



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage

CHPC



NUMBER 001



1st SESSION



41st PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Tuesday, June 21, 2011



Chair

Mr. Rob Moore

Standing Committee on Canadian Heritage

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

•(1105)

[*English*]

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Christine Holke David): Honourable members of the committee, I see a quorum.

I must inform members that the clerk of the committee can only receive motions for the election of the chair. The clerk cannot receive other types of motions, entertain points of order, or participate in debate.

We can now proceed to the election of the chair.

Pursuant to Standing Order 106(2), the chair must be a member of the government party. I am ready to receive motions for the chair.

Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus (Timmins—James Bay, NDP): I nominate Mr. Moore.

The Clerk: It has been moved by Mr. Angus that Mr. Moore be elected chair of the committee.

Are there any further motions?

Is the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

(Motion agreed to)

The Clerk: I declare the motion carried and Mr. Moore duly elected chair of the committee.

[*Translation*]

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

The Clerk: Before I invite Mr. Moore to take the chair, if the committee wishes, we will move to the election of the vice-chairs.

Pursuant to Standing Order 106(2), the first vice-chair must be a member of the official opposition.

I am now ready to receive motions for the position of first vice-chair.

[*English*]

Mr. Scott Armstrong (Cumberland—Colchester—Musquodoboit Valley, CPC): I nominate Mr. Angus.

[*Translation*]

The Clerk: Moved by Mr. Armstrong that Mr. Angus be elected first vice-chair of the committee.

Are there any further motions?

Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

(Motion agreed to)

The Clerk: I declare the motion carried and Mr. Angus duly elected first vice-chair of the committee.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

[*English*]

The Clerk: Pursuant to Standing Order 106(2), the second vice-chair must be a member of an opposition party other than the official opposition.

I am now prepared to receive a motion for the second vice-chair.

Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I nominate Mr. Simms.

The Clerk: It has been moved by Mr. Angus that Mr. Simms be elected second vice-chair of the committee.

Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

(Motion agreed to)

The Clerk: I declare the motion carried and Mr. Simms duly elected second vice-chair of the committee.

I now invite Mr. Moore to take the chair.

The Chair (The Honourable Rob Moore (Fundy Royal)): Thank you all for your votes. I appreciate it. Congratulations to the vice-chair and second vice-chair as well.

I look forward to working with all of you in this 41st Parliament on the Standing Committee on Heritage. I know there's a lot of good work that is going to be done.

At this point, and with the committee's consent, we'll proceed to consideration of the routine motions. I believe the clerk has distributed a list already of the principal routine motions.

The first motion is to retain the services of analysts: that the committee retain, as needed and at the discretion of the chair, the services of one or more analysts from the Library of Parliament to assist it in its work.

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: At this time I want to introduce the analysts from the Library of Parliament, Michael Dewing and Marion Ménard. They will be assisting us in the capacity of analysts.

I also wish to thank the clerk for starting the meeting off. We look forward to working with you as well.

The next motion is on the subcommittee on agenda and procedure. Is there any discussion on that motion?

Mr. Calandra.

Mr. Paul Calandra (Oak Ridges—Markham, CPC): Mr. Chair, I have an amendment to that, which I printed out. I can provide it to you, if you want to read it, or would you rather I read it?

The Chair: Go ahead.

Mr. Paul Calandra: Okay, I'll read it and then we'll go from there:

That the Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure be composed of five members, including the chair, two vice-chairs, a parliamentary secretary, and a member of the Conservative Party; that quorum of the subcommittee shall consist of at least three members, including one member of the government and one member of the opposition; and that each member of the subcommittee shall be permitted to have one assistant attend any meetings of the Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure; in addition, each party shall be permitted to have one staff member from a House officer attend any meeting.

The Chair: Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I would like to have that read again.

The Chair: Do you want me to read it? Do you want Mr. Calandra to read it, or would you like the clerk to read it?

