



House of Commons  
CANADA

# **Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics**

---

ETHI • NUMBER 002 • 1st SESSION • 39th PARLIAMENT

---

**EVIDENCE**

**Monday, May 15, 2006**

—  
**Chair**

**Mr. Tom Wappel**

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

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

## Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics

Monday, May 15, 2006

•(1530)

[English]

**The Chair (Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough Southwest, Lib.)):** I call this meeting to order. This is meeting number 2 of the Standing Committee on Access to Information, Privacy and Ethics.

You have an agenda in front of you, colleagues, and it has two items on it. We're going to deal with them in the order they're listed.

Item 1 is the first report of your subcommittee on agenda and procedure, and it contains three paragraphs. For your benefit I would like to flesh out some of the information that was required in order for us, as a subcommittee, to make this report for you.

You will notice that item 1 indicates that the recommendation of the subcommittee is that this committee meet on Monday afternoons and/or evenings. The reason for this—and we've discussed this at the organizational meeting—is that rule 115 of the Standing Orders provides that this committee cannot meet at the same time as the legislative committee dealing with Bill C-2, the accountability bill, because it involves either the same subject matter or the same agencies. In order to accommodate that rule, we either don't have any meetings or we change the meeting dates. So the subcommittee went through a number of dates and we ruled out Thursday afternoon. Really, the only time we were left with was Monday.

We're talking about the period of time that we're going to sit until Bill C-2 completes its work. Once Bill C-2 completes its work, we will then go back to the times and slots that the whips have agreed to, unless we as a committee decide we're going to change. Of course, I have no information in terms of the future as to how long it will take the legislative committee to finish its work and report. How long it takes to go through the House is irrelevant, as long as the legislative committee has finished its work. In any event, our best guess would be that it would take us to the adjournment.

So when we put Monday afternoons and/or evenings, the suggestion I made was that we could meet for three hours—from 3:30 to 6:30—and not have a working supper, which would give us three hours instead of four, or we could meet from 3:30 to 7:30 with a working supper, which would give us four hours a week, which we would have if we were going to have our two regularly scheduled meetings. That's not part of the motion. I just wanted to give you the background of it, because as we deal with the points, we can discuss those issues.

The subcommittee felt that in the time remaining between now and the June adjournment, it would be a good idea for all, but in particular the new members, myself included, to get the four

commissioners or the four people who report to this committee to come and brief us on their departments and their wish lists, I guess is the way I would put it. In that regard, if the committee sees fit to do that, I can report that our clerk has lined everybody up, more or less, so we would definitely be able to have meetings for the next four Mondays with those four commissioners.

Paragraph 3...the Registrar of Lobbyists also reports to this committee. I guess that's the fourth commissioner—I won't call him a commissioner, I'll call him a registrar. It was recommended that we invite the Registrar of Lobbyists to appear before the committee and do the same thing as the three commissioners.

So that is the first unanimous report of the subcommittee. Are there any questions? Would someone like to move it, and then we can discuss it?

Mr. Zed will move it.

**Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal (Newton—North Delta, Lib.):** So we're saying it will start next Monday, May 22?

**The Chair:** No, May 29. Monday, May 22, is a holiday.

•(1535)

**Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal:** That's fine. That's the day I planned something in my riding, so I was thinking...because of the weekend we have off. That's why I wondered if we could have it the week after, or is it going to be starting that week?

**The Chair:** Everybody is going to have a problem because initially we thought we would be sitting on Tuesday and Thursday afternoons. So given that we're not, the best we can do is the Monday afternoon idea, if the committee adopts it. Given your scheduling conflict, I guess you would have to miss that particular meeting, if you can't make it. We could arrange for a substitute, or whatever.

Are there any other questions?

Mr. Stanton.

**Mr. Bruce Stanton (Simcoe North, CPC):** I have a question in terms of three or four hours. I haven't seen how that actually ends up. If you take time for supper and so on, does that kill a whole hour? Is it felt that we need four hours of proceedings to accomplish what is in front of us between now and the adjournment? What works better there? It doesn't really matter to me. I'd be probably favouring the three hours straight and then that gets it done with and that allows the members to get on with whatever events or other activities they need to get to. But if it's felt that we need that four hours or the extra half hour that might afford, then that would be worth knowing.

