



House of Commons  
CANADA

## Standing Committee on the Status of Women

---

FEWO • NUMBER 058 • 1st SESSION • 39th PARLIAMENT

---

EVIDENCE

**Tuesday, May 29, 2007**

—  
**Chair**

**Ms. Yasmin Ratansi**

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

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

## Standing Committee on the Status of Women

Tuesday, May 29, 2007

•(1535)

[English]

**The Chair (Ms. Yasmin Ratansi (Don Valley East, Lib.)):** The meeting will start off in public. We will go through Ms. Neville's motion, and I understand that Ms. Smith has an amendment to the motion. After that, I need to do some committee business in public.

What I am going to request of committee members is that as we go through the motion and amendments, could we restrict the debate for each portion to 20 minutes? That will give us time to go in camera to discuss the issue we want to discuss.

There are votes tonight, so the bells might ring at 5:15 p.m., and we will have to stop at that time.

Could I have the unanimous consent of committee members that we will restrict the debate on the motion and the amendment to 20 minutes each?

**Hon. Anita Neville (Winnipeg South Centre, Lib.):** I have to be away by 4 p.m., Madam Chair.

**The Chair:** That's going to make it a little difficult. Okay, we'll see.

Ms. Neville, could you please read the motion for the record?

**Hon. Anita Neville:** Madam Chair, I wonder if I could have the permission of the committee to take six words out of the motion. This might alleviate the issue of an amendment. I don't know.

**The Chair:** Could you tell us which six words you would like to remove?

**Hon. Anita Neville:** If possible, the six words that I'd like to withdraw are "during the duration of the games".

**The Chair:** Procedurally you can't make amendments to your own motion. You have to read the full motion, and then we will do what is procedurally right.

**Hon. Anita Neville:** Okay. It reads:

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2) that the Standing Committee on the Status of Women recommends to the government that a plan be developed and implemented prior to the opening of the 2010 Olympics to curtail the trafficking of women and girls for sexual purposes during the duration of the games and that the Chair report the adoption of this motion to the House without delay.

Can I speak to it? Briefly, the reason I suggested withdrawing those six words, Madam Chair, is that it should happen not only during the duration of the games, but it should be an ongoing process. I'll leave that up to the committee.

We've heard testimony over time from the Vancouver police department and from others who came before the committee. I have

the testimony before me indicating that Vancouver is both a sex city...that the rate and intensity of the trafficking of women, men, and children for the purposes of sexual exploitation during large international games increases substantially.

It's important that we be alert, so that we draw attention to this and have a strategy in place.

I'll comment later.

**The Chair:** Does anyone else wish to speak to the motion?

Ms. Smith.

**Mrs. Joy Smith (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC):** Thank you, Madam Chair.

It's not time to talk about the amendment right now. I understand it's speaking to the motion that's already on the table.

I want to commend the member for putting this motion forward. I think it's a very good one, and our witnesses certainly impacted this committee.

I was on this committee during the past election and this one. In 1999, it was very hard to get this on the status of women committee. The member opposite, Ms. Neville, who put this motion forward, has certainly seen the importance of protecting people, particularly in the Olympic games.

I would agree that this needs to be done right now and all the time, but I also commend her for paying attention to that special point that the Olympic games do bring in more trafficking people, because of the nature of the games.

Members on this side of this House, as you know, we have an amendment that we would like to add to strengthen this motion.

I commend members opposite for putting this motion forward. It's something we would like to see here.

**The Chair:** Are there any other discussions on this motion?

Ms. Mathysen.

**Mrs. Irene Mathysen (London—Fanshawe, NDP):** I would also like to support the intent of this motion, because if we are going to address this crime against women, we have to begin in our own backyard. I would like to add my support.

**The Chair:** Procedurally you have an amendment to the motion. So before I call for a vote, I'd like to....

Yes, Mr. Stanton.

**Mr. Bruce Stanton (Simcoe North, CPC):** A point of order, Madam Chair. Perhaps it's more of a question, but I think it is a point of order.

Are we talking about the amendment that Ms. Neville put forward to her own motion?

**The Chair:** No, we are talking about Ms. Smith's amendment.

**Mr. Bruce Stanton:** The one that was circulated?

**The Chair:** The one that just arrived on our desks.

**Mr. Bruce Stanton:** All right, thank you. I appreciate that.

**Mrs. Joy Smith:** Thank you, Madam Chair.

I will read it out. As I say, this is an amendment to strengthen the intent of the original motion, which we consider a very good one to have. This is the amendment to the motion:

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2) that the Standing Committee on the Status of Women recommends to the government that a plan be developed in collaboration with provincial and municipal counterparts as well as experts from the police, international organizations and NGOs and implemented prior to the opening of the 2010 Olympics to curtail the trafficking of women and girls for sexual purposes during the duration of the games and that the Chair report the adoption of this motion to the House without delay.

