



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

43rd PARLIAMENT, 2nd SESSION

Standing Committee on Health

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 005

Friday, November 6, 2020

Chair: Mr. Ron McKinnon



Standing Committee on Health

Friday, November 6, 2020

• (1450)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Ron McKinnon (Coquitlam—Port Coquitlam, Lib.)): I call this meeting to order.

Welcome to meeting number five of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Health.

This committee is meeting today to discuss supplementary estimates (B) for 2020-21.

I want to thank the witnesses for appearing today.

We have the Honourable Patty Hajdu, Minister of Health. From the Department of Health, we have Mr. Stephen Lucas, deputy minister; and Les Linklater, federal lead for COVID-19 testing, contact tracing and data management strategies. From the Public Health Agency of Canada, we have Dr. Theresa Tam, chief public health officer; and Iain Stewart, president. From the Canadian Food Inspection Agency, we have Dr. Siddika Mithani, president. From the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, we have Dr. Michael Strong, president.

Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format. I would like to start the meeting by providing you with some information following the motion that was adopted in the House on Wednesday, September 23.

As the committee is now sitting in a hybrid format, it means that members can participate either in person or by video conference. All members, regardless of their method of participation, will be counted for the purpose of quorum. The committee's power to sit is, however, limited by the priority use of House resources, which is determined by the whips. All questions must be decided by a recorded vote, unless the committee disposes of them with unanimous consent or on division. Finally, the committee may deliberate in camera, provided that it takes into account the potential risks to confidentiality inherent to such deliberations with remote participants.

The proceedings will be made available via the House of Commons website. So you are aware, the webcast will always show the person speaking rather than the entirety of the committee.

To ensure an orderly meeting, I would like to outline a few rules to follow.

Members and witnesses may speak in the official language of their choice. Interpretation services are available for this meeting. You have the choice, at the bottom of your screen, of floor, English

or French. I should note that if you are not using the latest version of the Zoom application, you need to switch to the particular language of interpretation that you're going to speak.

Before speaking, click on the microphone icon to activate your own mike. When you are done speaking, please put your mike on mute to minimize any interference.

As a reminder, all comments by members and witnesses should be addressed through the chair. Should members need to request the floor outside of their designated time for questions, they should activate their mike and state that they have a point of order. If a member wishes to intervene on a point of order that has been raised by another member, they should use the "raise hand" function. This will signal to the chair your interest to speak and create a speakers list. In order to do so, you should click on "participants" at the bottom of the screen. When the list pops up, you will see next to your name that you can click "raise hand."

When speaking, please speak slowly and clearly—and my apologies to the translators. Unless there are exceptional circumstances, the use of headsets with a boom microphone is mandatory for everyone participating remotely. Should any technical challenges arise, please advise the chair. Please note that we may need to suspend for a few minutes, as we need to ensure that all members are able to participate fully.

I'm not going to go through the "participating in person" part. I don't think we have any today.

That being said, I would like to invite the minister to make a 10-minute statement.

• (1455)

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner (Calgary Nose Hill, CPC): Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Is that a point of order?

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: Hi, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Are you raising a point of order?

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: I'm just wondering if you're recognizing me to speak.

The Chair: No. I recognized the minister to give her statement.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: On a point of order, the original motion for this meeting today requires that the minister stay for two hours. We've lost an hour of committee time. I'd like clarification on whether the minister and her officials will be staying for two hours today.

The Chair: Thank you.

The minister may wish to speak to that point at some point during her statement. I would certainly invite the minister to carry on with her statement, unless she wishes to answer—

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: It's actually a procedural point of order, so it's up to you to decide on it, not the minister.

The motion that was put before the committee was for the minister to stay for two hours. We have lost an hour of the meeting. The minister has not been in front of the committee in some months. We have billions of dollars of spending to scrutinize. A long statement from the minister with no questioning time from the committee is not sufficient.

I would like to know if the minister will be staying for the full two hours with the committee members today. Otherwise, perhaps the committee should make alternate arrangements for this before we proceed with the minister's statement.

Thank you.

The Chair: I certainly would invite the minister to respond to that, if she wishes. I don't see that it's really germane at this point. I would certainly like to hear the minister's statement.

Mr. Darren Fisher (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, Lib.): Mr. Chair—

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: Mr. Chair, are you overruling my point of order?

The Chair: Well, it seems to me you're asking whether the minister will be available for the full time. I'm certainly inviting the minister to respond to that question.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: Before she starts her statement...

The Chair: Sure. If the minister would like to respond to the statement, I invite her to do so.

Mr. Darren Fisher: Mr. Chair, I had a point of order as well.

I'm sorry, but we have these witnesses here. They've been patiently waiting. We have the ability to start this meeting, and if we can't finish this meeting, we can come back and invite them back to finish the meeting. Everybody has agreed that we want the minister for two hours. We have at least an hour. Let's start. Let's get focused and move forward on this, and please get some time in today. We'll happily make it up after the constituency week.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: Mr. Chair—

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Fisher.

I've asked the minister if she wishes to respond.

Mr. Larry Maguire (Brandon—Souris, CPC): Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

The Chair: Minister, did you wish to respond to the point of order?

Hon. Patty Hajdu (Minister of Health): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm able to stay today until 4 p.m. and I'm more than happy to come back to provide the additional hour of appearance.

The Chair: Thank you, Minister.

Mr. Larry Maguire: Well, Mr. Chair—

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: Point of order, Chair.

The Chair: Actually, Mr. d'Entremont has a prior point of order.

Go ahead, Mr. d'Entremont.

Mr. Chris d'Entremont (West Nova, CPC): Oh, that wasn't me. I'm guessing that was Mr. Maguire.

Quite honestly, if I can have a point of order, it's that we've been sitting here and there's an hour that's already gone by. We have two hours of questioning to do. We would like to do it all in one swoop. I'm just wondering if you could recognize Ms. Rempel Garner and maybe we can run a motion and try to find another date that would work for everyone.

