



House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on Official Languages

LANG • NUMBER 015 • 2nd SESSION • 39th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Thursday, February 14, 2008

Chair

Mr. Steven Blaney

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address:

<http://www.parl.gc.ca>

Standing Committee on Official Languages

Thursday, February 14, 2008

• (0905)

[Translation]

The Chair (Mr. Steven Blaney (Lévis—Bellechasse, CPC)): Good morning. Welcome to the 15th meeting of our Standing Committee on Official Languages.

[English]

Welcome, everybody.

This morning the meeting will be divided into two parts. First is the public part, where we are going to begin with Mr. Godin's motion, which was presented at the end of the last meeting. We will then take a short break to go in camera to proceed with the study of our report and the review.

I will now ask Mr. Godin to explain the motion he presented at our last meeting.

Monsieur Godin.

[Translation]

Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm going to start by wishing all the women here today a happy Valentine's Day. This is the day of kisses; we'll do that after the meeting. Happy Valentine's Day, Jean-Claude D'Amours.

I don't intend to debate this motion for long. It doesn't have to be debated. A series of witnesses have appeared before us. On a number of occasions, witnesses have said that the subject was not their responsibility. Others have said they could not talk about it since it wasn't their responsibility. The minister appeared before a Senate committee a few days ago. I believe she would like to appear before our committee to outline the position of the Department of Canadian Heritage, which is responsible for official languages. Out of respect, I think we can grant her that. At the same time, we have some questions to ask. I have questions to put to the minister to clarify certain aspects of the action plan and concerning the government's vision for the next action plan, and so on.

That's why I don't see in what way the motion would be negative. I'm certain the government doesn't want to prevent the minister from speaking before the Standing Committee on Official Languages. I'm sure the invitation to have the minister appear will be received with enthusiasm and joy so that we can question her. I have nothing further to say on that point at this time.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Godin. I'm sure all committee members appreciate all your good wishes on this fourteenth day of February.

We'll continue with Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Luc Harvey (Louis-Hébert, CPC): If I remember correctly, Ms. Verner appeared not very long ago. When exactly? In December?

Mr. Jean-Rodrigue Paré (Committee Researcher): On December 5.

Mr. Luc Harvey: That's less than a month and a half ago. The minister has previously appeared on a number of occasions; I don't know exactly how many times, four or five. Is it customary to have the minister responsible appear that often in committee? These are questions I'm asking really in good faith. I want to know the story. Is it common practice to have a minister appear as regularly as this, particularly when her last visit was a month and a half ago?

The Chair: Is the point of your question to know how many times the minister has appeared?

Mr. Luc Harvey: No. I want to know whether this is a customary way of operating.

The Chair: Mr. Paré, you may answer.

Mr. Jean-Rodrigue Paré: It's frequently done. Sometimes it happens more often, sometimes less so. In December, she appeared on the subject of a separate study. The committee is currently concerned with a new study, on which no specific question has been put to the minister. If committee members feel it's worthwhile to put certain questions to the minister—

Mr. Luc Harvey: Is this in relation to the plan we're studying?

Mr. Jean-Rodrigue Paré: Right now, yes, but it wasn't concerning that subject in December.

Mr. Luc Harvey: Is the request to meet with the minister in relation to the plan we are studying?

The Chair: Mr. Godin.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Yes. I've been a member of Parliament for some time, and, to my knowledge, the minister appears as the committee needs her. The law confers a function on the committee. In fact, the minister is responsible for official languages, and the committee asks her to appear as necessary.

The motion concerns the action plan. We're studying the action plan. Every time we conduct a study, we ask the minister to appear. Our current study concerns the action plan.

Mr. Luc Harvey: Is the intention to include her remarks in the action plan?

Mr. Yvon Godin: Absolutely.

Mr. Luc Harvey: We know that the House is recessed next week; this week is already over. Let's suppose the minister is available when we return; that means she would be coming in two weeks. Depending on our schedule, we had planned perhaps to table the report on the plan sooner than that. If the minister's comments must be part of the plan, do we delay tabling or what?

We're studying a plan; we're trying to develop a report, suggesting that what the minister says be included in the report. We're developing the report before having heard the minister. We've already prepared a report before hearing the final witnesses. In this case, I'd like to know whether we really need witnesses before drafting the report. We're finishing writing the report before even hearing the witnesses. Moreover, some very important witnesses appeared here when the report was already written.

Are we summoning witnesses for a real reason or just to fill up time? If that's the case, we're wasting our time. If it isn't the case, we'll be forced to suspend the report until we've met with the minister. I don't really feel comfortable approving the report or working on it when we haven't finished hearing our witnesses. Furthermore, last week, Mr. Bélanger said that we would probably need a kind of organization chart to determine who does what in all this.

Was that you who talked about the organization chart, Mr. Bélanger?

• (0910)

Hon. Mauril Bélanger (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): No.

Mr. Luc Harvey: In any case, it was someone from the Liberal side who talked about it. We no longer know who does what. We're working on a report that we haven't finished writing, any more than we've finished meeting the witnesses. I'm starting to wonder about this.

The Chair: Thank you.

I'd perhaps like to point out, Mr. Godin, that there is Chapter 3. I don't know whether you've had the time to read Chapter 3 of the report, which provides a brief description of the roles of the public service.

Mr. Yvon Godin: That has nothing to do with the minister.

The Chair: I just wanted to check.

We'll continue with Mr. Bélanger.

Hon. Mauril Bélanger: Mr. Chairman, since we're not in camera, I would encourage members to avoid talking about the report which, contrary to what Mr. Harvey appeared to suggest, has not been approved. A draft report has been prepared by our researchers, as should be the case. However, there can be an enormous difference between the first draft and the final report. I admit I haven't completely finished shredding it.

Mr. Luc Harvey: It isn't a good idea to shred it.

Hon. Mauril Bélanger: The final report could be substantially different from the draft. You have to be careful. It's absolutely legitimate for our researchers to prepare a draft when we appear to be finishing the meetings with the witnesses. I say that to point out that the report won't be definitely approved before all the witnesses have been heard.

Mr. Luc Harvey: That doesn't prevent the fact that we're nevertheless working—

The Chair: One moment, please. Let Mr. Bélanger finish his answer; then it will be Mr. Godin's turn.

Hon. Mauril Bélanger: I wouldn't want people reading or listening to this exchange to get the impression that it's not important to hear the witnesses or that what they say isn't taken into consideration, on the contrary.

I would like to make a second point. With regard to the minister's appearance, I am perfectly aware that ministers have fairly busy schedules, as we all do. An accommodation must be made. I agree with the colleagues who answered your question, Mr. Harvey: it isn't unusual for a minister to appear more often at certain times. We've handled two or three files one after the other. There were the parliamentary appropriations that had to be approved, the Court Challenges study, and now we're working to prepare the plan. If, at some point, some sort of bill is referred to us, concerning Air Canada, for example, and the subject is discussed here, the minister could be summoned at that time as well—it might not be that minister in particular. This is common practice. It's just that the present period is very busy; that's all.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Bélanger. You mentioned that at the outset, and it's true: it is good to remind all members that we are holding a public meeting and that the report is confidential.

Mr. Godin.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Chairman, the report is indeed confidential, but I think Mr. Harvey can remember—if he was in committee at the time; otherwise he can consult the blues—that we've had the same discussion in the past. At the time, we wanted to hear a new witness and stop conducting the study or preparing the report. We said then that we would add a short meeting to receive the minister.

Some questions require an answer or have to be clarified before our report is written, particularly since the representatives of the departments very clearly said in camera that they weren't responsible for this or that they didn't know what was going on. I think we need to know where the government is headed.

We could meet with the minister in the evening. As she is responsible for official languages, I can't believe the committee isn't important to her. So I'm sure she'll be so kind as to want to come and meet with this wonderful committee, especially on Valentine's Day.

• (0915)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Godin.

We'll now hand over to Mr. Lemieux.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This discussion started because some committee members weren't sure who had this responsibility. Mr. Godin therefore suggested that we invite the minister.

Now we're talking about witnesses, and I'd like to know whether we have to hear more and, if so, why. I would like to move that we invite

[English]

the Public Service Agency of Canada. We had them here.

[Translation]

The Canada Public Service Agency is responsible for the general management and review of official languages for all the departments.

[English]

So they actually have very specific official language responsibilities, particularly when it comes to the implementation of official languages within the departments, within the public service. I have a couple of concerns. The first is that if the minister comes, my colleagues may ask many questions about the official languages plan, what's coming and what are the priorities. Of course, she won't be able to comment on that. In our Speech from the Throne we have reiterated

[Translation]

our commitment to the action plan. However, the minister won't be able to go into details. That's why Bernard Lord conducted those consultations across the country and why we decided to conduct our own on the priorities, successes and challenges involved in implementing the last version of the action plan, which is currently being prepared.

