to stand up for all of the people who are left out, and there are. You know. You've met with them. How can we say that this is a universal child care bill if we don't include them? What are we saying to Canadian families who are left out in the cold, to women who can't go to work and small entrepreneur women who are going to have to shut their doors? This is actually hurting so many women, because they can't choose that.

All we're asking for today is for you to consider this amendment seriously, because I think there's an opportunity to strengthen this bill in a way that says that we here at the House of Commons, we as elected officials, care for everyone, and yes, we will be flexible and say, yes, we will trust parents to choose what's best for their children.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Next is Ms. Falk.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster, CPC): Thank you very much, Chair.

I too want to speak to this amendment and in support of this. Looking at the amendment, it says “regardless of the provider”. I have met with many new Canadians who have come to Canada and who rely heavily on their ethnic community, whether that's grand-parents, friends or family from where they're from.

Also, in a rural aspect as well, I think it's important to note that not every community, especially in rural Canada, has access to day care or to a day care facility. I know that a lot of families in my communities are using home-based child care, with nannies, shared nannies and au pairs. I have communities in my riding that have au pairs from Europe.

The end half of this says, “that meet or exceed standards set by provincial governments or Indigenous governing bodies”. As Ms. Ferreri has said as well, we heard a very compelling argument earlier from MP Gazan when it comes to indigenous women and children. She said herself that any parent wants, in her terms, free, prior and informed consent, but being able to have that opinion and be included....

I just really hope that the members of the other parties really seriously consider this and the fact that there's a lack of spaces in the country as it is. There are rural parts of this country that don't have access to an urban centre that may offer a program that is approved by the federal government under this layout.

Thank you.

• (1700)

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Falk.

Seeing no further discussion, I will ask the clerk to call a recorded vote on the amendment of Madam Ferreri. Just to be clear, we're voting on CPC-1.

(Amendment negated: nays 6; yeas 5)

The Chair: The amendment of Madam Ferreri has been defeated. That allows NDP-2 to be moved.

Madam Gazan, are you moving it?

Ms. Leah Gazan: Yes.

I move that Bill C-35, in clause 7, be amended as follows. Part (a) of the amendment would replace line 4 on page 5 with the following:

(a) increase the provision of, and facilitate equitable access to, high-quality early learning and child care

Part (b) of the amendment would replace line 8 on page 5 with the following:

ements or Indigenous governing bodies, that are reflective of other evidence-based best practices in high-quality service provision and that re-

Part (c) of the amendment would replace line 10 on page 5 with the following:

(b) enable families of all income levels, including low-incomes, to benefit from

Part (d) would replace lines 13 and 14 on page 5 with the following:

(c) support the provision, including in rural and remote communities, of early learning and child care programs and services that are inclusive of children from systematically marginalized groups, including children with disabilities, and of children from English and French linguistic minority communities, that

Part (e) would replace, in the English version, line 16 on page 5 with the following:

ilies and that respond to their varying needs; and

Finally, part (f) would replace lines 21 and 22 on page 5 with the following:

qualified early childhood education workforce that is well-supported by good working conditions, livable wages and benefits, opportunities to obtain experience and ongoing training, and other measures necessary for the recruitment and retention of staff.

• (1705)

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Gazan.

Before I open the floor for debate, if NDP-2, the amendment moved by Madam Gazan, is adopted, then CPC-2 cannot be moved due to a line conflict. Both amendments seek to modify lines 10 on page 5.

Is there any discussion on Madam Gazan's amendment?

Madam Saks.

Ms. Ya'ara Saks: I'd like to thank my colleague from the NDP for putting forward the amendment to enhance the work that we're doing here today. It's important. She's made some very important interventions thus far.

With regard to part (a), I'm wondering if this is a friendly sub-amendment to simply change the word “increase” with the word “support”.

The Chair: We have a subamendment moved by Ms. Saks. It's a word change.

Is it clear to committee members with regard to the word change in the subamendment proposed by Ms. Saks?