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Mr. Chair, I've had my hand up to speak to the point of order.

If I may, it's more than just what people want. I'm going to read the motion that was passed, which is binding upon this committee and you. It says:

That, pursuant to the Order of Reference of October 22, 2020, the Minister of Health appear before the Committee for no fewer than 2 hours to consider the Supplementary Estimates (B) prior to November 6th 2020; and that this meeting be televised.

The motion couldn't be clearer. That's why having heard the point of order and having heard from the minister, who can only stay at this point for one hour, we would be violating the precise terms of the motion that we passed and will have no choice but to reschedule this meeting.

I appreciate the minister being here and all of the staff, and I appreciate it's not their responsibility or fault that this meeting has been truncated, although I do note that when we convened this meeting, when we started, generally the procedure would be to ask for unanimous consent to proceed with the meeting while the bells were ringing, and at least we could have had the minister's statement out and proceeded at that time. I noticed that you didn't even canvass that possibility, but just simply unilaterally said the meeting wouldn't start until now.

As the chair of the committee, you decided to start this meeting in the knowledge that we would have one hour to complete the meeting, when the motion calls for the minister to appear—not the meeting to be conducted, but for the minister to appear—for no fewer than two hours, which we all know now cannot happen.

● (1500)

Mr. Darren Fisher: On that point of order, Mr. Chair—

Mr. Don Davies: Excuse me, I still have the floor.

Mr. Darren Fisher: Certainly.

Mr. Don Davies: I know the minister has not appeared before the committee in a number of months. My honourable colleague with the Conservatives is quite right. There are massive numbers of areas to look into. It's not appropriate to have the minister come before committee, have a chance to have a statement, speak for 10 minutes, and then we have maybe enough for one round of questions before we stop the meeting.

Not only do I not think that we can go, or that we should stay for an hour today and reschedule, but in terms of the motion, we cannot. I suggest that we reschedule this meeting. The minister has graciously offered to come back for another hour. Let's just have the minister come back as soon as possible for the full two hours so that we can actually get that traction.

My final point is going to be this. I know it's hard to gather this many people together. If we were going to come together, let's spend the full two hours examining the issues that I know all members and the minister and her team want to cover, instead of breaking this up into smaller pieces.

Mr. Darren Fisher: On that point of order, Mr. Chair, does the motion say anything about having the two hours concurrently? There's no reason we couldn't do an hour today. We have these folks here. They're all sound-checked. Let's do an hour today and invite these folks back for another hour on another day after our constituency week. That still fulfills the motion that we all supported unanimously.

Mr. Don Davies: Yes, Mr. Chair, exactly. It does say that. It says no fewer than two hours on or before Friday, November 6, which is today.

The Chair: Clearly, the wishes of the committee are expressed in that motion. However, I should remind the committee that we cannot compel the minister to appear. The minister was invited to appear. She graciously agreed to do so, and she has graciously agreed to come back and fulfill the other hour in which we would like to hear from her.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: I have a point of order, Chair.

The Chair: It does seem to be the will of the committee to have a vote on this, but I will recognize Ms. Rempel Garner to move her motion.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I move:

That the committee reschedule the two hour meeting scheduled for November 6, 2020 to the week of November 9-13, 2020, taking into consideration the minister's availability, and that the same witnesses be invited to appear.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Rempel Garner.

We go now to Mr. Fisher.

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

For all the reasons I outlined before.... These extremely busy, brilliant people have been here waiting for a long time. They're all sound-checked. We can do an hour now and an hour after the constituency week. Let's not continue to waste time. We have Dr. Tam, one of the busiest people in the country. We have the minister. We have deputy ministers. We have incredible people here who are set

up and sound-checked. We can easily do an hour now, and an hour after the constituency week.

Mr. Chair, I move to adjourn debate.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Fisher.

There is a motion on the floor to adjourn debate. I would ask the clerk to call the vote.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Thériault (Montcalm, BQ): Mr. Chair, am I to understand that you are putting Ms. Rempel Garner's motion to a vote?

The Chair: Everything is in order with respect to Ms. Rempel Garner's motion.

The vote—

• (1505)

[*English*]

I'm sorry, I'll have to try in English.

[*Translation*]

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Jean-François Pagé): The vote is to adjourn the debate.

[*English*]

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: I have a point of clarification, Chair. My understanding is that the motion before committee right now is to adjourn debate on my motion so that it cannot pass, so that it can't be voted on, and so that the Liberals would continue with the meeting, in a spirit against this motion.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Rempel Garner.

There is no debate on this. Certainly, Mr. Thériault is entitled to know what we're voting on. The motion is to adjourn the debate.

Mr. Clerk, please go ahead.

Mr. Don Davies: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair. I'm not clear what we're voting on or what the consequences of the vote are. We can't cast a meaningful vote if we don't know what we're doing. Perhaps the clerk can clarify what the vote is and what the import of the vote is.

The Chair: Let me clarify. Ms. Rempel Garner moved a motion. Mr. Fisher moved to adjourn debate on the motion. We've done this many times. The vote is on the question of adjourning the debate. If the motion passes, the meeting will continue; if the motion is not successful, we will debate Ms. Rempel Garner's motion.

I'm sorry, Mr. Clerk. Please start.

Mr. Marcus Powlowski (Thunder Bay—Rainy River, Lib.): I have a point of clarification. Are you saying that if we vote to adjourn debate then we're going to vote on the motion itself by Ms. Rempel Garner?

The Chair: Negative. If we adjourn the debate, then the meeting will continue as scheduled. If the motion to adjourn debate fails, then the debate will continue, and we will then debate Ms. Rempel Garner's motion. I think that should be pretty clear to everybody now.

Mr. Clerk, please conduct the vote.

Mr. Larry Maguire: Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Sure, one more. Go ahead.

Mr. Larry Maguire: If we vote against this adjournment motion that came forward, we will continue to debate the motion that Ms. Rempel Garner put on the floor.

The Chair: If you vote against adjourning the debate, then the debate continues, yes.

