



House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development

AANO • NUMBER 003 • 1st SESSION • 39th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Monday, May 8, 2006

—
Chair

Mr. Maurice Vellacott

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

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

Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development

Monday, May 8, 2006

• (1530)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, CPC)): Today we're getting at our work plan; that was the agreement from last time. We've had some very good submissions from various members of the committee—from all sides actually. Some very good ideas came forward. I think we'll probably get a consensus; I'm anticipating that over the course of the meeting.

Off the top, there were a few 48-hour advance motions hanging there, if those people want to proceed with them. If there's not a desire to proceed with those right away, we can do them at the end of the meeting. If there's not a sense that you want to proceed with any motions right now, then we can actually move right to the work plan.

Monsieur Lemay had a motion over here, Mr. Bruinooge, but we can go right to the prioritization if we want.

[Translation]

Mr. Marc Lemay (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Chair, I suggest that we wait until other members of the committee arrive, because I know that our Liberal colleagues are on their way. Oh, here they come!

Mr. Yvon Lévesque (Abitibi—Baie-James—Nunavik—Eeyou, BQ): Mr. Chair, at the last meeting, we were told that if we had any suggestions for the future business of the committee, we should send them to the clerk. I am going over the list that was distributed, and I see that my suggestions have not been included. Is there an explanation for this?

[English]

The Chair: The clerk will respond.

[Translation]

The Clerk of the Committee: Mr. Lévesque, I received your suggestions this morning. I had the document translated and I will be sending a copy to all members of the committee.

Mr. Yvon Lévesque: Very well, but I thought that they were sent on Friday.

Ms. Mary Hurley (Committee Researcher): We had asked that they be sent out on Thursday afternoon, at the latest.

The Clerk: I was only made aware of them this morning.

[English]

The Chair: Monsieur Lévesque, we are still going to include them today, though. Our intent is to meld those in as we come to those different issues there. Would that be fair?

Hearing nothing more at this juncture, I suggest we get right to these various suggested topics that were distributed to everybody *en français* and in English as well.

[Translation]

Mr. Marc Lemay: Mr. Chair, I respectfully suggest that we begin with the motions. That way, we can be done with them. The motion that we are tabling regarding the Kelowna Accord is very important and may alter subsequent suggestions concerning committee business.

I suggest that we begin with the motions, the first of which is the Bloc Québécois motion on the Kelowna Accord.

[English]

The Chair: Does everybody have their copy in French and English before them? Monsieur Lemay, you would want...

On all of these motions we need to be fair. If any of these are proposed 48 hours in advance, then from there it's an issue of that individual or somebody else moving the motion at the meeting itself. So it just sits on the table in limbo, or lingers.

So you're moving it?

[Translation]

Mr. Marc Lemay: Yes, I move the motion.

You should have received it on Thursday, May 4, at 4:14 p.m. in both French and English. I have a copy here. It is a notice of motion from Marc Lemay. Thank you.

[English]

The Chair: It's in order.

Is there any discussion with respect to the motion moved by Mr. Lemay?

Mr. Rod Bruinooge (Winnipeg South, CPC): Mr. Chair, with all respect to my honourable colleague, I would like to suggest that before adopting a motion such as this, I think it would be prudent for this committee to actually study the document that it's about to recommend to Parliament. I know this committee hasn't studied this in the past, and I think it would be prudent for us to proceed on that basis before adopting such a motion.

• (1535)

The Chair: Okay.

Other comments?

Monsieur Lemay.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marc Lemay: Mr. Chair, I do not want to take up too much time, but I want to point out that this motion tabled by the Bloc Québécois respects the agreement signed by two nations. In November 2005, the First Nations and the Government of Canada signed an agreement called the Kelowna Accord. We are asking for this document that was signed by two nations on November 25, 2006, to be respected and implemented. That is what this motion means. To my mind, it is obvious that this motion is very significant and respects the politicians who signed this agreement and the governments that ratified it.

[*English*]

The Chair: Ms. Crowder.

Ms. Jean Crowder (Nanaimo—Cowichan, NDP): Thank you.

I'm speaking in favour of the motion by Monsieur Lemay. An extensive amount of consultation and work went into developing the agreement that occurred in Kelowna. What we know from a number of other committees is that sufficient study has been done on closing the poverty gap.

These are just figures that I think will be helpful for the committee to know, and these are the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs' own figures. In 1999-2000, the funding had decreased for First Nations and Inuit communities by 13% for things like education, economic and social development, capital facilities, and maintenance. I would urge the committee that the time for action is now. I think we've gone far beyond the time for talk. So I would encourage the committee to support the Kelowna agreement, and I fully support Monsieur Lemay's motion.

The Chair: Thank you.

Anita.

Hon. Anita Neville (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.): Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I strongly support Mr. Lemay's motion, and I think the time for discussion and action is today. I think it's incumbent upon everybody around this table, by virtue of sitting on this committee, to be familiar with the Kelowna accord.

The Kelowna accord, as my colleague has indicated, was arrived at by a collaborative, consultative process with 10 premiers, three territorial leaders, aboriginal leadership from coast to coast to coast, and the Government of Canada. It's an agreement signed by the Government of Canada and it's an agreement that should be honoured by the Government of Canada, whatever its partisan stripe.

I think it is important that we move forward and that we show the conviction of this committee today in endorsing the Kelowna accord. Canadians from all across the country are familiar with this, and it is—and I'm repeating myself—a time to move and a time for action.

The Chair: Thank you.

Rod.

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: Mr. Chair, I believe Ms. Neville has raised some valid points. I think there's no question that we as a government would agree with the targets that were sought at the previous first ministers meeting. There's also no question that the actual document generated has not yet been presented to our government or this committee. I think for us to put forward to

Parliament that we want the Kelowna agreement ratified before we've studied it, before we look at the document itself, is something above and beyond what we should be doing at this point as a committee.

I would also mention that aboriginal people across Canada want to see the funding that is meant for aboriginal people flow through to aboriginal people at the street level, and that was a concern raised by many people. I think before we inject that type of investment, we need to ensure that the system is able to deliver the returns that aboriginal people across Canada want from it.

The Chair: Anita.

• (1540)

Hon. Anita Neville: I just want to comment again, Mr. Chair. I don't mean to get into an argument, but I think that's a false argument that the member is putting forward.

This is an agreement that's been arrived at by the Government of Canada. This is an agreement that was done in consultation with aboriginal communities across the country. The agreement was signed; the money was booked; the agreement is in place. I know from my conversations that communities across the country are waiting for this money. The agreement provides hope, it provides opportunity, and it provides an opportunity for peace and progress in aboriginal communities. To put up another barrier, in my mind, is short-sighted, obstructionist, and is in some way reinforcing what I view to be a rather colonial mentality as it relates to aboriginal peoples.

This agreement was signed, this agreement was done in concert and in collaboration... and there is no reason not to move forward and endorse it. As I said before, it's incumbent upon every member of this committee to be familiar with it, as Canadians across the country are.

The Chair: Okay.

We'll have Mr. Lemay and then Jean.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marc Lemay: Mr. Chair, I am going to answer the honourable parliamentary secretary in two short sentences. However, before doing so, I wish to acknowledge representatives of the First Nations who are attending today's meeting, listening to us, and who are anxiously awaiting today's decision.

Provincial premiers and national aboriginal leaders are determined to strengthen relations between aboriginal peoples and the federal, provincial and territorial governments. These relations must be built on improved collaboration, strong partnerships, and mutual respect. With this in mind, provincial premiers and aboriginal leaders launched a 10-year initiative in order to close the existing gap between the quality of life of aboriginals and that of other Canadians.

Mr. Chair, communities, the First Nations and the government cannot afford to lose one year. Discussions on this agreement lasted 18 months. We finally arrived at a consensus after endless and difficult discussions. I believe that the time has come to move ahead and vote on this proposal.

[*English*]

The Chair: Jean.

Ms. Jean Crowder: In terms of a procedural matter, the way I read this motion is that the committee would be adopting these recommendations as a report to the House, and the government will then have an opportunity to report back to the committee. That's the way other committees have functioned; once we submit a report, the government then has an opportunity to respond. I believe that would be the procedure here, because this is a recommendation that we submit as a report to the House.

So given the fact that there was this extensive consultation, that the premiers across Canada signed on to this, and that First Nations, Métis, and Inuit peoples were extensively involved in this process, I think it would be a responsible thing to do to submit this as a report to the House and then allow the government to respond.

Is that the correct procedure, Mr. Chair?

The Chair: That's exactly how you can proceed. We're just checking out the period of time in which the government has to report back to this committee in response to the report.

Ms. Jean Crowder: There is a very set timeframe. So that would certainly address Mr. Bruinooge's comments around the government having an opportunity to study the report and respond. Then there would be a response to the committee and certainly a response to First Nations, Métis, and Inuit communities across this country.

The Chair: I think I heard him say that this committee study it. I don't think he was talking about the government. I think they're probably quite aware of that, but I thought it was this committee that was referred to.

Ms. Jean Crowder: Yes, and I'm just suggesting that we circumvent that step, since so much work already went into it, and this would be an opportunity for the government to actually respond to this report.

The Chair: Yes, and they would be required to respond, by way of Standing Orders, within a certain period of time. I think it's 60 sitting days or something like that.