[English]

My concern is that if we have the minister come, she will not be able to comment on the specifics of *le renouvellement du plan d'action*. I actually think the Public Service Agency of Canada is the one responsible, for example, for issuing directives that give effect to parts IV, V, and VI of the Official Languages Act. They are responsible for recommending regulations.

So in terms of the hands-on portion, we spoke about asking to see if we could see an organizational chart, and I think there's value in the research analyst putting together an organization chart to basically show the key players, where they fit into the implementation of the Official Languages Act within the government, and then we can have a discussion about the roles and responsibilities to make sure we invite the appropriate people. I don't think any of us wants to lose a meeting by inviting someone who will not necessarily be able to answer our questions in the detail that we will be asking.

For example, as I said, the Public Service Agency of Canada has a lot of direct hands-on responsibilities with respect to the implementation of official languages. By having them come, coupled with having the researcher put together a chart that we can look at to see who the key players are, what their roles and responsibilities are...if we still have misunderstandings, if we still have questions about who is responsible for implementing what, then that will allow us to be able to focus our questions on the appropriate person.

Mr. Chair, that's what I would like to recommend. It's part of debating Monsieur Godin's motion, but I would like to discuss this, having this agency come in, because I think they would offer valuable information.

Let me just confirm this. Was the Public Service Agency here before?

Mr. Jean-Rodrigue Paré: Yes, they were here. Madame Karen....

● (0920)

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Yes, that's right.

Mr. Yvon Godin: She could answer nothing.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Then maybe we either weren't asking the right questions or we were not pressing home what she is responsible for. I didn't hear anyone say, "You're not answering my question. Your responsibilities are this, this, and this, and I want you to comment specifically on this, this, and this."

So if we had questions of a particular witness and they were not asked or clarified, even if they appeared before the committee previously...I think this is Monsieur Godin's argument. Monsieur Godin's argument for having the minister come back is that we want to

[Translation]

clarify questions. We're currently conducting a study, so more direct questions must be asked regarding our concerns, our lack of knowledge and understanding of certain matters.

So we must do that with the Public Service Agency, a representative of which appeared here, just as the minister also appeared before this committee. If we want to ask more specific questions, we could put them

[English]

to the Canada Public Service Agency. We have an opportunity.

I think this is a better use of the committee's time. They have specific responsibilities when it comes to the implementation of what it is we're looking at—the very questions we were asking at the end of the last meeting.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Lemieux.

I would like to know if you are throwing this idea on the floor to raise discussion.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Right now we're debating Monsieur Godin's motion. I'm raising it. I hope we have more discussion about it. I'd like to know what my colleagues think of this. It's in the context of that motion.

The Chair: I have a few speakers on the list: Mr. Petit, Mr. Simard, Mr. Bélanger, Mr. Gravel, and Mr. Nadeau.

Daniel, you're on.

[Translation]

Mr. Daniel Petit (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Thank you very much. May I begin?

Mr. Yvon Godin: It's because we want clarification.

Mr. Daniel Petit: I received the motion, which is very simple. I'd like to draw your attention to the fact that, at the last meeting on February 12, Mr. Rodrigue Paré stated the following:

I would like to clarify one point. In the original action plan in 2003, the Commission was responsible for everything, because that was before the agency was created. Originally, in the Action Plan, the Commission was to receive \$38.6 million to handle all training, bilingual capability in full. Subsequently, a portion or all of the those budgets were transferred to the agency when it was created in late 2003. The agency itself then transferred some of those budgets for the creation of the school. That's why there may have been some confusion in the mandates.

There lies the problem. In 2003, I wasn't here, but they were. We could ask some committee members—Mr. Godin, for example, our expert in the field—to testify. Mr. Godin knows everything that has happened since 2003, whereas I don't know. The report that is made public is only at the draft stage. I think Mr. Paré is right. He focused the problem precisely on that.

The problem stems from the fact that something happened in 2003. The Liberals were with the NDP, the NDP told the Liberals nothing, and the Liberals told the NDP nothing. That changed at the time of the official commission.

I'd like to draw your attention to the fact that I agree with Mr. Godin. We are at a point where we must prepare a report. I've already read this report. I hoped to be able to discuss it more quickly today. The last witnesses really surprised me. It was mainly Mr. Donald Lemaire who spoke. I thought those people were coming simply to confirm what we had observed and to tell us that we were good-looking and nice. However, he said that there was nothing. I think Mr. Godin is right. We have to know exactly where we're headed. If we have to prepare a draft and recommendations, they have to make sense so they don't wind up on shelf 13, as it's called.

I'm a member of Parliament, as you all are. After the next election we may all be here still, maybe not. It's important to leave something that makes sense. Some files appear to be in disorder. I'm not responsible for that disorder, because I wasn't here. Perhaps Mr. Bélanger, who has been here much longer than I, can explain to me why things changed in 2003 and why that should have been here. The Liberal Party definitely had to intervene at that time. Why have we gotten to this point? Why does Mr. Lemaire appear to be saying today that, because of this dispersion of authority...

Mr. Bélanger has raised some good points. He asked why it shifted from the Treasury Board to another place. As Mr. Godin said, everyone was monitoring the Treasury Board. Subsequently, it was the Privy Council Office's turn. We have to know exactly where we're headed. It's a question of governance.

We are parliamentarians; we aren't the government. We perform another function elsewhere, but here we are parliamentarians. We have to tell Parliament that the change it made in 2003 wasn't right. That doesn't mean that it will change matters, but at least we'll have put our finger on the problem. We're playing with approximately \$800 million, which represents more than three-quarters of a billion dollars. I'll never earn that much money in my life. That's a lot of money, and it's a lot of workers' money.

● (0925)

We absolutely have to find an answer to this question, and perhaps look more deeply into this case and find out why this changed. Perhaps they were right; I don't know, and I wasn't here. Perhaps

Mr. Bélanger could give us an explanation because perhaps he was a member of the Official Languages Committee.

Mr. Godin, who is here on a full-time basis, could tell us what happened in 2003. We should know. That's why I draw your attention to the fact that I think the motion is appropriate, but I think we've created an opening. I wondered whether it was right or not. I think it's right, but perhaps we should go further, but quickly, and avoiding discussing too many matters.

One question is legitimate, and it's on my mind. Why did it change in 2003? I want to know why as well. Was it a question of governance, to save money, because it was better, because more people were receiving instructions? I don't know, but I want to know. The people who are most knowledgeable about the organization chart could inform us. Once again, we come back to the damned organization chart that we should have before us. I really would have like to have it so we know where to place all our people. We've given out \$800 million; I want to know how this works, how the money is distributed, to whom, in order to be sure that our fellow citizens, who will have to face the consequences of our decisions, can know whether those amounts were well spent.

Mr. Godin has said it from the start: he thinks the money is here, but is not necessarily well spent, or that it is misdirected. That's a problem. He's entitled to know, as I am, because we are parliamentarians. From what I know, the minister, Ms. Verner, wasn't here in 2000, nor was I either, nor many people who are here now. Perhaps Messrs. Bélanger and Godin could further clarify matters for us. Something happened and he's referring to it today, in 2008. Why didn't he do that in 2003? I don't know. Perhaps it would be valid to see whether we can reopen the debate before this document that we have to table in Parliament is finished, so that we can have a proper view.

I feel uncomfortable. Mr. Godin's question is very legitimate; I support him in that respect, but is Minister Verner the right person or the only person? I wonder. I don't think she's the one and only person. Perhaps we should also hear from former Liberal ministers so they can tell us why they changed that in 2003. Perhaps they had a very good reason. That's what I want to know.

● (0930)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Petit.

We'll continue now. We're going to take the time to listen to each other.

Mr. Simard, it's your turn.

Hon. Raymond Simard (Saint Boniface, , Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair: I should say the Honourable Mr. Simard and perhaps minister of a related area—

Hon. Raymond Simard: I agree with Mr. Petit on the first half of his remarks. However, I'm not sure where he was headed with the second. One of the problems is that there was a devolution of responsibilities to the departments. That was done in 2003. When the Liberals were in power, there was significant oversight by the Privy Council because there is a direct link with the Prime Minister. Based on the last interview, which was conducted on Tuesday, there no longer appears to be that kind of oversight. People couldn't respond.

Mr. Lemieux told us that we should perhaps have people from the Canada Public Service Agency appear again. I think they'll tell us that the changes were made at the political level, not by the public service. So we should bring in the person responsible for the political level and ask that person to explain to us how the new structure works and how they intend to control that, because there have been structural changes and no one seems to be responsible for anything. As I said the other day, I worked with Mr. Bélanger in that field. I can tell you that there is incredible resistance to the official languages in the departments. It's enough for one person to make things difficult and everything stops. As we know, not all the departments are at the same point; some are much more advanced than others.

I believe we are all people with a sense of responsibility. We don't want to waste the minister's time; we know how busy ministers are and how busy we are as well, but I think it will be difficult to finish the report without at least knowing what the structure is and whether we are comfortable with the way that's managed. I think we must now speak to the political level.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you for that brief speech, Mr. Simard.