Anybody else?

Mr. Larry Maguire: Thank you.

The Chair: One more time, Mr. Clerk, please commence.

(Motion negatived: nays 6; yeas 5)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Clerk.

Therefore, the debate is not adjourned. We can continue.

Mr. Fisher and Ms. Rempel Garner have their hands up.

Do you wish to speak again, Mr. Fisher?

Mr. Darren Fisher: Again, I don't know where we're going now. I guess we're going to debate Ms. Rempel Garner's motion to reschedule this meeting. It's a shame. Again, I apologize to our witnesses. We have the opportunity to get a really good hour of fulsome discussion in here, so I apologize for all the waste of time here. It certainly wasn't the intention on this side of the House. We want to get down to work.

Thank you so much. We'll wait to see where the debate goes.

• (1510)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Fisher.

We'll go now to Mr. Davies.

Mr. Don Davies: Like many of us here, I've sat on committees for a long time. What is customarily the case when we ask the minister to appear is that the minister appears for one hour on estimates, and then the minister's staff stays for the remaining hour. That was specifically and explicitly not done in this case. In fact, it's the first time I can remember a committee saying that it wanted the minister there for two hours, and why wouldn't we? We have the Minister of Health in the middle of the biggest "pandemic in a century." Those are the words she uses, and she's right to use them.

By the way, it's also the governing party, the Liberals, that chooses when to schedule votes. They control the Order Paper in this case, and they chose to have a vote today in the middle of this meeting. One of the reasons that committees, which are the masters of their own business.... If we decide that we want the minister here for two hours because in our wisdom we believe that's the amount of time we need in order to have a fulsome explanation of the issues, then that's the will of the committee. If the government decides to schedule a vote during that time and to deviate and inter-

ferre with the committee's ability to enforce the very motion that we all passed...including the very same Liberals who are speaking today saying an hour is okay, who voted in favour of having the minister come for two hours, or if they didn't vote in favour, the majority of the committee said that's what it wanted, so that's what we need to do.

If you take this argument to its extreme example, the minister could have come, given her 10-minute statement and left, or she could have come and given a 10-minute statement and stayed for 10 or 15 minutes to answer questions. That's not what this committee requested and what we passed.

I think it's very unbecoming for a member of the government side to suggest that we're losing time when it's his own government that scheduled a vote that made it impossible for us to carry out a long-scheduled, two-hour meeting to have the Minister of Health come to answer questions.

I'm going to also say that one of the reasons we want two hours is that there are so many issues to canvass, and it's important to hear our colleagues' questions and the minister's answers so that we can actually follow up with further questions. When you only have one hour, that process is interrupted.

Where I'm going to conclude is where I started at the beginning of this. This motion says that she has to be here for a minimum of two hours. If she says that she can't be, then the motion cannot be respected, and we have no choice but to reschedule this. I sincerely hope that the minister will be available sometime next week to come for two hours. She has already offered generously to come for an hour. I'm sure we can find another two hours.

I'll conclude by saying that I realize there are a lot of important, busy people before this committee. So are the members of this committee. We are elected here by Canadians as the health committee, the Standing Committee on Health, to hold this government accountable. We haven't heard from the minister or Dr. Tam or staff for many months now. It's not an indulgence or a favour that the minister and these staff appear before this committee. It's their duty. It's their responsibility. The only question that we have here is that, of course, out of respect for the minister's schedule, we need to find an appropriate time. I'm sure we can do that. After all, we found two hours with the minister on slightly less than two weeks' notice already.

Mr. Darren Fisher: I have a quick point of order on Mr. Davies' comments.

The minister agreed immediately to two hours. The committee all supported this. We all supported this. We see that this is a good thing. The argument is whether we can do an hour today—

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: Debate, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Rempel Garner. I'll step in when I feel it's appropriate.

Mr. Fisher, that is debate. We need to go to our next debater.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Thériault, you have the floor.

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Chair, we have Ms. Rempel Garner's motion before us. I'm not sure whether Ms. Rempel Garner would agree to amend her motion. I will not repeat all the arguments made by my colleague Mr. Davies. I agree with them. On matters of substance, he always gives very good advice, keeping the committee on the right track.

That said, we have all prepared for this meeting. We clearly wanted two hours and we worked very hard to prepare for it. However, we did not have a session scheduled for the coming week. Some members of the committee—and I'm not the only one—also sit on the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights, which is already scheduled to sit for two days next week.

I would like us to be able to include in Ms. Garner's motion the exclusion of the time slots for the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights, taking into account the minister's availability. That way, next week, we can all participate and work together when the minister appears. Not all the work we have done will be done by others. At the same time, we will ensure that there will be no conflict in scheduling. I have been very flexible, and I'm open. I think it's very important that we stick with the motion asking the minister and all her officials to answer our questions for two hours.

Would Ms. Rempel Garner agree to that addition to the motion? If not, I will make a subamendment.

• (1515)

[*English*]

The Chair: Monsieur Thériault, it's up to you to make the amendment if you wish to do so.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Thériault: If I understand correctly, there is no answer from the Conservatives. I am therefore making a subamendment.

[*English*]

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: Sorry, Chair, I have a point of clarification.

I support what Mr. Thériault is saying. I understand that, procedurally, he has to make the amendment in order for it to count, but we would support that.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Thériault, if you wish to move that amendment, please do so.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Thériault: Yes, I am proposing that amendment.

Mr. Clerk, is it clear enough?

The Clerk: Yes, if the motion passes, I'll make sure they are not the same time slots.

Mr. Luc Thériault: That's very good. I am prepared to vote on that.

[*English*]

The Chair: Is the committee comfortable with the amendment that Mr. Thériault has proposed?

We have the opportunity now to debate this amendment. Does anyone wish to debate Mr. Thériault's amendment?

I see that Mr. Kelloway's and Mr. Van Bynen's hands are up.

Mr. Kelloway, go ahead.

