



House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities

TRAN • NUMBER 029 • 3rd SESSION • 40th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Tuesday, October 26, 2010

—
Chair

Mr. Merv Tweed

Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities

Tuesday, October 26, 2010

• (1105)

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum (Markham—Unionville, Lib.)): Good morning.

I think we will begin now. We're considering Bill C-509, beginning with clause 1.

I'm sorry. Mr. Tweed is going to make a statement.

Mr. Merv Tweed (Brandon—Souris, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Very briefly, as you consider my bill clause by clause, I would explain the impetus behind it. During the course of a campaign, I discovered that Canada Post offers libraries a reduced rate to move books back and forth across not only the province but across the country, and this amendment will actually put that discounted postal rate into legislation. That was the intent, so that libraries could feel confident that they weren't going to wake up some morning and find the rates had either been increased to full retail, or any amount, and that if Canada Post were to decide to increase the amount, it would have to come to the executive council of cabinet for a final decision.

There are a couple of amendments being proposed. I have seen them and I certainly agree with them. With that, I thank the committee for its hard work and also the House for its unanimous approval to bring the bill forward to committee.

Thank you.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Thank you very much, Mr. Tweed.

Now we'll go to a round of questions or comments, beginning with Bonnie Crombie.

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie (Mississauga—Streetsville, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to thank the member for the bill. I do support it, as my party does support greater service and access for affordable library materials for all Canadians, especially Canadians in rural and remote areas, seniors, and Canadians with disabilities, and we think this bill may do that. Canadians rely on the book rate for transferring materials across the country, as we know.

Libraries have become dependent on the book rate; this allows them to transfer the material more comfortably around the country. It's imperative that our libraries are well stocked, and we are concerned that the larger metropolitan libraries would stockpile or hoard some of the more modern media that's available, without the

ability to transfer them affordably. So I commend you for this initiative, as that will assist, in a very cost-effective way, to transfer materials.

I do have a couple of questions for you. I wondered if you had considered how we can ensure that Canada Post maintains this reduced library book rate for a greater amount of time, not necessarily in perpetuity.

Mr. Merv Tweed: The intent of putting the amendment forward into the legislation was to eliminate the doubt that some of the libraries had. As it stands now, Canada Post can raise that rate without any formality, and that was the fear that libraries had. By ensconcing it into legislation, it actually means that before Canada Post can raise the rate, it would have to come before Parliament.

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: Is there not a concern that it could be repealed through orders in council?

Mr. Merv Tweed: Yes, it could be, but I would think that any responsible government would think twice about doing something like that. That's why I wanted it to be brought before parliamentarians for that decision, because I think it would be very difficult for members of Parliament to go back to their communities and say they voted against our libraries.

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: How often can Canada Post seek an increase in the library book rate today?

Mr. Merv Tweed: Right now they have the ability to do it whenever they choose.

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: How often do they do it?

Mr. Merv Tweed: They haven't done it for the last several years, but it's a year-to-year agreement, and this would actually guarantee that before they can increase the rate, they would have to come before Parliament. That's the intent of what I'm trying to do.

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: The bill will confirm that Parliament's approval is necessary before the rate be increased, decreased, or changed in any way.

Mr. Merv Tweed: Absolutely.

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: We know there's a small loss in revenue for Canada Post. It's small, and certainly it's probably worthwhile as a cost of doing business in providing this service. Is there any thought to compensating Canada Post for the greater revenue loss that this will certainly predict?

Mr. Merv Tweed: There is a clause in the bill that addresses that. My thinking is that over time, as we move away from books into video, I hope we'll actually reduce the cost to Canada Post.

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: My final question is this. I had a thought that if we put a timeframe around this to allow a review of the book rate so that we would ensure that the rate would come under review over a specific and set timeframe, no matter what it be—I was suggesting every ten years, but it could be sooner, it could be later—it would help protect Canada Post and it would help protect the libraries as well. Do you have any thoughts about that?

Mr. Merv Tweed: I have no objection to it. In fact, one of the discussions I had early in preparing the bill was that all legislation should come under review after a period of time to make sure it's working and doing what it was implied to do, but also to hear the concerns from the parties that are involved in it.

I have no problem with that at all.

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: Thank you very much.

[Translation]

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): We will continue with Mr. Guimond or Mr. Nadeau. It is your turn.

Mr. Michel Guimond (Montmorency—Charlevoix—Haute-Côte-Nord, BQ): I share Ms. Crombie's concerns regarding the duration of the rate. I think it is a good amendment by the Liberals. I have no other questions.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): That is it?

Mr. Bevington, your turn.

Mr. Michel Guimond: You are not used to hearing that sort of thing out of me.

Some hon. members: Ha, ha!

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Okay.

[English]

Mr. Dennis Bevington (Western Arctic, NDP): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I really don't have much to add to this, other than to say congratulations on getting a bill through Parliament unanimously.

I have a question on the amendments. Are you satisfied with the nature of the amendments, that they will assist your bill?

Mr. Merv Tweed: Yes. What I've seen is that it's really more just for clarification of the language on two of them, and the other one is removing "Heritage" and replacing it with "the Government of Canada". I have no problem with either.

Mr. Dennis Bevington: Okay.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Mr. Jean.

• (1110)

Mr. Brian Jean (Fort McMurray—Athabasca, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And thank you for presenting this bill today.

Representing one of the largest rural constituencies in Canada, I have had overwhelming support for this bill from my post offices, especially in the small communities—some 47 in Alberta. So thank you very much for this.

I have just one question in relation to it. Is this not about a modernization? My understanding is that you can send a book somewhere under the reduced library rate, but you couldn't send, for instance, a CD or a DVD, even though it would contain exactly the same material. It would cost a lot less to send.

I see that your proposal is a modernization and a fixture of cost and availability to Canadian libraries from coast to coast. Is that a fair way to put it?

Mr. Merv Tweed: That's very much what we're trying to do, obviously, with the new genre of reading material. You don't have to travel very far out of this room to find people reading tablets. Again, I think it's a benefit to Canada Post over time. I don't think it's going to happen overnight, but you can send 15 discs for the same cost as you can send one book.

Mr. Brian Jean: Thank you very much for finding the consistency among all parties to support a good piece of legislation.

Mr. Merv Tweed: Thank you.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): If there are no more people wishing to ask questions, we'll go to clause-by-clause.

Does anybody else want to say anything?

(On clause 1)

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): I think there might be an amendment proposed.

Mr. Jean.

Mr. Brian Jean: Yes, Mr. Chair. In clause 1, what we are doing is a clarification regarding the original clause 1 so that there is no uncertainty.

I'm sorry, Mr. Chair, but I've lost my notes here.

The installation of the definition of "library materials"... My understanding is that there would be, with the original one that was proposed, the consistency to suggest that it includes...so it's not fully encompassing. In the original one, if memory serves me correctly at this stage, it says that "library materials" includes, etc. It is not totally inclusive. With this amendment, what we're trying to propose is that it would be totally inclusive, so it wouldn't just include, but it would be "means".

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Monsieur Guimond.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Guimond: Mr. Chair, the Bloc Québécois will vote against the amendment put forward by the government. We feel that the English term "means" is too restrictive, when the bill talks about being inclusive. It provides a lot more flexibility and is much more suited to new technologies when passing legislation. Of course, an act can be amended and improved. It has to be an evolving mechanism. I think we should keep the idea of inclusiveness, instead of being more specific and restrictive by using the term "means". So we will vote against the government's amendment.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Are there any other interventions?

Bonnie.

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: Maybe I can ask for clarification from the French translators. I think the French definition is more restrictive than the English definition is, and I think you are missing the word “materials”, after “audio-visual”.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Mr. Jean.

Mr. Brian Jean: All I can say is my understanding is that's exactly the purpose of the motion, to align the French with the English.

I'm not certain why Monsieur Guimond does not want to make sure that what we intend them to utilize through the service is defined exactly, but the government is totally amenable to any change that would reflect the English in the French, of course, and to have the consistency between them, because that's exactly what we're trying to do.

Possibly Monsieur Guimond, or someone else who is fluently bilingual, would be able to propose that.

I'm not sure, Ms. Crombie, if you....

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: No, it just seemed more restrictive. I think we are missing “video cassettes”, but I could be wrong, and maybe that's what “disques” is.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Usually the French is longer than the English, and this time the French is way shorter. I can't imagine that it's exactly the same.

• (1115)

Mr. Brian Jean: Mr. Chair, I think the difficulty is that if we do not restrict the definition, we're suggesting that the legislation will leave it open for parties to do their own interpretation of what is or is not able to be utilized under the book rate. I think what we're trying to do is have certainty in relation to the legislation itself so that people who utilize the service know exactly what they are entitled to send through Canada Post.