Mr. Mauril Bélanger.

Hon. Mauril Bélanger: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Petit, I got the impression at one point that you were going to ask me to testify before the committee.

Mr. Daniel Petit: That would be a pleasure for me.

Hon. Mauril Bélanger: And for me as well, Mr. Petit. Take note of that.

Mr. Daniel Petit: We could trade some interesting remarks.

Hon. Mauril Bélanger: I agree with Mr. Petit that this is a question of governance. It's in fact the question that concerns us. I also completely support Mr. Simard's comments. We seem to want to identify a problem, or at least put the finger on the problem. I believe that transferring the Official Languages Secretariat from the Privy Council Office to the Department of Canadian Heritage is at the source of that problem.

I agree with Mr. Simard on that question as well. When I was the minister responsible for official languages and he was my parliamentary secretary, the Secretariat had a mandate to coordinate and oversee what went on with the implementation of the Action Plan for Official Languages.

I'll explain why I think Mr. Godin's motion is valid.

We monitored what went on. Now that the Secretariat has been transferred—and that's a decision by Mr. Harper's government—the problem nevertheless boils down to a question of governance. The person responsible, and her title indicates that, is Ms. Verner. She is the Minister of Canadian Heritage, but we're not inviting her in that capacity, and the minister for the status of women, and we're not inviting her in that capacity either, but she is also minister responsible for official languages. She can bring whomever she wants when she comes to appear, people from the Public Service Agency, from the Privy Council Office or from her Secretariat,

whomever. We're clearly seeking to know how that coordination is currently done in the public service.

As far as I know, there is one player we haven't even spoken to, and that's the Treasury Board. From what I know, it is responsible for establishing policy. I think it's entirely legitimate for Ms. Verner to come and testify, not next week, but the following week, I hope, on the way her government is taking charge of that governance, of that coordination question.

Ultimately, we could invite the Prime Minister, given that it was he who decided to transfer the Official Languages Secretariat to the Department of Canadian Heritage. I think that, for the moment, inviting the minister responsible is a respectful gesture, in that it shows that we understand the Cabinet hierarchy and that we are speaking to the person responsible for that governance. That's a response to both Mr. Lemieux's remarks and Mr. Petit's questions.

Mr. Godin's motion is perfectly legitimate, utterly reasonable, and I think we should adopt it.

● (0935)

The Chair: Thank you, Mauril.

Mr. Gravel.

Mr. Raymond Gravel (Repentigny, BQ): I wasn't here in 2003 either. I wasn't even here in 2006. We said earlier that we didn't want to waste our time or waste the minister's time. However, I get the impression that we're wasting our time this morning. I find it hard to believe that we can be hearing this kind of nonsense. Mr. Lemieux, either the minister doesn't want to come—

Mr. Daniel Petit: I have a point of order.

The Chair: There is a point of order.

Mr. Daniel Petit: I think everyone is speaking properly. If the Bloc québécois representative wishes to say this kind of thing, this isn't the place: this meeting is public. If he isn't pleased, that his business. He says we're talking nonsense, and I think that should be withdrawn. That isn't the purpose of this meeting, all right?

Mr. Luc Harvey: It's not acceptable in a parliamentary context.

Mr. Raymond Gravel: In any case, I'm going to say what I have to say.

An hon. member: Precisely, we can't say everything we want.

The Chair: One moment. Mr. Petit, I think that's a point of debate, for the moment. Whatever the case may be, I'm going to appeal to the good will of all committee members by asking them to be open-minded when they make comments, and not necessarily to make value judgments on the comments made. That doesn't help us move the debates forward.

Mr. Raymond Gravel: I mean that—

The Chair: That's why I ask you to continue, Mr. Gravel.

Mr. Raymond Gravel: I get the impression we're wasting our time. I think the motion is legitimate. If you listen to what's being said on the other side, you conclude that either the minister doesn't want to come, which appears to be the case, or she is incompetent. If she is the minister for official languages, she should be competent and be able to answer our questions.

Mr. Daniel Petit: I have a point of order.

That's enough. You don't have the right to use the term "incompetent" in speaking of parliamentarians. Can you prove that she is incompetent, Mr. Gravel?

Mr. Raymond Gravel: No.

Mr. Daniel Petit: Then withdraw your remarks. That's enough.

Mr. Raymond Gravel: I'm not saying she's incompetent.

Mr. Daniel Petit: That's enough. Is that clear?

Mr. Raymond Gravel: I didn't say she was incompetent. I said that, judging from the remarks we hear from the other side, either she can't come—

Mr. Daniel Petit: We understand what you mean, Mr. Gravel. That's enough.

The Chair: Order, please. We'll speak one at a time.

Mr. Raymond Gravel: Yes, and I would like to finish.

The Chair: Mr. Gravel, I'm going to finish my remarks.

There is a lot of noise around the table, and I find it hard to hear what's being said. Mr. Gravel, I'd like you to note that we are debating a motion and that suggestions accompanying that motion are being discussed. You have the right to feel this isn't productive, but committee members have a right to speak and not to share your point of view.

Mr. Raymond Gravel: I'd like to finish what I have to say.

The Chair: Yes, you're going to do that, Mr. Gravel, but there are a number of people speaking.

Mr. Raymond Gravel: Mr. Chairman, if we asked the minister to appear, it's because we think she is competent.

The Chair: Mr. Gravel, I'm going to finish my remarks, and then I'm going to hand over to you.

I would like us to speak one at a time because, otherwise, we won't be able to cope. I remind committee members that this meeting is in two parts. The first, which concerns committee business, is public. I also remind you that what we're doing now is public: the population of Canada can see us, listen to us and observe us. Then we're going to go back to the report.

With those comments, I turn the floor over to you, Mr. Gravel.

I would like us to listen to Mr. Gravel.

Mr. Raymond Gravel: I'd like to emphasize that I didn't interrupt the others earlier.

If we invite the minister, it's because we want to ask her questions. If she is the minister for official languages, she must be competent in that area. That's why we're asking her to appear. Unless she doesn't want to come. That's what I'm wondering. If she doesn't appear, either she doesn't want to come, or she is incompetent. I don't know. I don't doubt that she's competent, but I want her to appear, and I think Mr. Godin's motion is entirely appropriate.

We heard witnesses last week. I'm not an expert in the field, but I observed that they did not answer questions because either they didn't know the answer, or that wasn't within their responsibility or duties. If we summon other witnesses to appear and they tell us the

same thing, I don't see how that will be helpful. We're going to waste our time. I think the minister could give us some clarification on these questions. That's why I'm in favour of the idea that she should appear.

By the way, the word "argente" is masculine, not feminine. I note that the feminine has been used for a while now. Furthermore, Mr. Lemieux said that we were going to ask "straight" questions. I don't know what he means by that, but whatever the case may be, we're going to ask the minister "straight" questions.

● (0940)

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Nadeau.

Mr. Richard Nadeau (Gatineau, BQ): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We have a minister responsible, and she's from the political field. She's the person who tells the officials, following political decisions, how the structures should be developed. The fact that she was around in the year 10 or the year 1 before Jesus Christ is not very important: she's the political person responsible in the context of this matter.

In these conditions, the motion introduced is entirely honourable. We're asking the minister to come and explain to us parliamentarians points that we consider problematical and that are part of a file that is her political responsibility. We must vote in favour of this motion, since we're asking the person concerned, the minister, to come and do what she must do to clarify matters for us. If we have specific questions to ask her concerning structures, it is up to her to answer us, not officials who are locked into a structure that they have no power to change.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Nadeau.

Mr. Godin.

Mr. Yvon Godin: I'm going to try to be brief, Mr. Chairman.

I've never seen this in the history of the Standing Committee on Official Languages. It's true that this is a committee that normally shouldn't be political. Since 1998, every time we've wanted to ask a minister to appear before the committee, we've never argued as we are doing now.

Mr. Lemieux said that the questions will have to be direct and specific. Mr. Chairman, I won't present my questions to Mr. Lemieux the day before to determine whether they are good or not. I'm going to ask my questions, allow the minister to answer them and see what comes out of them. She'll answer the way she wants, and I'll feel good about the questions that I've asked her. I don't have to ask anyone whether my question is good or not. I can live with my question and with the answer.

We're inviting the minister responsible for official languages to the committee. She may be accompanied by whomever she wants to assist her in answering the questions ask her. That's just normal. I must admit that Mr. Gravel is right to ask whether she is competent, because every time we've asked a minister to appear before the Standing Committee on Official Languages, we've run into difficulties. This isn't the first time that has happened; one need only read the blues from our other meetings.

A little respect, please. We want to have the minister appear before the committee; let's vote on this question and it will be resolved.

The Chair: There are three speakers on the list. I would invite committee members to maintain a respectful debating tone.

Hon. Mauril Bélanger: Decorum.