**The Chair:** I guess the answer to the question would be that when I say a working supper, I mean a working supper. Witnesses would continue, questioning would continue, and members would get up and get their meal as an opportunity presented itself, but we would continue to work through for the four hours. There's no magic to that. It's just that if we meet Tuesday and Thursday for two hours each, that equals four hours. We can always fill two hours, so I don't see why we can't fill four hours. But if we're only going to have one commissioner per meeting, we could easily go with three hours and work right through the three hours. I'm sure one commissioner and all questions could easily be done within the three-hour period. So I guess that's how I would respond to that.

Mr. Wallace.

**Mr. Mike Wallace (Burlington, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My question to the subcommittee, since we're looking at three hours, really.... I can't remember, was it was the Thursday afternoon that was in conflict or the Tuesday afternoon that was in conflict?

**The Chair:** Tuesday afternoon is the conflict.

**Mr. Mike Wallace:** Did the committee discuss that we just meet for two hours for this until the end of June and just cancel the Tuesday meeting and have our Thursday slots?

The difficulty for me, and I'm sure for everybody, is that as you get your House duty all lined up and you have trades and all that stuff, now we have to do it again. Based on what you've told me in terms of what the agenda items are for the next little while, they don't seem that terribly onerous and controversial, so I don't know why we wouldn't be able to do the work in one slot a week at two hours. There's no law saying we can't do that, is there?

**The Chair:** None whatsoever. There's a general expression of dislike for Thursday afternoon. Certainly it was voiced at the subcommittee, and that's been my experience, but that doesn't mean we cannot meet.

What I would not like to see is us schedule a meeting with these commissioners, who would then bring themselves, have an excellent preparation, bring their staff, be ready for questions, and maybe we have three or four members here, which in my view is an insult to the witnesses.

**Mr. Mike Wallace:** I'm beginning to feel that Thursday night is because people try to get out of here to go home.

**The Chair:** Yes, that's the reason.

**Mr. Mike Wallace:** Okay. In our case, on this side, we're not doing that, so that wasn't part of my consideration.

**The Chair:** But some of the people on your side—

**Mr. Mike Wallace:** If you check Fridays, we've got pretty good attendance.

**The Chair:** Mr. Wallace, some of the people on your side did express that concern.

**Mr. Mike Wallace:** I didn't actually speak for everybody.

**The Chair:** Of course. That's why we're having a full meeting.

**Mr. Mike Wallace:** Okay. I'll listen to the discussion, but I'm satisfied with two hours on Thursday instead of screwing up the schedule. And on points two and three, I'd be happy to see the commissioners as the first order of business.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Are there any other comments?

Mr. Dhaliwal.

**Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal:** I personally think that if we have to decide, instead of changing again and again, we should just go at it now. If we say Mondays, then go at it now and finish it off.

I think we all have duties and scheduled things, on Thursdays, Wednesdays, Tuesdays, or Mondays, but I think we could move that motion if you wish.

• (1540)

**The Chair:** The motion is moved. I'm just inquiring about further discussion.

Is there any further discussion on the motion to adopt the first report?

Madame.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée (Saint-Bruno—Saint-Hubert, BQ):** For your information, further to our last meeting, the clerk ultimately decided not to provide us with a legal opinion on Standing Order 115.

**The Chair:** That's correct, and the reason is that the clerk is not a lawyer. I've spoken personally to Ms. Lajoie and she has advised me that my interpretation of Standing Order 115 is correct.

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée:** Lawyers for the Bloc Québécois believe otherwise.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Are there any other comments or questions before we vote on the motion?

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

**The Chair:** Thank you.

That means we will meet May 29 at 3:30, and we will go through and try to complete it within three hours.

The second item is a notice of motion that we received from Madame Lavallée, which you also have. It's in front of you in both official languages.

Madame Lavallée, the floor is yours.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée:** When the committee met on November 3, 2005, it was agreed that it would ask the Information Commissioner to issue some recommendations pertaining to the draft bill that had been tabled. The request came in the form of a motion from Mr. Pat Martin. We ultimately asked that a bill be referred to this committee. If you like, I could supply you with the minutes of the November 3 meeting.