Mr. Charlie Angus: Mr. Moore, you are very careful in how you speak, so you'd probably speak a little slower. I'm a little slow at things; I sometimes need to write things out as people are talking.

The Chair: It says:

That the Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure be composed of five members, including the chair, the two vice-chairs, the parliamentary secretary, and a member of the Conservative Party; quorum of the subcommittee shall consist of at least three members, including one member of government and one member of the opposition; that each member of the subcommittee shall be permitted to have one assistant attend any meetings of the Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure; in addition, each party shall be permitted to have one staff member from a House officer attend any meeting.

Mr. Angus.

• (1110)

Mr. Charlie Angus: The standard at committees has been the chair and the two vice-chairs. We don't have a problem with the parliamentary secretary, even though I think that is a change from past practice in the House of Commons; the parliamentary secretaries weren't on subcommittee. I don't see the need to add an extra member of the Conservative Party. The subcommittee is where we're going to discuss overall business. If there is an issue of a vote, it would come back here. The Conservatives already have a majority, so I don't think they need to worry about having an extra member to stack the subcommittee.

The Chair: Mr. Calandra.

Mr. Paul Calandra: Mr. Chair, the suggestion just reflects the current makeup of the committee. Of course we could always, as Mr. Angus said, come back to the full committee to debate anything. But it would allow us, in subcommittee, to reflect the makeup of the committee and set an agenda. Again, as Mr. Angus said, if we had dilemmas, we could come back to the full committee.

The Chair: Mr. Simms.

Mr. Scott Simms (Bonavista—Gander—Grand Falls—Windsor, Lib.): I don't remember this being a standard practice. Nonetheless, I agree with Charlie on this one. I don't think the extra member really makes that much difference. Certainly if a problem were to come out of a particular meeting, it would go back to full committee. Why would we stack the subcommittee for unnecessary reasons? I like the makeup. The presence of the parliamentary secretary is fine, but the extra member, I don't see the point.

The Chair: Is there any further discussion?

Mr. Armstrong.

Mr. Scott Armstrong: One of the advantages of having the extra Conservative member is if there were a question in the subcommittee, we wouldn't waste time bringing it back to the main committee, where the majority of members would probably pass it anyway. It would allow us to move more quickly and when we're in committee focus on what the committee is supposed to be doing, which is in the best interest of Canadians, instead of going back and forth on things we can't decide in a subcommittee where it could be tied on the votes.

The Chair: Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I've been sitting on this committee for seven years, through various governments and various makeups of this committee. This is one committee that has worked together extremely well. We have come here with our various political points of view to ensure that the issue of Canada's cultural development, our cultural sovereignty is first and foremost.

It would send a disturbing signal in the beginning to be thinking there's a need to start stacking subcommittees, when in the past—and I'm sure my colleagues who've sat on this committee would agree—we have always managed to find common ground, and when common ground has not been found, it's on the fair vote of committee. I would ask my colleagues to extend a branch of conciliation at this point and say that we should go with standard practice and not try to stack the deck.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Angus.

You've put forward a motion with that wording. Is it the will of the committee to adopt that motion?

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

The Chair: The next routine motion is on meeting without a quorum: that the chair be authorized to hold meetings and to receive and publish evidence when a quorum is not present, provided that at least three members are present, including one member of the opposition.

Is there any discussion on that motion?

Mr. Calandra.

Mr. Paul Calandra: We have a bit of a change. I'll read it:

That the chair be authorized to hold meetings to receive evidence and to have that evidence printed when a quorum is not present, provided that at least four members are present, including one member from the government and one member of the opposition. In the case of previously scheduled meetings taking place outside of the parliamentary precinct, the committee members in attendance shall only be required to wait for 15 minutes following the designated start of the meeting before they may proceed to hear witnesses and receive evidence, regardless of whether opposition or government members are present.

The Chair: Is there any discussion?

We'll go to Mr. Angus.