Mr. Mike Kelloway (Cape Breton—Canso, Lib.): I'm wondering, first, if you could read Mr. Thériault's amendment again, so I'm clear on it.

The other aspect of this is with respect to some of the discussion that has come up today, in particular Mr. Fisher's discussion on an hour here and an hour the following week or the week after.

I'm new to elected office. I know many here have been around for a long time. Maybe I'm looking at this differently, I guess, but I look at the fact that we have an enemy in COVID. It is certainly rearing its ugly head again in round two or maybe round three. We have the generals here, the advocates, who can speak for an hour. It's not an indulgence on our part. I think that's rather coarse.

They're here. They're serving like you are and like I am. We're elected officials. We want to ask them questions. We want to ask them tough questions, too, just like you do. We want to be fair, just like you do. The fact of the matter is, we can have one hour and then look at another hour very soon. In the midst of a pandemic, we need to hear from our officials. I'm just blown away.

The Chair: Mr. Kelloway, please address your comments to the chair, not to individuals.

Mr. Van Bynen, please go ahead. I believe you are still muted.

• (1520)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Chair—

[*English*]

Mr. Tony Van Bynen (Newmarket—Aurora, Lib.): Is it working now?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Thériault: Mr. Kelloway asked that we reread the amended motion to fully understand it. Shouldn't we read it again right away?

[*English*]

The Chair: You're quite correct. I apologize.

Mr. Clerk, perhaps you could clarify for Mr. Kelloway and others the exact amendment that has been proposed.

[*Translation*]

The Clerk: I will read it in French, because Mr. Thériault moved it in French. As I understand it, he wants to add “taking into account the availability of the Minister, and excluding the time slots of the Standing Committee on Justice and Human Rights.”

Mr. Luc Thériault: That's right, Mr. Clerk, and then the motion continues.

The Clerk: “and that the same witnesses be invited to appear.”

Mr. Luc Thériault: Yes, that's it.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Clerk.

Thank you, Mr. Thériault, for bringing me back on topic.

We'll go now to Mr. Van Bynen.

Mr. Tony Van Bynen: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This discussion now, then, is with respect to the amendment only. Is that correct?

The Chair: That is correct.

Mr. Tony Van Bynen: While I appreciate that there will be other meetings that could have a conflict here with respect to other committees, my concern is that we've been a long time planning this constituency week. There are a number of very significant meetings that have already been arranged by myself, and I'm sure by other members within this group to live up to their obligations to listen to their community and to their constituents. It would be embarrassing and somewhat disrespectful to our constituents to have to change all of those meetings to accommodate this.

My suggestion would be that we also allow for other commitments. I know there's a reference to a timetable, but why are we restricting it only to the justice committee? Should we not also be looking at the availability of other members of the committee and recognizing their commitments?

The Chair: Do you wish to make that as a subamendment?

Mr. Tony Van Bynen: Yes, I would. It would be taking into consideration the justice committee commitments, as said earlier, as well as other committee member commitments to their constituents.

The Chair: Thank you.

Is everyone clear on Mr. Van Bynen's subamendment?

Mr. Darren Fisher: Mr. Chair, I think my name is on the list to speak next.

I apologize, as this is not meant to be a point of order, but can we please release the witnesses? We've heard from Mr. Thériault; we've heard from Mr. Davies, and we know the Conservatives want to reschedule this meeting.

Can we please just let these amazing people log off and go back to the amazing things they do?

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Fisher.

Unfortunately—

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: On that request, Chair—

The Chair: Ms. Rempel Garner, I am speaking.

Pursuant to your request, Mr. Fisher, until we dispose of this particular motion, we don't know whether we will be able to call upon the witnesses.

Mr. Darren Fisher: Okay.

The Chair: We have to deal with this first.

The debate at this time is on Mr. Van Bynen's subamendment. Is there any comment or discussion on this subamendment?

I see Mr. Thériault.

[*Translation*]

You have the floor.

Mr. Luc Thériault: Given that Mr. Davies has clarified the meaning of the initial motion, namely to have the minister appear for two hours, and that Ms. Rempel Garner's motion proposes either to bring the witnesses back to the meeting or to excuse them from having to stay, I am very surprised that people want to continue the discussion rather than to vote.

What Mr. Fisher just said is happening. We want to move subamendments on subamendments. Out of respect for the witnesses, there should be a vote on the motion to see if they can leave the meeting. Mr. Van Bynen's intervention is contradictory and I will oppose it.

• (1525)

[*English*]

The Chair: When we call the vote, you can vote whichever way you please. It is the prerogative of the members to speak on motions and subamendments and it is their privilege to do so.

Is there any further discussion on Mr. Van Bynen's subamendment?

Seeing none, I will ask the clerk to conduct the vote.

Mr. Don Davies: May I have the question read as to what we're voting on, please?

The Chair: Very well.

Mr. Clerk, please read it, if you could.

The Clerk: I have the French version here.

Do you want me to read the whole motion, or just the subamendment?

Mr. Don Davies: Whatever it is we're voting on now.

The Chair: We're voting on the subamendment. Mr. Van Bynen has moved that we add the availability of other members of the committee.

The Clerk: I have it: “taking into consideration the minister's availability, except for the time allotted to the justice committee, as well as other committee members' availability.”

The Chair: Is everyone clear on the subamendment?

Mr. Clerk, please conduct the vote on Mr. Van Bynen's subamendment.

(Subamendment negatived: nays 6; yeas 5)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. The subamendment is defeated. We go back to Mr. Thériault's amendment.

Is there further discussion on Mr. Thériault's amendment regarding the justice committee?

Seeing none, I will ask the clerk to conduct the vote on the amendment by Mr. Thériault.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Thank you.

The discussion now is on Ms. Rempel Garner's motion as amended.

I see Mr. Fisher. Please go ahead.

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

I understand that the minister is not available next week, but she is available the week of the 16th to the 20th. I wonder if that would be something that we could amend to ensure that we are able to get the minister back here again for two hours.