We will have Gary, and then it's over to Colin.

•(1545)

Mr. Gary Merasty (Desnethé—Missinippi—Churchill River, Lib.): Good afternoon, everybody. I agree with the motion as put forward.

There was a criticism of the Kelowna accord from the minister that there were no plans in place, although there was agreement with the targets and objectives. Key here is that the spirit and intent of the Kelowna accord was to come together and collaborate and jointly develop plans. All they could do at the front end was come together and talk about targets and objectives, talk about funding, and talk about how that relationship can move forward, instead of government going off and developing solutions in isolation.

It's critical that this does move forward in its current form and that we work in collaboration with First Nations, Métis, and Inuit people in the development of plans to address housing, education, economic development, and health, as outlined in the Kelowna accord. So I think that's the key here. For example, the AFN talked about a joint policy initiative towards the establishment of a First Nations Auditor General. I think that's a landmark; that's hugely significant. This is a

solution by aboriginal people to move forward, and we don't want to move backwards to solutions developed in isolation.

The Chair: Okay.

From there, we have Nancy. I'm sorry, we have Colin—my mistake.

Mr. Colin Mayes (Okanagan—Shuswap, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

My problem is that, as the leader of the opposition said about the budget that was submitted last week, the devil is in the details. I really don't want to minimize the amount of work that has been done in the past by this committee and those who were negotiating provincially and for the First Nations, but I'd like to know what those details are.

My colleague across said that there were just targets and objectives. But without budgeting the costs of those targets and objectives, it's very difficult to make a decision. I would want that information first—what the timelines are, what the actual dollars are—before I could make a good judgment on whether this is a good accord. I just need some time to digest that, and I ask for an opportunity to do that.

The Chair: Okay. We'll go to Nancy right away.

But first, Jean, I should interject. In answer to your question, we just found out in the Standing Orders that it's 120 days, four months approximately. That could run over the summer, so in effect, if this were moved and passed, adopted today, then it would be sometime in early September when this would have to be responded to by the government. The House may not be sitting at that point, but they would have to respond within that timeframe.

Nancy, go ahead, please.

Ms. Nancy Karetak-Lindell (Nunavut, Lib.): Thank you.

I totally agree with the intent of the motion. I'm probably repeating some of the things that Gary said, but when people say there weren't details and there weren't any budgets and timelines, that's not true. I was in Kelowna sitting there as they were making the final agreements on each of the different areas, such as education, health, government, and accountability.

What was significant was the type of relationship that we were then entering. It's not always about dollars and cents, in my opinion. Yes, we need to have the money and the resources to implement initiatives that are agreed to. But some of the most important things that I thought came out of this process were the different working relationships between the Prime Minister and the Prime Minister's Office with the recognized aboriginal groups in Canada.

Throughout my whole lifetime we have worked long and hard to be at the same level of discussions and decision-making and being part of the process. What I saw beginning to happen out of that—we've been working towards it for a long time, but it was really I think a turning point for us as aboriginal people—was our being able to be part of the process that makes decisions for our lives. I don't think you can put a dollar figure on that. It's something the new Conservative government is not getting, in my opinion—that respect and understanding of where we've come from and of how we want to be part of the process and make decisions together.

It's not about Ottawa knowing best what decisions should be made that will affect our lives. We've been there, done that, and we don't need to do that again. We were rising to a new level of discussing issues or maybe compromises, because every decision between two sides means a compromise on both sides, if not three.

In this case, there were tripartite agreements between provinces and territories, the aboriginal groups, and the federal government. And what you saw there was an opportunity for all the concerned groups to be working together. That's something that people seem to be missing in the equation. Yes, we were at a time when the final t's weren't crossed and the i's weren't dotted, but there was a budget made for it. The timelines were set for five and ten years to go back and re-assess what the provinces have done, what the aboriginal groups have done, and what the federal government has done, with regard to judging the agreements.

We need to be back at that point. I know every time we have an election there are groups that fall through the cracks because there's no continuity, and we have to make sure that injustice is not done to us again because of party politics.

I would like to go back to the residential schools agreement and Kelowna and where we were in being able to talk with the Prime Minister's Office. We had a previous Prime Minister who gave a directive to all his cabinet ministers that we were not to see any more cabinet decisions made by cabinet ministers for the people, and that he wanted decisions to be made with the people. And we need to get back to that same level of recognition and understanding. I think putting forth the Kelowna agreement will put us back at that same level and we can go on from there.

How we get there is not always something that we're going to agree on. But I think we all agree as Canadians that the end result is what we all want to strive for. We have to work out the details of how to get there, but it has to begin with mutual respect and understanding.

• (1550)

So I truly think we should put this motion forward and expect a response from the government. It will be a first step, I believe, for us, again, to get to that level that I thought we had achieved by November of last year.

The Chair: I guess the other thing, as your chair, is that I need to understand that if this motion were to pass today, would that obliterate the need to actually look at some of the Kelowna accord and the preceding round tables and so on? I don't know what the understanding of the committee members is with respect to that. I'm at your pleasure here with respect to that, but I do need to get a clarification of that as well, because we've got a work plan. If we pass this, will something of that sort still be part of the work plan?

We've got Todd first, and then we'll have comment with respect to the motion or with respect to my question.

Todd.

Mr. Todd Russell (Labrador, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I, too, want to add my voice in support of this particular motion. I believe the work has already been done, so much of it by aboriginal

people, for aboriginal people, and the Kelowna accord, of course, was the result of that.

It was a process driven by aboriginal people primarily that created a confidence in the aboriginal people I represent in Labrador that I haven't seen for quite some time. To be quite honest, it also drove aboriginal people to become more involved in the democratic process we have in Canada, because they saw I think once...well, not just once, but I would say that in a very concrete way they saw something tangible that they could take home. It was about their health, it was about their education, it was about the economic development that was required for our communities to move forward.

I remember sitting and talking to elders, who were telling me that for once there seemed to be a respectful relationship or that there was an increase in the respectful relationship between aboriginal and non-aboriginal people. I talked to youth who said, "We see opportunities before us". Kelowna represents opportunities.

The Kelowna accord wasn't only signed by the premiers, the territorial leaders, and the Prime Minister; it was signed by every single national aboriginal organization. It was signed by the Congress of Aboriginal Peoples, which the minister himself touts now in his own speeches. It was signed by the Métis National Council. The Métis National Council and other Métis groups felt that the Kelowna accord opened a door that had not been opened for quite some time for Métis peoples in this country. It was signed by the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, the Inuit peoples of Canada, because they too saw the hope that exists there, the real tangibles that could affect their lives and their communities. And it was signed by the Native Women's Association of Canada.

All five national aboriginal organizations signed onto the Kelowna accord after 18 months of hard work. I believe we would do a disservice to the aboriginal people we represent in our respective constituencies if we said we'd shelve this now, we'd delay it now, this particular motion and moving Kelowna forward, by further study. We've done the work. The product is there now before us all. It's been there for some months, and in fact it's been debated for some months, in the public venue, during the election campaign. This motion just makes sense, that we put this forward to the government for their response.

So I support it wholeheartedly, and I encourage all members of every party to move forward and vote for this particular motion.

• (1555)

The Chair: Thank you, Todd.

Monsieur Lemay.

[Translation]

Mr. Marc Lemay: Mr. Chair, I do not want to take up anyone else's time, but as I am of course going to request that we vote on this motion, I wish to have the last word before the question is called.

Mr. Chair, I would remind you that we have to finish discussing the three other motions on the agenda, in addition to future business of the committee by 5:30 p.m. Perhaps we should speed things up. Thank you.

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Bruinooge.

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: Mr. Chair, I'd like to respond to a few of the things that have been raised by my colleagues.

I think one thing is sometimes forgotten when we say things like "this government is not recognizing aboriginal people". I'd like to remind my honourable colleagues that as an aboriginal Canadian I'm very proud of the fact that the Prime Minister has placed me in the position of Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs, and I think it clearly shows that the Prime Minister is interested in the views of aboriginal people.

I very much take exception to Ms. Neville's insinuation that I'm a colonialist. Of all things, I am surely not that, and as an aboriginal person I find it offensive to be called a colonialist.

We need to think about how to approach the objectives of the Kelowna accord. These are the things that all aboriginal people want to see: they want to see better housing, they want to see better education, and they want to see clean water. There is no doubt that our government wants to see those things occur as well. We would, however, like to improve the system through which these services are delivered to aboriginal people before a major new investment is made.

But having said that, there is new money that we have put forward as a government, but until such time as we are able to ensure that the money actually flows through to the people who need it most, it's difficult to proceed with the budget that was proposed at the meeting of first ministers. When we look back at previous Liberal budgets, there were no new investments for the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs. In this budget, there is a new investment, and it's something I'm proud of.

I think today we need to look at the objectives of the Kelowna accord. If I were to make an amendment—and in fact, I'd like to—it would be that we as a committee recommend that the objectives of the Kelowna accord on housing, education, and clean water should be the things this government needs to pursue.

•(1600)

The Chair: Okay. You're amending the motion. Can you again state the recommendation, in the manner that you did? I didn't catch all of it. It recommends the objectives of...?

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: It's the objectives of the first ministers meeting of November of last year, specifically education, water, and housing.