If Monsieur Guimond has another idea on how to enlarge the definition while ensuring that there's no uncertainty, I think the government is more than happy to be amenable to that.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Guimond: The point is to keep “*documents de bibliothèque*” *Livres, magazines* [...]” in the French version. The point is to keep the wording before us in its entirety.

The words “*inclure notamment*” could be added to the French version. The same could be added to the English version with the words “include *notamment*”.

How do you say “*notamment*” in English?

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Okay, so between Monsieur Guimond and Monsieur Proulx, maybe we can get a French version.

[Translation]

Mr. Marcel Proulx (Hull—Aylmer, Lib.): I'd like to know...

Michel, in the first line of the proposed amendment, what do the letters “*nes*” refer to?

Mr. Michel Guimond: You have to look at the wording of the bill.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: I have it.

Mr. Michel Guimond: The letters “*nes*” refer to the last letters in the word “*magazines*” in the bill. It is on line 2 of the proposed wording.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: Fine. So we do not have the same wording.

Mr. Michel Guimond: You have to look at the bill.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: I understand, but I am looking.

An hon. member: We are working on the English version. The word “include”....

[English]

It should be “includes, amongst others”. You don't have the right word.

Mr. Michel Guimond: It should be “amongst others”.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Mr. Bevington.

Mr. Dennis Bevington: I think the problem actually lies with the English, not with the French. “Library materials” in English is different from “*documents de bibliothèque*”. “Library materials” in English opens up too broad a definition. It could include anything that's used in a library. The English version needs to be brought down, whereas the French version, which speaks to the “*documents de bibliothèque*”, clearly identifies it with the product of a library.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): So are you proposing an amendment to the English version of the amendment?

Mr. Dennis Bevington: I'd say that I would support this amendment, and I trust that the French language version would remain the same.

Mr. Merv Tweed: One of the concerns I had, even as I was proposing this, was the definition of “library materials”. I think what the English is trying to do is actually define what it is. If you say “library materials”, it could be a chair, if it's in a library.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Yes, Monsieur Guimond.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Guimond: Mr. Jean said that I was perfectly bilingual, but I do not make that claim. However, I speak Canada's other official language better than he does. It is simply an observation, I am not trying to insult him.

In my opinion, the word “means” corresponds to “*signifie quelque chose*” in French, especially grants.

We are working on the English version, so do not agonize over the French version. The amendment has to do with the English version. The word “means” is used to refer to books, magazines, records, CDs, CD-ROMs. Why would you not say:

• (1120)

[English]

“library materials” means, amongst others”.

[Translation]

That way, it would not be restrictive or limiting. If you have some sort of electronic medium that is not a book, a magazine, a record, a CD or a CD-ROM, libraries will not be able to take advantage of the reduced rate, as Mr. Tweed's bill purports to achieve.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Does that mean you're suggesting that the English be amended to say, "means, amongst other things"?

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Guimond: Forgive me, I did not understand.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): You are proposing an amendment to the English version, instead of what there is now:

[English]

"library materials' means, amongst other things".

Mr. Michel Guimond: Yes, "amongst other things, books, magazines, records".

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Okay.

Mr. Jean.

Mr. Brian Jean: The difficulty with that is that, again, as the proponent, Mr. Tweed, said in this case, library materials means, amongst other things...what you're allowing is chairs to be shipped, or other things like that. The difficulty long term for this legislation is that we want to make sure the cost to Canada Post is in line with what they're actually sending, so that it's not abused by people who would abuse it. We want to make sure it's a long-term program, and if the list is not restrictive, it allows people to send or to expect to send things through the post that they're not entitled to send.

I understand what Monsieur Guimond is trying to avoid. It's exactly why we're here today, to make sure we can modernize it. I'm wondering if maybe, instead of "means, amongst other things", we could have some direction as far as similarity of other things. For instance, "library materials' means books, magazines, records, CDs, audiocassettes, CD-ROMs, videocassettes", etc., "and other similar materials" or "other similar library materials".

The difficulty is we're trying to tighten the list so that it's not abused, and if we allow it to be open-ended...I mean, frankly, I don't see how the program can continue. That's the difficulty.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): You're saying amend it, and instead of saying, "and other audio-visual", you'd say, "and other similar library materials".

That sounds reasonable to me.

Mr. Brian Jean: My proposal would actually make it restrictive, but I think it's a workable compromise.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Bonnie.

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: I'd like to ask the member what the problem was with the original definition. I think it's quite definitive. It puts parameters; it limits it; it describes "library materials" to include the following: "books, magazines, records, CDs, CD-ROMs, audiocassettes, videocassettes...and other audio-visual materials".

Mr. Brian Jean: Because that "includes", Ms. Crombie. It doesn't mean it includes, which means it's including the subset of 5% of the total, or 1% of the total, or 99% of the total. You don't know what it includes.

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: So why don't you say "defined as"?

Mr. Brian Jean: That's why we're saying "means"; "library materials' means books, magazines"—

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: —"are defined as"—

Mr. Brian Jean: Sure, "are defined as". Great proposal.

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: But, Mr. Chairman, as things evolve, do we not want to include new media that may evolve?

Mr. Brian Jean: If we have a clause in there that brings us back to Parliament every 10 years—that was your proposal—I would imagine at the same time they would look at the definition to see whether or not it's too restrictive to modernize it again.

The difficulty is, as I said, we don't want people shipping chairs through the mail.

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: Well, no, I think we're limiting ourselves to media materials, and I think we all understand that—not chairs. But certainly within the past 10 years we were listening to eight-tracks as well, so things have really evolved.

Mr. Brian Jean: I wasn't.

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: Some of us were.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: You should have.

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: What's the lifespan on a laptop these days? It's about six months.

Perhaps we need a review in less than 10 years in that case. I'd like to see it a little more open-ended than you're suggesting, because media do evolve very rapidly.

Mr. Brian Jean: As long as it's "other similar materials". That's for sure. I have no difficulty with that, just as long as it's not—

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: Right, those kinds of words, so that the intent is—

Mr. Brian Jean: Exactly.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Monsieur Guimond.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Guimond: As Mr. Bevington mentioned, the English definition of "library materials" needs to be revisited. In French, it says "*documents de bibliothèque*". It is clear that a "*document de bibliothèque*" does not refer to a table, a chair or a cat that might be one town's library mascot and that they might want to give to another town. Let's say that the cat is the library mascot for a town in the Charlevoix region that is paired up with a town in British Columbia and that the town in the Charlevoix region decides to give its cat to the library in B.C.

In French, it is clear that it is not a "*document de bibliothèque*", but is it included in the term "library materials"? I want to respond to Mr. Jean, who is afraid that it might refer to a table or a chair. In French, it is clear that it does not. We know it is not a "*document de bibliothèque*".

You may want to rework the definition of "library materials".

• (1125)

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Having listened to all this, I think there might be a consensus on an English version. Perhaps I could read out a suggestion, that we say:

“library materials” are defined as

instead of “means”, and then it goes the same as before:

books, magazines, records, CDs, CD-ROMs, audiocassettes, videocassettes, DVDs and other similar library materials;

Mr. Brian Jean: That's perfect.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: So it's “materials” or “documents”? Is the last word “materials”?

Mr. Brian Jean: It's “materials”. A CD is not a document.

That's perfect.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Is that all right?

Mr. Brian Jean: Absolutely.

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: Did you include audio-visual?

Mr. Brian Jean: Yes, he did.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): We have to get the French, though.

Mr. Michel Guimond: You're right.

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: That's right. They didn't jive.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Can we pass it, and someone can work on the French translation? Can we do that?

Mr. Brian Jean: Absolutely.

An hon. member: Agreed.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Okay. Shall clause 1...?

Sorry.

Mr. Wayne Cole (Procedural Clerk): Could you just read again what it is they're voting on?

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Okay.

The amendment is the following:

“library materials” are defined as books, magazines, records, CDs, CD-ROMs, audiocassettes and videocassettes, DVDs, and other similar library materials;

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: You missed the audio-visual again; “DVDs, audio-visual materials, and other similar materials”.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Okay.

Mr. Brian Jean: Actually, if I may, the government amendment 1, with the other addition that was suggested, lists all of them, I think, because we think we missed audiocassettes as well.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): I said “audiocassettes and videocassettes”, but do you also want to have—

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: And “audio-visual and other similar materials”.

Mr. Brian Jean: So it's “videocassettes, DVDs, and other audio-visual materials”.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): So “DVDs, audio-visual materials and other similar library materials”. Is that what you want?

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: Do you want me to read it? Okay.

It reads:

“library materials” are defined as books, magazines, records, CDs, CD-ROMs, audiocassettes, videocassettes, DVDs, audio-visual materials, and other similar library materials;

Mr. Marcel Proulx: Did you say “audio-visual”?