The Chair: Yes, we must maintain a certain amount of decorum on this 14th day of February. I ask members to stick to the argument.

We'll continue with Messrs. Lemieux, Rodriguez and Harvey.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Chairman, I want to explain because I don't think I was impolite or that I used a tone... The situation is such that we have to get serious.

I said what had happened in committee in the past. Every time we've wanted a minister to appear before the committee, there has been resistance from the government; it has even always voted against it. The government has never voted in favour of a minister appearing before the committee. We have a right, as a committee, to ask a minister to come and answer our questions. My motion is in proper form. I think this is really a waste of time. We could spend the entire day here and give committee members a chance to speak, but we want the minister to appear before the committee. I'm not asking any more than that.

The Chair: Mr. Lemieux.

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to just make a few comments. With respect to Mr. Godin, he says he's never seen this. That's because under your excellent leadership, Mr. Chair, we are getting some format to these meetings. The way it used to happen, certainly in the first session when I was here, all of sudden, 30 seconds before the end of a meeting, Monsieur Godin or another member would come up with an idea. Maybe it was in a motion, sometimes not, and all of a sudden that would just carry. That would be our next order of business. There was very little debate or no debate.

Under your leadership, at least people have to put forward a motion. This is what happened at the last meeting: with 30 seconds to go, Monsieur Godin said he wanted the minister, and I think he expected it to carry. But he had to be reminded that there are rules associated with this committee. One of the rules is that you deposit a motion and the motion is open to debate.

The other point I want to make is that the minister has always appeared. Every time the committee has asked a minister to appear, the minister has appeared. The minister has been open to questions. The minister has given good presentations. The minister has addressed the questions asked of her. So I reject what Mr. Godin is insinuating. Right now we're talking about his motion, and within

his motion we're also discussing—because debate has to be as open as possible—which witnesses would contribute to the finalization of this report of our study on official languages.

So this is where the debate is. This is not wasting time. This is debate. We live in a democracy. This committee operates under democratic principles, which means MPs have the opportunity to speak, and I thank you for respecting the speakers' list because there are MPs on your speakers' list who want to address this issue and they should be given the opportunity to do so.

With respect to Monsieur Gravel, yes, he is new, and perhaps he's not used to democratic debate. He, too, calls it a waste of time. In every committee when there's a motion on the floor, members are allowed to debate the motion. They're allowed to express themselves, and they can take two minutes or they can take ten minutes. That's their right as MPs, especially when we're representing the people who elected us. It's not wasting time. It's not *inutile*. It serves a useful function. That's the way the committee works.

I'm glad to see we're having some debate in this committee about a motion. Oftentimes, as I mentioned, Mr. Chair, we don't have debate, just a lot of arm waving, a lot of raising of voices, and then all of a sudden something, our

● (0945)

[Translation]

paths appear before us. How did we get here?

[English]

So I'm actually glad to see we're following some process and we're having some discussion and debate about, for example, the important work of witnesses, who the witnesses should be, and why they should be invited or not invited. As I mentioned before, MPs should be allowed the latitude of debate. That's the way it works around here. It's the same in the House. In the House you have a certain amount of time to express yourself, and you can be very narrow in your comments or you can be wider in your comments. But allow MPs the opportunity to express themselves.

Chair, I don't know why he feels threatened by that. I don't know why Monsieur Godin feels threatened by that. Why are they both up in arms about what we're discussing?

To go back to the issue of who could come in front of this committee, I'd just like to remind committee members that in 2003—so this is under the previous government—the Canada Public Service Agency was created and the Treasury Board Secretariat transferred its responsibilities to the Public Service Agency. The Public Service Agency is responsible, for example, for very hands-on types of implementation decisions and policy directives for establishing policies with respect to official languages within the public service. So if we have specific questions about who makes decisions—who's responsible for what, how does this work in this department, how does that translate over there, how is this being rolled out in the public service—we should be talking to the Canada Public Service Agency. It also has the responsibility to issue directives under parts IV, V, and VI of the Official Languages Act.

So if it can issue directives, I think these are the questions we have. This is the question Monsieur Godin raised at the end of the last meeting. The question he raised was that we're not sure who is responsible for what. I'm saying the Public Service Agency has very direct responsibilities. Yes, ask them direct questions. If they were here before and you didn't get the answers you wanted, well, I would say you either didn't ask your questions properly or you didn't obligate the witness to answer your specific questions, if you asked those specific questions.

The Public Service Agency also has a responsibility for evaluating the effectiveness and efficiency of its policies, so not only is it responsible for implementing, but the feedback loop is there as well. It is supposed to be evaluating the successes and the challenges, the weaknesses, the strengths, and then it would revise its policies to better implement the Official Languages Act within the public service. To me, that's where the questions need to be directed, and that's where we want to have our debate.

There are other things, Mr. Chair. While we're talking about this study we're doing, I'd like to raise an issue that's of concern to me, and that is that I have a hard time understanding something. We're working here as a committee, and we try to work together as MPs, but there are definitely parties at work here, right? The Liberal Party has a particular position on official languages and on the Official Languages Act and how it should be implemented, as does the NDP, as does the Bloc, as do the Conservatives. We're not always aligned perfectly. We try to accomplish our work, but I must admit that recently I've certainly become confused about where the Liberal Party is coming from. It actually affects the work on this committee, because we have four MPs here from the Liberal Party who are expressing the point of view, I suppose, of the Liberal Party as it applies to the Official Languages Act, as it applies to the *plan d'action* and its priority across Canada.

One of the things I would like to bring up are the comments concerning Justin Trudeau, because I feel there is confusion here between what he has said and what the members across are saying. I would like to discuss whether he might be an appropriate witness to bring in front of the committee because of some of the things he said. I want to remind the committee of some of the things he has said.

They're shaking their heads because it's a bit embarrassing for the Liberal Party, because there is this huge disconnect that is causing confusion. One of the areas—

● (0950)

[Translation]

Mr. Richard Nadeau: Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Nadeau.

Mr. Richard Nadeau: We're off track now. Aren't there rules stating that you're called back to order when you go off topic? He's talking to us about elections, about the person who, perhaps one day, we don't know, will be a candidate, and so on. We're completely off topic, which is the Action Plan for Official Languages. That's what I wanted to bring to your attention. I think Mr. Lemieux is doing a little too much ranting.

The Chair: In fact, Mr. Nadeau, that's a point of debate.

I would just like to remind members that we've been debating the motion for nearly an hour. There are two more speakers on the list. So I would invite Mr. Lemieux to—

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Certainly you can invite me. But to respond to the point of order, we are discussing who should be appearing in front of the committee, and we're saying that MPs should have the latitude to debate. So we're in the midst of a debate. As soon as they don't like something, they want to terminate the debate.

Hon. Raymond Simard: Try to be reasonable.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: It is reasonable. I'm explaining where the disconnect is. Justin Trudeau....

Could we have some order, Chair? I'm trying to talk.

[Translation]

The Chair: Please speak one at a time.

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Justin Trudeau is a member of the Liberal Party and a Liberal candidate.

[Translation]

He's a star candidate, well known across Canada, and he has said some embarrassing things.

I would like us to invite Mr. Justin Trudeau to this committee so we can clarify his position relative to that of committee members and that of the Liberal Party.

[English]

It's not because he's Justin Trudeau. He has made some significant comments regarding bilingualism and official languages. One of the things he has said, for example, is that unilingual anglophones and unilingual francophones are lazy if they do not pursue bilingualism.

This is important, because I don't understand the Liberal position on official languages. On the one hand they are saying here in committee that they support official languages, which is supposed to respect the choices of unilingual anglophones and unilingual francophones—

● (0955)

[Translation]

The Chair: Pardon me, Mr. Lemieux, but I must interrupt you. I would like to ask you to conclude on the subject of the motion. In fact, I would like to know your point of view on the motion, and for you to conclude, if possible.

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: No. I will address this, Chair.

At the beginning of the meeting Monsieur Godin tabled a motion, and we've allowed discussion on who should come in front of this committee pertaining to the work we're doing. No one cut me off when I was talking about the Canada Public Service Agency. I didn't see arms going up and people saying, "Oh that's irrelevant. Cut him off, get him back on track." We discussed bringing in other witnesses. I haven't heard push-back on that.

We are trying to finalize our work on official languages as the official languages committee. As part of the discussion on the motion, and in keeping with what we've been discussing all morning, I'm proposing a potential witness, and all of a sudden they're upset about this one. Why didn't they cut me off about the Canada Public Service Agency when I brought that up?

In accordance with the way the debate has been managed this morning, I'm raising a valid point that the Liberal members here advocate for official languages. They say they respect the choice of unilingual anglophones and unilingual francophones to be served in their own languages, and we're not to pressure them to pursue bilingualism, for example.

But we have a star candidate. He's not an unknown; he's a *candidat vedette*. There's even talk of his running for the leadership at some future point. He made headlines across Canada with his comments insulting unilingual anglophones and unilingual francophones across Canada. The Bloc should be interested in this because they—

[Translation]

The Chair: Mr. Godin, you wish to raise a point of order?