• (1530)

The Chair: Mr. Fisher, do you wish to move such an amendment?

Mr. Darren Fisher: Sure. Thank you.

The Chair: Could you be more precise about the amendment?

Mr. Darren Fisher: Yes, she is unavailable next week, so I would move that the minister come back for two hours during the week of November 16-20.

The motion does speak to the availability of the minister, and the minister is not available next week.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Fisher.

The amendment on the floor at this time is to modify the time, as Mr. Fisher has proposed.

Is there any discussion on that?

Ms. Rempel Garner, go ahead.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: I find it a little strange that the minister couldn't find two hours in the entire week. We could meet in the evening. We could meet in the early morning. I am just wondering how the minister can't be available for an entire week to come in front of a parliamentary committee for the supplementary estimates when she is asking Parliament to spend billions of dollars.

It seems a little ridiculous to me. In fact, it seems a little contemptuous. How can you not, as the minister—

Mr. Darren Fisher: On a point of order, Mr. Chair, "contemptuous?" Really, Mr. Chair?

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Fisher.

I draw the member's attention. We need to treat our witnesses with courtesy and respect. Thank you.

Are you finished with your comment?

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: I am not, and the minister also needs to treat this committee with respect, so I allow my comment to stand. To summarily say that there is no availability next week.... Look, I have a lot of questions. This committee has not met for months. Honestly, we need her here for two hours and we need her here next week, not the week after.

She could be sitting here. What could she possibly be doing, Chair, that she can't answer questions?

Mr. Darren Fisher: She could be answering questions right now.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: I need two hours, Chair.

The Chair: You're moving against the—

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: I still have the floor, Chair. Thank you.

For the record, we could have passed this motion, and the minister could have availed herself of two hours next week. This is billions of dollars of taxpayer spending. Besides that, it's public policy decisions on restaurant closures and vaccination timetables.

When we lose a week on this, we could have more closures across the country, so honestly, I don't understand why the minister can't make herself available for two hours—

Ms. Sonia Sidhu (Brampton South, Lib.): Point of order.

Mr. Darren Fisher: As a point of order, the minister is making herself available for two hours and we have just wasted—

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: —next week, within a week.

The Chair: Hold on, guys.

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

Ms. Sonia Sidhu: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We all know that the minister said she was happy to stay until 4, and I'm very disappointed. I have some questions about long-term care. I have some questions—

The Chair: I'm sorry, Ms. Sidhu. This is not a point of order.

Let's go back to the motion.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: I still have the floor.

I know there is a lot of high tension here, but we need two hours with the minister, Chair, and I would respectfully ask the minister, given the amount of money she is asking this committee to approve through the supplementary estimates, that she would avail herself of two hours next week, given the urgency of the situation and given that one of her primary roles in her mandate letter from the Prime Minister is to be accountable to Parliament.

She has not been in front of this committee for some time. Surely she can find two hours to do that in the next week, which is a break week from Parliament so she does not have the typical timetable of question period and other things. Surely she can find two hours in her time next week to appear on this.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Rempel Garner.

We will go now to Mr. Kelloway.

Mr. Mike Kelloway: Thanks, Mr. Chair.

Where do I begin here? We all agree that this is absolutely the issue of our times. We want to have questions for the minister and Dr. Tam.

Looking at my clock, I see that it's 4:34 Atlantic Standard Time, so for 34 minutes, we've been debating and making subamendments, which we as parliamentarians have the right to do. Meanwhile, the minister is just to the left of me. If this were the Brady Bunch set, she would be right down in the left-hand corner and we could ask her questions about it.

But, instead, some of us are making good points, and I would argue that some are pontificating on their points and repeating their points. Right now we have issues with long-term care. Right now we have issues with airports not being open. Right now this is going on, and we're talking now in minute 35 saying that we want to ask the minister questions. I do. I would have loved to. I would have loved to hear her statement for an update. I would have loved for Canadians to hear that, but now we're into minute 35 of this committee.

I am absolutely floored by this. I think most Canadians would be, too. We can look at a time that we can get two hours or we can look at a time that we can get an additional hour. I don't know the minister well. I know her schedule is busy, because she's one of the top people who, along with a lot of people in the public service, is ensuring that Canadians are safe.

Come on, folks. Canadians are expecting us to get to work, so let's get to work.

• (1535)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Kelloway.

Mr. Davies, go ahead, please.

Mr. Don Davies: Just briefly, I want to make one point. I do hope that colleagues will stop just hitting their microphone and interjecting when someone is speaking. I'm not going to single out anybody—maybe we're all responsible for that—but we really do have to respect whoever has the floor.

I must say that Ms. Rempel Garner made a point that I thought was valid, which is that next week is a break week. I do know that we're all busy, but at least the duties in the House are not there for

the minister or for the parliamentary secretary, so that should be, I think, a little bit easier to schedule.

Once again, I also want to add my voice and say that I guess it's up to the minister. She controls her schedule, and it's up to her whether or not she feels she can rearrange it and whether or not this committee is important enough or priority enough for her to appear before this committee next week for two hours, given the fact that the estimates are on a bit of a timeline here. I know she's very, very busy doing a lot of very important things, but I would say that this committee ranks up there in importance in terms of her responsibilities.

I'm going to repeat that it's been months since the minister last appeared; I want to say since March, but I'm not 100% sure of that. I apologize if I'm wrong on that, but it has been a number of months.

I also hope that we don't keep going back to this issue of what we could have done in the last hour. I'm going to say, again, that the motion this committee passed was to have the minister here for a minimum of two hours, so you can't show up for the meeting and say, "Well geez, how about half an hour?" and act like it's a waste of time if we don't use the half-hour, when this committee explicitly debated and passed a motion that said a minimum of two hours. It doesn't lie in the mouth of anybody in this committee to now second-guess that and make it seem as though people aren't interested in working.