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: It's “audio-visual materials, and other similar materials”.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Is it “other similar library materials”?

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: Sure. It's “library materials”.

Mr. Brian Jean: That's perfect.

It's going to be a good day, I can tell already.

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: That's perfect.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Okay.

Is everyone in agreement with the amendment?

(Amendment agreed to)

(Clause 1 as amended agreed to)

(On clause 2)

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): I think there's both a government amendment and a Liberal amendment. So we'll start with the government amendment.

Mr. Brian Jean: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

My understanding, from what I've read, is that this is to actually align the English and the French text. I understand that the English regulatory power of prescribing is narrower than the French and would not allow setting the rate, which uses a formula with extended variables, which is required pursuant to the regulations.

Possibly Monsieur Guimond could comment on whether or not the French is indeed broader than the English. “Prescribing”, I understand, is the key word, so the only amendment from the government's perspective is to change “prescribing” to “providing”.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Is there any discussion on the government amendment?

Bonnie, if you want to do your amendment, you have to present it now as a subamendment.

• (1130)

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: All right. Thank you.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Then we can discuss the two together. Go ahead.

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: I'd like to table a subamendment to G-1—we can call it G-2—so that we would provide for a reduced rate of postage for a period of at least 10 years.

The reason for that is I think there should be a period of time to give this some lifespan, so that we have an imposed period where there will automatically be a review. It's less likely, I feel, to be repealed in that case, because there is a prescribed timeframe. As we discussed earlier, media do evolve and change very quickly, so there would be an opportunity at a minimum of every 10 years to go in and review the legislation. At least we'll know that rate will be guaranteed for a period of 10 years as well.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Mr. Jean.

Mr. Brian Jean: My only difficulty with this, and I'd like to hear points of view on it, is that if we say for 10 years, a prescribed period, and Parliament doesn't get back to reviewing that, are we not then enabling Canada Post to decide to automatically increase it after 10 years? That's my difficulty. I'd prefer that there is no prescribed time and there is a review recommended to be done in relation to either the definition or the rate. I just don't want to see a situation where Canada Post comes forward and says, it's at 10 years, the library book rate is over.

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: Perhaps we can ask the author of the bill, but I understand that his intent is that it only be reviewed and altered through an order in council, if I'm not mistaken.

Mr. Merv Tweed: That's the way the bill is constructed right now.

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: I'm just suggesting that there be a review of it every 10 years.

Mr. Merv Tweed: I have no problem with the review. I just don't think it's the committee's responsibility to set the rates. That's done by application of Canada Post to the government and to members of Parliament, who will then make that decision.

I think every piece of legislation should be reviewed. I think if you want to add a subamendment, it might even be as clear as that: that this bill be subject to a review after 10 years to see, one, how it's working out for both parties.

Mr. Brian Jean: The only thing I'm suggesting is...I think that's great, but possibly it should be in a different section. How I read it under that proposal is it enables Canada Post to automatically, after 10 years, say, you know what, the reduced rate is for 10 years; therefore, we don't have to do the reduced rate. If Parliament gets around to reviewing it in the next 10 years, that will be a miracle.

I think the review's a great idea—

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: Right.

Mr. Brian Jean: —and however that is to be done and the reporting mechanism for that, but I think what we should do is make sure it's not in the same paragraph as a reduced rate, just to make sure Canada Post does not reduce the rate automatically without coming back to Parliament.

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: Right, but my intent was that the rate would be protected for a minimum of 10 years and the rate could not be altered otherwise—

Mr. Brian Jean: For 10 years.

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: —except by an order in council following, not by Canada Post.

Mr. Brian Jean: But you're restricting it to 10 years.

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: Yes, and the legislation would be reviewed every 10 years. We would alter the rate after the 10-year period only.

Mr. Brian Jean: I've only been here for seven years, but I see very few times where timeliness follows legislation. That's the difficulty I have. I don't think Parliament is going to get back to it in 10 years. I think it's great if it does, but I don't want to trust that to happen and in the meantime have Canada Post increase the rate to users.

Mr. Chair, have you thought about that in relation to this particular amendment? Sorry, Mr. Chair, I mean the proponent.

Mr. Merv Tweed: I worry about the way it's stated as 10 years. I think the review in 10 years is fine, but again, If you say "prescribed for 10 years" and, as Mr. Jean suggested, if government doesn't review it, it may open the door for Canada Post to say the agreement has been for 10 years and now it's over.

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: But the protection exists.

Mr. Merv Tweed: It will exist, but I think if you put a timeframe on it, you're actually saying it will exist until that end date.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Marcel Proulx.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: Am I to understand from Mr. Jean and Mr. Tweed that without putting in the 10-year provision, this reduced rate of postage will exist until it's changed by Parliament?

• (1135)

Mr. Merv Tweed: What the bill is suggesting is that before Canada Post can raise the rate, they would have to bring it before executive council and ask for that increase. Previously they've had the ability to raise the rate without any government approval. I'm trying to protect libraries from waking up in the morning and having their rates go back to 100%.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: Therefore, if we put in the 10-year period, for the first 10 years nothing can happen, and then after 10 years they would still have to come back to request permission?

Mr. Merv Tweed: Again, my intent was not to actually set the rate; mine was to fix the rate or make it so that Canada Post had to apply before they could increase the rate. I don't think it's the committee's responsibility to set the rates. I think it's up to Canada Post to tell the government what they need and have government or members of Parliament approve it.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Okay.

Mr. Jean.

Mr. Brian Jean: I was just going to ask, if indeed Ms. Crombie would be interested in this, about leaving G-1 as the government proposal for providing for a reduced rate and then having a different section that invites Parliament to come back every 10 years to review the legislation. I mean, they can hear our discussions. We're interested in them reviewing it in relation to the definition and whether or not the rate should continue. But if we leave it that way, it doesn't give Canada Post any legal room to increase rates after any fixed period of time and Parliament still has exactly what Ms. Crombie wants, which is the review after 10 years. I'm just suggesting maybe the government is totally prepared to offer unanimous support to not waive the 48-hour notice for any amendment and to do that wherever you think appropriate.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Do you agree?

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: Yes, I agree with that, perhaps a section 21.2 in clause 3.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Okay, then we'll agree on government amendment G-1.

Is there agreement on that?

Mr. Marcel Proulx: We're on G-2 now. We've already done G-1.

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: We're debating a subamendment of G-1.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: No, this is G-2.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): All right, G-2, providing for a reduced rate of postage.

Mr. Brian Jean: Yes, it's your subamendment.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): All in favour?

Mr. Jeff Watson (Essex, CPC): A point of order, Mr. Chair.

Just so I understand, did we now withdraw the subamendment? Is that what's happened here and we're now on the main amendment?

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): The subamendment has been withdrawn—

Mr. Jeff Watson: Okay, that's what I wanted to know.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): —with the idea of adding it as a separate section of the bill.

Mr. Jeff Watson: Right.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): So we're left only with this one government amendment.

Mr. Jeff Watson: Okay. I just wanted to be clear.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): I think there's agreement. Is there agreement on this amendment?

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

(Clause 2 as amended agreed to)

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Mr. Jean.

Mr. Brian Jean: Mr. Chair, I noticed the Bloc didn't agree to the amendment. I'm wondering if there's something that would be a better solution to fix it. I know it's passed already, but would they prefer something different? I just want to get the best bill possible, and if they have a different opinion, I would like to hear it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Guimond: I have no objection to starting. I had all kinds of arguments against the government's amendment, but since it is 11:40 a.m. and since we have a very important bill on the National Capital Commission that affects my colleague's riding of Gatineau, I have decided to hold my fire until later. Under the rules of the house, we have the right to vote for or against a motion, and we do not have to justify our choice. So I would like us to move on to something else.

Mr. Jean, your office is not far from mine. I will go over and explain loud and clear why I found it a bit problematic. It won't keep me awake at night, and it won't keep you awake either.

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Okay. Thank you very much.

(On clause 3)

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): I believe there is a government amendment.

Mr. Brian Jean: Yes, Mr. Chair.

The government is proposing in this case to remove the reference to Canadian Heritage, just simply because we feel it would be better to just mention Her Majesty in right of Canada in its entirety and not restrict it to just Canadian Heritage. Obviously, the Department of Canadian Heritage is not involved in the library book rate, and as a result, it would bring more clarity to it and make a lot more sense.

• (1140)

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Is there any discussion on this amendment?

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: Mr. Chair, when is the appropriate time to introduce the subamendment?

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): I'm not quite clear if this would be a fourth clause to the bill or whether it would be a part of clause 3.