The Chair: Give us one more shot here, please, Rod. "That recommends the study", did you say?

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: No, we endorse the objectives of the meeting of first ministers in November of last year, specifically in relation to housing, education, and clean water.

The Chair: Okay. It's housing, education, and water. Did I miss anything? Was there something else?

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: Going back to my colleague's point, I think he specifically, and others, would like to have the report tabled, if that is the intention of others, to move forward with Mr. Lemay's motion. I think it would be prudent for the committee to receive the

report from the Kelowna accord. It seems prudent, but that's not related to my amendment.

The Chair: I thought there were two other objectives. One was in respect to economic development or something.

Mr. Colin Mayes: Health.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Todd Russell: On a point of order, who's making the motion?

The Chair: I'm not sure. Mr. Bruinooge was the one who suggested it.

Mr. Todd Russell: Mr. Chair, I would also like to make the point that the amendment he is putting forward is already contained, I would argue, within this particular motion. I'm sure the objectives of the Kelowna accord are within the Kelowna accord itself. Why would you make another motion?

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: I think the difference in my motion is that as a committee and as a government we want to find ways to make the objectives of the Kelowna accord happen. I don't think, however, that only money is needed to do it. I think you need to look at the system and find ways to improve the system to deliver those services. In my opinion, money isn't always the answer.

Mr. Todd Russell: A point of order. I don't know if we have a motion we want to debate, but I believe the motion is out of order because it's already contained within the main motion.

The Chair: We'll go to Mr. Albrecht at this point.

We now have an amendment on the floor. Are you speaking to the amendment?

Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC): I am speaking to the amendment, in the sense that I don't think anyone around this table disagrees with the objectives that are generally stated in the Kelowna accord. I certainly want to see social justice prevail as it relates to our aboriginal people.

I don't, however, share Ms. Neville's confidence that Canadians are familiar with the details of this accord. I think we need to remember that while this committee in its previous life may have had some input, we are a new committee, there was a new election, and a number of new members are here who have not had the opportunity to speak to the issue. I think we owe it to our constituents to at least study it here in committee before we come up with the details, which are also included in the news release that Prime Minister Martin delivered following the signing of the accord.

Certainly when I look through the general principles here, the ultimate goal of this effort is to address the serious conditions contributing to poverty among aboriginal people. Yes, I'm behind that.

The next paragraph on measuring progress—of course.

Recognizing and respecting a diverse and unique history and traditions—again, I'm totally behind that.

Respecting regional differences... We could go on through the entire accord and in general certainly give our approval to it. But when it comes to the details, as my colleague has said, I'm not sure that we as a committee are totally familiar with them, and certainly our Canadian people aren't.

I just want to highlight some of the statements that former Prime Minister Martin made in his news release. He said: "Our plan is built on a foundation of respect, accountability, and shared responsibility". I agree with that. Part of being accountable is to know what we as a committee are recommending forward to the House.

Many of the veterans here do know, but we new members haven't heard all of the discussions. Yes, I've read through the accord, but I'd like some time to debate it before we advance it to the House. I think that's a duty of any duly comprised committee of this Parliament; otherwise we are simply going to rubber-stamp things that have been done before and continue on.

So I would like us to at least take the time, before we pass this motion, to study in more detail the implications of this accord and the implications of the recent budget, which does include a lot of funding for specific initiatives that are included as general principles in the Kelowna accord.

Those are my points, Mr. Chairman.

• (1605)

The Chair: Now on the subamendment, in terms of the objectives of the first ministers meeting of November 2005—housing, education, water...

Ms. Nancy Karetak-Lindell: I don't think it's fair for us to—

The Chair: Just a second. I want to get an understanding myself, Nancy, but I'll come back to it right away.

Ms. Nancy Karetak-Lindell: We would like a copy of the amendment, because I don't think it's right for us to debate a motion or an amendment that none of us has seen.

The Chair: Absolutely. I'll read it again, just so we're all aware. I think Nancy makes a very important and valid point here.

This is the amendment to the motion that was put forward by Monsieur Lemay. It reads:

That pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the committee recommends to study the objectives of the first ministers meeting of last November, particularly in relation to housing, health, education, water, and economic development.

We'll need to get that in French.

Mr. Lévesque and Mr. Lemay, did you catch the translation there okay? We can get it in writing as well, but we'll need to have some acceptance of moving in that fashion or we'll be kiboshing everything else we do here after.

Mr. Lévesque is next, on the amendment.

[Translation]

Mr. Yvon Lévesque: Mr. Chair, on the one hand, we have begun discussion on an amendment that, to my knowledge, was not seconded.

On the other hand, I do not believe that we...

[English]

The Chair: It doesn't require seconding.

[Translation]

Mr. Yvon Lévesque: That is fine.

Moreover, I don't think the issue is the content of the agreement, but rather the notion of respect between two nations and respect for a signed agreement.

We want the committee to recommend to the government that it implement a signed agreement; this is a matter of respect between two nations. The First Nations have often been criticized for not respecting agreements or for always begging. What is provided for in the budget is of little importance, because the government prepared the budget when the agreement was already in place.

Given the fact that the parliamentary secretary is a member of the Métis community and that this issue affects him more than it does me, I can only hope that he will support the agreement that was signed by the First Nations. This agreement does not appear anywhere in the government's agenda. As such, we are asking the government to implement this agreement. I do not see why we would amend something that has already been concluded.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Lemay, you have the floor.

Mr. Marc Lemay: When I was a lawyer, it was our job to know the Criminal Code, the Civil Code, and the common law. I can only hope that all members of the Standing Committee on Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development have all read the Kelowna Accord.

I would also remind you that not too long ago, the current Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development sat at this very table, and defended the Kelowna Accord. Perhaps he was thinking of reviewing some of the administrative details of the agreement, and not necessarily the substance of the accord.

Mr. Chair, I believe that we have to vote against this amendment, because it is not our job to review what has already been discussed, supported and approved. Both the First Nations and the Government of Canada have come to an agreement. We want to impress upon the government once again that it must implement this agreement. I know what the current government will do: it is going to push this back to the furthest extent possible, until the end of the 130 days. We cannot afford to waste any time. We must call upon the government to implement this agreement. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote against the proposed amendment.

• (1610)

[English]

The Chair: To Mr. Merasty—and then my apology to Colin—I appear to be a bit of a left leaner here and have not picked up on you. But you've actually been in the batting order well and I omitted you, so here you go.

Gary Merasty is next, and then Mr. Mayes.

Mr. Gary Merasty: Not to sound too blunt here, but I think it's ignorant to assume that the government is better able to come up with the plans and procedures talked about in the Kelowna accord. The whole spirit and intent of the Kelowna accord from before 18 months ago was to jointly agree on setting the targets and the objectives and then working together to ensure that we hit those targets. That's why there was a recommendation to revisit and have first ministers meetings every two years or thereabouts.

The AFN, the MNC, and the ITK have worked with these issues for decades. Now, I cannot believe that the in-depth review the government may want to do will actually provide the answers to the members opposite here on the impacts of CMHC section 10 and section 95, the constriction that A-base capital has, securitization models being proposed, current construction costs as they relate to isolated and other semi-isolated communities. Do they know the impact of the 1989 post-secondary cap that was imposed? Do they know the impact of the AHRDA agreement being capped and kept as is for the next five-year period? Do they know the impacts of the ROP program in economic development? Do they know the impacts of health care redesignation at the community level, the 2% cap on growth, and the impact on uninsured health benefits, child care, early learning? There's nothing in the budget. Kelowna had early learning child care spaces.

The plans have been in place. If you go to the AFN website, there's talk of plans there. There's a plan outline. If you meet with some of the other aboriginal groups, they have plans. They didn't go into this process with a complete blank slate; they came with decades of experience, knowing what they wanted to talk about. They've been asking for a Kelowna accord type of meeting, a first ministers meeting, for years. To go back and revisit and assume that we know better than they do the issues that they're dealing with on a daily basis is ignorant. That's what they're going to say.

As for the amendment, I don't think we can go down that path. I agree with Mr. Lemay that we agree to vote it down and move forward with this motion.

The Chair: Mr. Mayes, in terms of your response to the amendment.

Mr. Colin Mayes: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Once again, I'd like to direct a question to some of the colleagues across from me here.

What I'm hearing is that if we were to look at education at \$1.8 billion, which is the figure put in the Kelowna accord, you could break that down into the different components. You see, I have three responsibilities. I have a real burden for First Nations and addressing some of those issues that have been with us for many years. But I also have a responsibility to the taxpayers of Canada, and I have to make sure they're getting good value for their dollar, that there's efficiency, because the taxpayers of Canada want this to happen too. But they want to make sure it does happen, and I think that's the important thing.

So that's my question: is there detail that I can see that will break down that \$1.8 billion for education, so I know it will all add up and that this is what's going to be done?

•(1615)

Mr. Gary Merasty: Can I answer that?

The Chair: Yes, you can, in the course of time.

Mr. Gary Merasty: Through you, Mr. Chair, to—

The Chair: We'll have to go to Anita and then Nancy, Jean, and Gary.

Hon. Anita Neville: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to prolong the debate. We're all accountable to the taxpayers of Canada, but as parliamentarians and as a government, we're also accountable to the people we serve, and when I listen to the parliamentary secretary's amendment to the motion, it distresses me no end.