• (1115)

Mr. Charlie Angus: Wow, we're really getting off to a start here, aren't we. We're going to try to treat the heritage committee as though it is one of the more contentious committees. We certainly think that this is heavy-handed, extremely unnecessary, and I'd say, frankly bizarre.

With what we've seen from the last vote, I would put it to my colleagues to vote. This is very unnecessary, and it would certainly be an attempt to ram through legislation at times or ram through evidence without giving people proper warning. That certainly sends a wrong signal.

If we're going to work on this committee, and we're going to make this committee work, we have to find some common ground. If we're not going to be finding common ground, then we'll certainly be in a much more combative atmosphere. And I think it wouldn't be in the interests of what this committee has done and what this committee has stood for and the kind of excellent work this committee has done in the last seven years. You would find this committee probably the most productive of the committees that have sat, because year after year we've produced good reports based on the sense that we were going to try to work somewhat as a team.

I think this is an unnecessary motion, and I think it's a rather provocative motion.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Benskin.

Mr. Tyrone Benskin (Jeanne-Le Ber, NDP): I'd just like to ask a question. Why feel the need to change from common practice if it has allowed this committee to do the work? Obviously I'm new to this committee, though I have presented in front of this committee before. If past practice has allowed this committee to do the work as a committee of the whole, why is this necessary?

The Chair: Mr. Calandra.

Mr. Paul Calandra: The wording of the motion seeks to guarantee that a member of the government and a member of the opposition.... It outlines the fact that when presenting evidence, we have to have, even in a reduced quorum, a member of the government and a member of the opposition before we can do that. I am not entirely certain why ensuring that there is representation from both sides would be seen as provocative.

The Chair: Mr. Simms.

Mr. Scott Simms: For the record, yes, it is somewhat provocative. I'm trying to figure out the origin of this. But anyway, that's fine.

When the honourable member says "opposition", is he talking about one entity or two? Because we are two entities. I would like to see both opposition parties present at that time, respectfully, of course.

Mr. Paul Calandra: The motion speaks directly to the opposition and not to a party.

Mr. Scott Simms: And that's that.

The Chair: Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'd like him to read the section about the 15-minute notice for witnesses and explain why that would be necessary if we were doing this without quorum.

Mr. Paul Calandra: I'm sorry. I'll read it again.

In the case of previously scheduled meetings taking place outside of the parliamentary precinct, the committee members in attendance shall only be required to wait for 15 minutes following the designated start of the meeting before they may proceed to hear witnesses and receive evidence, regardless of whether opposition or government members are present.

Those are committee meetings that are off-site.

Mr. Scott Armstrong: That's if not everybody shows up.

Mr. Paul Calandra: That's the idea. So if we're off-site, the committee is not held waiting and the witnesses aren't held waiting while either government members or opposition members get to the hearing. We can start hearing evidence and get on with doing what we've travelled to do.

The Chair: I think what I'm hearing is that it would be if we were travelling....

Mr. Paul Calandra: Yes, we would be off-site.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: It would certainly be a bizarre situation that we spent the taxpayers' money to fly to Edmonton and then nobody showed up. I don't think that's ever happened on any committee I've ever been aware of. The motion seems to be a little contradictory. In the first place, it says we can have a reduced quorum with one member of the opposition, and then it says we can hear witnesses without any members of the opposition present. If we want to get this through, we would say that we'll wait 15 minutes provided there's at least a member of the government and a member of the opposition. That would certainly establish that this is about us getting down to the business of hearing our witnesses. If people haven't bothered to show up, that's something they have to be held accountable for on their own. But if we just say a member of the government and a member of the opposition, then we're fine with that.

• (1120)

The Chair: Mr. Simms.

Mr. Scott Simms: So if I show up and nobody shows up from the NDP, then we go ahead?

Mr. Paul Calandra: That's correct.

The Chair: Just so we're clear, do you want to read that again, Mr. Calandra, with the revised wording?

Mr. Paul Calandra: Sure.