Mr. Brian Jean: I think they are in clause 2, but—

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): If it's to be part of clause 3, you should introduce it now.

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: Okay. Then I would like to introduce the motion. I can dictate the wording to 21.1, or we could make it 21.2, I guess.

I move that the government review the legislation at a 10-year period.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Yes.

Mr. Brian Jean: I note that we have a legislative clerk here. I'm wondering if that, in his opinion, is the best place to put that amendment. He could tell the committee, or where he would recommend the best place to put it would be.

Mr. Wayne Cole: The committee would really need to consult the legislative drafter, which I am not. The section that is being discussed.... These are amendments to the regulation-making power of Canada Post Corporation provided for in the statute. It's not clear to me that this is the best place, but as I said, I'm not really qualified—

Mr. Brian Jean: That's why we're asking you.

Mr. Wayne Cole: —to express an opinion.

Mr. Brian Jean: Where would you recommend it?

Mr. Wayne Cole: If the regulations section, and the only amendment is to review one of the regulations—part of the regulations. I would presume it could be put at the end of the regulations section.

Mr. Brian Jean: Which clause would that be?

Mr. Wayne Cole: It would have to be a new clause at the end of the section, so it would have to be a clause separate from the amendment that you have moved, G-3.

It would become a new clause.

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: It's clause 4.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): We'll put it separately as an additional clause 4. Is that what you're saying?

Mr. Brian Jean: Perfect.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Okay. Then let's leave yours until we finish clause 3.

Is there any discussion of the amendment to clause 3?

(Amendment agreed to)

(Clause 3 as amended agreed to)

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Now we go to a new clause 4.

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: I'd like to introduce the concept of a clause 4, which would read that the government review the legislation at a 10-year period.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Do we have discussion?

Are all in favour of the new clause 4?

Mr. Wayne Cole: Just a moment. We need to have the committee agree to the exact wording. It's not enough to just agree to the idea.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): We vote separately on wording and then—

Mr. Wayne Cole: Hang on just a minute. We don't have any wording yet.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Okay. Can you repeat that, please?

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: Are you ready? I move that the government review the legislation at a 10-year period.

The intent is, of course, to consider whether there are evolving media products and consideration of rates, etc.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): That the government shall review the legislation—

Mr. Wayne Cole: You can't say “the legislation”. You have to make it “this legislation”, which is going to disappear because these are amendments to the Canada Post Act.

Is it “review after 10 years?”

• (1145)

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Every 10 years.

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: Yes, every 10 years.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Okay.

Let's have you read it first.

Mr. Wayne Cole: Okay. It would read, “The government shall review the definition of library materials in proposed subparagraph 19(1)(g.1) every 10 years.”

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Yes, Brian.

Mr. Brian Jean: Instead of the government reviewing it, I'm just wondering if it might be advantageous for the committee that's responsible for crown corporations to review it. In this case, Canada

Post is the appropriate committee. I'm wondering if that's Ms. Crombie's intention. The government can review things pretty quickly without anybody knowing about it. We might have an NDP government for that matter at that stage.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: What a jokester.

Mr. Brian Jean: Would it be better to have the appropriate committee have it so that we would receive notice here, and if the committee wanted to study it, the committee could and then make a recommendation to the House or the government?

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Mr. Guimond.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Guimond: The problem can be easily solved. Instead of talking about the government, just change it to “Parliament”. When you talk about “Parliament”, it refers to a committee reporting to the House and the House, which meets in Parliament, adopting that report.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Okay.

D'accord.

Mr. Wayne Cole: The difficulty with saying “Parliament” is it's not clear whether it's the House and the Senate or the House or the Senate.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): What can you say, then?

Mr. Brian Jean: They can recommend to do nothing further and not to report it to the Senate, or to change the legislation and then it would go to the Senate in due course. We don't need both places to—

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): So you accept that, “Parliament”?

I think we may have arrived at a consensus: “Parliament shall review”.... You go ahead.

Mr. Wayne Cole: It would be “Parliament shall review the definition of library materials in proposed paragraph 19(1)(g.1) every 10 years.”

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): All right. Is there agreement? I can now ask for a vote on this?

Shall new clause 4—

Mr. Marcel Proulx: On a point of clarification, wouldn't this mean that it couldn't be done before the 10-year period or before it has been 10 years? Let's say that at the end of five years—

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: Things change.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: —things have changed. Could they still do it after five years, or would they have to wait until the 10th year?

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: At least every 10 years?

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Guimond: Your amendment, Mr. Proulx, referred to at least ten years.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: I am asking the question.

Mr. Michel Guimond: Very well.

[English]

Mrs. Bonnie Crombie: What if we said “at least every 10 years”?

Mr. Brian Jean: What a great idea.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Okay, at least every 10 years.

I shall now ask for a vote.

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

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Shall the bill as amended carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Shall the chair report the bill as amended to the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Shall the committee order a reprint of the bill as amended for the use of the House at report stage?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Vice-Chair (Hon. John McCallum): Very good.

We'll suspend for a minute. This ends my debut as chair of the committee.

● (1145)

(Pause)

● (1200)

The Chair (Mr. Merv Tweed (Brandon—Souris, CPC)): Welcome back. Thank you to Mr. McCallum and the committee for helping me with my bill.

I have two things to raise before we start on the bill. It was discussed at our last meeting that we would consider all the evidence that had been brought before the committee on Bill C-37 as part of our study on Bill C-20, so I would ask for a motion for that information to be brought forward and included with the deliberations that we're continuing with today.

Mr. Brian Jean: I make that motion, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Jean.

Any comments? Monsieur Proulx.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: Thank you.

We have to take for granted that since the study of Bill C-37 prior to prorogation until now, there have not been any major changes, whether it be the evidence that was given to us by different witnesses or whether it be changes brought on in the daily operation of the National Capital Commission.

I see you have a witness this morning. I don't know exactly what the witness will tell us or what we're driving at, but I simply want to make sure that there is no knowledge of major changes in any of the testimony or any of the evidence that was tabled or brought to the table under Bill C-37.

[Translation]

If there happen to have been any major changes or if amendments were made by the National Capital Commission, perhaps we should have that information, Mr. Chair. I will trust my colleague, the parliamentary secretary, to keep us up-to-date on the matter.

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Jean.

Mr. Brian Jean: Yes, and I understand Mr. Proulx's concern with that. I have had an opportunity to speak to the department, and that's why I actually suggested this matter be adjourned at least one week from where it was set originally. That is so that each party could see for themselves that the changes are minimal in nature and only as far as drafting. As far as I'm aware, the substantive part of the bill has not been changed.

Also, I would like to make comment for the committee that the former minister did meet with a member from each caucus, Monsieur Proulx, Monsieur Nadeau, and Paul Dewar from the NDP, who are all obviously concerned with this particular bill because it touches on all their constituencies. I understand that there were compromises reached in relation to most, if not all, of the issues that are before us today. But that, of course, begs to be seen in the next day or two.

● (1205)

Mr. Marcel Proulx: That's news to me.

Mr. Brian Jean: Well, that's my understanding. I'm only reciting what I was told.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: You were told that by whom?

Mr. Brian Jean: By the minister, that compromises had been reached.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: The present minister?

Mr. Brian Jean: The previous minister. But that was last May, so—

Mr. Marcel Proulx: Oh, okay.

Mr. Brian Jean: After the meetings had taken place with all the parties.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: That was a long time ago.

Mr. Brian Jean: Yes, it was. That's why I say we'll wait to see what happens.

[Translation]

Mr. Marcel Proulx: Fine.

[English]

The Chair: Monsieur Nadeau.

[Translation]

Mr. Richard Nadeau (Gatineau, BQ): If I understand correctly, Mr. Jean, you are talking about meetings we held in the fall of 2009, not recent meetings.

Mr. Brian Jean: Precisely.

[English]

The Chair: Our guest at the end of the table is from the department. Welcome, and if there are any questions for you, I'm sure members will ask.

Also, for information, we have tentatively suggested November 22 for La Pocatière—that is a Monday—and I would ask members to check their calendars. We haven't confirmed anything, but I'm putting that out there. I know, Mr. Guimond, you talked about a Monday.

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Guimond: Could you repeat that?

[English]

The Chair: November 22.

Mr. Michel Guimond: November?

The Chair: November 22. It's a Monday. I'm putting that out there, and I would ask committee members to get back to Bonnie as quickly as they can, if that works. The funding has been approved for it. We were scheduled to do it in the last session, and due to circumstances, we didn't get there. They've invited us back.

We'll now move on to Bill C-20. The preamble and clause 1 will be postponed until the end.

(On clause 2)

The Chair: We have a government amendment, G-1.

Mr. Jean.