• (1540)

**The Chair:** Are there any discussions on this motion?

Ms. Davidson.

**Mrs. Patricia Davidson (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC):** Thank you.

I'd like to speak in support of the amendment. I think the original motion is very much needed. The amendment does strengthen the original motion. The testimony we heard was that no one group can do it by themselves; it needs to be in collaboration with the people who are going to be there, on the street and working with the people.

The federal government needs to have that collaboration to put a workable plan in place. I support the amendment.

**The Chair:** Ms. Neville.

**Hon. Anita Neville:** Thank you.

I also support the amendment, Madam Chair.

It reinforces something that concerns me that we did not deal with adequately in the report on human trafficking. Not only are we looking at the trafficking of individuals from outside the country, but we also have to be very cognizant of the trafficking of individuals within our own borders and across the country.

In putting this amendment forward, it may well address some of those issues as well.

There are two weaknesses in our trafficking report, and it is the internal trafficking that we might have been stronger on. So this amendment would address that, and I support it.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Procedurally there is an amendment on the floor that I'm sure—I'm going to speak for the committee—the committee agrees with.

But there is another amendment, which Ms. Neville spoke about, that would basically make it even stronger, because you do not really want it only during the duration of the games.

So what I would like to do is vote first on Ms. Smith's amendment. Then I propose that someone else—because procedurally Ms. Neville cannot amend her own motion—put another amendment for the removal of those six words.

You can't do it either, Ms. Smith.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Nicole Demers (Laval, BQ):** Madam Chair, we should amend the member's motion before we amend the main motion.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** We vote first on Ms. Smith's motion. Then we can take the next step.

**Ms. Nicole Demers:** We have to amend her motion first, because it's the first amendment. So we have to amend the amendment, if we want to be able to amend the main motion afterwards.

We just want to take the words out.

**The Chair:** Madame Demers, a subamendment is allowed. So you can subamend Ms. Smith's amendment.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Nicole Demers:** I would like to move that the words “*pendant la durée des jeux*” or “during the games” be deleted. I would just like to take these words out of the motion.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** *Oui, six mots.* The six words are “during the duration of the games”. So that is a subamendment. Now we have to vote on the subamendment.

No?

The clerk asks that she explain what's going on.

**The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Michelle Tittley):** I just seek to clarify for the knowledge of the committee.

The motion was moved by Ms. Neville. We then had an amendment moved by Ms. Smith. The amendment would be what is on the floor presently, because the subamendment that was proposed by Madame Demers is actually a subsequent amendment, not amending the subamendment.

Therefore, what we will proceed to do is vote on the amendment. Then perhaps we will have another amendment proposed, vote on that amendment, and then vote on the motion.

**The Chair:** My first proposal was right, so let's go back to the first proposal.

*Oui, madame.* No problem. *Pas de problème.*

**Ms. Nicole Demers:** I apologize.

**The Chair:** So all in favour of the amendment proposed by Ms. Smith, raise your hands.

(Amendment agreed to)

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** You can now move the other amendment.

**Ms. Nicole Demers:** I move that the words “during the games” be deleted in Ms. Neville's motion.

• (1545)

[English]

**The Chair:** So we are proposing the removal of those six words, “during the duration of the games”, from the amendment.

Yes, Mr. Stanton.

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

I think the amendment in this case is certainly well intentioned. The only difficulty I see is that it changes the essence of the motion, in terms of broadening its scope.

Essentially it is then asking the government, working in collaboration and so on to develop and implement a plan to curtail the trafficking of women and girls for sexual purposes. By not putting that qualification in there, it leaves it general in nature for all future purposes. The only thing that is being compelled vis-à-vis the Olympics is the timing of such plan and implementation.

This is really suggesting that the government, working with other governments, plan and implement this initiative prior to the opening of the 2010 Olympics.

It's relatively broad in its scope, and certainly it's well intentioned. But I don't know what implications that has. For example, is it in conflict with what we have already done in the recommendations of our comprehensive report on human trafficking?

Before agreeing to that amendment, I want to go back and take a look to see if in fact we have not already done that. Because I believe we had recommendations around curtailing the trafficking of women and girls for sexual exploitation.

