



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

## **Standing Committee on the Status of Women**

---

FEWO • NUMBER 001 • 1st SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

---

**EVIDENCE**

**Tuesday, June 21, 2011**

—

**Chair**

**Ms. Niki Ashton**



## Standing Committee on the Status of Women

Tuesday, June 21, 2011

• (1535)

[English]

**The Clerk of the Committee (Mrs. Julie-Anne Macdonald):** Honourable members of the committee, I see a quorum.

My name is Julie-Anne Macdonald and I am the clerk of the committee.

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, cannot entertain points of order, nor 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 official opposition.

I am ready to receive motions for the chair.

[Translation]

**Ms. Françoise Boivin (Gatineau, NDP):** Good afternoon everyone. I am very pleased to be part of this committee as the official critic for the status of women.

I would like to nominate Niki Ashton for the position of committee chair.

[English]

**The Clerk:** It has been moved by Ms. Boivin that Ms. Ashton be elected as 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 Ms. Ashton duly elected chair of the committee.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear!

**The Clerk:** Before inviting Ms. Ashton to take the chair, if the committee wishes we'll proceed to the election of the vice-chairs.

[Translation]

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

I am now prepared to receive motions for the first vice-chair.

[English]

Ms. Bateman.

**Ms. Joyce Bateman (Winnipeg South Centre, CPC):** I'd like to nominate Tilly O'Neill Gordon.

**Hon. Judy Sgro (York West, Lib.):** I move that nominations be closed.

[Translation]

**The Clerk:** Are there any further motions?

It has been moved by Ms. Bateman that Ms. Tilly O'Neill Gordon be elected as first vice-chair of the committee.

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

(The motion is carried)

**The clerk:** I declare the motion carried and Ms. O'Neill Gordon duly elected first vice-chair of the committee.

[English]

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear!

**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 motions for the second vice-chair.

Mr. Holder.

**Mr. Ed Holder (London West, CPC):** It would be my honour to nominate Judy Sgro.

**The Clerk:** It has been moved by Mr. Holder that Madam Sgro be elected as 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 Ms. Sgro duly elected second vice-chair of the committee.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear!

**The Clerk:** I now invite Ms. Ashton to take the chair.

**The Chair (Ms. Niki Ashton (Churchill, NDP)):** First of all, thank you very much. It's a real honour to have been nominated and supported to be chair of the status of women committee, a committee that I was honoured to be part of in the last Parliament and certainly a committee that I believe in a great deal. I am looking forward to working with every single one of you, women and men, to ensure that we move forward in an area that is so important to all of us, essentially, the status of women in our country.

If I may, I will just start off by saying that my priority is to make sure that we have a respectful and certainly equal approach to debate and discussion, and I look forward to bringing that forward as I can, as chair, and I would hope that we can all be part of that valiant effort.

Again, thank you very much.

I understand that the first order would be to discuss the routine motions. Would it be the wish of the committee to enter into that discussion?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** We'll begin with the sheet outlining the routine motions.

The first one deals with services of analysts from the Library of Parliament. On the left we have what was adopted in the last Parliament and on the right is the proposal for this Parliament.

Is there support for the proposal for this Parliament? It is found in the right-hand column.

**Mrs. Susan Truppe (London North Centre, CPC):** I move that motion.

**The Chair:** Is the committee in agreement that we accept the first one?

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

**The Chair:** Excellent. I would like to invite our analyst to come and join us at the front here.

We'll move on to routine motion number 2, which deals with establishing the subcommittee on agenda and procedure. Do we have a mover of the motion?

• (1540)

**Mrs. Susan Truppe:** I move the motion.

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

**The Chair:** The second motion is accepted.

We can move to motion number 3. Is there a motion to—

**Ms. Joyce Bateman:** I want an explanation first, before we have a motion on this one.

What is the subtlety or the thinking behind “that the chair be authorized to hold meetings to receive” or “that the chair be authorized to hold meetings and to receive”?