Mr. Brian Jean: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The amendment we're proposing has to do with a definition of “ecological integrity”. Obviously the document can speak for itself, but I will recite it into the record:

“ecological integrity” means a condition that is deemed to be characteristic of a natural region and likely to persist, including abiotic components and the composition and abundance of native species and biological communities, rates of change and supporting processes;

I understand that this definition was taken from the definition in law.

Mr. Dubé confirms that.

Mr. Simon Dubé (Director, Portfolio Management, Crown Corporation Governance, Department of Transport): It's from the National Parks Act.

Mr. Brian Jean: Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. Jean, in the second line it says “that is determined”.

Mr. Brian Jean: Yes.

The Chair: You used the word “deemed”.

Mr. Brian Jean: Yes, “that is determined” is proper, and the text is correct.

(Amendment agreed to)

The Chair: We have another government amendment, G-2.

Mr. Jean.

Mr. Brian Jean: There was quite a discussion amongst members previously on what “greenbelt” means. That's why the definition has been added.

So “greenbelt” means an area whose boundaries are described in schedule 2.1.

The Chair: Before I go to comments, I'm advised that this amendment is beyond the scope, in adding a new concept of “greenbelt”. It would also impact amendments G-3, G-4, LIB-7, G-8, G-9, and G-10.

Obviously, if the committee chooses to take a different position on that and support the amendment, I'm not going to rule all the other amendments out of order. If my decision is overturned, it will apply to all of those, and we will include them in the discussion.

Monsieur Proulx.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: On a point of information, do we have schedule 2.1 somewhere?

Mr. Brian Jean: Monsieur Dubé.

Mr. Simon Dubé: It's one of the motions—probably the last one. I don't have the numbering, but it's schedule 2.1.

The Chair: It's BQ-10.

Mr. Simon Dubé: As it stands now, it just provides room for the actual description of the boundaries, because they do not exist now, as they do for Gatineau Park. So if you go through all the motions the government is presenting, it provides for the insertion within five years of the actual description of the greenbelt boundaries.

• (1210)

The Chair: Monsieur Proulx.

[Translation]

Mr. Marcel Proulx: In other words, you are suggesting including the term “Greenbelt” in the bill, when that term is not defined or described anywhere.

Mr. Simon Dubé: In the national capital region, everyone has an idea of what the Greenbelt is. Furthermore, the commission is not able to provide a legal definition at this time, as is the case for Gatineau Park.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: Mr. Chair, once again, things are being hidden, as was the case when we were studying Bill C-37. A bit further on, we will come to a point when we will want to discuss the description for Gatineau Park. I think the bill has some 37 pages of descriptions.

Right now, we are being asked to endorse a term because the government implied that there was an intention to extend the same protection to the Greenbelt as the protection that will apply to Gatineau Park. So we are being asked to add the Greenbelt without knowing what it refers to.

If you were to ask 10 Ottawa residents to define the Greenbelt, no two people would give you the same answer. It is very unfortunate that the government wants to keep us so in the dark. It would certainly be a first to agree to include a term in a bill without being able to define it. I am very disappointed.

[English]

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Jean.

Mr. Brian Jean: I'll come back to the legislative clerk. Can I ask, Mr. Chair, in respect of your ruling, if the new concept is the definition of “greenbelt”? Is that correct? Is it a new concept outside of the scope?

The Chair: Right. It's an amendment to a bill that's beyond the scope and the principle of the bill. It introduces the introduction of the greenbelt as a new concept, which is actually beyond the scope. That's why I said the ruling impacts several other amendments, and if the committee chooses to ignore my ruling, then we would deal with all the amendments that are included.

Mr. Brian Jean: My understanding, though, of this particular concept—and correct me if I'm wrong, please, members from the other side—is that it is a concept brought in by the opposition parties during the discussions. In fact, I think Mr. Proulx was leading that charge, in that he wanted the greenbelt to have some sort of significance as a terminology and some form of protection other than what it would have had as the bill was phrased originally. So this is actually a concept brought in by the government at the request of the opposition party.

This, of course, is the difficulty. If you're ruling it out of order, Mr. Chair, and even if we challenge it, obviously it's going to go back to the House, and the House, as it has done for another bill of ours recently, could sustain your ruling. Then we'd be back to the same place we were before. So I see no advantage in challenging the chair at this stage, especially having regard to what Mr. Proulx said.

Does Mr. Proulx or Monsieur Nadeau have some other suggestion in relation to this?

The Chair: Monsieur Nadeau will be next, but if it is reported back to the House after my ruling is challenged and overruled, it would only become an issue in the House if it is raised as a point of order to the Speaker. If there's agreement in the committee, it can be presented back into the House. In the case of the previous bill, there was a point of order raised against it, and it therefore became the issue.

Mr. Brian Jean: I understand.

The Chair: Next is Monsieur Nadeau, and then Monsieur Proulx.
[Translation]

Mr. Richard Nadeau: Mr. Chair, I agree that this amendment is out of order, primarily because it introduces something that was not included in what was presented to us previously in Bill C-37 or currently in Bill C-20.

Therefore, we will vote against the amendment.
[English]

The Chair: Go ahead, Monsieur Proulx.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: To start with, this is not a new concept. As your witness just said a few minutes ago, the greenbelt is known in the Ottawa region. It's being referred to in all types of different municipal, provincial, and federal uses.

To say that it's a new concept to the bill.... I don't agree with Mr. Nadeau. We had witnesses. When we had hearings on Bill C-37, we had witnesses come and explain to us what the needs were to protect the National Capital Commission's part of Ottawa known as the greenbelt. The greenbelt does exist in Ottawa. It's to pin down what territory it covers.

Now, if we were to accept this way of doing things, does it mean that for schedule 2.1 to be legal or to be accepted eventually it would have to come back to this committee, sir? We would be accepting

schedule 2.1, but in fact the schedule doesn't exist, so we would have to create that schedule sometime in the future.

• (1215)

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Jean.

Mr. Brian Jean: Clearly this happens all the time when we refer to something in legislation that comes out later in regulations. It's no different than a schedule or anything else, and every—

Mr. Marcel Proulx: We're going to vote on a schedule, Brian, that doesn't exist.

Mr. Brian Jean: Exactly, Mr. Proulx.

If I may continue, all legislation refers to regulations that don't come into place until after the legislation is passed. The regulations are done similarly and identical to this, as the schedule would be, because it would pick a place that was recognized as part of the greenbelt.

But, Mr. Proulx, you are entitled to challenge the chair, as Mr. Nadeau is then able to not vote for that challenge and then bring it up in the House, where, again, if it's not sustained, the Speaker would rule in favour of Mr. Nadeau—

Mr. Marcel Proulx: Okay, but—

Mr. Brian Jean: So we're wasting our time—

Mr. Marcel Proulx: No, we're not wasting time.

The Chair: Order.

Mr. Brian Jean: I'm trying to explain, if I can. I have the floor, I believe.

[Translation]

Mr. Richard Nadeau: Point of order, nevertheless.

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Jean, finish, please.

Mr. Brian Jean: What I'm trying to say is that ultimately it would be best if we tried to find a solution here today, rather than go through that circus called...what can happen next if we don't agree with the challenge, or if Mr. Nadeau doesn't. I think that's the reality, and that's why we met with all the parties to try to resolve this outside of this committee. But if we can't have it—you're totally within your right to challenge the chair.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: We're not at the point....

Do you have a point of order?

The Chair: Monsieur Nadeau, do you have a point of order?

[Translation]

Mr. Richard Nadeau: Mr. Chair, you have made a decision, and therefore it is not open to debate. If someone wants to challenge that decision, go ahead. Otherwise, we should not be discussing a ruling that you made and that cannot be debated. Thank you.

[English]

Mr. Marcel Proulx: You have to challenge the decision, then.

The Chair: Okay. Mr. Proulx has challenged my ruling.

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Bonnie Charron): On the question, shall the decision of the chair be sustained?

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Guimond: Could you repeat the question?

Mr. Proulx, you are the one who wanted the ruling challenged.

• (1220)

Mr. Marcel Proulx: I want to know whether the ruling has to be sustained.

[English]

The Chair: The question is—

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Guimond: But the....

[English]

The Chair: The question of the chair is, does the committee support the ruling of the chair, yes or no?

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Guimond: And the Conservatives are opposed to it?

Mr. Marcel Proulx: One person voted in favour of it.

Mr. Michel Guimond: Very well. Forgive me.

[English]

(Ruling of the chair overturned)

The Chair: As was previously stated, rules applying to G-3, G-4, LIB-7, G-8, G-9, and G-10 will be considered admissible and debatable.

Mr. Jean.