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Chairman, earlier Mr. Lemieux said that Mr. Godin introduced motions three minutes before the meeting ended. He also said that you were a very good chairman.

The Chair: That's a point of view, Mr. Godin.

Mr. Yvon Godin: I don't disagree on this Valentine's Day.

He hasn't introduced a motion. The motion we're discussing doesn't concern future witnesses. It asks that the minister appear before the committee. He doesn't even have the heart to introduce a motion to call for other witnesses. We've found a solution to his concern: we've said that the minister can be accompanied by whoever she wishes. We'll hold the meeting in a bigger room or at the Château Laurier if necessary. She can bring whoever she wishes, but let's move forward.

The Chair: Pardon me, I'm going—

Mr. Yvon Godin: Otherwise, let him say that it's obstruction and we'll drink coffee until 11 o'clock.

The Chair: I allow your point of order. I remind committee members that the discussions must be on the subject of the motion or propose amendments thereto, if that's the case. Of course, if committee members wish to introduce subjects that are not related to the subject under study, that may form the subject of a separate motion, with 48 hours' notice.

Mr. Lemieux, I turn the floor back over to you and ask you to state your intention to introduce an amendment or a change.

There's another point of order.

Mr. Petit.

Mr. Daniel Petit: Mr. Chairman, as Mr. Godin has been a member for a long time, perhaps he could help us. When a motion is under study, we can amend it, as far as I know.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez (Honoré-Mercier, Lib.): He just said that.

Mr. Daniel Petit: We're discussing and we may introduce amendments. I want to be sure I have clearly understood. We have

the right to introduce amendments immediately. Each amendment will be considered on its merits.

The Chair: Mr. Petit—

Mr. Daniel Petit: We're discussing the main motion.

The Chair: Mr. Petit, it's—

Mr. Daniel Petit: From the start, we've been asking Mr. Godin for explanations and we've been talking solely with him. In reality, all the questions put to you are directed to Mr. Godin. You aren't in question; it's Mr. Godin who is. We're trying to find out from Mr. Godin what the scope of Ms. Verner's testimony will be. Will she be testifying solely on the plan as a whole? We're simply trying to limit the debate.

• (1000)

The Chair: Thank you.

That's more of a point of debate than a point of order. I'm going to hand back over to Mr. Lemieux. If other speakers wish to be added to the list, it is still possible to do so.

I now ask Mr. Lemieux to conclude his argument.

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Well, no, I may not be ready to conclude.

Chair, this is how this committee works. When they're not happy, they just—

[Translation]

Mr. Jean-Claude D'Amours (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.): We're not even talking yet.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: He says he's not talking. That's an enormous contradiction because he just spoke. It's incredible.

[English]

Mr. Chair, this is how this committee works. When everything goes the way of the opposition, they are quite happy to move things along—and let's be slamming the gavel and let's be defining the future order of business and let's continue on. As soon as there's any resistance to what it is they want to do or any debate—Mr. Godin, obviously, is not used to debate here on the committee—then all of a sudden there are points of order.

There he goes....

[Translation]

The Chair: Mr. Godin.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Briefly, we agree to ask him to stop talking aimlessly. Let him introduce a motion and we'll study it. I want to have nothing to do with Justin Trudeau. He can walk from the Atlantic to the Pacific; that's not why we're here this morning. I want to know whether the minister is coming to testify or not. If he isn't satisfied with that, let him introduce a motion and we'll study it.

The Chair: That's not really a point of order, Mr. Godin.

There are a lot of interruptions. We've been debating for an hour. I'd like us to conclude the debate. We're going to break for a few minutes, if committee members consent to that. Otherwise, we'll continue.

•(1000)

(Pause)

•(1005)

[English]

The Chair: Welcome back, everybody.

Okay, *tout le monde*, let's go.

[Translation]

I would ask members to resume debate.

We took a little break. I remind you that we're debating Mr. Godin's motion. There are four speakers on the list: Messrs. Rodriguez, Harvey, Bélanger and Simard.

But first, Mr. Lemieux, you have the floor.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[English]

I was in the process of saying that I don't understand the position of the Liberal members. It's very confusing. The Liberal Party seems to be very divided on its view of official languages.

I bring up the case of Justin Trudeau. I am suggesting that we should talk to him as a committee to figure this out, because he made some highly offensive statements about unilingual anglophones and unilingual francophones, and he did it in front of 400 professors in Edmonton. This was not some sort of quiet discussion he had with someone; this was very public, and he is an approved Liberal candidate.

As I said, it was carried across Canada. For example, it was in *L'Acadie Nouvelle*, out in your part of the woods. It was in *La Presse*. It was in the *National Post*. It was in *Le Devoir*. This news is across Canada, and yet here we sit with this confusion.

•(1010)

[Translation]

Hon. Raymond Simard: Mr. Chairman, in all the committees on which I've sat, the discussion has had to relate to the motion—

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: And be non-repetitive.

Hon. Raymond Simard: — and must be non-repetitive. There are rules, Mr. Lemieux. You are someone who is really attached to the Standing Orders. It seems to me you should follow them.

Otherwise, if we talk about Mr. Trudeau, for our part, we'll want to talk about Mr. Harper and his comment that “bilingualism is the god that failed.” I'd really like to welcome Mr. Harper here. We'll never be done if we go down that road.

Mr. Chairman, we have to maintain a certain amount of decorum—we talked about that earlier—we have to discuss Mr. Godin's motion and decide whether or not we invite the minister to appear before the committee.

The Chair: Ultimately, you're raising a point of order to indicate that we have to hold relevant discussions.

This morning—

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Are they on the same point of order?

[Translation]

The Chair: Ultimately, this discussion concerns Mr. Godin's motion. Perhaps Mr. Lemieux would like to continue.

I would simply like to check as to whether you want to amend this motion, Mr. Lemieux, because if you want to submit another motion unrelated to the one we're debating, I would recommend that you state it in a separate motion and introduce it.

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Thank you for the advice, Mr. Chair, and thank you for the advice, Monsieur Simard.

My point is this. The conversation today actually started with your saying that the first part of the meeting would be public and that we would be discussing committee business. Then Monsieur Godin's motion came up. We began discussing his motion, but within the context of the debate of that motion we were trying to determine who should best meet with the committee as we finalize our report.

Our discussion this morning has not just been about the minister, it has been about—

[Translation]

Mr. Yvon Godin: I have a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair: One moment.

Mr. Godin.

Mr. Yvon Godin: I would like to remind you, Mr. Chairman, that, if you check the agenda, it states: “Committee Business — Motion from Yvon Godin”. That's what's entered under “Committee Business”.

[English]

Hon. Raymond Simard: That's number one.

[Translation]

Mr. Yvon Godin: It's not written that we have to hold a public meeting to discuss future business. It states: “Committee Business — Motion from Yvon Godin”. I would like you to take a look at the agenda and for us to stick to it.

The Chair: I allow your point of order in that debate must concern the motion and that there may be a vote on the motion. Subsequently, if there are other subjects—

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Great.

Monsieur Godin has proposed that the minister come in front of the committee. One of my proposals was that the minister not come in front of the committee because it might not be appropriate—this is part of debate—and that the Canada Public Service Agency come in front of the committee.

[Translation]

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Not again.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Well, you believe in democracy or—

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: No. How come your points of order are not points of order? They're points of debate.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Chair, Monsieur Lemieux said he believes in democracy and that people should talk. It's part of democracy and of the rules that you're allowed to ask for a point of order. If he believes in democracy, he should let me speak.

[Translation]

The Chair: You have a point of order on what subject?

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Great!

Mr. Yvon Godin: He said very clearly, Mr. Chair, that...if he wants a motion to not have the minister come, that would go against the motion—completely against the motion. The motion is for her to come. If he doesn't want her to come, he just has to vote against it. You cannot have a motion going against a motion. You cannot go contrary to the motion.

We have to deal with the motion, and if you don't like the motion you vote against the motion.

[Translation]

The Chair: The argument is that, if people aren't in favour of a motion, they may vote against it and propose a debate on the subject. That's more an item of information than a point of order. I'm going to ask you to—

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: I did not put forward a motion against his motion. I did not do that.

[Translation]

The Chair: One moment, please. One can of course make excessive use of procedures, but I would ask members to continue the debate and perhaps to let Mr. Lemieux speak.

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Okay. I would like to comment on what Mr. Godin is saying.

I did not suggest putting forward a motion against his motion. We are discussing his motion, and I'm allowed to have an opinion. I'm allowed to comment in my debate that I don't happen to think it's a good idea to have the minister. That doesn't mean I'm putting forward a motion directly contrary to his motion. It's part of debate.

I don't understand what these members here across the table don't understand about debate. I look at you, Mr. Rodriguez, and it's unfair because you've been most amiable this morning.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: I didn't speak today.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: It's your colleagues. I don't understand what they don't understand about debate.