The Chair: Go ahead.

Mr. Paul Calandra: I'll go to the second part, because I think that's the part that's causing some of the trauma.

In the case of previously scheduled meetings taking place outside of the parliamentary precinct, the committee members in attendance shall only be required to wait for 15 minutes following the designated start time of the meeting before the meeting may proceed to hear witnesses, so long as a member of the government and one member of the opposition are present.

Does that work?

The Chair: Is there agreement on that wording?

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

The Chair: Next under principal routine motions is time for opening remarks and questioning of witnesses.

Is there any discussion on that motion?

Mr. Paul Calandra: Sorry. That was the full motion at the end.

The Chair: Is there any discussion on time for opening remarks and questioning of witnesses?

Mr. Paul Calandra: We're there. Okay.

The Chair: Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm wondering about this ten-minute and then five-minute round. I think traditionally there was five minutes for the first round but the standard at most committees would be seven-minute rounds. We would certainly support a seven-minute introductory round with the New Democrats, Conservatives, Liberals, and then we would have to decide how we would do it for the second round. There are various models in committees. I think seven minutes is fair, rather than ten minutes. I think that would slow us down.

The Chair: Mr. Simms.

Mr. Scott Simms: I would agree.

I think seven minutes has always been pretty routine. I find seven minutes is good, especially if you get the other round involved now. Granted, if I'm getting only one question, then I would revert back to the ten, but I'll leave that open for now.

The Chair: Mr. Calandra.

Mr. Paul Calandra: I think I would agree in essence with the seven minutes, with ten minutes for opening statements and then seven minutes in the first round with the order to be, I would suggest, Conservative, NDP, Liberal, Conservative for the opening round.

Mr. Scott Simms: Could you say that once more, Paul?

Mr. Paul Calandra: It would be Conservative, NDP, Liberal, and Conservative. There will be four questions in the opening round.

The Chair: Pardon?

Mr. Paul Calandra: So the second round will be five-minute rounds. Subsequent rounds would be the same: Conservative, NDP, Conservative, NDP, just rotating through to the subsequent rounds.

The Chair: Mr. Simms.

Mr. Scott Simms: It wasn't a slip of the tongue, was it? I was glaringly absent from your roll call.

I can understand, to a certain degree, that I don't get every round, but this gives me only seven minutes, period, for every witness. Is that correct?

Mr. Paul Calandra: Yes.

Mr. Scott Simms: I'm assuming this is a formula based on representation in the House purely on percentages.

Can I make one little intervention, and I'll leave it at that?

In the 37th Parliament, the Liberal Party of Canada had 173 seats, representing 57.5%. The Reform Conservative Alliance had 66 seats, or 21%. Every party in the 37th Parliament, including the Progressive Conservative Party of Canada, received 20% of the speaking allotments in the true spirit of getting different voices from all parties—varied—to hold people accountable and get the right information. That was our majority. We never did go to the actual percentages of representation, because we felt that was fair.

I'll leave it at that.

• (1125)

Mr. Paul Calandra: I don't know...starting, I guess, as an intervention—

The Chair: Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm looking at this compared to other committees. I think there are problems in the first round. I would say: Conservative, NDP, and Liberal in a first round of seven minutes. Then I think it's fair if we go to a five-minute round.

As has been suggested, if we had kept that second seven-minute round for the Conservatives and then a five-minute round, that would have given them 12 minutes total, which would certainly have changed the dynamics. So I suggest the first round be Conservative, NDP, and Liberal.

In the subsequent rounds of five minutes—and I was looking at how we'd done this in the government operations and ethics committees—it would be Conservative, NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Liberal, and NDP.

I think it's important that we've always had a second round for everyone in the smaller parties. I don't think it sends a good message that we're going to try to freeze Mr. Simms out. This is about giving people the opportunity to speak. So if it's Conservative, NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Liberal, NDP, I think that would be a fair balance.

The Chair: Is there any further discussion?

Mr. Allison.

