



House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics

ETHI • NUMBER 002 • 1st SESSION • 38th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Monday, November 1, 2004

—
Chair

Mr. David Chatters

All parliamentary publications are available on the
"Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire" at the following address:

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

Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics

Monday, November 1, 2004

•(1535)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. David Chatters (Battle River, CPC)): We might as well get started. This shouldn't take us too long today.

I was told that I should keep control of the conversation a little better. It makes it very difficult for the translators to know who's talking. So please talk through the chair so that I can recognize you, and we can maybe make it easier for the translators, at least.

The first order of business is to present the report of the subcommittee on agenda. We met last week. We did suggest that we start off by bringing in the Information Commissioner, the Privacy Commissioner, and the Ethics Commissioner, but as it stands today, we still don't have a mandate for the committee covering the Ethics Commissioner. That hasn't come through the procedure and House affairs committee yet. We can discuss that a little more later on.

Certainly there's nothing preventing us from moving ahead and introducing ourselves to them and they to us, both the Information Commissioner and the Privacy Commissioner, to deal with the estimates. There's an annual report for, who was it, the Privacy Commissioner?

It was the Information Commissioner.

Is there any discussion on that?

Go ahead, Marlene.

Hon. Marlene Jennings (Notre-Dame-de-Grâce—Lachine, Lib.): I wonder how many members are aware that the Public Service Commission did an audit of the Privacy Commissioner. We may wish to make that decision either through subcommittee or steering committee, or here in committee of the whole.

The reason the thought came to me was because of the motion from Mr. David Tilson. It says "That whenever a Chapter of a Report of the Auditor General refers to a subject under the mandate of the Committee..." Well, I would add to that any audit, any commission that does an audit, like the Public Service Commission, so that any time there's a study done by a government agency of another agency, and the agency subject to the audit, verification, or review comes under our mandate, we're authorized to call in the agency that has done the review, audit, or whatever.

My only question is that given that the steering committee has, in subsection 1(2): "A meeting with the Privacy Commissioner of Canada on Vote..." would we want to add in the issue of the Privacy Commissioner being the subject of an audit by the Public Service Commission?

The Chair: That's a possibility, but I guess we'll have to discuss the notice of motion from Mr. Tilson. I think that's probably where we want to amend that and bring that in at that point.

I would also think we would want to hear from the Privacy Commissioner and bring that issue up in the discussion with the Privacy Commissioner as well before we decide that we want to go down that road any further. But I agree that it's certainly a subject we would like to talk to the Privacy Commissioner about.

Hon. Marlene Jennings: In that case, would we just go forward and adopt the first report, and depending on how we deal with the notice of motion, we may then wish to have an addendum to the first report?

The Chair: Yes, absolutely.

Is there any more discussion?

Go ahead.

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Laframboise (Argenteuil—Papineau—Mirabel, BQ): Mr. Chairman, it suits me to discuss votes, but I think that we should also be able to discuss any other topic. If in the next few weeks the commissioner tables his own report, we can ask him to come and testify about that report. Indeed, he produces a report on his work every year.

So the topic will not necessarily be votes. After the words "a meeting with the Privacy Commissioner of Canada on vote 45", I would add "and any other topic the committee deems useful."

[English]

The Chair: I don't think that's a problem. I don't think the motion before us restricts us to only those topics. Certainly if they have an annual report that they've tabled before Parliament, we would want to talk about that. So that would be part of it, I think.

I guess we'll split those into three motions. Derek Lee moves the first one.

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

•(1540)

The Chair: Would somebody move number two?

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

The Chair: I'll bring you up to date on number three, and we can have a bit of a discussion there as well. I did talk to the chief clerk at some length on the issue of the Ethics Commissioner. It is my view—and it seems to be the view of others—that this committee will deal with all issues of ethics for members of Parliament, the civil service, the cabinet, and parliamentary secretaries.

From my understanding, because the code itself refers issues of ethics of members of Parliament to the procedure and House affairs committee, if we are going to do that we have to change the code itself. Once that's done, we can change the standing orders so that those issues come to this committee. As it stands, it specifically says in the code that issues of ethics for a member of Parliament go to procedure and House affairs. That will probably take some time, and it'll have to go back to the House. It will take some debate within the procedure and House affairs committee, and perhaps in the House, to amend the code so we can proceed with that.