The motion that I am introducing today follows up on the motion contained in the minutes of the November 3 meeting. It reads as follows:

That this committee reaffirms the need to maintain the independence of the Office of the Information Commissioner and recommends that the Justice Minister consider the advisability of introducing before June 23, 2006 legislation in the House of Commons based on the provisions of the "Open Government Act" presented by Information Commissioner John Reid, with the assistance of the Legislative Counsel of the House of Commons.

Those who served on the committee in the last Parliament will see that my motion is indeed a follow up to the earlier motion.

Mr. Martin, in particular, will agree that this follows up on his motion of November 3. Correct?

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Are you moving this motion?

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée:** Certainly.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** The motion is moved.

Is there any discussion?

Mr. Martin, since your name was mentioned...

**Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, NDP):** Thank you, Chair, and thank you, Carole, for the opportunity of bringing this forward.

I guess we would want to be certain that the motion says what we really want it to achieve. So I don't understand why we need to reaffirm the need to maintain the independence of the Office of the Information Commissioner. I'm not clear why we would preface a motion like this with a comment like that. I don't think the independence of the Office of the Information Commissioner has been threatened or challenged in any way, certainly not in this Parliament.

The idea that we should have a draft bill to work on here rather than a discussion paper, which has been tabled, is something that I share. I think our time would be much better spent if we had draft legislation and we were working with a meaningful working document rather than spinning our wheels once again and revisiting this whole immense subject of access to information legislation.

John Reid did table a very helpful package last fall that was set out as draft legislation. Clause by clause, he would have in there, "Here's

what we seek to achieve, here's the change that would be necessary in the bill, and here's the actual language."

Page by page, it would be very easy to collate that into a draft piece of legislation, and that's what I think our starting point should be. So I would vote in favour of this motion, subject to clarification of what we mean by the opening sentence.

● (1545)

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Do you wish to respond, Ms. Lavallée?

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée:** I'm a little taken aback. Perhaps some finer points escape me. The purpose of the motion that was unanimously adopted by this committee on Thursday November 3, 2005 was to instruct the Justice Department — the wording was different, but the meaning was the same — to consider the advisability of introducing legislation, not a draft bill, in the House before December 15, 2005 based on the provisions of the act and the proposed amendments. It was understood that this would be presented by Commissioner Reid.

I see no reason for a draft bill when we're perhaps at the stage of drafting a bill. The proposed changes to the Access to Information Act have been amply discussed, in my view. First, we had the Bryden committee. I've been told a Senate committee also examined this issue. The committee has done many studies and analyses. In addition, the Conservative government recently tabled a discussion paper.

I think the time has come for the government to table a bill to this committee. Then, we'd have something concrete to debate, not mere recommendations, guidelines and suggested topics of discussion.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** At this point, no one has spoken against your motion. Mr. Martin has asked you to clarify why you feel you need the words "reaffirms the need to maintain the independence of the Office of the Information Commissioner". I believe he clearly said that he would support the rest of your motion as indicated. Do you have some explanation as to why you included those words?

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée:** My motion is further to the work done last November. Having said that, I'm not particularly attached to it. If Mr. Martin wishes to withdraw... I would find it odd if we were to withdraw them. I fear it might send out a message that we're not concerned about maintaining the independence of the Office of the Information Commissioner. However, if, in withdrawing the motions, we're not at the same time sacrificing the independence of this Office, then I have no objections.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Mr. Tilson, and then Mr. Stanton.

**Mr. David Tilson (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC):** I don't think this committee has ever challenged the independence of the commissioner. In fact, if you ever meet him, you'll find out he's pretty independent.

This committee requested the commissioner and his staff to prepare a bill, Mr. Chairman, which was prepared after much debate in this committee about proceeding with information. We did it out of frustration, quite frankly, with the lack of action by the former minister. The minister did come to us and present us with a paper, I recall, and the commissioner prepared a draft bill. He came, and we were briefed on that bill. I think there was even a report that went to the House, although I don't think it went on concurrence. But it did get to that stage.

It is unusual for this committee, of course...well, I guess nothing's unusual in this place, but normally the government decides whether they're going to introduce a bill and when they're going to introduce a bill. I guess there's nothing wrong with this committee doing that, but to be fair to the minister, I believe the minister should be given some time to prepare. He may introduce it—I don't know.