Is that significant or is that just accidental?

**The Chair:** I understand that the intent is that in the event that witnesses are unable to make it to the committee and are held back for some urgent or last-minute reason, this is to be able to have the chance to hear from them. This would not be a votable submission.

Pardon me. That was a misunderstanding on my part. It is actually so that if all the members are not here at the beginning of the meeting, but the witnesses are, we would be able to begin the meeting and begin to hear from the witnesses while waiting for members to arrive.

**Ms. Joyce Bateman:** What is the difference? I'm just curious.

**The Chair:** There is no difference in the intent. It's just that the wording was altered slightly.

**Ms. Joyce Bateman:** Should we use last year's wording?

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Françoise Boivin:** Only the words “la présidente” have been changed?

**Ms. Joyce Bateman:** No, it is the word “plus”, and I have not yet checked the French.

[*English*]

**Ms. Françoise Boivin:** I don't have the French text. That might be a good reason I haven't looked.

**The Chair:** I think Wai is weighing in on this.

**Mrs. Susan Truppe:** Can I make an amendment?

**The Chair:** We'll take the amendment as soon as we hear from Ms. Young, who had her hand up.

**Mrs. Susan Truppe:** Sure.

**Ms. Wai Young (Vancouver South, CPC):** Thank you very much, Ms. Chair.

I just wanted to note that, in the English anyway, by including and adding the word “and”, it separates out the two functions, for me anyway, in my reading of it, so that it then reads: that the chair be authorized to hold meetings and to also receive and publish evidence, etc. I don't think that's the intent.

Picking up on my colleague Ms. Bateman's comment, I don't see the reason for the change in the wording, because I think it takes away from the original intent, which was just that the chair would be in a position to receive and publish evidence if a quorum is not present.

• (1545)

**The Chair:** Ms. Truppe.

**Mrs. Susan Truppe:** I'd like to move a motion to add to the amendment where it says “including one member of the opposition”. Could we also add “and member of government as well”?

**The Chair:** We'll discuss the amendment that was put forward. Just to clarify, it would be adding to the last sentence “and one member of the government”.

**Mrs. Susan Truppe:** That's right. Thanks.

**The Chair:** Ms. James.

**Ms. Roxanne James (Scarborough Centre, CPC):** Madam Chair, just put me on the list.

**The Chair:** On the amendment?

**Ms. Roxanne James:** Yes, on the amendment. I totally concur with my colleague's amendment to add “one member of government”, but I would like a ruling of the chair on the amendment. Are we keeping the “and”? As my colleague Ms. Young said, that really does give it a different meaning, so are we going with last year's take? A ruling from the chair is fine.

**The Chair:** It seems that there isn't a problem with the last version in the last Parliament. Is there any opposition to adopting that elimination of the “and”, with the amendment as well? It would be this version plus the amendment. Okay?

Is everyone in agreement? Excellent.

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

**The Chair:** Madam Boivin.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Françoise Boivin:** There is no issue. We are working with different versions. We do not have the same problem in the French. Unless my francophone colleagues tell me otherwise, the only change in the French text is that the word “présidente” is to be changed for the word “président”. I think that the previous text was very good. Writing “[...] the chair be authorized to hold meetings [...]” was very good. I would leave everything as is, adding my colleague Ms. Truppe’s amendment about “and a member of the government”. We need to make these two adjustments. The amendments are in different places in the French and English texts.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Okay. With that agreement, it seems that we’re okay to move to number four.

Is there any discussion on distribution of documents? Do we have a motion to approve that?

**Hon. Judy Sgro:** I move approval.

**The Chair:** Everyone agrees?

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

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Number five is on working meals. I’ve seen some interesting discussions take place on this one. Are there any thoughts on this?

**Mrs. Susan Truppe:** I’ll make the motion to accept.

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Ms. Boivin, the floor is yours.