We'll suspend for a few minutes while we get clarification for the members.

• (1705)

(Pause)

• (1710)

The Chair: Committee members, we'll resume.

The clerk has advised me that committee members should have the word change. The word change was moved by Madam Saks as a subamendment to the amendment of Madam Gazan, which was being debated.

Does everybody have the word change?

Do you want to reference the word again, Ms. Saks?

Ms. Ya'ara Saks: It's changing the word "increase" in proposed paragraph (a) to "support".

The Chair: The subamendment of Ms. Saks is to change the word in the amendment.

Give it again, Ms. Saks.

Ms. Ya'ara Saks: It's to change the word "increase" to "support".

The Chair: Seeing no further debate, I'm going to call a vote on the subamendment of Ms. Saks, which you all have.

(Subamendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We will now revert to the amendment of Ms. Gazan as amended.

Ms. Saks.

Ms. Ya'ara Saks: Thank you, Chair, for recognizing me.

I would like to put forward another subamendment to part (f) to replace lines 21 and 22 on page 5 with the following: "development of young children, including through the recruitment and retention of a qualified and well-supported early childhood education workforce, recognizing that working conditions affect the provision of those programs and services."

I believe that has been submitted to the clerk and can be circulated to the members. If there's a need to suspend to review, that's quite all right.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Joël Godin: Mr. Chair, would it be possible for the clerk to add my name to her "to" list? I am not receiving the subamendments.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Godin.

[*English*]

To the committee, we have the second subamendment by Ms. Saks to the amendment of Madam Gazan.

Is there any discussion?

Ms. Falk.

• (1715)

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Can you repeat what you want it changed to?

Ms. Ya'ara Saks: Sure.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: I feel like I have half a word, and I don't—

Ms. Ya'ara Saks: It's "development". If you look at the paragraph as written in the actual bill, it jumps to the next line. It's on lines 20 to 22.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Thank you. That makes more sense.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Ya'ara Saks: Mr. Godin, is it necessary in the French version?

Mr. Joël Godin: Yes.

[*English*]

The Chair: Ms. Gazan, did you have your hand up?

Ms. Leah Gazan: I appreciate the subamendment. I think it's unfortunate that it's not as clear in terms of protection for workers. I just want to have that on record.

The Chair: Is there any further discussion on the subamendment of Madam Saks?

Mrs. Gray.

Mrs. Tracy Gray: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Now that it's finally come in and we've all seen it, can we have a moment for discussion?

The Chair: Do you wish to suspend for a few minutes?

Mrs. Tracy Gray: Yes, just for a moment or two.

The Chair: Good. We'll suspend for a few moments while members are considering the subamendment.

• (1715)

(Pause)

• (1720)

The Chair: Currently on the floor is the second subamendment of Ms. Saks.

You all have it. Is there any further discussion on the subamendment of Ms. Saks?

Seeing none, Mr. Clerk, I will ask you to call a recorded vote on the subamendment of Ms. Saks to the amendment of Ms. Gazan.

(Subamendment agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

The Chair: We'll now move to the amendment of Ms. Gazan as amended.

Ms. Ferreri.

Ms. Michelle Ferreri: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I just want to put on the record where the thoughts are from this side in terms of this amendment. While the NDP has removed the previous proposed language of licensed child care—which we support, because we've been pretty adamant about including everyone and being universal—from the legislation, it still calls out public and not-for-profit, which goes against parents' rights to choose the child care that is right for them, which, again, goes against the main tenets of this legislation of quality, availability, affordability, accessibility and inclusiveness in child care.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Madam Ferreri.

Seeing no further discussion, I'll call for a recorded vote on the amendment of Madam Gazan as amended.

(Amendment as amended agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

The Chair: That means amendment CPC-2 cannot be moved.

Madam Bérubé, do you have an amendment to move in this section?

We're still on clause 7.