I came to this committee today prepared to work for two hours as well. We all did. It's not a comment on anybody's work ethic if suddenly some people behind the scenes make a decision that subverts the very meaning of the motion we had. That's on them. That's not on this committee. I don't want anybody's work ethic questioned here when the motion that we passed is being violated.

I'm going to finish by saying this. There are a lot of parliamentary games that are played. There are a lot of tricks on everybody's plate. The government has probably the biggest plate of tricks, and whoever on the government side chose to schedule a vote today on a subamendment that did not have to be scheduled today, knowing that they had cabinet ministers coming to committee, did that knowing that it would interfere with the ability of this committee to hold the minister accountable.

Again, I'm not going to hear any government-side witnesses talk about how sad they are that they missed this opportunity, when it was their side that interfered with the ability of this committee to carry out the precise terms of the motion that we passed democratically, and they should be ashamed of themselves for trying to proceed in derogation of that motion. It makes a mockery of the motions we pass.

I'm going to agree with Michelle Rempel Garner on this. There is no reason that this cannot be scheduled for next week. I know we're all busy, but we can find two hours next week to discuss the myriad health issues. I'm going to ask the health minister to rearrange her schedule and treat this committee as a high priority and find two hours next week that work.

On that point, in terms of our time next week, we don't have to have everybody who is sitting at this table at the meeting next week. We can send substitutes, and we also have quorum rules, so every party can easily have someone representing it at this committee next week, no matter when it is scheduled, and no matter what other committees are being conducted at the same time.

If we really want to stop wasting time, let's get to the motion and just pass the motion that asks the minister to come to this committee next week if she can. I understand that this motion still has built into it the ability subject to the minister's schedule, in any event, so if she really can't come next week, if there really aren't two hours next week during which she can come to the Standing Committee on Health to hold herself accountable for questions, then she can make that decision. We can't compel her to come. But let's get to it and let's pass this motion and leave it in the hands of the minister and her scheduling.

And if she can't come next week—and I suppose she can't—we'll do it the week after, but let's move on. If everybody really believes their own rhetoric here and wants to move on and quit wasting time, let's get to the vote on that and try to get this meeting for two hours scheduled as soon as we can.

• (1540)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Davies.

We go now to Mr. Van Bynen.

Mr. Tony Van Bynen: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: The debate is on Mr. Fisher's amendment.

Mr. Tony Van Bynen: The concern I have is that we hear that there's a sense of urgency. Frankly, the urgency is in the field. The urgency is in delivering the services that our constituents and our residents need.

If I understand it correctly, these supplementaries are not due until December. If the debate and the discussion are about the supplementaries, then why is next week so urgent? Unless we're going to be discussing something other than supplementaries, I don't think that was the intent.

I agree that we should go ahead and make sure we vote on the issue, but I'm just not quite accustomed to all the finger-wagging and the finger pointing that I'm seeing in some of these discussions. I would hope that we would all focus on moving forward and doing what we can for our constituents.

I'll leave it at that, but it's not an issue of its being priority enough; it's an issue of how we are creating a sense of urgency on the supplementaries, which are not due until December. I'll leave it at that, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Van Bynen.

Is there any further discussion on Mr. Fisher's amendment?

Ms. Sidhu, please go ahead.

Ms. Sonia Sidhu: Mr. Chair, I think Mr. Fisher's amendment is very reasonable, and we all should think about it.

The other thing is that we are not playing any games. We all want to work together. The minister is here and all her health officials are here. They are amazing people who are very busy. I think Mr. Fisher's amendment is very genuine. We should look into that.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Sidhu.

Is there any further discussion on Mr. Fisher's amendment?

Seeing none, I'll ask the committee if everyone is comfortable with what the amendment is.

Mr. Tony Van Bynen: Mr. Chair, would you please repeat the amendment?

The Chair: Yes. Mr. Clerk, if you would, please.

The Clerk: I will ask Mr. Fisher, because it's not clear to me what the motion actually says. I'm sorry.

Mr. Darren Fisher: My apologies.

Thanks, folks. I just have the motion adjusted to have the minister appear in the week between the 16th and the 20th, not next week.

The Chair: Thank you.

Is everyone clear on Mr. Fisher's amendment? Seeing no dissent, I shall ask the clerk to call the vote on Mr. Fisher's amendment.

(Amendment negatived: nays 6; yeas 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Clerk.

Mr. Fisher, the amendment does not carry.

We go back to Ms. Rempel Garner's motion as amended by Mr. Thériault. The debate resumes on that matter. Is there any further debate on the motion as amended?

Dr. Powlowski, I see that you're waving your hand. If you could do it on the side thing, that keeps everybody in the same thing.

I see no conflict there, so please go ahead, Dr. Powlowski.

• (1545)

Mr. Marcus Powlowski: I think and hope that we're just going to vote it out. I do suggest that in the future we try to have more harmony. This has been how many weeks with us spinning our wheels and doing nothing.... One way or the other, we have to actually start debating COVID. It's getting kind of crazy. How many weeks has it been now that we've basically been in procedural wrangling?

I do want to discuss the issues. This is the number one issue. The blood is squirting on the ceiling. As an emergency room doctor, that's what I get worried about. Yes, okay, it's not real people's blood, but it is public health blood, and people are dying from this. We do need to start addressing the issue and stop the procedural wrangling. Please, let us all keep that in mind and for the next meeting come here and actually start doing the work instead of wrangling over procedure.

The Chair: Thank you, Dr. Powlowski.

We'll go now to Mr. Van Bynen.

Please go ahead.

Mr. Tony Van Bynen: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just have a comment. I would have hoped that there might be some flexibility on the other side from the individuals who put forward the motion to give some consideration to extending it by one week. I still don't understand what the sense of urgency is, and I'm concerned that this may become a tempest in a teapot.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Van Bynen.

We have Mr. Kelloway next.

Mr. Mike Kelloway: It just seems like we're going to a vote. In Atlantic Standard Time, it's almost 10 minutes to five, so let's vote.

The Chair: Ms. Sidhu, you're next.