My colleague Mr. Merasty has addressed the issue probably more eloquently than I can. But what I'm hearing is that we, the people around this table, can better determine what is required for aboriginal peoples than those who are involved, than those who were part of the Kelowna agreement, than those who did the 18 months of consultation leading up to Kelowna. We can't cherry-pick. We can't tell them that this is better and do it in a non-consultative manner.

What we have to recognize is that this is a nation-to-nation agreement, signed by the leadership of every government in this country. It's time to move forward. People across this country are waiting for it.

I can't give you details of the \$1.8 million, Mr. Mayes, but I can tell you that in communities in the province of Manitoba they know what they want to do with it. They know the plans they have coming out of Kelowna. They have the \$5.1 billion laid out. They know what the \$1.8 million in education means in terms of the numbers of young people who can go on to post-secondary education. They know what it means in terms of teacher training. They know, in the health accord, how many more young people will be able to go forward for training as health professionals. They know what their communities need, and far be it from us to tell them better.

The Chair: Nancy.

Ms. Nancy Karetak-Lindell: I do not support the amendment as presented, even though I haven't seen it in writing yet, because I think it totally changes the focus of the original motion.

In the original motion, we're asking the government to implement the Kelowna agreement and to respond to us in 120 days as to what their intent is. The amendment totally takes away that request for the government to respond to our motion, because he is asking the committee to study the agreement and see if it's good enough for the Conservative government to implement.

We've been hearing a lot in the last little while about the moneys that are being put out by the agriculture minister. I don't hear anybody from the agriculture committee asking to study that agreement or whether that money is being put to best use. We do put the trust of decisions in our governments; we try, anyway, to give the prerogative to the minister and the Prime Minister to make decisions on behalf of the people of Canada. Where there's a will, there's a way, and I don't see the will in the Conservative government to look beyond party politics to really address the needs of aboriginal communities.

Again, in the way of the funding announcements, we're not hearing any committee asking to study any of those agreements in the same way that I believe the members across the way are asking that the Kelowna agreement be studied. As we've said on this side, the work has been done. They might want to talk about how best to work with the aboriginal groups to implement the recommendations, but I don't believe it's up to this committee to study every line in that agreement to see if it best serves the people of Canada.

I'm very proud that our side has every recognized group in the country represented on this committee. That is one thing that the budget failed to note, that there are three recognized aboriginal groups in Canada. We have a lot of messaging to do in that we tend to think "First Nations" equals "aboriginal people" in Canada. It doesn't. There are First Nations, there are Inuit, and there are Métis. That's a fundamental misunderstanding that we see all the time. That's how we sometimes gauge how understanding the people are who are talking about the issues. If they fail to recognize the three aboriginal groups, then I know right away they haven't done their homework. They don't understand the First Peoples of Canada. That, to me, was evident in the budget.

To go back, I do not think the amendment is serving the purpose that we want to see in the main motion.

• (1620)

The Chair: Jean.

Ms. Jean Crowder: It seems that the wishes of various members of the committee are clear, so I'm not sure why we're not moving to a vote on the amendment and the original motion. We can continue this debate across the table, but I would suggest we vote.

The Chair: Well, as long as there's discussion with respect to an amendment or a motion, I'm not in a position to actually call the vote.

Ms. Jean Crowder: I can't call the question?

The Chair: You can call the question, but then—

Ms. Jean Crowder: I'm calling the question.

The Chair: Well, there's discussion on the question.

Anyhow, at this point, Gary, do you want to speak with respect to the calling of the question, whether or not we should go to a vote?

Ms. Jean Crowder: The question has been called.

The Chair: It's no matter. Now you can speak with respect to the question, so go ahead.

Mr. Gary Merasty: Well, I guess part of the answer to my colleague across—

The Chair: Did you want the question called? You can have your debate as long as you want and then comment as you choose.

Mr. Gary Merasty: Okay. I'll call the question to the motion.

The Chair: She has called the question. You're responding; you're debating; you're discussing.

Mr. Todd Russell: The question is not debatable.

The Chair: Gary, have you ceded to the floor at this point?

Mr. Gary Merasty: Sure.

The Chair: Go ahead.

Mr. Harold Albrecht: The question is debatable. I think the previous speaker should move the previous question and we vote on that if we want to close down debate.

The Chair: Okay, carry on.

I mean, you can call the question, I guess, was my point. It's not receivable, in that if there's still debate, it carries on. That's the way the committee structure works, and that's the way the Standing Orders operate. At the point where nobody has anything further to say, we go to the question.

Gary, I don't know if you had anything more to say. Then I have on my list Mr. Bruinooge. We'll proceed, I guess, based on that. At the point at which there's nobody further to talk or discuss, in terms of the amendment, then we go to the vote on that, and after that we see if there's discussion with respect to the main amendment, back to the main amendment.

Gary, I guess I didn't hear from you. Did you want to speak?

Mr. Gary Merasty: Yes.

The Chair: We're on the amendment at this point.

Go ahead.

Mr. Gary Merasty: The question posed talked about taxpayers, and I think there are a number of things here.

Let's look at the impact of the 1989 cap. Since 1989, the federal funding has virtually been flatlined, but the aboriginal population has gone like this, and you've ended up with a huge gap.

Plans? You'll hear plans from across the country from all aboriginal groups talking about, yes, we need to increase the funding, support and increase the funding to the ISSB, Indian students support program, for example, to support the institutions that are out there, like the Native Law Centre, the First Nations University of Canada, Saskatchewan Indian Institute of Technology, and others across the country. They'll talk about partnerships between universities and colleges to ramp up and ladder programs to increase aboriginal participation in post-secondary institutions—i.e., the National School of Dental Therapy, the U of S, U of R, FNUC, SIT Partnership for Registered Nursing. So the plans are there. And as I said, they've worked on these plans for decades. They've had models of success. Studying has been done. The work is done.

As for the taxpayers payment, one of the front-loaded items in the Kelowna accord was relationships. I mentioned the joint policy initiative towards the establishment of a First Nations Auditor General, for example. The Auditor General herself, who, in my previous capacity, met with my office, said it is unfair for them to come in without addressing three main things in aboriginal communities right now: building the capacity, because your bureaucracies are compressed, and we need to increase the capacity at the First Nations, Métis, Inuit level; establish the financial management standards, which work has been ongoing; and establish national standards. Until that point, the Auditor General will say, it's unfair for her to go in because it would set up an opportunity for them to provide a bad report, and that's not our intention. Our intention is to work with you and ensure accountability to, first, the members you service in the aboriginal community, and go on from there.

So those are some of the responses to your question.

●(1625)

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Bruinooge.

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: Maybe I'll just address some of the points raised by Mr. Merasty. He first mentioned the flatline funding. Of course, we have to look back to the previous 13 years and wonder—

Mr. Gary Merasty: In 1989 the Conservative government implemented it.

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: —why it hasn't increased in funding until the very last moment of the Liberal mandate. The insincerity there, I think, is quite apparent.

Mr. Gary Merasty: Kelowna.

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: One thing our government plans on doing is actually—

The Chair: We'll just have one at a time, please.

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: —making real progress. I assure you, we will do that. One thing that Conservatives are well known for is actually achieving results, and I'm looking forward to being a part of that.

You talked about the capacity, the systems not being ready, and I think you make a good point. That's the point I've made already today, that we want to ensure that the system is ready for new investment. After we've studied that system and have found new efficiencies, I think that will be a good opportune moment to bring about perhaps an increased funding scenario.

So I think when we look to the point of my amendment, it is endorsing the objectives of the accord, but it's not tying ourselves to it, in the sense that we want to look for those additional options, we want to be able to make sure that there are other opportunities, through making the system more efficient, to achieve the goals. That is the perspective I bring, and I think many members of our side bring, to this discussion.

The Chair: Mr. Storseth.

Mr. Brian Storseth (Westlock—St. Paul, CPC): Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Bruinooge had some of my lines there, but one of the things that I would like to make clear is that I haven't heard anybody here disagreeing with objectives of the Kelowna agreement. Indeed, I've sat down with many of the First Nations leaders in my riding and discussed the objectives with them, and they're in agreement with the way the Conservative government is proceeding with this.

What Mr. Bruinooge is suggesting here is simply that the committee take the time to study this further, talk to some witnesses. One of the criticisms I've heard from people in my riding is that in some areas the Kelowna agreement doesn't go far enough in addressing the concerns of some First Nations groups. So that's one of the things I would like some responses to.

Thank you.

The Chair: At this time, if there are no further responses with respect to the amendment before us, we'll have the amendment read. If there are no further comments with respect to that, we'll go to the vote.

Hon. Anita Neville: A recorded vote.

The Chair: A recorded vote. Okay.

The Clerk: The amendment would read:

That pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the committee recommends to study the objectives of the first ministers meeting of last November, particularly in relation to housing, health, education, water, and economic development.

The Chair: That's understood?

Is the French translation coming through okay?

[*Translation*]

The Clerk: Would you like me to read it in French?

Mr. Marc Lemay: As for me, it is not necessary. No means no.

The Clerk: It is the same in both French and English.

[*English*]

The Chair: Just to be clear now, we're voting on this amendment to the main motion that Mr. Lemay has before the committee.

Mr. Brian Storseth: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: A point of order, yes.