Mr. Brian Jean: I'm wondering if the legislative clerk can advise whether it's the term "greenbelt". I know we've already dealt with this, Mr. Chair, but it's important because I don't want to have this situation where we have a bill that comes before the House and we lose a couple of months without getting this bill passed, and then it's challenged and we have to go back to where we were.

I'm wondering if it's the term "greenbelt" that is found outside of the scope, because certainly if the greenbelt or the green area is referring to the place around the park, I can't see how that would be out of the scope. If the greenbelt or the green area defines an area outside of the park, which of course it does, because it's the park that surrounds it, would it not still then be within the scope of the bill?

Mr. Marcel Proulx: May I interject here?

The Chair: Please.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: I think Mr. Jean doesn't understand what we're talking about.

Just in case, the Gatineau Park is on the Quebec side of the Ottawa River. It's a free-standing park—fantastic. You told us before that you've been in the park. Good for you. The greenbelt is an assembly of land on the Ontario side of the Ottawa River that forms a U around the city of Ottawa, starting in the east end. It's an assembly of land that has been identified. It goes through the south. The Ottawa International Airport is part of the greenbelt. It ends up on the west side of Ottawa at the Ottawa River also. So it has nothing to do with the Gatineau Park.

The reason why we brought this into the debate is that we had witnesses who came in front of us for Bill C-37, asking us to have the same environmental consideration for the greenbelt that we were having for the Gatineau Park.

The Chair: For clarification, the term "greenbelt" wasn't introduced in the previous bill.

Mr. Brian Jean: I understand that.

The Chair: It's a concept that's outside of it. We've agreed that it's acceptable, so as we proceed, the greenbelt will be considered part of the terminology.

Mr. Jean.

Mr. Brian Jean: I'm trying to find clarity from the legislative clerk. This is the third time something like this has happened in a bill. This particular case is a good example.

I appreciate the lesson on geography, Mr. Proulx, and I listened to the same witnesses, so I understand what the greenbelt is.

What I was trying to use as an example is, if the definition of "greenbelt" is changed to refer to what the bill is actually dealing with, which is the park, if that is included in the definition, is it then within the scope?

I'm directing that question towards the legislative clerk.

The Chair: Again, I will answer on his behalf.

The greenbelt is not discussed in the previous bill. It has been added to it, which means that it has broadened the scope of the bill, which means it's inadmissible. If the committee agrees that it should be included, which they have by overruling me, then it is now included in all of the discussion. It's like discussing this room and then adding the room next door to the discussion without anybody knowing why it was added. We've agreed that it should be added and we'll proceed with it as part of the definition.

Mr. Brian Jean: I understand, Mr. Chair, but with respect, this room does have a room next door and we all know that the room is next door, even though it's not referred to in the legislation. I'm wondering how we can change the definition to acknowledge that it is referred to, the room next door, that this room does exist.

The Chair: You would have to do it by consent of the committee, which you just did. You can't just assume that people are going to know it. You have to either have it in the bill or have agreement to have it added, and we've had agreement to have it added.

Now we will open the floor to debate.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: Mr. Chair, may I have an answer to the question I was asking? Seeing that we are asked to approve schedule 2.1 but that schedule 2.1 does not exist as such, does it mean that when schedule 2.1 is proposed, either by the government or by the department of the government, it will have to come back in front of this committee, or whatever committee at that time is responsible for the National Capital Commission? Does it mean that it will have to come back to that committee so that the contents of schedule 2.1 can be approved?

Is that the way you see it, sir?

●(1225)

The Chair: My understanding is that it does not have to come back before a committee.

Mr. Dubé, can you...?

Mr. Simon Dubé: One of the motions the committee will consider will create schedule 2.1, if agreed. One thing I will point out is that one of the motions that will also be before this committee in the coming hours or days on this bill provides for a process on how schedule 2.1 will be populated, if I may put it that way.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: Thank you.

The Chair: We have amendment G-1. Is there any further debate on it?

Mr. Nadeau.

Oh, I'm sorry. I mean amendment G-2.

[Translation]

Mr. Richard Nadeau: Mr. Chair, we are in a bit of a grey area here.

We know there is a greenbelt. I remember discussing it with Ms. Lemay. The boundaries, the perimeter, of Gatineau Park were described in detail for the first time ever here, in this very committee, about one year ago, precisely for the purpose of including them in the bill. That never happened. We were able to ask questions about it. Some cities are located within Gatineau Park, such as Chelsea. Other cities, such as Gatineau and La Pêche, are located only partly within Gatineau Park. It is crystal clear. We brought that forward, and we even asked some mayors to come and meet with us. Mr. Perras accepted our invitation. He made a presentation. We asked him questions to make sure the information we had was accurate. We had a document that served as a basis for further discussion.

But the Greenbelt was not included in either Bill C-37 or Bill C-20. The people at the NCC, who support this bill because it affects them, did not see fit to include it at the time. Was there a reason for that? Did it have to do with the fact that the boundaries had not yet been established? Whatever the reason, the outcome was that we could not invite mayors, council or interested parties in the municipality of Ottawa or municipalities surrounding the Greenbelt to appear and give us assurance that we had the right definition.

The newspaper *Le Droit* recently published a series of articles on the Gréber plan, which was developed some 50 years ago and which mentioned the Greenbelt. The article said that the surface area of the Greenbelt had shrunk slightly as compared with the initial plan. It would have been a good idea, at the time, to talk to people living in the city of Ottawa region. They could have given their opinions on how large the Greenbelt was, which would have helped us determine whether our boundary description was accurate or not. We did not do that. The issue was not referred to the committee. The committee cannot study a document that it does not have and that does not exist. As lawmakers, we cannot study an issue that was not referred to us through the appropriate legal channels and determine whether we agree or disagree with the boundary description in question. We could have done it by consulting those who are very knowledgeable about the area where they live and which they manage in conjunction

with the NCC. I am talking about the Greenbelt, specifically. No Ontario stakeholders affected by this situation, whether at the municipal or provincial level, appeared before the committee on the matter.

I am extremely uncomfortable talking about the Greenbelt as a principle, given that it is not even defined and no one ever saw fit to include it in Bill C-37. Everyone was set on passing the bill swiftly and picking up right where we left off on December 9. Everyone wanted to continue the debate and present the bill in the House of Commons so that it would become law.

I think we are going to have to do our homework. The issue of the Greenbelt should be the subject of another study, and the legislation should be amended to allow us to speak with the stakeholders, at the right time, and include this element in the bill and eventually the act if the bill is passed.

You will understand that I am going to vote against this amendment, precisely for this reason.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

●(1230)

[English]

The Chair: Monsieur Proulx.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: We've had an explanation from the witness saying that the intent is to eventually describe or create the text for schedule 2.1. I think that just to include the greenbelt or "*la ceinture de verdure*" in Bill C-20 is a big step forward, with the understanding that the NCC, in a future that I hope will be near, will arrive at a description of the greenbelt. So we will be voting in favour of amendment G-2.

The Chair: Mr. Bevington.

Mr. Dennis Bevington: Mr. Chair, I'd like to understand exactly what's proposed with the addition of the greenbelt.

Are we going to see that the greenbelt then becomes completely similar to Gatineau Park, in terms of the legislation driving it? Is that a large step forward from where it's at already, this greenbelt, in terms of how the land management is conducted?

The Chair: Mr. Jean.

Mr. Brian Jean: I would like to hear from Mr. Dubé, but I do understand that with this new concept of greenbelt included within the legislative framework, it's also going to require the NCC to come up with their action plan in the master plan of what they're going to do with the greenbelt.

I understand that actually it's going to be left with the board, an independent board, with of course members from Quebec and members from Ontario and across the country, which will include in their master plan their intention and what they plan to do with the greenbelt. Of course, in my understanding, from a general perspective—and correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Dubé—some of it is commercial, light industrial, residential areas, which obviously cannot have the same prescriptive approach that a park can have, but at the same time, they would be able to take recognition that it is a green area and that they want to protect the green area and the existing flora and fauna in that area.

Is that correct, Mr. Dubé?

Mr. Simon Dubé: Yes, that's correct.

And I will just point out that we can look in isolation to that specific proposal to have a definition, but, collectively, all the motions provide for some clearer status to the greenbelt with respect to the master plan, with respect to planning and protection of that territory or area in the NCR.

The Chair: Mr. Jean.

Mr. Brian Jean: I'm just wondering, Mr. Dubé, what happens after the master plan is proposed by the NCC board. What happens to it then? Who authorizes it? Is it automatically recognized? Has that been the situation, or what happens then?

Mr. Simon Dubé: As it stands now, we don't—

Mr. Brian Jean: If the legislation as proposed is passed, what happens to the master plan after it's gone to the board?