Ms. Sonia Sidhu: Mr. Chair, I want to apologize to all the health officials and the minister. This team is at the forefront in fighting COVID-19, and I think we've wasted their time. I just want to apologize.

Everyone is watching. This is the health committee. I'm very disappointed today. We had an hour. We've wasted that hour while our residents are watching us. They are asking me questions, so I have many questions about long-term care, mental health and rapid testing, and there are many other things.

We all have hard questions to ask our officials and our minister, and we've all wasted our time. This is not what Canadians want to see, and I want to apologize to the minister and all health officials.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Sidhu.

Is there any further discussion on Ms. Rempel Garner's motion as amended by Mr. Thériault?

Seeing nothing else, is everyone clear on the motion as amended? Seeing no dissent, I will ask the clerk to conduct the vote. The vote is on Ms. Rempel Garner's motion as amended by Monsieur Thériault.

(Motion as amended agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Mr. Barlow, did you have an interjection at this point?

• (1550)

Mr. John Barlow (Foothills, CPC): Yes, Mr. Chair. I appreciate your giving me the floor here for a moment.

I'm wondering if we can save some time and have more opportunity for questions for the minister. I'd like to table a motion that the minister table her opening statement that she was going to give today so the members of this committee can review it in preparation for the meeting, which we are rescheduling, hopefully, for next week.

The Chair: Did you actually want to move that motion?

Mr. John Barlow: Yes, I'd like to move a motion that the minister table her opening statement for this committee so that we can review it in preparation for the next meeting.

The Chair: Mr. Fisher, go ahead.

Mr. Darren Fisher: Mr. Chair, I think the minister has to have the right to make that opening statement.

I'm sorry. I just do not agree with this at all.

The Chair: Thank you.

Is there anybody else?

Mr. Barlow, are you raising your hand again?

Mr. John Barlow: No, I'm sorry.

The Chair: Is there any further debate on Mr. Barlow's motion?

Mr. Kelloway, go ahead.

Mr. Mike Kelloway: Mr. Chair, on a point of clarification, what I'm hearing is about a written statement, as opposed to her speaking through the statement. I just want to be clear.

Mr. John Barlow: Yes. In response to Mr. Kelloway, my motion would be that the minister table her statement. My reason for this is that it would give us more time, and all of us here today have spoken about the need to have as many opportunities as possible to present questions to the minister and officials.

I would prefer that we have that 10 minutes to pose questions, rather than having an opening statement that we could all read over the next week and be prepared and be ready. I think that's a better use of our time than just having the minister use that 10 minutes to give an opening statement when we could read it. Now that we know it's ready, we could read it over the next week and not have her read it again at the next meeting.

Mr. Mike Kelloway: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and, through you, thank you for that, MP Barlow.

I would just say that I look at this also as an opportunity, obviously, for the minister to have a conversation with us in her 10 minutes—and it is 10 minutes, I believe—but it's also a conversation to be had with the Canadians who are watching.

I see Mr. Barlow's point of view, but I would prefer it if the minister spoke to parliamentarians on this committee and, through us and then through other means, spoke to Canadians.

The Chair: We go now to Mr. Van Bynen.

Mr. Tony Van Bynen: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm concerned about the request or the motion, largely because it's not following a pre-established routine motion. We have never asked others to present their opening speeches in the past. It's inconsistent with *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, chapter 20, at page 1069, so we're establishing a different precedent here. Will that be the expectation or will that be required of all other witnesses? Let's be fair.

The Chair: Let me interject here. I think we can ask, but I don't think we can compel in this case.

Mr. Fisher, please go ahead.

Mr. Darren Fisher: Mr. Chair, with all due respect to Mr. Barlow's motion, we see a pandemic that's changing on a daily basis. An opening statement next week by a minister could be a different opening statement than we would have heard today.

This does not show any respect at all to the Minister of Health. This is not something I have seen on any committee. I absolutely think...and I apologize to Mr. Barlow, but I feel this is a ridiculous request.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Fisher.

Let me interject here. We have already passed the motion and it says that we are going to reschedule the meeting, so we really have no further need to compel our witnesses to stay.

I would like to thank the witnesses, thank the minister and all the officials for being here. We hope to see you soon when we reschedule. Thank you.

If the minister and the officials wish to depart, I think that's okay. We can carry on with this discussion.

• (1555)

Mr. Larry Maguire: Mr. Chair, point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Maguire, go ahead.

Mr. Larry Maguire: That would be relevant, unless we vote that the minister should table her words today, in which case, if she's not here, she can't do it. I just raise that as an issue.

The Chair: Thank you, but of course we can make that request, and whether she's here or not, she can fulfill it or not, as appropriate, depending on circumstances.

I really would like to thank the witnesses for taking so much of their valuable time and offering it to us today. I know we can count on them down the road.

We will carry on the debate on Mr. Barlow's motion.

Mr. Davies, you have the floor.

Mr. Don Davies: Thank you.

I have a couple of preliminary observations. I do think that we in the past have at various times cut down the amount of time for witnesses to give opening statements, and we routinely request that witnesses provide written documents.

In this case, I'm going to disagree with the motion, with respect. I think Canadians do want to hear from her. The meeting is televised, and I think it gives her and witnesses the opportunity to speak directly to Canadians, as all witnesses do.

The other thing is that if we do meet next week or the week after, there could be other developments that occur between now and then that may affect what the minister wants to say or comment on.

I do think that out of respect for our witnesses, who do take time out of their busy lives to come and share their time with us, the minister should have the opportunity to have her 10 minutes to address the committee and Canadians, as every other witness does.

I think it is a good point that Mr. Barlow makes about providing more time for us to ask questions, but even given that, I think it's important to give our witnesses the chance to give their statement. I'm going to oppose the motion to have it tabled in writing, and allow the minister to provide her opening remarks in person if that's what she prefers to do. I suppose if she wants to table them in written form, she could, but I think that if she wants to prepare and to give her remarks verbally, I think she should have the right to do so.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Davies.

We go now to Mr. Barlow.