●(1630)

Mr. Brian Storseth: I haven't actually had a chance to read this amendment. Is it possible to see it in writing? I believe that is in the Standing Orders, and it's also something that can go to the heart of the motion.

The Chair: My understanding is that this is substantive—at least those on that side have argued so—but I don't think we're going to press it for 48-hour notice, because we have had the motion before us and we normally proceed in a manner where this is valid discussion at this point. It's a significant amendment, but as long as we're all clear in terms of what the amendment is before we go to the vote....

So do you want it read again, Mr. Storseth? Would you like that read again, so that we're clear on it?

Mr. Brian Storseth: Yes, please.

The Chair: I think those for whom French is their first language indicated to me they are clear in terms of what that means. So let's have it read, let's listen carefully, and we'll slow down as you require.

The Clerk: It reads:

That, pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the committee study the objectives of the first ministers' meeting of last November, and in particular in relation to housing, health, education and economic development.

The Chair: Ms. Neville has asked for a recorded vote.

(Amendment negatived [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: We're back to the main motion now, if there is comment or discussion in respect of that. At the point we run out of people talking, we go to a vote on that.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marc Lemay: I believe that we have had enough discussion, Mr. Chair. I would ask that we now vote on the main motion.

[*English*]

The Chair: Is there any more discussion at this point? Hearing none from anyone, then we will proceed to a recorded vote, as requested by Ms. Neville.

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

The Chair: So that will be a report, based on that vote, presented to the House. As I understand it, the Standing Orders require a response from the government within 20 days of that.

Now, we're on to additional or other—

The Clerk: It's 120 days from the time of tabling.

The Chair: I'm sorry, I should clarify or qualify that; it's 120 days from the time it's tabled.

The report to the House could be done in the week following; there is nothing delaying the report on that.

Ms. Neville.

Hon. Anita Neville: Mr. Chairman, I would like to move the motion that I gave advance notice of last week:

That this committee (Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development) request a joint meeting with the special legislative committee that is dealing with Bill C-2 ('the Accountability Act') to examine the portions of the act that deal with First Nations Accountability.

The Chair: There are two things. I'll have our clerk respond first, and then I have some comments as well.

Go ahead.

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: Mr. Chair, can I just ask a question?

Are we able to add a dissenting opinion to the report that we're proposing to Parliament in the previous motion?

The Chair: There is that possibility, Mr. Bruinooge. If one so moves, that could be done, and the committee has the chance to reject that. They also have the opportunity, I'm told by the clerk, to actually request to see that before it's actually voted on. That would be your option.

I'm at your mercy with respect to that as a committee.

If a motion is put forward, you can certainly request that. It would then be a debatable and votable motion. At that point they may

choose to decline it, and they may also choose to make a request to see it in advance of appending as well. Those are the options the members have.

• (1635)

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Go ahead.

Ms. Nancy Karetak-Lindell: I have a question on that, because my understanding was that because this motion was approved it is the report of the committee—

The Chair: That's correct.

Ms. Nancy Karetak-Lindell: —and the only people who have an opportunity then to put a dissenting report would be the opposition members. Unless I've totally misunderstood who puts in the dissenting reports, I understood that if a report is passed by a committee it is a committee report. In that case it is then seen, I would think, as a government report because it's a report coming from the committee, and the only person who could then put in a dissenting report would be a member from the opposition. Maybe I need to have clarification on this, but that was my understanding.

The Chair: We've served on committee before, Ms. Karetak-Lindell, and that would be the norm, where any dissenting reports are proposed by opposition members, but that's not exclusive to them; it could be a member of the government side. In fact, these are not government.... As we bring that to the House, it is not a government...it's not even deemed to be, as you suggested they—

Ms. Nancy Karetak-Lindell: I said it was from the committee.

The Chair: From the committee, exactly. Correct. Yes.

No. It's the option of anyone. There can be a dissenting report to this particular motion, which we have now passed, by any member of one of the opposition parties. There can be a dissenting report tabled from the government's side. That's not excluded from any member within the committee.

Ms. Nancy Karetak-Lindell: Thank you.

The Chair: We were about to go to a motion on the floor, but I do require us to conclude this matter of business here in respect of the issue of a dissenting report, which, as I understand it, is debatable and also votable. We now have that on the floor, I assume. With that, what is your intent?

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: I'll consider the information you provided. We are not proceeding with it.

The Chair: You're not proceeding with any of this at this point?

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: At this point, no.

The Chair: But you'd have to act with considerable haste, because this will be drawn up as a report and at the earliest opportunity will be presented in the House by the chair of the committee.

Ms. Neville.

Hon. Anita Neville: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I read the motion that I gave advance notice of, and I gather you or the clerk have some comment on it.

The Chair: That's correct. First of all, the clerk does, and then I have a comment to speak to as well.

Hon. Anita Neville: I will speak to it as well.

The Clerk: Madam Neville, I wanted to mention this to you prior to the meeting, but the opportunity didn't arise.

Legislative committees are not empowered by Standing Order 113 to hold joint meetings, while standing committees are, at 108(1)(a). We have to conclude that a legislative committee is not empowered to hold a joint meeting.

I have informed the clerk of the legislative committee, who has also informed the chair of the legislative committee, and the procedure would probably be for members of the aboriginal affairs committee to attend the legislative committee's meeting when they are having hearings concerning the aboriginal affairs mandate.

Hon. Anita Neville: If I may ask, what does "attend" mean?

The Clerk: Well, it would be possible for... because it's not a joint meeting you would attend as a parliamentarian who can attend any committee meeting. Now for your right to speak or not, that would depend on the chair of the committee and the arrangements he takes at that time.

The Chair: Or the other option, as you would now well know, Anita, would actually be subbing in for a committee member as pertains to the... if it's aboriginal issues under discussion at that time. With the other option there is risk involved because you don't know whether the chair would recognize those other members. They do not have to.

Hon. Anita Neville: Mr. Chairman, my motion requests a joint meeting, and I can appreciate what the clerk says, that while it's not mandated, the option can at least be provided to the special committee for a joint meeting. We've just spent a great deal of time talking about the Kelowna accord and the whole matter of accountability, governance, and capacity building was an integral part of the Kelowna accord.

We are the committee that is seized with the whole matter of aboriginal affairs, and I think it is incumbent upon us to be able to at least request the meeting to talk about this. This is a very important issue in terms of accountability. Again, Mr. Speaker, it's an act that has been drawn up without consultation with aboriginal people across the country as it relates to accountability, and I think it is important that we have some opportunity to have standing to deal with this matter.

I would ask you to request a meeting. If it is ruled out of order, then I will come back with something else. But it is important that, as a committee, we have an opportunity to address this issue.

• (1640)

The Chair: I don't know if we want to get to a list here on this, but I'm told in fact that rather than get to a list, the motion, from the standing order point of view, is not receivable.

I did on my own undertake to talk to the House leader's office, and I would suggest that the way around this may be to actually go back to your procedural experts within your respective parties and see if there's a way around it. But as things stand, I did some checking through the Standing Orders myself. The clerk did his research

through that, and it's not a receivable motion before us at the committee today, unless there's some other way to deal with it or word it, kind of do a creative end-run around it. But for my part—I want to assure Ms. Neville—I've actually talked to the House leaders, and they have basically the same approach; it's not permissible under the present Standing Orders.

Hon. Anita Neville: Well, I too have consulted and have been advised to move forward with this request. I do appreciate that it is mandatory for standing committees, or it's obligatory, perhaps, is a better word, for standing committees to have joint meetings. This is a special circumstance, and again I would ask you to request a meeting. That is all I'm asking.

I think your suggestion of subbing in is not adequate, or I'll put forward another motion.

The Chair: Well, as the matter stands, my understanding is I'm not in a position to receive the motion. I don't think it can proceed from here based on the Standing Orders we have before us. That's the issue at stake right now.

With that, then, we'll move to—

Hon. Anita Neville: Mr. Chairman, I would like to challenge the ruling of the chair and see if there is support among the committee to challenge that ruling.

The Chair: I'm advised—and I guess this does ring some bells from the past—that when a chair is challenged, yes, that is in effect a motion. It can be debated and discussed now, that notwithstanding my ruling on the matter this motion still proceed.

So this is what's under discussion: first of all, do you agree with this challenge to the chair in respect of requests going forward? Then we have hurdles and obstacles from there.

Go ahead, Monsieur Lemay.

[Translation]

Mr. Marc Lemay: Ms. Neville, the chairman and the clerk feel that the motion is not in order and that we have to check this with our party leaders. In order to be able to check this and in order to avoid having the debate continue or having the motion defeated, could we delay it to the beginning of next Wednesday's meeting? I didn't know that it was not in order. I'd like a little more time to check with our committee that is in charge of legislative matters and see whether it's possible for us to support this motion. This way, we might avoid having the motion defeated, or having a decision made that a new motion must be tabled 48 hours ahead of time, that it be translated, and so forth.

• (1645)

[English]

Hon. Anita Neville: I'm in agreement, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair: You withdraw your challenge?

Hon. Anita Neville: I withdraw it.

The Chair: Ms. Neville has withdrawn her challenge to my ruling.

With that understanding, we will proceed to take this up, having consulted with our respective procedural clerks, House leaders, etc., as the first order of business at the Wednesday meeting. So that is tabled for the Wednesday meeting for our purposes.