Mr. Simon Dubé: Once the NCC has approved it, it will need Governor-in-Council approval, and all together, all the proposals that are before this committee, would ensure that the greenbelt is covered in that master plan for the national capital region. So it would obviously be a significant component of that master plan.

And to lead to the approval of the plan, there will have been consultations, as the NCC is already doing. They're embarking on this adventure, if I can say, to update the existing plan. So all together that's what would be the process.

Mr. Brian Jean: What are the proposals in respect of the greenbelt at this stage? If it's proposed, and if it passes, what's your understanding of the special recognition for the greenbelt?

Mr. Simon Dubé: Once the boundaries are defined in the schedule and it's clear for everybody what the greenbelt is physically, the master plan would elaborate on what can be done or not done in the greenbelt, what is the long-term intention with the lands in the greenbelt, and how they are managed. So it's the overarching guiding principles for the greenbelt, as well as other components of the region.

• (1235)

Mr. Brian Jean: Who does it now? Who does it currently? Who manages the area? Who cuts the grass? Who makes sure the litter is picked up? Who does that?

Mr. Simon Dubé: The greenbelt—and Mr. Proulx had a very good definition of the greenbelt—is a collection of various types of land that includes the Ottawa airport, some agricultural land, some light industrial land, some wetlands. There's a very wide variety of land in the greenbelt, so that's why it's hard to say that the greenbelt.... You cannot just have one principle to manage that area because of the variety of the land. But assuming everything goes through, it's going to be clear what the greenbelt encompasses and how it will be possibly managed.

[Translation]

The Chair: Mr. Nadeau, you have the floor.

Mr. Richard Nadeau: Mr. Chair, the first question we need to ask ourselves is: Why did no one see fit to include the Greenbelt and all the related legislative provisions in Bill C-37 when it was brought forward in June 2009, in order to lay things out clearly or, at least,

ensure that everything was done in accordance with the rules that would have been established.

We heard Mr. Dubé and Mr. Proulx talk about the wide variety of lands that make up the Greenbelt, which, by the way, spans a vast area. This was put to us today without any groundwork having been done, without any evidence from knowledgeable witnesses on the matter, which is one of the National Capital Commission's many responsibilities. Either it was a mistake, or it was not done intentionally to provide an opportunity to gather more sound arguments for discussion down the road, especially in terms of defining the duties and responsibilities related to the famous Greenbelt.

We did it for Gatineau Park, and that is great, but we did not do it for the Greenbelt. It is extremely difficult to accept, even if we say that we will provide an explanation in a schedule. We are required to vote on all the elements contained in the bill before us, not on things that appear out of nowhere in an amendment on a major issue concerning the National Capital Commission.

Mr. Chair, I am not trying to take away from the Greenbelt or diminish its importance. It is just that we did not study the issue, we did not propose it for consideration, we did not set out the necessary parameters to pass legislation on the issue and then clearly identify the corresponding responsibilities.

It is also to protect the Greenbelt. It is important to keep in mind what Russell Mills said before he was appointed chair of the National Capital Commission's board of directors. He said that he did not have a problem with carving up the Greenbelt; he was willing to hand it over to the private sector. Forgive me, but let's define everything first and give the Greenbelt legislative protection, to prevent the Russell Mills of the world from, one day, selling off pieces of the city of Ottawa's environmental heritage.

To do that, we need a piece of legislation. But we do not have that here. We should have done it in due course. It is never too late to do things right, but it would have to be through another motion or another amendment to the current act, in order to ensure that the job is done well and that the Greenbelt is given adequate protection. The boundaries need to be known and established, to be sure that we, as lawmakers, are protecting an area with known and established boundaries. We would also need to ensure the sustainability of this land for future generations of Quebecers and Canadians alike.

But that is not the case right now, and so we have this grey area referred to earlier. You cannot just cook this up, and come here and tell us that everything is hunky-dory and that we should have confidence in it even though we were not given the slightest opportunity to discuss it or to hear from witnesses on the matter, if only regarding the boundaries of this extremely diverse and significant area.

• (1240)

[English]

The Chair: Thank you.

Before I recognize Mr. Proulx, I think Mr. Dubé and his comments again refer back to my ruling. Amendments G-3, G-4, G-8, G-9, G-10, and L-7 actually address some of those issues. As we move through the bill, it will clarify itself.

It is at the first. I understand that.

Monsieur Proulx.

[Translation]

Mr. Marcel Proulx: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I simply want to point out to my colleague, Mr. Nadeau, that it is no surprise that we are discussing the Greenbelt this morning. On the contrary, it was part of the amendments that were made to Bill C-37. And I would add that it is now the government adding this clarification, which requires us to discuss the issue of the Greenbelt.

[English]

In amendment G-1 we clarified the proposed bill by accepting a new definition of ecological integrity. One of the objectives in including the greenbelt in this particular bill is exactly that, to make sure that the ecological integrity within the greenbelt, where possible, will be protected. As you are very right in saying so, as we go along, the definition of the greenbelt will be better known.

Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. Jean.

Mr. Brian Jean: *La première question* from the member was on who suggested “greenbelt”. It was the opposition parties, and the government was trying to find a compromise. That's why we proposed amendment G-2. So it was brought forward by the NDP, and we thought the Bloc and also the Liberals, and we were trying to find a compromise to get exactly what we have moving forward, which is a minority government, and trying to get a good bill that the people of this area have been asking for. That's where it comes from.

The Chair: Okay.

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

The Chair: Next we have amendment G-3.

Mr. Jean.

Mr. Brian Jean: Mr. Chair, we're suggesting that clause 2 be amended by replacing lines 20 to 23 on page 2 with, of course, “National Interest Land Mass”, and a definition of that along with where it is located, and again the reflection of the greenbelt. I think everybody has the wording on that and what it does.

The Chair: Just for the information of the committee, I'm advised that if amendment G-3 passes, amendment BQ-1 cannot be moved.

Monsieur Nadeau.

[Translation]

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

Precisely because it will follow, our proposal is somewhat related.

We are in favour of removing the whole national land mass issue from the bill for the simple reason that we want to make sure that, at some point in the future, given this or that circumstance, there is no infringement on Quebec in terms of the land mass belonging to it either inside or outside the park.

I understand the proposed G-3 amendment, but because of our position that follows on it, we will simply vote against it.

[English]

The Chair: *Merci.*

Is there further comment?

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

(Clause 2 as amended agreed to)

(On clause 3)

The Chair: On clause 3, we have amendment LIB-1.

Monsieur Proulx.

● (1245)

Mr. Marcel Proulx: For those of us who were here when we discussed this under Bill C-37, the purpose of this particular amendment was to make sure we did not end up with tie votes at the board. The bill is suggesting 14 members. This is strictly a mathematical amendment, so that we will have 15 sitting on the board.

The Chair: Are there comments?

Mr. Jean.

Mr. Brian Jean: Possibly Mr. Dubé could answer this question. Currently I understand there are 14 members, which obviously is an even number.

Mr. Simon Dubé: There are now 15.

Mr. Brian Jean: Are there 15 appointed all the time? How many members usually comprise the board?

Mr. Simon Dubé: The composition of the board is outlined in the National Capital Act, with so many members from the Ontario side of the NCR, so many from the Quebec side, the CEO, the chair, and eight members from across the country. That's the composition of the board. That totals 15. You could end up in a situation right now where the board is meeting and there are some people not able to attend the meeting, so obviously you could end up with 14 people in the room at the board meeting, as it stands.

Mr. Brian Jean: That's really my question. How many people are on the board right now? And are there consistently 15? Obviously, there are vacancies from time to time, and my understanding, in speaking to the department or the NCC, is that it's very usual for there not to be a couple of members, and certainly it's very usual for there not to be very many members show up. That is my understanding. Could you enlighten us on that?

Mr. Simon Dubé: It does happen, and under those circumstances the bylaws of the commission provide for the chair to cast a vote if there's a tie vote.

Mr. Brian Jean: So even if we have 14 and there is a tie vote, the likelihood is that only 10 or 12 people are going to show up, but then even if only they show up, the chair of the board has a casting vote.

Mr. Simon Dubé: Exactly.

The Chair: Is there any further comment?

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

The Chair: On amendment BQ-1.1, Monsieur Nadeau.

[Translation]

Mr. Richard Nadeau: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

We want to make sure that Quebec and Ontario have the same number of members on the....

[English]

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

Mr. Marcel Proulx: Yes. We have a second package where amendment BQ-2, I think, is being replaced by amendment BQ-2.1. But there was also amendment BQ-1.1.

The Chair: This is amendment BQ-1.1.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: Are we now on amendment BQ-1.1? Oh, I'm sorry. Okay.

[Translation]

Mr. Richard Nadeau: I heard BQ-2.1 earlier.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: Me too.