Mr. Dean Allison (Niagara West—Glanbrook, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm just visiting, but in terms what I've seen in some of the other committees, I think it's fair and reasonable for the members of the government who come to this committee and prepare to give another opportunity.... By all means, if there's time available, the committee could decide to give the Liberals a second intervention after all the members of government have had a chance.

I'll leave it for the parties to decide, but all the members who come here study just as hard. I've seen many times that when there were shorter timeframes they didn't get a chance to bring their questions in. I'd certainly like you guys to consider another intervention after the government members get a chance.

The Chair: Mr. Calandra is next, then Mr. Simms and Mr. Angus.

Mr. Paul Calandra: Certainly in the second and subsequent rounds we'd be more than willing to accept government, opposition, government, opposition throughout, as long as we rotate from government to opposition. We can work with the opposition to decide what opposition party speaks when.

Mr. Scott Simms: God knows, Paul, I don't ask for a lot.

Mr. Paul Calandra: We're quite prepared to have government, opposition, government, opposition, and follow that format. I'll allow the opposition to suggest to me what that rotation will be.

Mr. Scott Simms: But Dean had asked about the fact that they get a subsequent round. I'm not saying we should go to the formula that was in the 37th Parliament. I'm just asking, in the spirit of what was then, if I can get a little more in there—just one question for witnesses, when everyone else is getting far more than that.

The Chair: Mr. Angus is next.

Mr. Charlie Angus: We're going all around. You know me, I get lost along the way, so I just want to back up. For our first round I raised the question of having three seven-minute rounds, and then we could get into the five-minute rounds. I would accept Mr. Calandra's position on the second round that it's government, then opposition. We can decide that.

Scott, we've got your back; you'll get a spot. I don't think we need to argue about this. But I think in our first seven-minute round we should do three.

Mr. Paul Calandra: I'm not off on the first round, but on the second round I'm okay.

The Chair: Mr. Angus has proposed that the first round be Conservative, NDP, and Liberal for seven minutes. Then it would be Conservative, opposition, Conservative, opposition subsequently.

Is there any further discussion?

Mr. Paul Calandra: I'm okay on the second round, obviously—government, opposition, government, opposition—I think that's fine.

On the first round, though, I would prefer Conservative, NDP, Liberal, Conservative. The Conservatives should get an extra question on the first round.

The Chair: Is there any further discussion?

Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Then we get really thrown out of whack when the second round begins.

●(1130)

Mr. Paul Calandra: Then switch the second round to opposition, government, opposition, government. Does that work?

The Chair: We need to be really clear. I think this is important, because in the fall we're going to be having meetings, questions and witnesses. I think I'll see how the clerk does with this.

Do you want to attempt to summarize the discussion and put that into wording that we approve? Or do you want me to do it?

Mr. Calandra.

Mr. Paul Calandra: As long as we are in agreement. We will have ten-minute opening statements followed by the first round of seven minutes, which would be Conservative, NDP, Liberal, Conservative. The second and subsequent rounds would start with opposition, government, opposition, government—at five minutes.

The Chair: For five minutes?

Mr. Paul Calandra: Yes.

The Chair: Is there any further discussion?

Mr. Scott Simms: That's straight through to the end, opposition, government, opposition, government, right? Okay.

The Chair: There was a discussion that Mr. Simms had raised. I think Mr. Allison had raised the point about when people come to committee expecting to ask questions and are we adopting the principle that no one would get a second question before people had a first question? Is that what we're talking about?

Mr. Paul Calandra: Given the opportunity, you might cede your time to someone else.

The Chair: Is it the will of the committee to adopt the motion as put forward by Mr. Calandra?

Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Just to be clear, we're going to go Conservative, NDP, Liberal, Conservative, seven minutes, and then opposition, government in subsequent rounds of five minutes.

The Chair: Just to be clear, there's no distinction on NDP or Liberal opposition. You will work it out? Okay.

Mr. Allison.