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

If you could indulge me, Ms. Smith, I think the removal of the six words has been suggested by Ms. Neville.

I think Ms. Demers was just facilitating the process. So could Ms. Neville please clarify why she feels it necessary to remove this, because it was her original motion?

**Hon. Anita Neville:** My intent in putting the suggestion forward was that important processes will be put in place for the Olympic games. But once the games are over, we don't want these processes to be dismantled and the intensity of the activity...

The Olympics will generate its own activity and intensity, but it's important that these organizations remain vigilant on the issue as well.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Ms. Smith.

**Mrs. Joy Smith:** Just to simplify things, I would agree with Ms. Neville that she makes a very good point. However, I also think she brought up a very important motion because of the Olympic games. So I'm wondering if she might think about doing this motion with the amendment—this is a suggestion to the committee—because it addresses the Olympics, and then perhaps the member could bring another amendment forward to expand on that motion at another time.

So in other words, there would be two different motions, because I believe what she's done is very important. I don't think it would curtail anything, because we have the report tabled in the House of Commons.

We have my motion 153 that has been supported by all members, and this motion is the first to address the Olympics. I just throw that out.

If everyone wants to take out the six words, I'm more than willing to do that, because it's a good motion. But it's very strong with the Olympics, so I would like to have the motion remain with the amendment and all of us see that through. We will support either way.

Do you know what I'm saying? I'm just saying that this is very important, and if she takes out the six words, she might lose some of its strength.

**The Chair:** For my clarification, do you want this amendment to stay? Then would you like the Olympic aspect of it, “during the duration”, and then should she make another amendment, saying that we have the systems in place, don't dismantle them?

**Mrs. Joy Smith:** No, I'm saying today—

• (1550)

**The Chair:** Not today, but next time.

**Mrs. Joy Smith:** No, we're making this too complicated. I agree with what the member is saying. I know she looked at this a second time and said, oh dear, I don't want it to stop with the Olympics. I totally agree with that. This motion will be supported by this side of the House.

I'm just thinking that the very important aspect that she brought forward about the Olympics has never been brought forward before.

I put the amendment forward to make sure it was in collaboration with all the members. So if she would be willing, I would like to see her original motion and the amendment be carried today. Then if we need more at a future time to carry on...because this is a very important motion put forward today in its original form.

But I'm willing; I just want to throw that out.

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Fine.

Ms. Deschamps.

**Ms. Johanne Deschamps (Laurentides—Labelle, BQ):** Madam Chair, I have a suggestion that could be simpler than removing six words. The motion could read, “a plan to curtail the trafficking of women and girls for sexual purposes during and after the duration of the games”.

**The Chair:** The amendment would be “during and after”, or “*pendant et après*”. I see.

**Ms. Johanne Deschamps:** It is that simple.

**The Chair:** Yes, it is fine.

Ms. Demers—

[English]

would you like to withdraw your amendment and...?

[Translation]

**Ms. Nicole Demers:** My pleasure, Madam Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

Ms. Deschamps, your amendment includes the words “during and after”. Agreed.

[English]

Do you want to speak?

**Mr. Bruce Stanton:** I have one other item.

**The Chair:** Sure.

**Mr. Bruce Stanton:** Perhaps this is out of order, but do you want to get concurrence on the amendment as now suggested by Madame Deschamps?

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Mr. Bruce Stanton:** Okay, then I have an item after that.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Yes, Ms. Keeper.

**Ms. Tina Keeper (Churchill, Lib.):** Is what's being proposed “during and after the games”?

**The Chair:** Yes, to curtail trafficking. Let's read it.

**Ms. Tina Keeper:** No, I don't need to read it.

I wasn't part of this committee in hearing the witnesses, but my sense is that what is being proposed here is to have a sort of model developed, in terms of a crisis response in a situation that is unusual, extraordinary, and this requires extraordinary measures.

I assume that your report has recommendations for the country and day-to-day life, in terms of these issues, but it seems to me the specific of this is that it would be in response to something extraordinary.

My concern would be that anything that sort of takes it out of the timing of the event sort of waters it down. What you're trying to develop is a crisis response, and you have to sort of stay within that framework of time. That's the way it seems to me.

So I think the wording should just stay.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Ms. Keeper, you make lots of sense because you are right. If you take a step back—the chair is commenting, but it's her right to comment—you're right. A crisis response is put in place, especially because during an Olympics there will be a higher blip in the human trafficking, and then it will slow down.