Are there other motions, with 24 hours of advance notice, that anybody wants to proceed to move at this point? After that we'll move to the issue of possible study subjects.

Mr. Bruinooge.

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: I have two motions that were submitted within the 48-hour timeline. Based on some discussions, I think there may be an amendment forthcoming. I'm not sure if that is actually going to happen, but we will see.

The Chair: Motions one and two have been duly moved by Mr. Bruinooge. They were submitted 48 hours in advance. They're listed on the same sheet of paper, in both English and French.

The first one reads as follows:

That whenever the Main Estimates or Supplementary Estimates are tabled in the House, 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.

That's just with respect to the main estimates. It's not to say that we can't do television at other times as well, but specifically then.

The second motion is as follows:

That whenever a Chapter of a Report of the Auditor General refers to a subject under the mandate of the Committee, the Committee invite 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.

We can discuss these one at a time. We'll start with the first one and proceed to the second one, assuming there's time before the meeting ends at 5:30.

Speaking to the first motion, on the main estimates being tabled and the committee inviting the minister and relevant senior officials, go ahead, Monsieur Lemay.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marc Lemay: If the mover agrees, I'd like to add something to the first motion so that it reads as follows: "That whenever the Main Estimates or Supplementary Estimates are tabled in the House, the committee invite the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development [...]"

Right now it's a bit vague. I therefore move that we add the words "of Indian Affairs and Northern Development" after the word "Minister". I would like to make sure it's precisely this minister, so that when we discuss the financial affairs of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, we avoid having the President of the Treasury Board come and explain the situation. I think I understand the essence of the proposal by the parliamentary secretary. With the addition I've just mentioned, I think that we could easily support this motion.

[*English*]

The Chair: I'm thinking that you're coming with the intent of a friendly amendment. If Mr. Bruinooge wishes to move or accepts the amendment, then we don't need to have further debate or discussion in respect of it.

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: A friendly amendment.

The Chair: You accept it as a friendly amendment.

The other thing we should draw to the attention, Mr. Lemay, or for the purposes of all committee members here, is that if we get into a discussion of main estimates or supplementary estimates as pertaining to residential schools, it is a different minister again. It is the Minister of Canadian Heritage who covers off that. Whether this requires a further friendly amendment, I leave to the committee, just so long as we have things covered off here.

• (1650)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marc Lemay: I don't agree with you and let me explain why. If we're talking about the agreement on schools, that's a whole other matter. Here we're talking about the Main Estimates and the Supplementary Estimates tabled in the House. This is the wonderful document we received from Indian Affairs and Northern Development. I would like to see the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development come and appear before us. When it comes to the schools, that's a different issue.

[*English*]

The Chair: I understand. But just so we're clear here, I want to be transparent and up front on this issue. If it ever happened that there are main estimates or supplementary estimates with respect to this new office of residential schools, if you don't want to exclude that person, you may want to include this item as well.

Obviously, with respect to all other things it's the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. If you have no interest in calling this person forward—the Minister of Canadian Heritage—with respect to main estimates or supplementary estimates on residential schools, that's your pleasure, if you choose to do it. But that's in effect what you'd be doing. Anything that comes up in respect of residential schools, by way of the friendly amended motion here, would be excluded.

[*Translation*]

Is that clear?

Mr. Marc Lemay: Yes and no. In fact, I think it's not clear.

Here's what I mean: when the subject before us is the Main Estimates or the Supplementary Estimates of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, we have to call on that department.

However, it we're talking about agreements or other documents, the committee will call upon the persons who are in the best position to help it make decisions.

[*English*]

The Chair: Right. There's a whole bureaucracy that now deals with residential schools.

Todd.

Mr. Todd Russell: If I'm understanding correctly, there's nothing stopping the committee from calling the minister on these particular items of business or any other item of business, or the committee from calling any minister relative to any other initiative or piece of business, as far as I understand.

Maybe it's a good idea to have a motion to say we can call the minister on the supplementary estimates or the main estimates. We can do it anyway. We don't need a motion to say we should do it. We can do it.

We can call the minister on residential schools. We can call Bev Oda, the minister responsible for Canadian Heritage, on residential schools. If there's another issue.... We can call the finance minister, when we're talking about the main estimates, on why he never included the requisite funding for aboriginal people. I don't know why there's this major debate.

The Chair: Let me respond, Todd, to that very quickly. This is just putting a mechanism in so that the onus is on the clerk, in effect. Then at the point when he has to monitor, or if you as committee members monitor while these things come forward, fine: spring it forward a month from now, or just set the time, when it does. But if one of us happens, in the busyness of our lives, to miss it, then the opportunity has gone by. If you get it on the books now, as automatic, then the onus in effect rests with the clerk to watch—and our staff here, so to speak—to monitor this and be sure we don't miss it when it comes forward.

I should add as well that these particular motions that we have before us, which have been used as routine motions over a short time by some committees, are—how would I call it—a way of holding the government to account. It's your tool as an opposition member, or as opposition parties, to hold the government to account.

I'm certainly at your pleasure in terms of what you choose. If you don't want anything else in and you want, as you say, Todd, to bring it forward ad hoc or as it comes up, you certainly are in a position to do that, if you choose to.

Do we have any other discussion with respect to the motion? It's a friendly amended motion that's on the floor.

Hearing no other—

Hon. Anita Neville: It's just the first part of the motion?

The Chair: We're dealing with them separately, Anita.

Hon. Anita Neville: That's fine. Thank you.

The Chair: It reads:

That whenever the Main Estimates or Supplementary Estimates are tabled in the House, the Committee invite the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development and any relevant Senior Officials of a Department to appear at a meeting of the Committee and, if possible, that it be televised.

That's my understanding of the sense of the new, friendly amended motion.

• (1655)

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: I believe that to be the case, except for the fact that it's not Aboriginal Affairs; it is Indian Affairs, but we'll let that go by.

The Chair: Our committee is Aboriginal Affairs.

Now we will discuss this friendly amended motion if we all understand and are clear in respect of what is before us. Do we all agree to that?

(Motion as amended agreed to)

The Chair: The second motion from Mr. Bruinooge:

Whenever a Chapter or a Report of the Auditor General refers to a subject under the mandate of the Committee, the Committee invite 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.

Mr. Bruinooge has moved that. Is there general agreement? Is there any discussion?

Hon. Anita Neville: Mr. Chair, I'd like to make an amendment to that. I would like to insert "That whenever a chapter of a report of the Auditor General"... insert at this point, "or matters under the Federal Accountability Act, or other legislation, refers to a subject under the mandate of this committee". Then, where it says, "Auditor General of Canada", I would say, "and/or any relevant senior officials of a department to appear at a meeting of the committee".

The Chair: That is significant, possibly, but I should ask as well.... We've got an amendment here in respect of this. I think it's a little more....

Mr. Marc Lemay: Can you read it again?

The Clerk: It reads:

That whenever a chapter of a report of the Auditor General refers to a subject under the mandate of the committee, or matters under the Federal Accountability Act—

Hon. Anita Neville: It should read, if I might, Mr. Clerk:

That whenever a chapter of a report of the Auditor General, or matters under the Federal Accountability Act or other legislation refers to a subject under the mandate of the committee, the committee invite the office of the Auditor General of Canada and/or relevant senior officials....

[Translation]

Mr. Marc Lemay: I think that that completely changes the essence of the proposal.

[English]

The Chair: Maybe the mover of the amendment would have an opportunity to respond here. You will assume, in view of the new Financial Accountability Act, that this will come up on a regular, routine basis. Is that the assumption here?

Hon. Anita Neville: I'm not following you.

The Chair: What would trigger something coming before the committee?

Hon. Anita Neville: It would happen when there are significant pieces of legislation that are introduced, that go into another committee, but that fall within the mandate of this committee as well. I can think of potentially two, at the moment, including the Federal Accountability Act. There are potentially other issues that could go to other committees, for instance, health or status of women.

The Chair: Okay. That's significant. That has been moved.

Is it a friendly amendment from your point of view, Mr. Bruinooge or should we just proceed to discussion?

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: It wouldn't be a friendly amendment. I think it substantially changes the motion I made. I think perhaps it might be a subject for a new motion, so I suppose the next step would be some discussion of this amendment.

Ms. Neville, go ahead, please.

Hon. Anita Neville: Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the motion and introduce it as a separate motion and give 48 hours' notice, which will make it a little simpler.

The Chair: Okay. You would endeavour to do that, so we will have that withdrawn at this point.

We go back to the motion as it stands here unamended, with the undertaking that we will have a new amendment put forward subsequently, with the 48-hour notice. So we're back to the main motion now.

Do we have agreement in respect of this? Are there any suggestions for tweaking it?

Seeing no indications of anyone wanting to speak to the motion then, do we have agreement around the committee table, with just a quick show of hands, or do we have any discussion in respect of this?

We'll call the vote on that unamended motion.

(Motion agreed to)

• (1700)

The Chair: We have gone through all of those for which we had the adequate 48-hour advance notice. Now we can proceed to our workplan.

Would everybody grab that in hand and consult that? It was passed to you. There are some additions being distributed as well. Roger has some additional ones here too. There are suggestions by Yvon Lévesque, Colin Mayes, and Harold Albrecht. There are two by Yvon, three by Mr. Mayes, and three by Mr. Albrecht.