Mr. Dean Allison: Sorry to be a pain in the butt, but in regard to starting the second round with the opposition, if we go opposition, government, we're still going to be short a member at the end. It's going to end up with another opposition before our members have had a chance to go once. I state that for the record. The committee can do what they want to do, but if we go with that rotation we'll end up with another opposition going before all our members have had a chance to speak.

The Chair: Is there any further discussion?

Mr. Hillyer.

Mr. Jim Hillyer (Lethbridge, CPC): Maybe to get around that problem we would just go and start opposition, government, opposition, government and when we get to the point where it would be someone speaking twice we go government-government.

The Chair: That would have to be part of the motion.

Mr. Simms.

Mr. Scott Simms: Just to speak to that, I think we've been in situations, even in a minority—and Charlie, you would agree—where there were times when we've actually done that. We've just said the rules state it's opposition-government but if there is somebody who needs a question, like, Mr. Hillyer, if you want to ask a question and it's back to opposition and I go again I'm certainly willing to give you an opportunity. We've done that on many occasions. I think in good faith we can work our way through it.

The Chair: Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I think we really can't start micromanaging. There are many committees we're on where one member will ask questions three times in a row because it's their file. So if we went to the position that until everyone gets to speak then we as opposition would say we're sorry, but the parliamentary secretary already spoke in the first round of questions, so he doesn't get the second round. That wouldn't be seen as fair. You have your rounds and you can divide them up the way you want. You have the extra seven minutes and you could have a four-minute and a three-minute if you wanted to.

So it's within the parties to decide who speaks, because there will be times when someone is going to be the lead on an issue and they're going to ask a series of questions. I think we have a good motion. We're pretty much there. I think we should vote on it.

The Chair: Did you want to speak?

Mr. Jim Hillyer: No, that's fine.

The Chair: Okay.

Are you clear enough on the motion?

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

The Chair: Next on the list is document distribution: that only the clerk of the committee be authorized to distribute to the members of the committee and only when the documents are available in both official languages, and that witnesses be advised accordingly.

Is there any discussion on that motion?

Mr. Angus.

•(1135)

Mr. Charlie Angus: We've always had a very clear rule that if a witness brings something that's not in both official languages, it cannot be distributed. They are told in advance. It can be translated. If they want to give it to us, it's translated, and we get it later, but it's not distributed at the table. We would be very strong about this.

The Chair: Is there any further discussion?

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: The next motion is on working meals: that the clerk of the committee be authorized to make the necessary arrangements to provide working meals for the committee and its subcommittees.

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: The next motion is on travel, accommodation, and living expenses of witnesses: that, if requested, reasonable travel, accommodation, and living expenses be reimbursed to witnesses, not exceeding two representatives per organization; and that in exceptional circumstances payment for more representatives be made at the discretion of the chair.

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: Next is access to in camera meetings: that unless otherwise ordered, each committee member be allowed to have one staff member present from their office and from their party at in camera meetings.

Mr. Calandra.

Mr. Paul Calandra: Would that include a staff person from a House officer?

The Chair: Yes.

Mr. Paul Calandra: Yes? Okay, then, that's fine.

The Chair: Is there any further discussion?

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

The Chair: Next is the motion on transcripts of in camera meetings: that one copy of the transcript of each in camera meeting be kept in the committee clerk's office for consultation by members of the committee or by their staff.

Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'm not going to contradict this. I always think, though, that perhaps this might be the one time to remind all our committee members of the absolute importance of in camera. An in camera meeting is in camera. It's very easy to walk out of here and be talking and maybe say what happened, because sometimes things are very political in camera. It's not necessarily something that people do because they want to undermine the work of the committee, but it really damages the ability of this committee to work if people take what happens in camera and say any of that outside.

So I just want to remind people of the importance here, that what's considered in camera is to be discussed only with the members who were there and is never to be spoken about outside.

The Chair: That's good advice.