**Mrs. Joy Smith:** I'm very happy with that.

**The Chair:** Madame Deschamps, did you understand what Ms. Keeper was trying to say?

**Ms. Johanne Deschamps:** *Oui.*

**The Chair:** So would you like to withdraw your motion?

**Ms. Johanne Deschamps:** No.

**The Chair:** No, okay.

*Oui.*

[Translation]

**Ms. Johanne Deschamps:** I think the motion moved by Ms. Neville and amended by Mrs. Smith is a positive gesture. Comes a time when one needs a significant gesture to go forward with a plan. This plan is included in the recommendations in the report.

If we have to wait until the second coming before we implement a plan, we could wait for a long time. Let us take this opportunity of an event where it is said...

• (1555)

[English]

**The Chair:** Can I suggest that you have misunderstood us?

**Ms. Johanne Deschamps:** Yes.

**The Chair:** The intent of Ms. Keeper's intervention was that human trafficking is there with the Olympics. We know, we understand, we prepared a report, etc., and we made recommendations to the government.

Generally, in an Olympic environment there is higher activity, so according to the amended plan, we need interdisciplinary intervention from the government and other agencies. The Olympic plan would be far stricter than what we want on a day-to-day basis.

So what Ms. Keeper is suggesting is that if we stick with the original motion, as amended by Ms. Smith, we will be able to have a plan. The plan would be in place during the Olympics, and the amount of resources required to monitor it after the Olympics may be slightly different from the resources required to do it during the Olympics. So the plan will be there.

We're recommending that the plan be there, but the intensity of the plan will be slightly different from the Olympics to normal day-to-day business.

[Translation]

**Ms. Johanne Deschamps:** How would the motion read?

[English]

**The Chair:** It will read the same.

[Translation]

You have Mrs. Smith's motion.

[English]

And it reads.... What am I reading the motion for?

Ms. Smith, could you reread your motion, please?

[Translation]

Ms. Deschamps, the motion is this.

[English]

**Mrs. Joy Smith:** Yes, the original motion is:

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2) that the Standing Committee on the Status of Women recommends to the government that a plan be developed and implemented prior to the opening of the 2010 Olympics to curtail the trafficking of women and girls for sexual purposes during the duration of the games and that the Chair report the adoption of this motion to the House without delay.

Then my amendment was:

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2) that the Standing Committee on the Status of Women recommends to the government that a plan be developed in collaboration with provincial and municipal counterparts as well as experts from the police, international organizations and NGOs and implemented prior to the opening of the 2010 Olympics to curtail the trafficking of women and girls for sexual purposes during the duration of the games and that the Chair report the adoption of this motion to the House without delay.

Just to strengthen this, if I could for just a minute, CIDA has brought forward.... The reason why I think Ms. Neville's motion is so strong, and the reason why I think I accommodated her to add the amendment, was because there is a draft report out on trafficking in human beings at the 2006 World Cup in Germany. A lot of those things that were happening there were implemented, as Ms. Keeper so eloquently said, in a crisis situation. The Olympics show that this kind of event is a crisis situation. So as the chair pointed out, more resources would have to be put in place.

**The Chair:** Madame Demers.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Nicole Demers:** Madam Chair, I understand the concerns of my colleague, whom I appreciate very much. I also understand Mrs. Smith's concerns.

Our report asked for a plan to eliminate human trafficking. The report is one step. The motion at hand will be a concrete gesture. We have an opportunity to make sure this action is not limited in time to just one event. This plan should be ready on time for the Olympic games, it should be implemented during this event, and we have to do everything we can to restrain or stop all trafficking for sexual purposes. But this plan should not stop there. If we do not stipulate that we want this action to go on after the Olympic games, even if we are quite satisfied with what has been done during the games, we will have to start the process all over again. We could keep the words "during the duration" because they are important, but I do not believe the words "and after" suggested by my colleague limit the motion, quite the contrary.

• (1600)

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you, Madame.

For the benefit of the committee, I'm just going to read the amendment that Madame Deschamps had made. It said "implemented prior to the opening of the 2010 Olympics to curtail the trafficking of women and girls for sexual purposes during the duration of the games and after"—so that it doesn't get lost—"and that the Chair report the adoption of this motion to the House without delay."

Can we take a vote on that motion, adding the words "and after"?

(Amendment agreed to)

**The Chair:** It's unanimous.

Now, on the motion as amended....

Yes, Mr. Stanton.