It was suggested to me by the clerk that we might want to adopt the code and the draft we had that gives us the Information Commissioner and the Privacy Commissioner. It does give us the ethics of the cabinet and the civil service, just not members of Parliament. We might want to adopt that mandate as it stands so we can move forward with the business of the committee. Then if we feel, as I do, that all matters of ethics should come to this committee, we can continue to push to have that happen. But I don't think we want to wait and hold up our committee while that process takes place, because it might take some time.

With that, we will probably not move forward with number three at this point.

We do have a roundabout way of bringing the Ethics Commissioner in, if you wish to do that, before we have that mandate sorted out, and have a discussion with him about that issue and others. Do you want the Ethics Commissioner to come in for the discussion?

Mr. Broadbent.

Hon. Ed Broadbent (Ottawa Centre, NDP): I for one would like to see the Ethics Commissioner come here. If we all agree on changing the code so that in future we would automatically deal with problems associated with members of the House as well, I think it would be a good idea for us, as a committee, to recommend that view to the House leaders, or whoever is responsible for dealing with that.

The Chair: Derek.

Mr. Derek Lee (Scarborough—Rouge River, Lib.): I'm sure everyone would like to have the Ethics Commissioner come by to say hello and discuss issues, but at this point we don't know which issues the Ethics Commissioner is to be asked about. In the meantime, we have an agenda that will allow us to look at the estimates for the Privacy Commissioner and the Information Commissioner. That will take us two or three weeks down the road

In the meantime our mandate will be firmed up. The questions we might want to put to the Ethics Commissioner can be clarified, both for him and for us. There will be enough time to look at that. So I suggest we simply adopt item three the way it is, and that we meet

with the Ethics Commissioner after the mandate has been adopted. Then we can be clearer with him what we want to discuss.

The Chair: Sure.

Marlene, do you have something more?

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marlene Jennings: I want to make sure I have understood correctly. Currently, the order of reference the House has given us is to oversee the work of the Ethics Commissioner as concerns the conflict of interest code for public servants, ministers, parliamentary secretaries and secretaries of state.

[*English*]

The Chair: The House has not given us a mandate at this point, so we just have a name basically. There have been two votes referred to us from the House on the estimates for those two commissioners, but the proposal as it currently stands is to give us the mandate you suggested, without members of Parliament in that.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Marlene Jennings: Does that proposal come from the committee, or are the leaders of the various parties in the House discussing a change to the Standing Orders of the House to entrust us with a mandate on the conflict of interest code for officials and members of the executive? Is that correct? I want to know whether we should be drafting a motion on that to report to the House, or whether the House is already working on the same issue.

• (1545)

[*English*]

The Chair: As it stands now, the issue is with the House leaders. The discussion and debate are going on there. So if members of the committee could make their views known to the House leaders, that would be helpful. If they ever come to an agreement, it will go to the procedure and House affairs committee in the form of a motion, and we'll go from there. But at some point, if the agreement is that this committee will deal with the ethics issue, it will actually have to go to the House in the form of a motion to amend the code itself.

At this point it's just with the House leaders, if that helps.

Hon. Marlene Jennings: Okay. Thank you for the clarification.

The Chair: Mr. Broadbent.

Hon. Ed Broadbent: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that dealing with subsection 1(3) along the lines that Derek has proposed makes sense, but I'd like to go back to what I proposed. Rather than just your view as the chairperson being expressed—which I strongly support—I propose that this committee in the future does deal with members of the House of Commons as well, that we adopt a motion at the committee and send it to the House leaders to say it's the unanimous view of the committee that the code be changed in the future so that problems of members of the House come to this committee too.

The Chair: That might be useful. Instead of individual members lobbying their individual House leaders—

Hon. Ed Broadbent: If it were unanimous.

The Chair: — if the view were unanimous on this committee—

An hon. member: Otherwise you'd need 48 hours' notice.

The Chair: That's right. That's the other side. If it's not unanimous, of course, under our rules of operation we couldn't do it.

Hon. Ed Broadbent: We could find out if it's unanimous.

Mr. Derek Lee: I'm reminded of the adage, be careful what you wish for.