The other thing about Mr. Godin is that he says a point of order takes precedence. It does; it takes precedence. When he says "point of order", it cuts into debate and you must deal with the point of order.

My point, Chair, is that most of his points of order are not points of order; they are points of debate, and there is—

• (1015)

Hon. Raymond Simard: Relevance is a point of order.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: An abuse of points of order goes on, not just in this committee and not just by Mr. Godin. It's in all committees. But I raise the point that the point of order is supposed to be a tool that cuts through debate to make a valid point of order, and most of the time it does not. It cuts through the debate, for sure, because the chairman has to recognize it; he doesn't know what the point of order is until it is explained to him. When it's explained to him, most of the time it's a point of debate.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: Why are you filibustering?

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: I'm not filibustering. What I want to do is discuss. What I am discussing is that we have been discussing—

[Translation]

Mr. Richard Nadeau: Try to say that without laughing.

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: These aren't lines; these are media reports. What I'm trying to show is that as we are trying to conclude our work on this committee, I think there are other witnesses we can bring forward rather than *Madame la Ministre*, ones that will be more pertinent. I mentioned the Canada Public Service Agency as one of them. I'm saying as well, as we're finishing our work, another appropriate witness would be Justin Trudeau because his comments, which have been broadcast across the country, confused Canadians as to the Liberal position regarding official languages. It's not just one time he has done this. He has made very negative comments about bilingualism three times. I just mentioned on this one why I think we don't need *Madame la Ministre*. We should have Justin Trudeau come because he insulted unilingual anglophones and unilingual francophones in the same sentence by calling them lazy. Then he went on to say....

[Translation]

He said, and I'll translate: "Sitting down and waiting for others to learn your language isn't just lazy, in fact it's shooting yourself in the foot, since you jeopardize your ability to speak to the rest of the world."

The Chair: Mr. Lemieux, I would ask you to speak to the motion, please.

Mr. Richard Nadeau: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair: If you have any amendments to move, I am prepared to receive them.

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: If I choose to table an amendment at the end, I will table an amendment at the end. If I choose not to...what we are discussing is Mr. Godin's motion—

Hon. Raymond Simard: You're filibustering to not bring the minister here.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Mr. Godin ended up—

Hon. Raymond Simard: Are you ashamed?

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: —putting forward a motion to invite the minister. During this debate we have discussed whether it is appropriate to have the minister come or whether it—

Hon. Raymond Simard: You're filibustering.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: No. What is it they don't like about debate? Whether or not to bring the minister—

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: If this guy were invited he would come any time, if he were minister, and she should come too.

A voice: Darn right.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: As I said, Chair, the minister has come every time we've asked the minister to come.

Hon. Raymond Simard: Bring her out.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: I'm trying to say that if we're going to be inviting different people to come—

Hon. Raymond Simard: But bring Harper, not his—

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: —then what we should be doing is inviting Justin Trudeau. So there's the pertinence right there. The pertinence is that we are looking at who should come before the committee as we finalize our work on the report. One suggestion, and the motion of Mr. Godin, is to invite *Madame la Ministre*.

[Translation]

Mr. Raymond Gravel: We know.

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Another suggestion of mine was to bring in the Canada Public Service Agency. A second proposal of mine is to bring in Justin Trudeau, because—and this is where it's relevant—we have four members of the opposition telling us or, I hope, advocating the position of the Liberal Party with respect to official languages, and we have Justin Trudeau, who is also a candidate, so he is a member of the Liberal Party in a very high-profile way, making comments that are directly opposed to official languages and to what official languages stand for.

[Translation]

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: Mr. Chairman, I have a valid point of order.

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: One of the points—

[Translation]

The Chair: Pardon me—

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: —that I'm bringing to—

[Translation]

The Chair: One moment, please. There is a point of order.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: Mr. Chairman, I have had the privilege of chairing this committee. I'm quite familiar with the Standing Orders as well.

Mr. Lemieux is engaging in a systematic obstruction, but he must do so in accordance with certain rules, including that of non-repetitiveness. He has to be quite good in order to waste everyone's time, but without repeating himself too much, which is not currently the case.

So you should cut him off and tell him that, if he wishes to continue this systematic obstruction and thus to continue wasting everyone's time, he should repeat himself a little less.

• (1020)

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: I have new information.

[Translation]

The Chair: I'm going—

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: For example, new information is that in the—

[Translation]

The Chair: Pardon me. I'm going to accept this reminder of the parliamentary rules made by Mr. Rodriguez.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: It's true that it's valid, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect.

The Chair: Of course, all committee members feel that each person's time is precious. I would therefore ask you to be brief and concise and to present new information to the committee.

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Absolutely.

The reason I repeated some of the things I was saying is that—

[Translation]

Mr. Richard Nadeau: He admits it, too.

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: —both you and my colleagues were asking me to explain the relevance, so I was explaining it again. I'd already explained it once, but I was asked the question a second time so I explained it a second time.

If they're going to repeat their questions, they're going to get a repetitive answer.

I'm willing to move on.

When Monsieur Justin Trudeau insulted unilingual anglophones and francophones across Canada, he insulted 22 million unilingual Canadians. As I'm pointing out, this is not the first time he has done this.

If you remember back in May, for example, it says here in *La Presse*:

[Translation]

The Leader of the Liberal Party yesterday disavowed Justin Trudeau, one week after he was elected as the Liberal candidate for the riding of Papineau. According to Stéphane Dion, Mr. Trudeau erred in advocating the abolition of separate Anglophone and Francophone education systems [...]

[English]

Education is part of our—

[Translation]

The Chair: Mr. Parliamentary Secretary, I apologize for interrupting you. I am prepared to hear you provide information, but to the extent it is relevant to the motion. However, I find at this time that it is not.

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: I'll have to repeat what I said before. The motion started with Monsieur Godin inviting the minister. That's what the motion is about. The debate is about whether or not the minister should be invited and who else we can—

[Translation]

Mr. Richard Nadeau: Then vote against the motion, that's all.

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Why do you try to railroad debate into this very narrow channel? Debate is supposed to be open, the widest possible debate.

[Translation]

Hon. Raymond Simard: I have a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Would you please repeat Mr. Lemieux's motion.

[English]

I would like him to repeat the motion so you understand.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: The chair can repeat the motion.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean-Claude D'Amours: In both official languages perhaps?

The Chair: Can you read us the motion, please?

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Graeme Truelove): Mr. Godin moves:

That the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Status of Women and Official Languages, the Hon. Josée Verner, be immediately called upon to appear before the Standing Committee on Official Languages as part of its study on the Action Plan for Official Languages.

Hon. Raymond Simard: Mr. Chairman, we're not talking about other guests or future committee business. The motion proposes that we invite the minister immediately. If Mr. Lemieux does not agree, then let him say so and we'll move on to the vote.

I think that, from the standpoint of democracy, we've been more than reasonable, Mr. Lemieux. You've had the chance to speak on behalf of your fellow citizens. You nevertheless have to be fair. If your fellow citizens saw you in action today, they would be embarrassed.

All we're asking is simply that the minister appear before the committee. It seems to me this is a reasonable motion.

The Chair: We've now repeated the motion.

Mr. Lemieux, do you have anything else to add to that?

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: I go back to the point at the end of the last meeting, when this first came up. The issue or the concern was that the committee did not have an understanding of a certain part of the work that we had undertaken.

Monsieur Godin, in his opening remarks today, commented that in order to finish our work we invite the minister. What's up for debate is that motion: should we be inviting the minister or should we be inviting other people?

Mr. Yvon Godin: No.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Well, I didn't hear any protest—

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: Well, you can't hear everything; you speak all the time.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: —when I was talking about the Public Service Agency of Canada. I was making points about inviting the Public Service Agency of Canada. Everybody was all right with that, because I was—

[Translation]

Mr. Yvon Godin: I have a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

There has been an objection, in one sense, because we said that, if she wanted to bring it, she could do so. If we want to invite Justin Trudeau, let her invite him.

With all due respect, the motion does not propose that we invite the minister and any other person who we think should appear before the committee. The debate isn't open yet. It's the minister, yes or no.

• (1025)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Godin. You're raising a point of debate.

Mr. Lemieux.

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: What I'm saying is that the Liberal Party itself has disavowed Justin Trudeau and yet he's getting headlines as a Liberal member—not as a member of Parliament but as a member of the Liberal Party and as one of their candidates—and it's news that affects the—

[Translation]

Hon. Raymond Simard: Mr. Trudeau, who is a Liberal candidate, has nothing to do with the motion.

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: He will assist us, Chair, in finalizing our work, because I'd like clarification on the Liberal position—

[Translation]

The Chair: I don't want to limit the members' right of expression, but they must obey the parliamentary rules that have been set. These are the two parameters in question. In that sense, your point of order is relevant, Mr. Simard. It's important that the subjects proposed be relevant to the motion.