**Mr. Bruce Stanton:** I still have an item I want to suggest.

**The Chair:** Sure. Go ahead.

**Mr. Bruce Stanton:** I appreciate the input in helping this motion to become as good as it can be.

I had a suggestion, actually, when I read the motion. I think it would be stronger if we word it in such a way that someone, at least, is taking action. The way this is worded now, "recommends to the government that a plan be developed", in my way of thinking could be worded more strongly in terms of who is in the lead in terms of not only planning but implementing this. I think perhaps if the mover would agree, there could be a friendly amendment to put the onus on the government in fact to develop and implement the plan, in collaboration and so on.

It's just a slight change in wording. My suggestion would be that the wording be changed to reflect that the Standing Committee on the Status of Women "recommends that the government develop and implement a plan in collaboration with provincial and municipal counterparts as well as experts from the police, international organizations, and NGOs, prior to the opening of the 2010 Olympics".

It's a subtle change in wording, but I believe it puts the onus on the government to lead in this initiative. While the current wording does indirectly suggest that, I think this wording would be somewhat stronger in terms of the leadership role the government will play.

**The Chair:** Is there any discussion?

Mr. Stanton, so that we know what we are now voting on, could you read the whole motion, please?

**Mr. Bruce Stanton:** It would read:

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2) that the Standing Committee on the Status of Women recommends that the government develop and implement a plan in collaboration with provincial and municipal counterparts, as well as experts from the police, international organizations, and NGOs, prior to the opening of the 2010 Olympics to curtail the trafficking of women and girls for sexual purposes during and after the duration of the games, and that the Chair report the adoption of this motion to the House without delay.

**The Chair:** On the motion as amended twice, all those in favour.

(Motion agreed to)

• (1605)

**The Chair:** I have a few housekeeping items before we go in camera.

First, the draft report on the economic security of women will be distributed this Thursday. As a committee, we will start to review it. I do not know how long Parliament will continue to sit, so if we hope to have this finished by this summer...once we review the report we will decide whether we want to hold extra meetings or whatever, so that we can get this report through before the summer break.

Second, Minister Oda is not available to come before the committee on May 30. Would the committee like to ask for her appearance in the fall?

Madame Deschamps.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Johanne Deschamps:** I think it is better if we get ahead. I still think she should appear before the committee.

[English]

**The Chair:** Okay. That was all I had for committee business.

On Pauktuutit, you will remember they had invited us to visit the north. I seek the committee's direction. I could ask the clerk to determine the feasibility, etc., and report back to us, and then we can discuss whether we can go or not.

Ms. Smith.

**Mrs. Joy Smith:** It's something that I think all sides of the House were approached about, and it's very interesting. I did discuss it with the minister, and she pointed out that there's going to be a ministers' conference. A lot of the ministers are going up to Esquimalt early in July. I would assume we could still do this, but she didn't seem to see a need to do it because of the activity that's going on there and the ministers actually being on site.

**The Chair:** If that changes the dynamics of going to the north, that's fine. We have to check to see whether it is desirable to go, how large the organization is, what it represents, whether our budget allows it, etc., because it all goes before the Liaison Committee.

Ms. Keeper.

**Ms. Tina Keeper:** I have a question, because the member mentioned that ministers will be meeting in Esquimalt, but that's on Vancouver Island. I wondered what that had to do with the request to go north.

**The Chair:** Where did you say the ministers were going, Ms. Smith?

**Mrs. Joy Smith:** I am sorry. It is Iqaluit.

**The Chair:** Thank you for that correction.

Ms. Mathysen.

**Mrs. Irene Mathysen:** Madam Chair, might I propose something in regard to the report we're going to be reviewing? The last time we had a report we had changes or amendments in writing before we went through clause-by-clause, and it seemed to make things go more smoothly and better. In light of the gravity of this report, I'd like to take some time. I wondered if it might be possible for the committee to receive the report and have the time between now and Tuesday, June 5, to look at it and put thoughts, amendments or changes in writing so we can pursue going through the report on Tuesday, June 5.

**The Chair:** That's a good idea, but we do not know how long we are going to be here, and the clerks and the analysts are working on the assumption that June 8 might be the last day. We don't know.

So if we don't know, we're working with so many permutations and combinations. Say June 8 was the last date we were in the House. Then the last possible date for the adoption of the report would be June 5. If we are not ready by June 5, then we will have to go into the fall to present our report.

Ms. Mathysen, your suggestion is good, because I would like to start a discussion.

Could you give me one second?