This committee never had public hearings on that bill. We simply passed it off to the House, and it was done in frustration, really. So we've never had public hearings on this bill, and I can't determine from the motion whether or not the mover is suggesting that precise bill be put forward, or whether some other legislation be put forward.

I have a lot of difficulty with the wording of the motion, because of the suggestion that the Office of the Information Commissioner is not independent. I think he is independent. In fact, I think he'd be quite offended by this motion.

I believe a more appropriate action would be.... Commissioner Reid will be coming to this committee. Presumably that will be scheduled by the clerk in due course. I expect it will be some time before the House rises—

• (1550)

**The Chair:** On Monday, May 29.

**Mr. David Tilson:** Quite frankly, I believe any form of motion such as this would be premature. The commissioner, I believe, has had discussions with the government officials. I don't know whether he's had discussions with the justice minister. But I think that before we get into this, I'd like to hear from the Information Commissioner as to what his position is and whether or not he's had discussions with the government. Once we've heard from the Information Commissioner, it would then be appropriate to determine what this committee is going to do with respect to any proposed information legislation.

Of course, the topic of information is being dealt with in the accountability legislation, and that may cause some problems as well as far as this committee and that committee are concerned.

Quite frankly, I think the motion is premature, and perhaps it might be more appropriate to table it after the Information Commissioner has had an opportunity to come and present his comments to the committee.

**The Chair:** I don't think I'll entertain any further comments on the portion of the motion that deals with the independence of the commissioner. The mover has already indicated she'd be happy to remove those words, so there's no point in debating it.

I'm advised by our researchers that this is the exact motion that this committee moved in the last Parliament—word for word,

including the word “independence”—and I am told that was at the request of Mr. Lee. That doesn't mean anything other than as a point of information.

Mr. Tilson's basic point is, why don't we hear from the Information Commissioner first, then consider this motion at that time.

I have Mr. Stanton, Mr. Zed, then Mr. Martin.

**Mr. Bruce Stanton:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I concur with my colleague on the points he raised on this. In looking at both documents that were tabled at the time that the Federal Accountability Act was introduced—one being the draft bill and the other being the discussion paper—and having looked at this for the first time, I note that by the information commissioner's own admission there have not been public consultations on this. I think this committee, and I'm sure the House, would benefit from that.

I also recognize that the motion in its wording is essentially non-binding on the minister, in terms of considering the advisability. Certainly we may get to a point at which we may want to look at something along that line, but I don't see the need at this point, in terms of imposing a deadline on this committee's work, of getting to that point and setting that time in front of us by the adjournment date.

The other point I have some real interest in, having looked at the discussion paper, is the cost implications. There is no question that we need to consider the kinds of amendments that need to be made to the proposed act—that's very clear—but it also carries, at first glance, a significant implication in terms of the cost and operations of government that I would like, as a committee member, to hear more about before we move ahead with that type of discussion.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Stanton.

As I read it, the motion does not compel the minister to do anything. To address another point that Mr. Tilson made, the legislation is recommended to be based on the proposed open government act. This clearly indicates the minister would be able to do what he wants, but recommends the use of the proposed open government act as a guideline, as opposed to the simple photocopying of it and calling it a government bill.

Mr. Zed.

**Mr. Paul Zed (Saint John, Lib.):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As I recall, Mr. Tilson was the chairman of the committee and there was quite a bit of interest on this side of the table at the time. The priority was...in fact, I think there was a consensus that had developed from all sides to comply with the June 23 deadline. Obviously, there's been a general election since then, but I'm wondering, colleagues, whether or not it would be helpful to hear from the Minister of Justice on his philosophy regarding the backdrop of this, as well as from the commissioner, who I understand is now scheduled. I'm drawn to the logic of Mr. Tilson, which is that we should wait and really hear from the commissioner.

Philosophically, it strikes me that we have a new Minister of Justice, and he may not be the appropriate person, because at the time this was drafted, he was the appropriate person. I don't know if he is or he isn't, but if he is, then it strikes me we would want to hear from him as well.

•(1555)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Mr. Martin.

**Mr. Pat Martin:** Thank you, Chair.

I wanted to ask, what date was the motion put last year? Was that the November 3 date? Is that the date that this exact motion was put forward last time?