The point is whether it's relevant to the debate. I ask you to stick to those elements that concern the motion relating to Ms. Verner. I feel that the points you've raised are not directly related to the motion, Mr. Lemieux.

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Okay, here's a fundamental concern I have.

We're putting together a report for the *plan d'action*, right? Commenting on the future *plan d'action*, our government, in its Speech from the Throne, said that it was committed to implementing a *plan d'action*. So we've called in front of us certain witnesses, and topics have come up—for example, education. One of the discussions in education is that we're talking about offering French training, we're talking about offering English language instruction, we're talking about offering immersion-type programs. What I'm saying is that I don't understand the Liberal position right now, and it's obviously going to have an impact on the report.

What we are discussing is this finalization of the report. What I'm saying is that there's confusion, because here in front of the committee we have members saying, you know, we respect the choice of unilingual anglophones and unilingual francophones to pursue their language choices. But we have a star Liberal candidate speaking publicly, in front of 400 professors this time, in news that is carried across the country, saying he doesn't support that. So I'd like some clarification.

When we get to certain sections—

[Translation]

The Chair: Mr. Godin.

Mr. Yvon Godin: You said that the point I made could be debated and did not constitute a point of order. And yet you had just said that we had to stick to the motion. So that was a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

If we want to go in that direction, we'll summon the Conservative Party's witnesses who said that Francophones cost Canadians too much money. Do they want to have a debate on what costs a lot of money? We could also talk about the comments the former Reform Party made. Do you want us to talk about that or about the action plan? If you want us to summon witnesses, we can do that by sending them a subpoena. They'll tell you why we cost you too much money. Is that what you want?

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Godin. That's a point of debate, but one that brings us back to the broader debate, the one that concerns the motion.

Mr. Lemieux, go ahead.

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Just let me say this. I'm surprised at Mr. Godin's position, because he is a strong defender of official languages and the policy's implementation. He's been a longstanding member of the committee, so I'm surprised that he is not concerned about the comments that were made insulting unilingual francophones and unilingual anglophones.

Mr. Yvon Godin: I was concerned about Reform insulting us too.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: What I will say, Mr. Chair, is that I will table a motion with the committee, with 48 hours' notice, to pursue this later. I think it's an important point, and I think the Liberals have to clarify their position with respect to official languages, so I will give consideration to tabling a motion.

With respect to the specific wording of this motion, as Monsieur Godin was kind enough to have it read out again, if we want to have the minister come.... I believe the motion started because you wanted

the minister to come to explain how official languages is managed within the government and its governmental departments. I think we should modify this motion to identify that.

One of the concerns I mentioned before is that there may be questions from opposition members that come up about the action plan, the priorities, what Monsieur Bernard Lord has said, what advice she is receiving, what her plan is moving forward—and she won't be able to answer those questions.

If Mr. Godin wants to be fair in allowing the minister to prepare appropriately for the committee, then it can't just be a wide-open blank cheque when she comes, which is the way in which the motion is worded right now. I think it would be advantageous if the motion were amended to say what we are going to be asking her, what we are going to be talking to her about. If we're going to be talking to her about—

• (1030)

Hon. Raymond Simard: We're not governed by Harper; we can ask her what we want. I'm sorry, you guys may be muzzled, but we're not.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Do you see the point, Mr. Chair?

An hon. member: Muzzle, muzzle.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: So there's lots of concern with this particular motion.

Again, as soon as you enter into debate on the motion, they get all upset. Actually, I think this has been a good practice in debate, Mr. Chair, because they're not used to debate in this committee.

Mr. Yvon Godin: We're not used to being muzzled, that's why.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Muzzled? Today you would say I haven't been muzzled. That's your point, I think.

Hon. Raymond Simard: Mr. Chair, I'd like him to table the 200-page document they have on disrupting committees, please.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Is that a point of order, Mr. Chair?

Hon. Raymond Simard: Absolutely.

[Translation]

The Chair: I don't think the tabling of documents can be the subject of a point of order, Mr. Simard.

Hon. Raymond Simard: No?

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Back to my point, where debates get interrupted—

[Translation]

The Chair: Mr. Lemieux, I want to remind you that you have the floor, but that you are not required to respond to what you hear.

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: I know. I'm trying to be charitable. It's Valentine's Day.

[Translation]

The Chair: Otherwise, that's a debate, and I don't know—

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: I hear a question from my colleagues, and I'm trying to be friendly. I'm trying to respond to their concern, that's all.

[English]

I would like to suggest that the motion be more specific, so that the minister knows what the committee is going to be asking her about. Right now it's just a wide-open issue.

But that's not where the motion started. The motion started with wanting to know more about who is responsible for making certain decisions within the government. I have pointed out, I think quite accurately, that the Canada Public Service Agency plays the key role of implementation, and the kinds of questions that were raised would be answered by the Canada Public Service Agency, not by the minister.

How that works is also not necessarily germane to the report we're doing, which is to identify areas that need further development with respect to the action plan.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Lemieux.

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: My time is already up.

The Chair: Mr. Rodriguez.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: Mr. Chairman, I have nothing to say. I'll say nothing so that we can continue.

• (1035)

The Chair: All right.

On the list, we have Messrs. Harvey, Bélanger, Simard and Petit.

Mr. Luc Harvey: I have a question for Mr. Godin. I don't know whether he'll be able to answer me or whether we can proceed this way. Are we summoning the minister so that she talks about the old program or the next program?

The Chair: With members' permission, the question will be put to the sponsor of the motion.

Mr. Luc Harvey: I don't know whether it can work that way.

The Chair: With unanimous consent, this question is put to the sponsor of the motion.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Chairman, I've never given my questions to the public or the minister in advance. I've never done it, and I won't start doing it today. Giving out my questions is certainly not a feature of my political career. We're studying the action plan. All I can tell you is that it concerns the action plan.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Godin.

Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Luc Harvey: As the old plan will come to an end very soon, it would be difficult to go back to it. That's why I asked that question. Considering the new plan and the report that will be presented in a few days, the minister won't be able to make any comments, if she appears before the report comes out.

Mr. Godin, we're talking about the study of the action plan. Sincerely, I'm not trying to make a speech that will take two hours, but to try to clarify the situation. The old plan will come to an end in two or three weeks. A new plan and a report will soon be tabled. If we want to talk about the old plan, I have some questions because there are two weeks left. However, if we want to talk about the next plan, a report will be coming out in the next few days. Do we have to wait for that report to come out?

I've tried in good faith to see with you whether we could find some meaning to the minister's coming. I asked you that question in order to be as efficient as possible. I'm not asking you to reveal your cards; that's not the objective.

The Chair: We'll continue with the people on the list.

Mr. Yvon Godin: He can continue, unless he has finished. If he has only one question, that's fine.

The Chair: If there is unanimous consent.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Chairman, I want to be clear. We're studying the action plan and making recommendations for the next action plan. We want to know the minister's position so that we can prepare our report on the next action plan. When the new action plan comes out, perhaps we'll ask the minister again to come and explain her new action plan. The old action plan will clearly expire soon. The purpose of this committee is to study the old action plan and to make proposals for the next one. The purpose of our discussions is to prepare the government's next action plan, and some of our questions have not been answered.

I think it is honourable to ask the minister to come to the committee. They seem to be saying the minister can't answer questions. If the minister can't answer the questions, she'll say so and she'll inform the committee of that. I'm sure the minister is competent, and she will be accompanied by a competent team. She can read the blues of our one-hour and 40-minute discussion, and she'll know where we're heading. We're preparing a report on the action plan so that we can comment on it and say what we would like it to contain.

The Chair: Thank you for that clarification, Mr. Godin.

Mr. Bélanger.

Hon. Mauril Bélanger: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to let the others speak so that we can vote on this motion this morning.

The Chair: Mr. Simard, go ahead, please.

Hon. Raymond Simard: Mr. Chairman, I too think we've said all there is to say on the question. The debate has been interesting, but I propose that we move on to the vote.

The Chair: There remains Mr. Petit.

Mr. Daniel Petit: I agree with my colleague. May I move a subamendment to the motion?

I don't want to shock you, Mr. Godin, but, with the text as it's worded now, you're going fishing, and I don't want to go. For this to be efficient once and for all, if the minister appears before this committee, she'll know—at the risk of displeasing Mr. Gravel—that she is competent enough to answer the questions.

• (1040)

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: That's impossible: she isn't.

Mr. Daniel Petit: So I'm going to move the following amendment.

The Chair: Order, Mr. Rodriguez.

Mr. Daniel Petit: I would like to amend the motion so that it reads as follows: That the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Status of Women and Official Languages, the Hon. Josée Verner, be immediately called upon to appear before the Standing Committee on Official Languages as part of its study on the old Action Plan for Official Languages, and solely in the context of the plan's application in the federal public service and the language industries [...]

The Chair: Could you reread it slowly, please?