For the information of members, I had a short discussion with the Clerk of the House on Thursday, with the objective of trying to clarify where these issues were headed. He was very good at explaining why the issue had not yet been cleared. It relates to the fact that reports dealing with individual MPs under the new ethics guidelines, or the code, are not referred to a committee. He explained that a report on that subject about any member of Parliament would be referred to the House—

The Chair: To the Speaker.

Mr. Derek Lee: To the Speaker. That's where a referral to the House would go.

At that point, then, the House leaders, etc., would make a determination about how they would... The Speaker would also make a determination subject to the Standing Orders. The question is, where would the House leadership want that report to go if it were to go to a committee? It might not go to a committee. It might stay in the House.

The committee that the House leaders have the greatest connection with is the procedure and House affairs committee, where all the opposition House leaders are represented directly or indirectly. That was the logic behind the lack of conclusion to this. There might be symmetry and logic in having all ethics matters come to this committee, but at the present time the House leaders have not yet disabused themselves of this desire to treat reports to the House on the ethics of an individual MP differently from other reports.

I wanted members to have the benefit of that short discussion. I don't have a firm view myself as to how we should treat that, but any member is free to speak to their House leader.

The Chair: I think your idea is good, Ed, but perhaps we could put off that idea until our next meeting. Perhaps we could bring back some kind of draft motion we could vote on.

●(1550)

Hon. Ed Broadbent: Do you like that idea?

The Chair: Yes, and it will give everybody a little time to do a little more research and a little more thinking. It gives us time to maybe draft something we could vote on to address the issue, as you put it, whether or not...

I'm not convinced that we necessarily want to deal with issues of individual breaches of code of conduct by members of Parliament here, as you say. I think we could draft a motion that would leave that with the procedure and House affairs committee. As to issues of the code and the disclosure document, I think those things should come here, but we could include those.

Go ahead, Mr. Lee.

Mr. Derek Lee: The issue now is who would draft the motion? I would ask Mr. Broadbent...perhaps the clerk could draft a motion that either expresses a view that we should deal with reports referred from the House involving individual MPs, or that we not. But either way, we are still able to deal with the motion and we can express our views at that time.

If the motion were drafted, Mr. Broadbent could move it and I'd be happy to second it.

The Chair: Sure, we'll have the clerk do that.

Go ahead, Mr. Laframboise.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Laframboise: Mr. Chairman, I sat on the Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure which examined the ethics code, and I would not set aside the possibility of inviting the Ethics Commissioner. As we speak, all things considered, he is probably the person who knows the code best, even better than the lawyers. As the bill was passed at the end of the previous Parliament, he had to work on this. I would advise you to convene him before the committee before adopting a motion, in order to ask him what he thinks of it.

The Commissioner and his office are probably the ones who worked the hardest on the whole issue of ethics. There were the elections and all of that, and I must say that that gentleman was extremely helpful to the Committee on Agenda and Procedure of the House and to the subcommittee. I would not set aside the possibility of asking him to appear. I would like us to know how he sees things.

[*English*]

The Chair: Yes. I guess I'm at the pleasure of the committee on that, but I'm not sure whether we get that mandate or we don't. If we do, the Ethics Commissioner and all his skills, all his knowledge and all his staff come with him, so we'll have that expertise if we get the mandate, regardless. It's not that we would deal with those issues without the Ethics Commissioner's expertise and experience. That would come with it.

We certainly can meet with the Ethics Commissioner and we can certainly ask him his opinion. We can pass number three, and we can move ahead and bring the Ethics Commissioner in. That could be part of the discussion, if you want. That's not a problem at all.

Go ahead, David.

Mr. David Tilson (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): I think Mr. Lee had it right. My first comment is that with the first two items, we'll be busy enough. I'm new to this, but I expect that those first two items will take some time to deal with. Perhaps by that time, we'd know how to deal with number three. Whether Ms. Jennings is right or Mr. Broadbent is right, we'll know eventually. My suggestion is that we defer item three until we've finished items one and two, or at least gotten close to finishing them.

The Chair: Well, we could certainly proceed with number three as it's stated, and that may be awhile. I have no indication when we'll receive the mandate, with or without the Ethics Commissioner, so we could pass the motion and move forward with it.

All right. If there's no more discussion on number three, would somebody move the motion?

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

•(1555)

The Chair: That clears up the first part.