**Ms. Nancy Holmes (Committee Researcher):** I'm not sure if it was November 3, but it was November.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée:** I have here the minutes of proceedings of the meeting of Thursday, November 3, 2005. That's not quite what the motion says. It reads as follows:

Pat Martin moved, -That the Committee direct the Research Staff to draft a report to the House of Commons, that the Committee accepts the Proposed "Open Government Act" as drafted by the Office of the Information Commissioner of Canada with the following changes [...]

**The Chair:** Could you read a little more slowly, please.

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée:** I apologize. The following is noted in the last paragraph:

It is further recommended to the House of Commons that it instruct the Justice Minister to table legislation within the House of Commons, based on the provisions of this Act and these proposed amendments by the 15th of December, 2005.

As I said, some of the words used in the minutes are different. They refer to "instruct the Minister" and, at the end "that the Minister of Justice consider".

That motion was introduced on November 3, 2005, but it's possible the other motion was adopted later, as the committee did meet subsequently.

[English]

**The Chair:** Mr. Martin.

**Mr. Pat Martin:** Thank you. I just wanted the dates, most of all, but what I was going to ask then is this.

On that day we asked the clerk to write the seventh report, and I'm just wondering if the most recent action we could build from is not this motion, but that seventh report, which was to be tabled in the House. Can you tell me what date that was completed and ratified by the committee?

**The Chair:** Mr. Clerk, can you help us?

**The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Richard Rumas):** I don't have the date, because I wasn't with this committee, Mr. Martin, but I can certainly find out.

**The Chair:** How about either of you? Do you know?

**Ms. Nancy Holmes:** It's the end of November.

**Mr. Pat Martin:** That does seem like the most up-to-date action of this committee.

**The Chair:** There are two issues, though. We have to find out if there was a report adopted by the committee—that's the first issue—and if there was a report adopted by the committee, whether it was in fact presented by the chair or the chair's designate to the House of Commons before the election was called. We do not know the answer to either of those—

Do we know?

It was adopted? What about being presented to the House?

**A voice:** I don't believe it was, but we can find this out.

**The Chair:** Okay, we'll find this out for you. If we can find it before the close of the meeting, fine; if not, we'll have it for Monday when we have our meeting.

Are there any...?

Mr. Dhaliwal.

**Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We said we wanted to listen to the Information Commissioner before we made a decision on this particular one. In fact, the commissioner already has presented a report to Parliament, the report I have here. He talks about the response to the government's action plan for the problem of the Access to Information Act. This is a 23-page comprehensive report where he has already said where the new government is heading.

**In fact, he says:** Finally, and most important, the content of the Federal Accountability Act, and the government's discussion paper on access reform, is a cause for grave concern. What the government now proposes – if accepted – will reduce the amount of information available to the public, weaken the oversight role of the Information Commissioner and increase government's ability to cover-up wrongdoing, shield itself from embarrassment and control the flow of information to Canadians.

Based on that, he has gone clause by clause through that information act. I'm certain, even before we listen to him, that he can clarify these things in his 23-page report on Monday. But we can make a decision on this particular issue today, before we listen to him.

•(1600)

**The Chair:** Okay, but I think the answer to the question is... The thinking was that if the commissioner were here, someone might be able to put the question: "Are you dealing with a minister on a new act; if so, who's the minister; if not, have you scheduled any meetings?"—that kind of thing. I gather that's what the general sense would be: that there be that kind of questioning of the commissioner.

We'll go back to Mr. Tilson.

**Mr. David Tilson:** Mr. Chairman, there was a letter, which I believe members have, from the minister addressed to you. I think we all have it. I think it was Mr. Zed who raised the comment.... This letter deals with the topic before us. In the final paragraph, he states:

I would be pleased to appear before the Committee to further discuss the issues raised by the discussion paper.

I'm only going to repeat what I said, that I believe before we get into legislation we should hear from Commissioner Reid.

Not only that; I believe we should hear from the minister. The minister says he'd be prepared to come to have a chat with us. I believe that before we get into rattling our sabres, those two people should come. Messrs. Zed, Martin, and I did hear Commissioner Reid, but we're only three people, and other members of the committee may wish to ask some questions.

**The Chair:** Of course that is right along the lines of what Mr. Zed said.

Mr. Wallace.