Ms. Mathysen, the report is in translation, and it will be ready by Thursday. So if we can give you the report on Thursday, and if you

decide, as a committee, that you do not want to read the report through at committee level, then we don't have a meeting; we'll just distribute the report. At that time, we will, as a committee, take responsibility, because then the clerks are not responsible for the report; we are. Privacy issues arise there.

We can do that if it's the will of the committee. On Thursday we will have the report ready. We will distribute the report on Thursday. We can go through the report at that time, and the outline of the report will make it very easy for us to go through the report. I understand we need to go through it with a fine-toothed comb, because things will happen. And we'll have to look at what recommendations come out of that report.

Ms. Mathysen, I hope that satisfies you.

• (1610)

**Mrs. Irene Mathysen:** Thank you. I appreciate that consideration.

**The Chair:** Madame Demers.

[Translation]

**Ms. Nicole Demers:** Madam Chair, there is a slight problem. The government's whip in chief told us yesterday morning in the House that this is the last week. In his answer to Mrs. Davies's question of privilege, Mr. Hill said,

[English]

It's unfortunate to start the final week this way.

[Translation]

This is the whip in chief. He must know a little bit what he is talking about. In some committees, no witnesses have been called for next week and no sitting is planned. I would not like our report to go unnoticed simply because we expect to be sitting until June 8. The whip used the words "final week". To me, this really means the last week. You can check the blues.

[English]

**The Chair:** *C'est ça?* This week is the final week?

[Translation]

**Ms. Nicole Demers:** In his answer to a question of privilege by Mrs. Davies, he said,

[English]

It would be unfortunate to start this final week this way—"this final week".

**The Chair:** Madam Smith, do you have any news that we don't have?



**Mrs. Joy Smith:** No, I really don't. I don't know when we're going to be adjourning, but my feeling is that some people do believe it's June 8. I'm not in that group. I feel we have to be cautious, and we have to make sure our work is done. I agree with Ms. Mathysen. If we could look at the reports and come back intelligently—and we have to be very mindful of the fact that it has to be done before June 8 in case—and if we could be very disciplined and get that done, that would be good, because I always like, when I'm looking at a report, to know what I'm saying. You don't have long, drawn-out conversations then. You know why you're saying what you're saying. We have to be very mindful of June 8, even though I don't believe we'll be dismissed by then. I don't know. I have no idea. So let's just be very prudent.

**The Chair:** So that we understand the timetable of a report, we need 48 hours. Once we agree to the report and make editorial or grammatical changes, there has to be 48 hours before it can be tabled in the House, so we will need those 48 hours.

Now, I am agreeable that if we decide on Thursday that the committee members will take it, review it, and send in their feedback over the weekend, Monday would be the day that we would have all the feedback, and at the Tuesday meeting you would actually be executing the report in a very automatic way. I mean you'll execute the report, and it has to be on a firm timeline. So if we do that, then perhaps we'll be ready for submission to the House on June 8.

We need to get this report into the House, I'm hoping before the summer, whenever the summer break is. Nobody knows.

Yes, Mr. Stanton.

**Mr. Bruce Stanton:** Madam Chair, on this question of timing, I want to add that the parliamentary calendar takes us to June 22. I have no knowledge of what was said; this is news. Perhaps I missed it when this occurred, but regardless of what words may have been said or speculated about, there has to be unanimity among the parties before that calendar changes to anything but June 22. So we have to assume that we're continuing on until we hear otherwise.

•(1615)

**The Chair:** Fair enough. So Thursday?

If I hear from the members that they want the report to be given to them, they want to take time to read through it on private time, on the condition that by the weekend you must send in your feedback.

**A voice:** By Friday?

**The Chair:** By Friday would be fine. Friday, Saturday, Sunday max. I could give you until Monday morning. So Monday morning would be the last time that we would look at it, in order to meet those very tight timelines.

The clerk has asked me a very valid question. If we are not going to review the report on Thursday, do you really want a meeting, or shall we just send the report over to your offices?

Okay, so there will be no meeting on Thursday. The report will be e-mailed to you, and you will work on the report. Monday is the deadline for submitting any changes, and that way we will be very tight with our timeline.

Do you want it e-mailed or a paper copy? There is more risk with e-mail. Stick with hard copy with your names on it, so that if you know it's private, nothing can be leaked from that report.

On that note, I would like to ask Ms. Smith to please chair the meeting next Tuesday, because I am going with your minister to an APEC conference.

**Mrs. Joy Smith:** It would be my pleasure.

**The Chair:** If the report is ready by Thursday, please present it to the House.

**Mrs. Joy Smith:** Absolutely.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

[*Proceedings continue in camera*]





**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.**