Is it the will of the committee to adopt the motion?

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: Our next motion concerns the notice of motion: that 48 hours' notice be required for any substantive motion to be considered by the committee, unless the substantive motion relates directly to business then under consideration; and that the notice of motion be filed with the clerk of the committee and distributed to members in both official languages.

Mr. Calandra.

Mr. Paul Calandra: I'm just going to read out a bit of a change:

That 48 hours' notice shall be required for any substantive motion to be considered by the committee; and that the motion shall be filed and distributed to members by the clerk in both official languages. Completed motions that are received by close of business shall be distributed to members the same day.

The Chair: So you're adding that last sentence.

Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: Sorry, what was the meaning of that last line again?

Mr. Paul Calandra: "Completed motions that are received by close of business shall be distributed to members the same day" means that we're not waiting.

Mr. Charlie Angus: But we're still requiring 48 hours.

Mr. Paul Calandra: Yes, absolutely.

Mr. Charlie Angus: And 48 hours is two sleeps, correct?

The Chair: On that point, the clerk has asked for some clarification.

When we say "close of business", if we could put a time, whether that be 4 p.m., 5 p.m., 6 p.m....

Mr. Scott Armstrong: We'll leave it up to you.

The Chair: Is there a time we could put on there?

Mr. Scott Armstrong: What works for her, though?

• (1140)

The Chair: Can we say 4 o'clock? Does that make sense?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Okay, so that would revise that motion, by saying "completed motions that are received by 4 o'clock shall be distributed to members the same day".

Any further discussion?

Can you read that one more time, Mr. Calandra?

Mr. Paul Calandra: Yes.

I'll read the whole thing: that 48 hours' notice shall be required for any substantive motion to be considered by the committee; that the motion shall be filed and distributed to members by the clerk in both official languages; and that completed motions that are received by 4 p.m. shall be distributed to members the same day.

The Chair: Any further discussion?

Mr. Benskin.

Mr. Tyrone Benskin: Just a quick clarification.

Are we dropping the "unless the substantive motion relates directly to business then under consideration"? It was read twice and that line wasn't read. I'm just wondering if that's being dropped.

The Chair: Mr. Calandra.

Mr. Paul Calandra: Yes.

The Chair: So under that motion that would be dropped, "unless the substantive motion relates directly to business then under consideration".

Mr. Angus.

Mr. Charlie Angus: I'd like to understand the desire to drop that line. It seems to me that we're talking about motions that come up as we're discussing, and those motions would require the unanimous consent anyway. If we take away the ability to do a motion on the floor, it could grind the business of our committee to a halt.

Many times we have worked out a motion as an issue comes up. I think that would really throw us backwards in terms of being able to address issues that sometimes come forward.

The Chair: Mr. Calandra.

Mr. Paul Calandra: We can keep it in there, that's fine.

The Chair: Okay.

The motion would read:

That 48 hours' notice shall be required for any substantive motion to be considered by the committee, unless the substantive motion relates directly to business then under consideration; that the motion shall be filed and distributed to members by the clerk in both official languages; and that completed motions that are received by 4 o'clock shall be distributed to members the same day.

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: That is all we have on our agenda today, so unless there are any further questions or comments, I will declare the meeting adjourned.

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:
Publishing and Depository Services
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5

*En cas de non-livraison,
retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :*
Les Éditions et Services de dépôt
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5

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

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

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

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

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

Additional copies may be obtained from: Publishing and
Depository Services
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5
Telephone: 613-941-5995 or 1-800-635-7943
Fax: 613-954-5779 or 1-800-565-7757
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca
http://publications.gc.ca

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the
following address: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

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

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

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

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

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

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les
Éditions et Services de dépôt
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5
Téléphone : 613-941-5995 ou 1-800-635-7943
Télécopieur : 613-954-5779 ou 1-800-565-7757
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca
http://publications.gc.ca

Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à
l'adresse suivante : <http://www.parl.gc.ca>