**Mr. Mike Wallace:** The point has been made.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

**The Chair:** All right.

This is the last opportunity for the mover. Madame Lavallée.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée:** Well, there is the motion that I am moving. There's also the letter from the minister in which he says he would like to meet with us to discuss this legislation. There's also the discussion paper "Strengthening the Access to Information Act" which was distributed on April 11, at the same time and along with Bill C-2.

We need to look at this at the same time, but it all points in the same direction, namely the tabling of a bill. No doubt that's up to the Justice Minister, since he's the one who wrote to say he wanted to meet with the committee. When he does, perhaps he could bring along the draft legislation. That would give us something concrete to discuss, unlike recent years where we've...

As I said earlier, a number of committee meetings have been held. The committee has also carried out some studies. A Senate committee has also explored this issue. We now have the Information Commissioner's paper which represents a response to the government's action plan. I think all of the documents tend to lean the same way, that is they advocate in favour of a bill. That's pretty much where we stand at the present time.

Perhaps our Conservative Party colleagues could let us know if their wish is to put the committee on hold until Bill C-2 is adopted, even if that means revisiting this matter later?

If that's indeed what they want, if that is their priority or strategy, then they should be honest with us, so that we can act accordingly. However, if that's not what they want, if they truly want to translate their words into action, then by all means, have a bill drafted and bring it to the committee table so that we have something to sink our teeth into, rather than just empty words or good intentions that lead nowhere.

Would you care to share your strategy with us? If it's your intention to have Bill C-2 on accountability eventually adopted, then we'll know better what we're doing here. Instead of sitting for three hours on Monday, we could perhaps focus on something a little more interesting.

•(1605)

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I'm not going to permit anybody to discuss political strategy. It's not relevant to this committee's work unless it impedes it, and we haven't seen any evidence of that.

We do have a request in writing from the Minister of Justice to work on this matter. We are going to hear from the commissioner, and it seems—this is simply my own point of view—that given those two points, this motion might be premature. I'm not saying it's forever. But it's not my decision; it's the committee's decision.

Having heard from the various people around the table, I want to ask Madame Lavallée—so we're clear on what we're talking about—do you accept the friendly amendment put forward by Mr. Martin to take out the words "reaffirms the need to maintain the independence of the Office of the Information Commissioner, and...?"

Yes?

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée:** I'll gladly accept the amendment, on condition, as I said earlier, that this does not affect the independence of the Commissioner.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** The answer is yes. So the motion that you have put forward begins: "This committee recommends that...". Now, that's what we're talking about.

Madame Lavallée, having heard what you've heard, would you like a vote on this motion, or would you like to see if the committee would unanimously consent to table it until after we've heard from the commissioner? It's your call.

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Carole Lavallée:** I'd like us to vote on it immediately, since we're talking about a motion that has already been adopted by the committee. I'd like to see some consistency in this committee's actions where this matter is concerned.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** All right, very good.

We'll have a recorded vote, please. It is on the motion as amended.

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

**The Chair:** The motion is defeated; the vote was close, but it was defeated.

Those are the two items of business. There is other business. We've touched upon one, which is the letter from the Minister of Justice. I have also received a letter from the Privacy Commissioner asking for an opportunity to appear before the committee, and of course we're going to hear from her. We'll schedule her as well.

Her point, among others, will be that the Privacy Act is a first-generation act. It needs to be reviewed and brought into the 21st century, and I think that's pretty well a statement of the obvious. So it will just depend on how hard we want to work, because there will be no lack of work for us to do if we choose to seize it.



Is there any other business before I adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Tilson.

**Mr. David Tilson:** I just have a question, Mr. Chairman, through you to the clerk, on whether you have a specific commissioner who would be coming at the next meeting.

**The Clerk:** Yes. Mr. Reid will come on the 29th. Madame Stoddart is pencilled in for Monday, the 5th. And as for Mr. Shapiro, it's 99% sure he'll be here on the 12th. Then we'll have one more Monday, and we'll likely get the registrar of lobbyists.

**Mr. David Tilson:** Thank you, sir.

**The Chair:** Is there any other business?

Mr. Wallace.

**Mr. Mike Wallace:** Can you send that out in a memo to us?

**The Clerk:** Indeed, I will. Tomorrow morning you'll get an e-mail.

**The Chair:** Is there any other business?

Thank you very much, colleagues.

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.**