Go ahead, Madam Bérubé.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Sylvie Bérubé: Mr. Chair, Bloc Québécois amendment BQ-1 proposes that Bill C-35, in clause 7, be amended by adding after line 29 on page 5 the following:

(3) Having regard to the special and unique nature of the jurisdiction of Quebec relating to early learning and child care in Quebec society and despite any other provision of this Act, the Government of Quebec may choose to exempt itself from the application of this Act by giving the Minister written notice to that effect, in which case that province may still receive the funding under section 8.

I will explain. As you know, the purpose of this amendment is to incorporate a clause to recognize Quebec's expertise in the guiding principles of the bill. This amendment also recognizes Quebec's jurisdiction and guarantees its right to withdraw with compensation from the application of this act. The idea is to avoid arguments between Quebec and Ottawa by recognizing from the outset what everyone knows here: Quebec is a forerunner when it comes to early childhood education and must continue to have sole control of its policies in this area.

In fact, Quebec was in the vanguard when it adopted its family policy over 25 years ago now. That policy, which can be described as progressive and feminist, enabled thousands of women and families to enjoy better work/life or school/life balance, specifically through the creation of a network of early childhood centres. This model is an asset and a source of pride for the entire Quebec nation. In fact, it is the inspiration for this bill.

This amendment therefore confirms the special and unique nature of the jurisdiction of the Quebec government in the area of education and child development, by giving it a right to withdraw completely with full compensation. As well, this is a field of exclusive provincial jurisdiction and we believe that this amendment, like all of the amendments we are proposing, will avoid arguments between Ottawa and Quebec in the future federal investments in this area.

I therefore invite all of my colleagues to vote in favour of this amendment and of recognition of all the work done by Quebec in the last 25 years.

● (1725)

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you, Madam Bérubé.

The role of the chair of the committee is to rule on admissibility of amendments as dictated by *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*.

My ruling, therefore, on this amendment is that Bill C-35 sets out the Government of Canada's vision for a Canada-wide early learning and child care system. The amendment proposes to allow the Government of Quebec to exempt itself from the application of the bill, while receiving federal funding for its early learning and child care programs and services. As *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, states on page 772:

Since an amendment may not infringe upon the financial initiative of the Crown, it is inadmissible if it imposes a charge on the public treasury, or if it extends the objects or purposes or relaxes the conditions and qualifications specified in the royal recommendation.

In the opinion of the chair, the amendment proposes to alter the terms and conditions for spending provided in the royal recommendation. In addition, the amendment is contrary to the bill's stated principle of creating a Canada-wide system, since there is no mechanism to allow any province or territory to opt out of that system while still receiving federal funding. Therefore, I rule the amendment inadmissible.

The ruling of the chair cannot be questioned.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Sylvie Bérubé: Mr. Chair, I challenge your decision and request a roll call vote.

[*English*]

The Chair: Yes, my decision can be questioned, but it cannot be debated. Are you challenging my ruling, Madam Bérubé?

[*Translation*]

Ms. Sylvie Bérubé: Yes.

[*English*]

The Chair: Madam Bérubé has challenged my decision.

Mr. Clerk, I call for a recorded vote on the decision of the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 9; nays 2)

The Chair: The amendment of Madam Bérubé cannot be entertained by the committee.

We'll now move to CPC-2.1.

● (1730)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Joël Godin: Mr. Chair, thank you for allowing me the time to present amendment CPC-2.1. I will try to be quick.

Amendment CPC-2.1 proposes that Bill C-35, in clause 7, be amended by adding after line 29 on page 5 the following:

(3) Federal investments in respect of early learning and child care programs and services subject to an agreement entered into with a province must be guided by the commitments set out in the *Official Languages Act*, in addition to the principles set out in subsection (1).

Clause 7 of this bill sets out the guiding principles of the funding granted by the federal government for early childhood services. The proposed amendment is critical in that it will ensure that the federal government takes its official languages commitments as set out in the Official Languages Act into account when it grants funding for early childhood services.