Mr. Daniel Petit: After "as part of its study", I would put instead "on the old Action Plan".

The Chair: Where do you want to make that change?

Mr. Daniel Petit: It's in the third line of the English version, following the words "as part of its study". I want to amend the motion so that it reads "on the old Action Plan for Official Languages", since there isn't a new one. With the words "and solely", I limit the debate to prevent anyone from going fishing. So we would say "and solely in the context of the plan's application in the federal public service". It's strictly in that perspective that we should prepare the report.

Mr. Luc Harvey: That's what we're talking about.

Mr. Daniel Petit: It's not about that. With all due respect, Mr. Godin is quite capable and knows how to manoeuvre in the context of a committee. I don't have that skill. He knows how to do it. He knows that, if the reason why the minister must appear is not limited, they'll go fishing. That way, he hopes to catch a fish or a whale, just to make the headlines. That's not what we want. As parliamentarians, we want to ensure that the amount allocated to the public service is well spent. That's our role as parliamentarians, regardless of the party to which we belong. We have to delimit the framework of the minister's testimony solely based on the report.

As Mr. Godin said, she will have an hour and a quarter to read the blues and see what was said. Depending on the questions that are put to her, she will be able to go into details. This is a question of governance, not just application. It shouldn't be forgotten that we may frequently hear the answer, "I don't know."

Mr. Bélanger said he had been minister of official languages. He probably knows exactly how that was applied. Mr. Simard, who was his parliamentary secretary, would be an excellent witness. Those two men know how things were done. An error may have been committed at that time—in good faith, it's understood.

I'm speaking on behalf of the minister, without having to testify for her. She cannot come and testify about subjects she does not know. Messrs. Simard and Bélanger would be the most interesting witnesses. They would be able to explain to us what happened, where the errors were made and what was subsequently done. That would be interesting. The minister can only say that she has read the blues and that, in the current situation, this is about governance. I agree with Mr. Bélanger on this point: it is indeed a governance issue. However, governance is politics. We are inviting the minister in her capacity as minister, and in the context of her political role, in order to find out where we are headed. I would like the debate to focus solely on the report that we intend to table. I wouldn't want to go beyond that framework.

I've just learned that Mr. Godin does not want to be forced to submit his questions in advance. I understand why: he wants to go fishing. It's as simple as that. That's what I don't want to see happen. Mr. Godin is an excellent parliamentarian, who knows how to manoeuvre well.

Mr. Richard Nadeau: Mr. Chairman, that's very disrespectful.

The Chair: You have a point of order?

Mr. Richard Nadeau: Yes, I have a point of order. It is condescending toward one's colleagues to presume that a member doesn't know how to direct his questions, that he is going fishing and that he doesn't address a file in a logical and concise manner. In this case, Mr. Petit has just demonstrated that the Conservative Party is disrespectful, that it is engaging in high politics rather than advancing this motion. That's utterly unacceptable.

I ask you, in your capacity as Chairman, to recall the agenda and explain to your colleagues—

• (1045)

Mr. Luc Harvey: That isn't a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Richard Nadeau: —to explain to your colleagues....

I'm talking; you'll talk afterwards.

Mr. Luc Harvey: I have a point of order.

Mr. Richard Nadeau: —and to explain to your colleagues, Mr. Chairman, that we are here to move the files forward, that they must respect members and that when we ask for something as simple as meeting a minister, it's not simply to waste the time of parliamentarians and the citizens who elect us. On the contrary, it's to move issues forward. That's not what's being shown by the Conservative Party, which is a shame in this debate.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair: All right.

Mr. Daniel Petit: May I, Mr. Chairman?

The Chair: I'm going to finish with Mr. Nadeau.

Mr. Nadeau, there is a point of order, but your speech may form the subject of a debate as well. Your comment is like a hybrid.

Mr. Yvon Godin: That's going to cost you 176 hours of taxes.

The Chair: I'm going to ask Mr. Harvey to speak to the point of order. Then I would like us to go back to Mr. Petit's amendment.

Mr. Luc Harvey: After Mr. Nadeau's distractions, Mr. Godin's questions were in good faith, as to whether we're talking about the old or the new plan. We're seeking clarification. I think that directly concerns the debate. If Mr. Nadeau is really doing something else than listening, that's not my problem. I believe that Daniel and I have been particularly respectful. There were no words. If saying that someone is going fishing is disrespectful, the Bloc québécois has reached the height of linguistic sensitivity.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: I have a point of order.

The Chair: Just a moment; we'll let Luc finish.

Mr. Luc Harvey: The questions that were put to Mr. Godin were related to the debate. I believe they were fair and relevant, and Mr. Godin answered them; that's it. The questions that my colleague Daniel Petit just raised are extremely relevant to the debate. I sit on other committees and I know that the Standing Committee on Official Languages isn't the only one that tries to determine what the debate will be about when the minister visits.

We're talking about an old program that lasted five years. We're presenting the conclusions of this program and we are proposing a new program, about which a report will be coming out soon. We will agree to say that this is a fairly broad topic. In saying "going fishing", Daniel was perhaps a little hard, but the scope of the debate is expanding greatly. Requesting clarification on what the debate will be about is particularly relevant, with all due deference to my Bloc québécois colleagues. That's the minimum amount of respect we can show the minister, who will be coming to answer questions. That will help her prepare.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Harvey.

Mr. Rodriguez, you have a point of order.

Mr. Pablo Rodriguez: Mr. Chairman, the situation today calls for apologies, and I'm weighing my words. They should apologize to the Minister of Canadian Heritage for referring to her as incompetent. If they are protecting her in this way, then they don't have confidence in her, Mr. Chairman. They should apologize.

The Chair: Mr. Rodriguez, that's a point that we can debate.

Hon. Raymond Simard: He raised a valid point.

The Chair: It's not a point of order. We'll go back to Mr. Petit's amendment.

Mr. Yvon Godin: Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The Chair: You have a point of order, Mr. Godin?

Mr. Yvon Godin: Yes, I have a point of order.

Mr. Chairman, the motion is clear. It states: "[...] as part of its study on the Action Plan for Official Languages."

The Chair: That's not a point of order. We can let Mr. Petit speak.

Mr. Petit, go ahead on the subject of your amendment.

Mr. Yvon Godin: He's answering my questions in advance.

Mr. Daniel Petit: I'd like to answer Mr. Godin. He asks a question; I think he has a right to an answer. The fact is that we have previously studied other parts of the action plan, we've even previously prepared a report, and so on. We are currently on a specific part of the action plan concerning the public service. That's what was agreed. I think Mr. Godin's motion should reflect what's currently being studied, that is to say the application of the old plan to the federal public service. That's the sole purpose of our efforts.

For it to be well prepared, if witnesses or other persons have to accompany the minister, we have to know exactly what to expect. Let's suppose there is a question and we're told that this isn't the department's responsibility, it's just so we can work.

• (1050)

The Chair: With your permission, simply to clarify matters, I'm going to reread the motion, just to recall, Mr. Petit, that the mandate concerns the study of the federal public service, but also of the language industries.

Pardon me, Mr. Petit.

Mr. Luc Harvey: It isn't just to—

The Chair: I said I simply wanted to remind you that the study we're currently conducting, the report that we want to discuss once we're in camera—the way things are going, that could be at the next meeting, I inform you right away, since time is passing—concerns not only the federal public service, but also the language industries. That's in the first chapter; I can't talk about it, but...

I'm going to reread the motion that you wish to amend:

That the Minister of Canadian Heritage, Status of Women and Official Languages, the Hon. Josée Verner, be immediately called upon to appear before the Standing Committee on Official Languages as part of its study on the old Action Plan for Official Languages, and solely in the context of the plan's application in the federal public service [...]

Mr. Luc Harvey: "[...] and the language industries."

Mr. Daniel Petit: The language industry: the title of the plan, that's it.

The Chair: So that's—

Mr. Daniel Petit: It's a question of government. Mr. Bélanger has grasped exactly what it's about; you can see he was previously a minister.

The Chair: I would be prepared to receive comments on Mr. Petit's amendment.

Mr. Raymond Gravel: We're voting. I'm ready to vote.

Mr. Jean-Claude D'Amours: Mr. Chairman, since no one is on the list, I request a vote.

The Chair: No one's on the list. Do the members wish to proceed with the vote on the amendment? We'll proceed with the vote on the amendment.

(Amendment negated)

Hon. Raymond Simard: Now we vote on the main motion?

The Chair: Do committee members wish to vote on the main motion?

Mr. Jean-Claude D'Amours: Mr. Chairman, I request a recorded vote, please.

The Chair: So it will be a recorded vote. I'll let the clerk call the names.

(Motion agreed to: yeas 7; nays 3)

The Chair: In view of the time, we'll continue the study of the report in camera at the next meeting.

Thank you.

The meeting is adjourned.

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

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

**Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address:
Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à l'adresse suivante :
<http://www.parl.gc.ca>**

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.