**Ms. Françoise Boivin:** I do not want to be tiresome, but I would like to know one thing. Why did we change the word “greffière” for “greffier”? We are the Standing Committee on the Status of Women and, in French, we have replaced the word “greffière” with the word “greffier” throughout the text. Is there a reason for that?

We do not have this problem in English, because words have no gender, which at times can be useful. I do not understand why we have made this change. I do not want our first decision to be to masculinize the terminology used at the Standing Committee on the Status of Women.

• (1550)

[*English*]

**The Chair:** In response to Madam Boivin’s comment, is it the will of the committee to ask that the male references to “le greffier”, and perhaps “le président” as well, be changed to the feminine form in the context of our committee here? If that is the will of the committee, we can direct the translation as such.

**Mr. Ed Holder:** I feel that deeply and I will accept that.

**Voices:** Oh, oh!

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

**Hon. Judy Sgro:** I think you’re going to be the most popular man on this committee.

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

On number five, working meals, do we prefer the old version or the new version that has been proposed to us?

A motion to accept? Does everybody agree with that motion on the new version?

Madam Boivin.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Françoise Boivin:** Why did we remove the wording “and that, reasonable child care expenses of witnesses be reimbursed”? Is that because these expenses were considered to be covered by the other ones mentioned above?

**The Chair:** We are still on the fifth point, which deals with meals.

**Ms. Françoise Boivin:** Oh, I apologize. I am going too fast.

**The Chair:** Your question pertains to the sixth point, right?

Are we all in favour of motion number 5?

(Motion agreed to)

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you. We can now move on to number six, on witnesses’ expenses.

Madam Boivin, would you like to repeat your question on this?

**Ms. Françoise Boivin:** Yes, now that I’m really on number six.

[*Translation*]

I just wanted to understand why we were eliminating “and that, reasonable child care expenses of witnesses be reimbursed”. When I read the text, everything that we want to include, I do not see how that will be included in any way at all.

**The Chair:** The motion is now general in nature and applies to all committees. The one used during the last Parliament was changed to reflect the requirements of the witnesses appearing before our committee specifically. If the committee so desires, we can change the motion to include this section contained in the previous motion, or we could vote in favour of the motion used during the last Parliament.

[*English*]

Ms. Sgro.

**Hon. Judy Sgro:** When you say “living expenses”, does that include child care?

**The Chair:** Child care expenses are considered an expense. It’s indicated that is covered, whether or not it’s explicitly mentioned, and that applies to every committee, I understand. But of course if it is the desire of the committee to be explicit in that statement—or perhaps go with the previous statement—that option is also available.

Ms. Young.

**Ms. Wai Young:** I would like to propose that we look at changing the phrase to something like “home care”. That also takes into consideration senior care, because many of us are moving into that area. So we won't just do child care; we would also look at the other spectrum of this.

**Mrs. Susan Truppe:** Are we talking about child care expenses once they get here? We're not talking about paying their airfare or anything else, just...we're taking the child and we're paying for a meal or whatever it is. I mean, as long as it's spelled out so we're not getting into additional costs, I think there would be no problem with paying for a meal for someone who had to bring a child with them or whatever happened to be...

If that's in fact the type of expense we're talking about...? What is the norm for child care expenses? Do we have anything on that?

• (1555)

**The Chair:** The clerk advises me that they don't have the figures here, but they can look into it.

I understand that both child care and elder care or home care are considered expenses that would be covered even under the general statement proposed here in the right-hand column.

Ms. Young.

**Ms. Wai Young:** Having appeared on committee before and having been involved in government for 25 years, there are some standard governmental stipulations about this. There are standard rates and stuff. I would just say that we go with the standard governmental rates, but I would like to see that broadened to the seniors care as well.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** We are unable to alter the existing rates at this point, but thank you for your comments, Ms. Young.

So do we approve of the current form that's in front of us, that clearly covers both child care and home care?

Ms. Bateman.