Mr. Barlow, please go ahead.

Mr. John Barlow: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate the feedback from my colleagues on the committee.

Mr. Fisher, you do not have to apologize to me. I'm a big boy, but I do want to point out, before I get to my comment, that you were incensed with the language from my colleague Michelle Rempel Garner, but you had no problem calling my—

The Chair: Can I ask the members not to speak directly to each other? Speak through the chair, please.

Mr. John Barlow: Mr. Chair, for Mr. Fisher to be calling my intervention “ridiculous” isn't exactly in the most parliamentary tone that we are trying to establish here on this committee, so I would say to be careful with glass houses. I don't think any intervention by any of our colleagues on this committee should be deemed ridiculous or inappropriate. I've certainly sat here for the past hour listening to all the comments from my colleagues on this committee and giving them the weight and attention they deserve.

My point with this motion, Mr. Chair, was simply to provide more opportunity for the members of this committee to ask important questions of the minister and the officials. This was not in any way to rob the minister of an opportunity to speak to Canadians, which she gets every single day at every press conference she wants to schedule and at question period every single day.

For my colleagues on the Liberal side to say that.... Yes, this is changing every single day; this is why we want the minister here next week and not in two weeks. Yes, we want to get to work. The opposition parties on this committee were not the ones that prorogued Parliament for almost a month when we could have been doing important work. When Canadians needed their elected officials, at the most important time in their lives, the government decided to prorogue Parliament.

I find it a little bit ironic that now they're complaining that it's time to get to work. Yes, we could have been working for the past two months. That is why we think it is critical that the minister appear here next week and that we have as much time as possible to ask her the important questions our constituents want us to be asking on their behalf. That was the impetus behind my motion, Mr. Chair.

• (1600)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Barlow.

Ms. Rempel Garner, please go ahead.

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: Again, I appreciate what my colleague Mr. Davies said. I also appreciate what my colleague Mr. Barlow said. I think the frustration here, Chair, is that we as a parliamentary committee are being asked to approve quite a bit of funding, and that in the last year, from my perspective, the government has seen this review process and this scrutiny as an inconvenience. It's actually fundamental to our democracy. I think the spirit of the motion that my colleague Mr. Barlow is making today is to say, table what you have today. We'd love to review it in terms of preparation to see if we have questions on the appropriateness of these expenditures. If stuff changes, table stuff next week too. Come prepared with another statement.

I think the point that's being made here is that we need more information, not less, and that it has become very difficult to be a parliamentarian under these circumstances when we're getting massive spending bills rammed through Parliament without really understanding how the government is making decisions and on what principles.

I would love to review that statement. I also want the minister in front of committee to make a statement, but I'd like to know what she would have said today, if the government had not conveniently scheduled a vote during the time she was to appear, so we couldn't start the meeting earlier.

I'll leave it to the committee. I think it would be great to review and to prepare for next week's meeting. As you said, she of course has the choice to make that...appropriate or not.

I think, Mr. Chair, this is meant to say that the days of the government ramming things through this committee and pretending

that we're not going to scrutinize their decisions or that they can't have accountability to us—

Mr. Darren Fisher: Is this still on Mr. Barlow's...?

Hon. Michelle Rempel Garner: It is. Thank you, Mr. Fisher.

Chair, to the points that have been made before, these types of interruptions are.... I get it. I'm a woman, and people usually interrupt me, but enough.

The days of that type of relationship with this committee are over. There is a responsibility to public health and there's also a responsibility to democracy, and every member on this committee has the right to scrutinize the government's decisions.

I believe that's the spirit in which this motion is being made, but, Chair, again, these are perhaps my feelings toward the government. They need to understand that we are going to be asking for information and we are going to be scrutinizing their decisions. It is also their responsibility to be accountable to this committee.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Rempel Garner.

We go now to Mr. Thériault.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Thériault, please go ahead.

Mr. Luc Thériault: I don't want to appear to be lecturing anyone, except that, as parliamentarians, regardless of our political stripe, we owe it to the voters, at the very least, to show good faith and consideration to one another.

I agreed with Mr. Barlow's motion until he revealed his intention. Inviting the Minister to submit her speaking notes before we meet, as other witnesses do, was fine with me. Going over the line and saying that, as a result, we don't need to hear from her, that's not okay with me. I consider it disrespectful, not to the executive and its authority, but to the person we are inviting to come and meet with us. If she is kind enough to submit her notes, I will certainly read them. However, supplementary estimates are already available and we are in the process of doing the necessary work in that regard.

As parliamentarians, surely we are not going to deny a witness the opportunity to speak. If the minister wants to tell us something and that takes 10 minutes, I think we should hear her out. That is having a modicum of respect. I will not cross that line. I am sorry, I will never cross it. I am a legislator. I don't like the executive branch sticking its nose into the legislative branch, but I am able to treat the people who have that power with respect. If the minister wants to speak to us, she can speak to us; gagging a minister is really no better than gagging a member of Parliament.

In that regard, I will be voting against the motion because I think the intent of the motion is malicious. Furthermore, if we start the work of the committee in this way, looking at what we have done from the beginning, I think we will never get anywhere.

I may be lecturing, but I have a moral compass. I will never do to others what I wouldn't want others to do to me. There is a pendulum between the blue power and the red power; our parliamentary system allows that pendulum to swing. That is healthy in a democracy. I put myself in the shoes of Minister Barlow, who would be outraged if he was treated like that. As a legislator, I will not do that. That's it.

• (1605)

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Thériault.

Is there any further discussion on Mr. Barlow's motion?

Seeing none, I will ask the clerk to conduct the vote.

(Motion negatived: nays 7; yeas 4)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Barlow's motion does not carry.

That brings us to the end of our business for today. I thank you all for attending and for your attention and all your diligent efforts.

With that, we shall now adjourn.

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

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

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

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

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

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: <https://www.ourcommons.ca>

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

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

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

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

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

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante :
<https://www.noscommunes.ca>