As we proceed to that, I should first report that we did contact the minister's office and the minister is prepared to come, which is encouraging. He is not dodging us, and he has committed to come as soon as we require. He could come as early as a week from Wednesday. That may be something that we should look at, discuss, and respond to very quickly.

Could you give me some direction in respect of what you want in regard to the minister coming—whether that is your wish or not? Is there any response to my contact with the minister, who is prepared to come to this committee a week from this coming Wednesday? Are we agreeable to that?

That is a week from Wednesday, Nancy. The minister is prepared to come and lay out his—

Ms. Nancy Karetak-Lindell: May 17?

The Chair: Yes. He is prepared to come and respond to the committee, and you can put him on the hot seat and query and quiz and challenge him with respect to vision and those types of issues and priorities he might have.

Anita.

Hon. Anita Neville: I have no problem with that, but my question to you is, do we know if the minister is tabling legislation that will be coming to this committee?

The Chair: I defer to the parliamentary secretary.

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: Mr. Chair, I did indicate at the last meeting that as soon as I have indication of legislation that is forthcoming, I will bring it before this committee as soon as possible.

The Chair: So there is nothing at the present time and we should just proceed with our plan.

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: There is nothing for me to report currently.

The Chair: Okay, there is nothing currently to report, Anita.

Monsieur Lemay.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marc Lemay: If we receive the minister on the 17th, will we have a briefing session with the officials from the department first?

[*English*]

The Chair: *C'est une bonne question.*

I guess that's a possibility if you propose to do that or for us to proceed in that manner. I guess, first off, my question is this. Do you want the minister to come a week from this Wednesday?

Of course, under that scenario, we have this Wednesday and Monday in terms of open dates. If you want to propose at that point that we have department officials in prior and preparatory, as some would suggest, then that could be done or it could be arranged to be done. We would need to have those people given notice to be here on the scene.

I have a further comment. I have invited the minister to appear. He is prepared to appear at the earliest opportunity and to come on Wednesday, the 17th of this month. Are we agreed to that?

Okay. Seeing no dissent, we'll schedule that on May 17th to have the minister appear before this committee.

On the next order of business, as we get into this, we're kind of moving into this in an interesting fashion. Monsieur Lemay proposes that in view of the fact that we've got a "book end" of a sort occurring on the Wednesday of this week and the Monday, because we can't launch a full bore study on something, you're implying that we should maybe have the minister on the Wednesday and the briefings by departmental officials on the Wednesday and the Monday prior.

Mr. Albrecht.

• (1705)

Mr. Harold Albrecht: I was only going to say, Mr. Chairman, that I would wholeheartedly support having the briefings prior to the minister appearing.

The Chair: Okay. On the nature of these briefings, to again be clear, I need to understand what you all intend by that.

Monsieur Lemay.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marc Lemay: I would like us to have a briefing session with the official representatives of the department this Wednesday. If we haven't finished after two hours, we can resume the meeting the following Monday. That way we'll be sure we have a clear picture of the department before we meet the minister.

[*English*]

The Chair: Are you suggesting, Mr. Lemay, that we only have one meeting in respect of the issue of the department officials coming to give us a scan of things?

There has also been a suggestion from our good clerk at the table that at one of these meetings, it has been suggested, there should be a scan in terms of the geographical layout of the various First Nations. That's a very big, tall order. Is that what you're talking about?

Our clerk has a suggestion. She will make that suggestion and then you can respond to it, but we need to proceed as quickly as we can.

Ms. Mary Hurley: The discussion I had with the clerk was in relation to briefings that were done in the context of the First Nations governance bill in 2003. I believe the composition of the committee was quite different at that time, but members of the committee found it very useful at that time to have a general briefing on demographics: that is, on the populations of the various aboriginal peoples in Canada; where the First Nations, Inuit, and Métis settlements are in Canada; employment levels; education levels, etc. I think this kind of basic information was considered very useful at the time.

I believe Mr. Lemay was interested in getting an overview of the department's function and organization, so that could be a second briefing.

I think the demographic information is readily available to the department and could probably be available in short order.

The Chair: We're talking about maps, charts, and graphs with respect to laying it out visually for us, I assume.

Ms. Mary Hurley: The way it was done in 2003 was with a PowerPoint presentation. It had maps and graphs, but it was also very accessible information. At the time, I thought it was useful.

The Chair: Okay. Do we want to move to a scenario where we have, as you've suggested, the demographic material across the country for First Nations, Inuit, and Métis people? Or you could go right to the department in terms of their scan and the outlay of what they'll do and the organization, programs, and services of DIAND. Do you have a suggestion?

Mr. Lemay, do you want to go with your suggestion first, which turns up as one of the suggested topics here? Do you want this on Wednesday?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marc Lemay: I think so. Our researcher's idea is a good one. It would be good to have a PowerPoint presentation to explain how this department operates. That way, we could ask more in-depth question on Wednesday and put much more specific questions to the directions general. I find this is an interesting idea. I want to have a clear understanding of how this department operates throughout Canada.

• (1710)

[*English*]

The Chair: So to be clear, there are two different things. There's one on this national survey over the country in terms of the demographics, employment issues, and so on, just to see, on a visual basis, where First Nations, Inuit, and Métis people are. We'll do that as our first order of business, then. We'll have the departmental people come in to do that. They can also relate and share in terms of a subsequent meeting—the Monday, perhaps—the various services they provide, the organization, the programs, and so on.

Is that agreeable to us as a committee? Are there any questions?

So if I see no comments in respect of that, are we all agreed to proceed in that manner? This Wednesday will be more of a demographic scan in respect of First Nations, Inuit, and Métis across the country.

We will proceed to the Monday, then, with a look at the particular services that DIAND provides—their organization and programs.

Do you have a question?

Mr. Harold Albrecht: Mr. Chairman, I'm sure this goes without saying, but I just want to reiterate the request that we have both the PowerPoint materials and any written materials in both languages, and I would especially request that the PowerPoint materials, the slides, be available to all members for follow-up study after that.

The Chair: Okay, that's fair.

So then we have those two initial meetings covered off here until a week beyond Wednesday. In effect, we've addressed some of the things that I think Monsieur Lemay has talked about: briefings have been covered off; having the minister in has been touched on. What, then, would be our item of business subsequent to having the minister in a week from Wednesday? What would be your next preference in terms of issues that we move on?

Is there any discussion?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marc Lemay: I'm asking you a question because I don't have a ready answer. Each one of us sent a list of subjects that we'd like to deal with.

I feel that the Library of Parliament did its job properly, and I suggest that we send these documents to the department officials so that they can be aware of our concerns. They will come to speak to us on Wednesday or Monday and the minister will appear afterwards, and perhaps we will be in a position to decide on our future business because we will then have an idea where we are going. We'll have a better idea about things, although we already have quite a good understanding. At most, we will have five or six more meetings before the summer adjournment. We will have to decide on five or six subjects that we want to deal with as priorities before adjournment, provided our friends opposite don't decide to keep us until June 28.

[*English*]

The Chair: Okay, we'll propose that in the first week after the break week.... We'll then have had the minister in, had a look at and quizzed him, queried and challenged him with respect to the visions and the priorities. We'll also have had the departmental people in prior to that, so we'll have got a little better scan of the horizon.

But I don't want to short-circuit anything here, because we have some very good ideas. If you want to proceed on the laying out of a plan for right after the week's break, we could do that now, or at your suggestion we could adjourn the meeting today and wait until we come back from the break week to take up further discussion in respect of these.

Anita.

Hon. Anita Neville: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would ask that some consideration be given to a briefing from either the minister or senior departmental officials from the Department of Justice as to the impact of the new legislation introduced on aboriginal peoples, the new bills tabled in the House on mandatory minimums and—

• (1715)

The Chair: On financial accountability.

Hon. Anita Neville: No, I'm talking about the justice bills. We all know that a disproportionate number of aboriginal peoples are currently in the justice system, and we all know that there are different forms of justice within aboriginal communities—restorative justice has had some success.

I'd like to have some understanding of what that bill does for aboriginal peoples.

The Chair: I am assuming that's what Mr. Merasty means under his suggested topic, aboriginal justice, but maybe it's broader than that.

I guess I'm saying, Anita, I don't see your specific suggestion on paper here, but I understand what you're saying.

Hon. Anita Neville: I think Mr. Merasty put down the whole matter of aboriginal justice, but I raise this issue because the legislation is currently before the House.

The Chair: Right, okay. Is there a comment with respect to that?

If you're following it, I also note that, hopefully, the residential schools agreement is about to be approved by cabinet. In my view, it's overdue. We'll be getting at that soon enough. Maybe we should have a discussion with respect to that agreement sooner than later, before it's a done deal, so to speak. I think the one outstanding issue might be the issue of how quick the payments are getting out. I know there's been some talk of interim and early payments for older people who were in the residential schools.

There is some timeliness, as Ms. Neville rightly points out, with respect to the justice bill that's before the House, and certainly with respect to the residential schools agreement as well.

Are there any quick comments with respect to that? We have to do this in a timely fashion too. You can always discuss these things after the fact, but it might be better to have some input in advance.

Comments?