**Ms. Joyce Bateman:** The proposed clause for this year covers both senior care—in deference to my colleague—and child care, and any other kind of care that might be envisioned. I think it would be great to just take the proposal; it would be fewer words to translate.

**The Chair:** Just to clarify, it does include costs that are involved with supporting dependants that the witness must deal with. “Dependants” is the key word.

If that is the proposal, Ms. Bateman, would you perhaps be willing to make a motion to accept the current proposal, the current number six?

**Ms. Joyce Bateman:** I think I already made a motion to accept it as is.

**The Chair:** Did you?

**Ms. Joyce Bateman:** Yes.

**The Chair:** That was a while ago.

**Ms. Joyce Bateman:** Yes, it was a while back.

**The Chair:** Are we all in agreement with number six?

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

**The Chair:** Excellent. Thank you.

We'll move on to number seven, which outlines the time limits for witnesses' statements and questioning.

**Mrs. Susan Truppe:** I would like to make a motion as to the order: for the first round of questioning, that it be Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Liberal; and for the second round, that it be Conservative, NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative.

**The Chair:** Is there discussion on the motion that has been put forward?

Ms. Sgro.

**Hon. Judy Sgro:** Thank you for putting that forward.

I'd just like to suggest that, especially at this committee, I think, it's important that we all get an opportunity to speak and to ensure that everyone does. I recognize the members that they have opposite, but it also seems fair—certainly when the Liberals had a majority back in 1993, it was made very clear that everybody on the committee got a chance to speak—that the Liberals as well would get a chance to speak twice.

Some of the committees are doing that now as they're going through the process. They're ensuring that the Liberal member also gets a chance to speak twice—subject, of course, to the time being available. I certainly would appreciate having that opportunity.

It does seem to me, in the interests of fairness, that giving everybody a chance to...but that's ensuring that everybody's had a chance to speak and that there are seven members on the government side.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Sgro.

Madame Boivin.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Françoise Boivin:** Given the nature of the committee and knowing that three members on our side will have an opportunity to ask a question during the first or second round, we could perhaps replace, in Ms. Truppe's motion, the last NDP intervention of the last round and give it to the Liberals, unless my colleagues are not in agreement. The order would therefore be as follows: C, N, C, L during the first round, and then C, N, C, N, C, L, C.

• (1600)

**Ms. Joyce Bateman:** So C-N-L...

**Ms. Françoise Boivin:** Just a second, I will repeat the order: in the first round, we would have Conservative, NDP, Conservative and Liberal; and in the second, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Liberal and Conservative. In fact, we are offering the last NDP slot to our Liberal colleague.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** This is an amendment that is being put forward. I will just repeat it. The first round will be as was initially proposed: Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Liberal. The amendment is making changes to the second round to make it Conservative, NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Liberal, Conservative.

**Ms. Joyce Bateman:** No, that's not what she said.

**Ms. Françoise Boivin:** Yes, that's what I said.

**The Chair:** Is there discussion on the amendment?

[Translation]

**Ms. Joyce Bateman:** Yes.

[English]

What I heard was Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Liberal, *et vous avez proposé* Conservative, so I'm going to start right at the start—

**Ms. Françoise Boivin:** First round?

**Ms. Joyce Bateman:** First round: Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Liberal.

[Translation]

**Ms. Françoise Boivin:** That proposal comes from your colleague.

[English]

**The Chair:** Ms. Bateman, please turn on your mike.

**Ms. Joyce Bateman:** I did. It cuts out.

I want to make sure. Madam Truppe could...

I heard you say: Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Liberal, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Liberal.

**Ms. Françoise Boivin:** And Conservative at the end.

**Ms. Joyce Bateman:** And Conservative at the end. Okay.

**The Chair:** Just to be clear, the amendment put forward pertains only to the second round. It would just involve switching the last two spots, ensuring that what was initially proposed as an NDP spot by Ms. Truppe go to the Liberals, as Ms. Boivin is suggesting, and then it would go back to the Conservatives, in line with the initial proposal made by Ms. Truppe. It only changes that second-last piece: from NDP to Liberal. Is there discussion on that particular amendment?