The next part presented a little more difficulty in our subcommittee. We had a lengthy discussion on the issue of how documents can be tabled with the committee and we did boil it down to the two motions you see before you.

I guess we could have a short discussion. I don't think we want to go on too long on this, but then we can vote on either one of the motions. If someone wants to move (a) or (b), we can vote on them and move forward. But we can have some discussion, if you like, before we do that.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Mario Laframboise: I move motion (b).

[*English*]

The Chair: We have a motion on the floor that we accept B. I would like to go over that again.

Go ahead, Mr. Hanger.

Mr. Art Hanger (Calgary Northeast, CPC): The focus, of course, is on the documents, but would you define what documents are being referred to?

The Chair: We're referring to simply any documents that a witness brings in to present to the committee. We had a discussion whether that includes documents that anyone on the committee might want to distribute or not, and I don't think this is what it refers to particularly. It's documents that a witness would bring to distribute to the committee, that it has to be distributed in both official languages. I don't think there's any argument about that. It's whether or not and how that would happen.

I don't see there's a big problem here, because as a matter of practice, when the clerk invites a witness to come before the committee, he automatically informs them that any material they want distributed has to be in both official languages—

Mr. Art Hanger: Does that include their own presentation?

The Chair: Yes.

Go ahead, David.

Mr. David Tilson: So that I'm clear from our discussions at the last meeting, in the event that something happens and someone shows up with a document in one language, it doesn't preclude members getting that document, if it's at the end of the table or however, and it doesn't preclude that witness talking about a particular paragraph or particular clauses in that agreement, does it?

The Chair: My view would be somewhat different from that.

Mr. David Tilson: Well, that's why I'm asking the question. You know, we started talking about what's formal, what filing means and what's official and what isn't official. I simply want to be clear that if someone shows up with a unilingual document, whether it be in French or English.... After all, we ask some witness from...it could be anywhere from the east to the west to show up and for some unusual reason.... I agree that it's probably going to be translated, but if someone comes a long distance and they can't talk about that document, there's something funny with the system.

The Chair: I don't think there is anything in this motion, or that anybody has suggested, that any witness can't come before the committee any time they're invited and make a verbal presentation.

Mr. David Tilson: That isn't what I've said.

The Chair: Yes, but I'll finish—

Mr. David Tilson: I understand documents officially becoming part of the record. I understand that; at least I think I do. But if someone has a pile of documents at the end, in whatever language, my question is this. Is there anything wrong with members of this committee going down to the end, if they wish, or even having the documents distributed—it's not part of the official record, but they can get those documents—so that the witness, whether the document is in French or English, can talk about particular paragraphs or clauses in the document, notwithstanding that it may not be filed with the clerk? But can they talk about it?

The Chair: No, it would be my view that if they have documents in either official language, or only one or the other, as chairman I would not have that discussion until those documents had a chance to be translated and presented to all of the committee.

•(1600)

Hon. Marlene Jennings: I have a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair: Yes, go ahead.

Hon. Marlene Jennings: Are we in debate now on option B?

The Chair: Yes, option B is a motion on the floor.

Hon. Marlene Jennings: The motion says:

That the Clerk of the Committee be authorized to distribute to the members of the Committee documents only when they exist in both official languages and that no document from a witness be distributed without the Clerk's approval.

The Chair: That's right; that's the motion.

Hon. Marlene Jennings: That's the subject, the motion being debated right now?

The Chair: That's right.

Hon. Marlene Jennings: Thank you.

The Chair: Which I think would answer your question, that the document—

Mr. David Tilson: But I want to know what it means, and you've now told me that the answer is no; the members might be able to sneak down and get a copy, but it can't be talked about. That's what you're telling us.

The Chair: That would be my reading of it, yes.

Derek.

Mr. Derek Lee: With respect to option B again, which we're debating, the wording in B says at the end that “no document from a witness be distributed without the Clerk's approval”.

That could not be referring to distribution by the clerk, because it involves the approval of the clerk, so it must involve distribution by someone else, and someone else could include an MP or someone else in the room, and it involves the approval of the clerk. I have never as an MP been subjected to the approval of the clerk.

An hon. member: That's right.

Mr. Derek Lee: And I'm sure the clerk would be the first to say, please don't ask me to sit in judgment and give my approval in relation to the distribution of documents to MPs.