Bill C-13, An Act for the Substantive Equality of Canada's Official Languages, specifically proposes to add a federal commitment to the Official Languages Act to advance learning opportunities starting in early childhood.

To help in understanding what is really happening, I will cite a few examples.

In New Brunswick, the government recently announced the creation of 1,900 child care spaces, 300 of which will be francophone. This means that barely 16 per cent of the spaces are being allocated for francophones, when francophones make up over 30 per cent of the population in the only bilingual province in Canada.

In Nova Scotia, faced with an outcry from francophones, the provincial government decided to reverse its plan, with funding from the federal government, to merge all francophone and anglophone child care centres in the province under a single provincial agency already in existence whose senior management is exclusively anglophone. That would have constituted a violation of section 23 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

In Ontario, it seems that francophone child care centres will not have access to the provincial funding intended to improve wages in child care centres. Only private anglophone agencies, that pay much less, will be receiving this top-up funding from the province.

In conclusion, I want to cite the example of Alberta. Out of the 1,500 new spaces announced recently, only 19 will be reserved for francophones. This means that 0.013 per cent of the spaces will be allocated to francophones in Alberta, when francophones represent over 2 per cent of the population of the province.

I could continue, with examples for British Columbia and Manitoba. Manitoba's history is positive, with the Manitoba government's intentions giving the province a good track record in terms of financial effects.

Members of the committee, I invite you to consider this point. This bill gives us the opportunity to offer the federal government tools it can use to get tangible results when it comes to francophone education and child care services in minority communities across Canada. I think this is important.

As I said at the beginning of the meeting, it is important to have this presence in all bill that come after. This is particularly important now that we have concluded the study on modernization of the Official Languages Act, the new version of which will probably be adopted by the House of Commons very soon.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Godin.

[*English*]

Just to be clear, my intention is to conclude at 5:40 p.m., if that's agreeable. We started about 10 minutes late.

We will open the floor to discussion on the amendment of Mr. Godin.

Madam Saks.

Ms. Ya'ara Saks: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[*Translation*]

I want to thank Mr. Godin for his suggestion.

[*English*]

I would ask at this time if we could get some, perhaps, weighing in by officials on the amendment proposed by my colleague.

Ms. Michelle Lattimore (Director General, Federal Secretariat on Early Learning and Child Care, Department of Employment and Social Development): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

From a policy perspective, the amendment that has been suggested is consistent with what we know of the Official Languages Act at this time. There's nothing additional to comment on beyond that.

The Chair: Is there any further discussion?

Mr. Godin.

• (1735)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Joël Godin: Mr. Chair, there is a typo in the text of the French version of the proposed amendment. The introduction should say "Que le projet de loi C-35, à l'article 7, soit modifié par adjonction, après la ligne 35...".

I request the unanimous consent of the members to correct the typo in the wording of my motion.

[*English*]

The Chair: We'll go to the legislative clerk so we can make that... In English, it's correct. In French, it refers to *avant*. We'll change it to *après*.

With that minor change in the French version, seeing no—

Ms. Michelle Ferreri: In English, it's wrong. In French, it's correct.

A voice: In English, it says, "line 29".

Ms. Marie-Hélène Sauvé: Just for clarification, the English is correct. The issue is with the instructions on the French side. It reads, "before line 35", where it should read "after line 35". There's really no consent needed. The text of the amendment doesn't change. The consent of the committee is not really needed for that. It was just for clarification. The English is correct.

The Chair: Okay. Seeing no one else, I will ask the clerk to do a recorded vote on the amendment of Mr. Godin.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0)

(Clause 7 as amended agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0)

The Chair: We'll conclude one more. On clause 8, there were two amendments, and they were withdrawn.

(Clause 8 agreed to)

The Chair: With that, committee members, I will adjourn the meeting until Friday, when we'll resume the clause-by-clause review of Bill C-35. Thank you for your participation this afternoon.

To the departmental staff, thank you for coming and for answering the questions that were directed to you by committee members.

Thank you all. 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>