**Mrs. Susan Truppe:** Yes. Let me make a motion on the order that we've just seen, Madam. We would have Conservative, NDP, Conservative, NDP, and Conservative, Conservative, Liberal, instead of Conservative, Liberal, Conservative.

**The Chair:** That is an amendment you're putting forward?

**Mrs. Susan Truppe:** Yes.

**Ms. Françoise Boivin:** Can you repeat it? I'm sorry.

**Mrs. Susan Truppe:** Yes: Conservative, NDP, Conservative, NDP, and Conservative, Conservative, Liberal, instead of Conservative, Liberal, Conservative. The same amount is in there; it's just that the last two are reversed.

**The Chair:** So this would be a subamendment by Ms. Truppe. This is a subamendment being put forward, with the last two positions going first to the Conservatives and then to the Liberals.

Is there discussion on the subamendment?

**Mrs. Susan Truppe:** May I move to accept?

**The Chair:** The motion is to accept the subamendment. Is everybody in favour of the subamendment?

Ms. Sgro.

**Hon. Judy Sgro:** I don't really understand. It leads with Conservative, NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Conservative. So you have one, two, three, four...

**The Chair:** The way the second round would work, as is being proposed in the subamendment, would be Conservative, NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Conservative, Liberal.

**Mrs. Susan Truppe:** That's correct.

**Hon. Judy Sgro:** I will say that I think it was very generous of Ms. Boivin to offer a spot up for me. I appreciate that generosity and I do support Ms. Boivin's amendment coming forward.

I just think it's really important. I'm not going to sit here and waste energy back and forth, but I just think it's very important that we all get a chance to speak, share our views, and work together in a positive way on this committee.

I think the status of women committee, contrary to its past, changes the vision that is out there of this being a totally dysfunctional committee. I think we have a wonderful group of people here. Especially as the status of women committee, I think, we should show real leadership here, show that we're all going to work together in a positive way, and share as much of the time as we can with each other.

● (1605)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Sgro.

We have the subamendment before us. Could we have a vote on the subamendment?

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

**The Chair:** So the subamendment is adopted, given that it was a majority vote, and now we'll move to the other significant part of this discussion on number seven: the timing in the first and second rounds of rotation. We have before us a reference to, first of all, 10 minutes for each of the witnesses, then 10 minutes for the first questioner of each party, and then the second round at five minutes.

Understanding, of course, the pressures of time in our committee, the generic proposal put forward, with 10 minutes for the first round of questioning, would quite frankly not allow us to get anywhere near the proposal that was put forward to allow all parties a chance to ask the witnesses questions.

There is the thought out there and discussions in committees to move the first round to seven minutes.

Is there any discussion on having seven minutes in the first round?

**Mrs. Susan Truppe:** Do you mean seven minutes and then five?

**The Chair:** It would be seven in the first round and five in the next.

**Mrs. Susan Truppe:** I'll move a motion to accept.

**The Chair:** Madame Boivin, do you have a...?

**Ms. Françoise Boivin:** No, it was the same.

**The Chair:** We'll recap. The first round, in which each party will have seven minutes, will be Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Liberal. In the second round, in which each party will have five minutes, it will be Conservative, NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Conservative, Liberal. That is the motion in front of us.

**Ms. Françoise Boivin:** Didn't we change the order? In the subamendment by the Conservatives that was just adopted, if I understand it correctly—and correct me if I'm wrong—it is seven minutes, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, NDP, and then five minutes, Conservative, Conservative, Liberal, NDP, Conservative. No?

**Mrs. Susan Truppe:** The second round is Conservative, NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Conservative, Liberal. And I don't think the first round changed. It is Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Liberal. That is the first round.

**The Chair:** Just to clarify, the first round stays intact. The only change is from 10 minutes to seven minutes. But the second round is where, with the subamendment, there was a change, namely to the last two positions.