For that reason, among others, I would not support option B, but I would just add parenthetically that I'd be happy to support option A.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Chair: Everybody should read them both because if we defeat option B, then someone can move option A—or when we vote on option B, it's passed, and then it would be the rule.

As I said, I don't think anybody here is preventing any witness from making a verbal presentation, but I would hesitate to have a discussion on a document that was only available in one official language. I would ask them to give it to us in both official languages or just make a verbal presentation.

Mr. David Tilson: You're looking at me, Mr. Chairman, and I believe that's what we have these things for. If you don't understand what the witness is saying and the witness reads something in French or in English, it can be understood.

The Chair: And that's a verbal presentation.

Mr. David Tilson: But that was my question. If someone has a document and reads from the document that is only in one language, you say no, you're not going to allow that to happen, and I say, why not?

Hon. Rob Nicholson (Niagara Falls, CPC): Presumably, Mr. Chairman, anybody can refer to anything they want to in a verbal presentation. They may be referring to the Magna Carta and find out

that it was in Latin or something, but they can refer to anything they want. There would be translation services for whatever verbal testimony there was, but I think what you're trying to get at is that if somebody has some sort of document here and they want to pass it around.... Well, I think it's unfair if it's not in both official languages, and I think that's what you're talking about.

The Chair: That's right.

Hon. Rob Nicholson: But I have no problem with Mr. Lee referring to a thousand statutes from a hundred different countries; it makes no difference to me. You can refer to anything you like, as long as there's translation of what you're talking about. But once you get into the business of saying, “Oh, I want everybody to have this”, I'd say, “Just a second, please. It has to be in both official languages”, and that's the only fair way to have it.

The Chair: And that's what we're talking about: distribution of documents, not presentation.

Hon. Rob Nicholson: In fairness, Mr. Chairman, you did speak at one point about somebody making a verbal testimony referring to “a document”. Well, that could refer to, say, the American Constitution; it might come up in a discussion. You're not going to stop somebody and say, “Don't you dare talk about the American Constitution unless you can convince me there are a couple of translations of it”. No, I don't think that's what we're talking about.

The Chair: Right.

Hon. Rob Nicholson: It's when somebody has something they want to pass around the committee that it has to be in both official languages, and I think that's reasonable.

The Chair: Yes, you're quite right.

Have we thrashed it about enough?

The motion is to adopt option B.

(Motion negated)

•(1605)

The Chair: Do we have another motion to put on the floor?

An hon. member: I'll move option A.

The Chair: Is there any discussion on that one, or has it gone around enough?

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

The Chair: Now we turn to the notice of motion.

David, if you would move your motion, we'll have some discussion on it.

Mr. David Tilson: Do you want me to read it, Mr. Chairman?

The Chair: Yes.

Mr. David Tilson: I would move that whenever the main estimates or supplementary estimates are referred to the committee, the committee invite the minister and any relevant senior officials of a department to appear at a meeting of the committee and, if possible, that it be televised; and that whenever a chapter of a report of the Auditor General refers to a subject under the mandate of the committee, the committee study the matter and invite officials of the Office of the Auditor General of Canada and any relevant senior officials of a department to appear at a meeting of the committee and, if possible, that it be televised.

The Chair: Is there any discussion on the motion?

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Laframboise: Mr. Chairman, when we submit a notice of motion in the beginning, do we not have to give 48 hours' notice? Did we receive that notice?

[English]

The Chair: The clerk tells me it was distributed to everybody's office on Thursday, so we've had it for 48 hours.

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Bernard Fournier): I have a receipt here.

The Chair: Go ahead, Art.

Mr. Art Hanger: I would like to point out that there are no ministers, I don't believe, directly associated with this committee, so I would suggest this be amended to "invite the commissioner and any relevant senior officials".

The Chair: Yes, you're quite right.

Maybe what we need to put is simply "commissioner or minister", so that we can cover both.

The Chair: Just before we move on in the discussion, I see a curious look on Mr. Laframboise's face.

Is it everybody's understanding that the 48-hour notice is notice in your office, or does notice have to be 48 hours' notice made in this committee and then discussed?

Is that what you were curious about?

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Laframboise: I only received it today. I did not receive it last week.

[English]

The Chair: Well...

[Translation]

Mr. Mario Laframboise: I'll look the other way. It's okay.