Mr. Richard Nadeau: Mr. Chair, our motion has to do with the fact that the chairperson of the National Capital Commission should be bilingual. Under the NCC's current structure, it now has a chairperson and not a chief executive officer, as it did before.

Nevertheless, the fact remains that the chairperson, namely the person carrying out that function, must be comfortable in both French and English. The person must be bilingual at the time of the appointment for the simple reason that, in the national capital region, be it in Quebec or Ontario, in Gatineau, Chelsea, La Pêche—I may be forgetting a town—or Ottawa, there are francophones. The chairperson must attend general meetings or even larger public gatherings. For instance, at one point, an event was held at the Casino Lac-Leamy in Gatineau. When the current chairperson, Mr. Mills, was appointed by the current Minister of Foreign Affairs and the minister responsible for the National Capital Commission, Lawrence Cannon—who was the Minister of Transport, Infrastructure and Communities at the time—he read introductory remarks in French. Actually, it was not when he was appointed, but rather when I attended the general meeting. When he was appointed, Mr. Cannon said that Mr. Mills would learn French, that there would be no problem.

• (1250)

[English]

He will go to Chicoutimi to learn French.

[Translation]

Mr. Chair, when I attended that meeting, he was not able to answer any of my questions in French. That happened in at least two meetings. There was another meeting that took place at Place de la Chaudière, on the Hull-Aylmer side. He could not respond in French at that meeting either, or at the most recent one.

If the government considered it important to have a bilingual person in the job, a person who was not bilingual should not have been chosen. There are other people who are bilingual who could have been chosen, people who could have done the job, if only out of respect for francophones in Gatineau and Ottawa. They are entitled to have a chairperson of the National Capital Commission—

an important part of the federal government—who will represent them adequately in their own language.

We miss Mr. Beaudry a lot in this respect. When he was asked a question in English, he would answer in English, and when he was asked a question in French, he would answer in French.

With that in mind, we need to ensure—and this is the purpose of the amendment—that the chairperson of the National Capital Commission, the person who sits on the board of directors of this crown corporation, can speak and understand French, in the same way that they can speak and understand English. That is our rationale, Mr. Chair.

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Jean.

Mr. Brian Jean: Mr. Chair, I just would hate to see the situation where a unilingual francophone is the right person for the job and doesn't get the job, even though there are tons of interpretation services across this great country, employing mostly Quebecers.

What if there is a good unilingual francophone who would be the best person for the job, and then all of a sudden we're eliminating them from the job because they don't speak English? I don't think that's fair, to not get the best person for the job.

So from my perspective, I think we should allow the best person to be appointed to do the best job for the people of Canada, whether that be a unilingual francophone or a unilingual anglophone. I don't think it matters as long as the interpretation services are there.

I don't understand why your questions weren't answered. Quite frankly, I think that's wrong, that there wasn't proper interpretation there for you.

The Chair: Further comment?

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

The Chair: We're now going to move to Bloc amendment 2.1.

Monsieur Nadeau.

[Translation]

Mr. Richard Nadeau: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The amendment has to do with the number of members. We want to make sure that the number of members from Quebec and Ontario is equal and that 25% of the other seats are held by residents of Quebec.

[English]

The Chair: Comment? Seeing none—

[Translation]

Mr. Richard Nadeau: I am simply adding an element. It is to ensure we are being consistent with what was said before, Mr. Chair, for the purpose of clarification. Paragraph 3(4)(c) contains the number 7, but it should be changed to 8 so that it is in line with what was adopted previously.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: It is 15, including the chairperson. If there are 14 people, plus the president, that makes 15.

Mr. Richard Nadeau: That is right.

[English]

The Chair: So you're correcting the amendment to read "eight" instead of "seven"?

[Translation]

Mr. Richard Nadeau: Paragraph 3(4)(c).

[English]

The Chair: So there has been an amendment to the amendment in paragraph (c). Instead of "seven", it should read "eight from Canada generally".

No comments? Mr. Jean.

Mr. Brian Jean: Could Mr. Dubé give us the current state of the situation, please?

Mr. Simon Dubé: Currently in the act it provides for two members from the Quebec side of the national capital region. Obviously, the members coming from the rest of the country...there are currently some members from Quebec. There's somebody from Sept-Îles and somebody from Beaconsfield and Gatineau. Well, Gatineau would be the legislative part.

•(1255)

The Chair: Mr. Jean.

Mr. Brian Jean: So currently there are two ordinarily resident in the national capital region.

Mr. Simon Dubé: That's the only part that is guaranteed by law.

Mr. Brian Jean: And how many people would reside in the national capital region, and how many local municipalities in Quebec would there be in that area?

Mr. Simon Dubé: On the Quebec side, that's a good question. How many people in Gatineau?

[Translation]

Mr. Richard Nadeau: Three, counting Gatineau, Chelsea and La Pêche.

[English]

Mr. Simon Dubé: Yes, and Pontiac.

[Translation]

Mr. Richard Nadeau: Four, counting Pontiac.

[English]

Mr. Simon Dubé: Four municipalities.

[Translation]

Mr. Marcel Proulx: There can only be two, according to the current wording.

[English]

The Chair: Monsieur Proulx.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: I'm looking at the existing act and it says that three must be from Ontario, from local in Ontario, from the national capital region, of which two must live in the city of Ottawa. Then it says two from local municipalities from Quebec, of which one must be from the west section of the city of Gatineau, and then eight from anywhere else across Canada.

The proposal maintains the three from the national capital region on the Ontario side. It adds a third one to the local Quebec

municipalities in the NCR, and then the other eight can come from wherever in Canada, but at least two from Quebec.

I think it's a fair balance, because it will give five from the province of Quebec and the other 10 will be from wherever, including three from Ottawa. I think it's fair.

The Chair: Before I recognize anyone, if we deal with BQ-2.1 and it passes, then BQ-2 won't proceed. I apologize for not saying that at the start.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: BQ-2.1 replaces BQ-2, doesn't it?

The Chair: Right. If the first one is defeated, we can move on to the second one and deal with it. If the first one is approved, then we won't deal with the second one.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: I see.

The Chair: Is there any further comment?

Mr. Jean.

Mr. Brian Jean: I understand there would be a minimum of five from Quebec, three from Ontario—so eight out of a possible 15—and seven from the rest of Canada.

Is that correct, Mr. Dubé?

Mr. Marcel Proulx: That sounds fine.

Mr. Simon Dubé: I don't have the motion in front of me, so it's not for me to comment.

Mr. Richard Nadeau: There would be three from Ottawa, three from Gatineau, two from Quebec, and the rest from elsewhere in Canada.

The Chair: That would add up to 16.

Mr. Brian Jean: That's my point.

Ms. Lois Brown (Newmarket—Aurora, CPC): But we just added these.

Mr. Brian Jean: No, we didn't.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: Three, three, and eight is 14, plus the president is 15.

Mr. Brian Jean: Yes, but my understanding is that five have to be from Gatineau.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: No. Five from the province of Quebec and three from Ottawa equals eight.

Mr. Brian Jean: Plus at least eight from the rest of Canada would make 16, but we only have 15 to deal with.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: No, you have 16 because the chair is counted.

Mr. Brian Jean: Is that correct, Mr. Dubé? I thought the motion was passed.

Mr. Simon Dubé: The chair should be counted as one specific member.

Mr. Brian Jean: So there would be 16 members on the board then. Is that what passed?

Mr. Simon Dubé: If you want to keep it at 15—

Mr. Marcel Proulx: No, it's 15. That's what I meant.

Mr. Simon Dubé: The chair...so you'd have 14 other members from across the regions.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: That's right.

The Chair: Since it is one o'clock and I know other people have.... We can take this back to our offices and add the numbers up.

We will reconvene on Thursday and start at this point.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: Are we back here on Thursday on Bill C-22?

The Chair: Pardon me, it's next Tuesday. On Thursday we have the minister and department officials.

Mr. Marcel Proulx: Next Tuesday will we have the full two hours?

The Chair: Yes.

● (1300)

Mr. Marcel Proulx: Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

The meeting is adjourned.

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:
Publishing and Depository Services
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5

*En cas de non-livraison,
retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :*
Les Éditions et Services de dépôt
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5

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

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Additional copies may be obtained from: Publishing and
Depository Services
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5
Telephone: 613-941-5995 or 1-800-635-7943
Fax: 613-954-5779 or 1-800-565-7757
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca
<http://publications.gc.ca>

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the
following address: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

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

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les
Éditions et Services de dépôt
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5
Téléphone : 613-941-5995 ou 1-800-635-7943
Télécopieur : 613-954-5779 ou 1-800-565-7757
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca
<http://publications.gc.ca>

Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à
l'adresse suivante : <http://www.parl.gc.ca>