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: I guess my comment would be that it would make a lot of sense—at least to me as a new member who hasn't operated on this committee in the past—to maybe have a plan of all the different topics we're going to study, in order, and to decide on that as a committee at some point, perhaps either today or at the next meeting. I think that would be a prudent approach. I'm just putting that forward as an idea. Maybe there's a way we can indicate on a white board or what have you, all the topics we want to do, in the order we're going to do them.

The Chair: Then we would obviously decide subsequently whether we take long or short terms of any one of these topics that we can maybe get quick and consensus agreement on.

Do I see any comment about Ms. Neville's proposal with respect to these justice bills and how they impact aboriginal people? That's

probably a valid and very good suggestion. There's also the issue of the residential schools. That is a concern of mine, but I don't want to impose myself on you as a committee.

Any other things that are time issues here?

Monsieur Lévesque, Mr. Albrecht.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yvon Lévesque: Among the subjects I proposed, I'd like to withdraw the second one for the time being, because it concerns heritage rather than Indians affairs. This is an urgent situation, and we must put the question to the minister.

In addition, since the researchers and our clerk speak both languages, I would like them to alternate between French and English when they speak to us, which would help us feel a little more valued here.

Now with regard to the issue we're discussing, depending on the subjects the committee will select, we will invite interested persons, be they from the Department of Justice or elsewhere. But first, the committee has to choose the subjects it deems most important.

[*English*]

The Chair: Are you withdrawing the financing of aboriginal awareness week then? Are you withdrawing that, pulling that back? Is that what I understand you to say? You're pulling that back. Okay.

Do I hear agreement, then, that at the beginning of the week after we come back from the break week when the House rises, we would be calling in Justice officials with respect to the impact of those bills before the House on aboriginal people? Is that my understanding?

Subsequent and pursuant to that, we would also look at the residential schools agreement and having those folks in?

Sorry, Mr. Albrecht.

Mr. Harold Albrecht: Mr. Chairman, I think we're jumping ahead of ourselves here. I was under the impression these were shopping lists that we had each submitted. It's clear to me that there's a large degree of overlap. I think all it would take is a group of two or three people to sit down and come up with a list of six or eight and say these are the priorities as we know them now. I think the department officials who are going to brief us would be well served to get a condensed list of what this committee's current thinking is; it doesn't tie our hands. I think Ms. Neville's suggestion about justice would go on this list, and I would support that as one of these topics we would discuss in the future.

• (1720)

The Chair: In terms of sequence. Okay, I concur with that, and I think if I've understood correctly, we would go with the justice issues after we rise, after we come back, and then the residential schools.

Hon. Anita Neville: I don't know about residential schools, but I think it's also important when we deal with the justice issues that we hear from aboriginal people themselves, not just the justice department, on how it impacts on them.

The other issue I want to flag to you, Mr. Chairman—and you were a member of the committee before—is an important issue, and there was an extensive study done, which I commend to members of the committee if they haven't read it yet, on the matrimonial real property law. There was a response from the government of the day last year. I don't know whether we want to resubmit that report and get a response from the current government. That is a pressing issue, an important issue for communities, so I would say that should have some priority.

The Chair: So we're having the department officials in this coming Wednesday and next Monday and the minister in the following Wednesday. The week we get back from the break we'll go to the impact on aboriginal peoples of the present Justice bills before the House and also endeavour—I'm saying to the clerk here—to have people in from the aboriginal communities who would actually respond in terms of the impact, the direct impact, on a personal, on-the-street kind of way.

The Clerk: On the same meeting?

Hon. Anita Neville: I couldn't answer that. It's up to you to determine the length of it and what it's going to take in.

Mr. Chairman, we may be sitting here until July, so we may have a lot of time ahead of us.

The Chair: Fair enough. So then you leave that to the discretion of the chair. If it takes a couple of meetings—

Hon. Anita Neville: It wouldn't matter. I think it's an important issue.

The Chair: —in terms of getting department officials here and then scouring the country to find and get people who have been impacted directly, aboriginal people—

Hon. Anita Neville: I don't think we need to scour the country, but I think there are people and we can find names.

The Chair: That seems to be the first order of business.

Does anybody oppose the suggestion subsequent to that, the residential schools scenario, looking at that particular agreement that is before, and soon to be hopefully signed by, cabinet? Would that be a next issue?

Rod.

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: Based on my previous statement about how I thought it would perhaps be best for us as a committee to decide what the first item of business would be, I'm not presuming that this is currently my forum to make my recommendation, but should it be, then I would say I would like to proceed with the study on education, federal standards associated with education and aboriginal communities, as our first item of business.

But putting that aside for a moment, I'm saying I think as a committee it would be best for us to put all the topics on the table and vote which one should be first and which one should be second. That seems to be the best method to approach.

The Chair: Let's go to votes on them very quickly then. Anita—

Hon. Anita Neville: Mr. Chairman, I think we need a little more time. We have four minutes until the committee adjourns. I think to do it in four minutes—

The Chair: So the next time we will have a discussion in terms of the work plan will be the week we arrive back after the House rises. The House rises for a week break and we'll come back—

Hon. Anita Neville: Or we can do it on Wednesday, or am I missing something?

The Chair: This Wednesday we are having in department people.

Mr. Rod Bruinooge: Perhaps we could compress that meeting in terms of providing at least the first portion of the meeting to discuss this and then the back half of the meeting to take some time on behalf of the....

The Chair: I see Mr. Lemay shaking his head.

I know it could take a while, so these people come....

Go ahead, and then Tony.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marc Lemay: I would like to suggest a way of proceeding here. I suggest that our clerk and researchers take a look at the lists we have, transcribe them onto a single sheet, and then we would indicate our first priority, our second priority, etc. I suggest that each member of the committee receive a copy of this sheet, that we all go and do our homework and return the sheet to the clerk. This way, we'll be able to see where we're going. Otherwise, we will spend...

For me, the issue of housing in these communities is urgent. We can't start discussing that this afternoon, because it's 5:28 p.m. Let us take all the subjects, list them on a single sheet and have it sent to us. They're all there. There won't be any others.

• (1725)

[*English*]

The Chair: You're still going to have to indicate your preferences. I don't know if I understand you to say you're leaving that to the discretion of the chair in collaboration with the clerk and the researchers to make that list? No? Then explain yourself again.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marc Lemay: Let me start over. I'm asking that the clerk and researchers prepare a sheet on which all the subjects will be indicated and that they send it to each member of the committee so that each one of us can indicate our priorities, the first, the second, the third, the fourth, and the fifth. The clerk and the researchers can then compile the results.

[*English*]

The Chair: So you don't need the names attached of which members propose what?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Marc Lemay: No, no, no.

[*English*]

The Chair: Okay, that's fair and understood.

Mr. Martin, and then Nancy. We're coming to a close.

Mr. Tony Martin (Sault Ste. Marie, NDP): I was just going to suggest that you might want to bring this to a subcommittee meeting, where, as Mr. Albrecht has said, you can look at what the overlaps are and probably come up with a shorter list and then bring it back. If everybody agrees, fine; if not, you can go one topic at a time and vote on each.

Are you not using your subcommittee to prioritize?

The Chair: We certainly could, and then it will come back here for discussion in terms of that anyhow. It's sometimes six or half a dozen.

Nancy, Todd, and then Anita.

Ms. Nancy Karetak-Lindell: I just wanted to make sure that a calendar is included, because that always makes it easier for us to make decisions when we're actually looking at the right number of slots left for this year.

The Chair: Okay, fair enough.

If I understand what I'm hearing the committee say, we will have a melded or merged list. There is some overlap here. There are no names attached, because I think we all have a common heart to improve the situation for aboriginal people. Then we will proceed based on your prioritization.

Mr. Russell.

Mr. Todd Russell: Mr. Chair, I just have one request in regard to the briefings we're going to get. I would like specifically to ask some departmental officials who can tell us what initiatives there are for Métis people and what the government's current policies are regarding the relationship between the federal government and Métis people. I would like someone to speak on that.

Can we request that?

An hon. member: The interlocutory role.

Mr. Todd Russell: Yes, the interlocutory role.

There might be overlap. We can ask Jim about that when he gets here, or the minister.

The Chair: Is that agreeable?

Mr. Harold Albrecht: I think that would be good to have on the agenda for the briefing session.

Mr. Todd Russell: That's what I'm requesting.

The Chair: One last comment from Anita.

Hon. Anita Neville: I just want to advise you, Mr. Chairman, that at the outset of Wednesday's meeting I plan to move a motion that I've given the clerk notice of already.

The Chair: Okay, we have it.

Hon. Anita Neville: Thank you.

The Chair: If I understood correctly, we will have this collated and melded.

On Monday we will have Justice officials here with respect to the impact on aboriginal people. That's my understanding. That's how we'll proceed.

Monsieur Lévesque.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yvon Lévesque: I move that this meeting be adjourned.

[*English*]

The Chair: Nancy.

Ms. Nancy Karetak-Lindell: I thought that was the following Monday—

The Chair: Yes, it is the following Monday, once we come back from the break.

Ms. Nancy Karetak-Lindell: I thought there was another briefing.

The Chair: There are two briefings coming up here, and then the week we get back from the break, Nancy, it will be the Justice issue.

The meeting is adjourned.

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

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

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

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

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