[English]

The Chair: Okay. I noticed your point.

If it's all right with everybody, we will do it that way.

Marlene, I think you had a point to make here.

Hon. Marlene Jennings: Yes. To come back to the point I raised earlier, I don't have any problem with this motion except that I don't think it covers all reports that may refer to a subject under the mandate of the committee. The perfect example of that is that the Public Service Commission did an audit of the Privacy Commission

following the Auditor General's audit, when Radwonski was there and then was asked to leave, kind of.

The Auditor General had done an audit of the Privacy Commissioner and made a series of recommendations. Some of those recommendations dealt directly with staffing, human resources, etc. The Public Service Commission then did an audit a year later to see where the commissioner had gotten to in implementation of those recommendations. Some of the recommendations had to do with bureaucratic patronage in hiring, competitions that were not fair, and there's one file that's actually been referred to the RCMP for outright fraud in hiring—by bureaucrats, I want to make it known, not politicians.

I would like to see the motion reworked so that it would allow that whenever a chapter of a report of the Auditor General or any other review agency refers to a subject under the mandate of the committee, the committee would study the matter and invite officials of the Office of the Auditor General "and/or of the auditing agency" and any relevant senior officials of the department to appear, etc. It would cover that.

I've actually read the Public Service Commission's audit of the Privacy Commissioner, and there's a whole section on ethics.

• (1610)

The Chair: Do you have some wording there that might work?

The Clerk: I think this would probably cover it. Using the second paragraph of the notice of motion, the first lines would read as follows: "that whenever a report"—we'll revoke the reference to a chapter—"of the Auditor General and/or a review agency..."

So we would remove the words "a chapter of a" and then we would add, after "Auditor General", "and/or review agency", and the rest continues—

Mr. David Tilson: Or commissions.

The Clerk: We'll call it a review agency, which would cover... If you try to list them, you could be here for two weeks, believe me. You would cover, among other things, the president of the Public Service Commission, whom we never would have thought of, I think. I think "review agency"—

The Chair: Would cover it.

The Clerk: It would continue: "the committee study the matter and invite officials of the Office of the Auditor General and/or relevant senior officials" and would leave it at that. I assume the Auditor General would not be invited on every occasion.

It could read like that, by adding those few words.

The Chair: Is that amendment all right?

Mr. David Tilson: I have no problem with it. I guess the first proviso could be amended as well, because of the comment that there's no minister.

The Clerk: We'll add "the minister or commissioner".

The Chair: Is there any more discussion?

Mr. Derek Lee: I understand why this motion is here. The opposition has urged that this type of motion be adopted by the standing committees so that, in the crush of work in a session of Parliament, things important to opposition scrutiny are not buried and swept under the rug. Normally, though, the future business of the committee would be selected by the steering committee. In principle, this attempts to shape the future business of the committee from way out in front, not in real time. But I can accept the thrust of it. I don't think we need to be too cute about it. If we tried to list all the potential future business we might wish to do, we'd still have to have a steering committee to figure out which priorities were there and the scheduling we'd use. I accept the desire to put this general principle in place and to have television. We'll battle it out with the other committees for CPAC time and cameras. I just don't want to waste too much time on too many details.

For example, it's arguable that with respect to the Privacy Commissioner and the Information Commissioner, the only two real envelopes we've got, there really isn't a minister. These are officers of Parliament. There isn't a minister in a government department involved in this stuff.

However, I may be making too fine a point here. Let's just let the stuff go through. We have a mixed bag of things here. I'll support it if we don't spend too much more time on it.

The Chair: Point well taken, but those votes from those two commissioners are referred to us. We have no choice but to deal with them as future business. We're just putting some frills on it here. At any rate, point taken.

All in favour of the motion?

• (1615)

Hon. Marlene Jennings: As amended.

The Chair: As amended, yes.

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

The Chair: For the meeting on Wednesday at 3:30 p.m., we do have the Information Commissioner waiting for a phone call. We'll book him for that meeting, if you agree.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. David Tilson: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, maybe by Wednesday they could fix these things. My ear hurts.

The Clerk: I promise you we won't meet in this room on Wednesday.

The Chair: The meeting is adjourned.

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

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

**Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:
Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique « Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire » à l'adresse suivante :
<http://www.parl.gc.ca>**

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

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