We have the motion in front of us. Is there support for the motion?

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

**The Chair:** Given the committee's show of support for the motion, there will be a new version drafted to reflect what we just passed. We did not have a chance to decide on the amount of time to be given to witnesses. This is something that perhaps in the interest of time we could decide prior to having witnesses, and this would allow us to move on to the next point, if that's okay.

• (1610)

**Mr. Ed Holder:** Madam Chair, I have a point of order. In the committees I've sat on in the past, 10 minutes has not been untypical for our guests to make their representations. Why don't we just deal with it now and then it will be done, if there's general agreement that we will do it that way, which I think there will be?

**The Chair:** That sounds good. Mr. Holder's proposal is to approve the 10 minutes for each witness. Is there any discussion? That sounds fine? Is everybody in favour?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** Excellent. We've cleared that one completely.

On number eight, staff at in camera meetings, is there any discussion?

**An hon. member:** I move approval.

**The Chair:** I have a motion for approval.

**Ms. Roxanne James:** Actually, I have a question. I just noticed that the word “staff” has been dropped from the sentence that reads “staff member present from their office or from their party”, whereas in the original one, it reads, “party staff member”. That has a completely different meaning. I think the word “staff” needs to be back in there.

**The Chair:** Sorry, to clarify, where would you add the word “staff”?

**Ms. Roxanne James:** In the right-hand column you have “unless otherwise ordered, each committee member be allowed to have one staff member present from their office or from their party”; “party” is different from a “party staff member”, and I think you need to have “staff member” in there if you're going to approve the second column for the revisions.

**The Chair:** Ms. Ambler.

**Mrs. Stella Ambler (Mississauga South, CPC):** It seems to me the new wording is actually reducing the number of staff at the meeting. It looks as though each member is allowed to have one staff or a person from the party, whereas it was clearly previously “in addition”.

I like the earlier wording. I like the wording from the previous Parliament better. It specifies that you can have one person from the member's staff, one person from the party.

**The Chair:** Ms. Sgro.

**Hon. Judy Sgro:** It's substituting the “or” for “and”.

**The Chair:** We could keep the old one, replace this with the old one.

Mr. Holder.

**Mr. Ed Holder:** Could I move a subamendment to that subamendment? Could I move that we vote on the original routine motion, which I think works extremely well, and we won't get into the confusion about office or not office folks? I just think it's fairly clean, and I would be comfortable if the committee might consider supporting that.

**The Chair:** Thank you for the proposal.

Everyone in support of Mr. Holder's motion to adopt the previous version for number eight?

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

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

We move on to number nine, on in camera meeting transcripts.

**Mrs. Susan Truppe:** I would like to make an amendment such that where it says “or by their staff” that we not have “staff” for the in camera meeting transcripts.

**The Chair:** Would that be in line with keeping the old version, which does not have that section?

**Mrs. Susan Truppe:** Yes, I think that would be fine, as long as it doesn't say “staff” on there. So I'd like to move a motion to go back to the original one.

**The Chair:** That sounds good.

Ms. Truppe has moved a motion to go back to the original version.

Is there any discussion? All in support of maintaining the previous version?

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

**The Chair:** Excellent. Thank you.



We move on to number ten, on notice of motions.

Is there any discussion on number ten?

**Mrs. Susan Truppe:** I would like to move an amendment to that as well, that we add “and that completed motions that are received by 4 p.m. on business days shall be distributed to members same day”.

**The Chair:** Just to clarify, this addition would be in what section, Ms. Truppe?

**Mrs. Susan Truppe:** I would put it right after the “and”: “to members in both official languages and that completed motions that are received by 4 p.m. on business days shall be distributed to members same day”.

•(1615)

**The Chair:** To clarify, this would be in place of the 48 hours' notice in general? You're clarifying the 48 hours. Would that be a fair assessment?

**Mrs. Susan Truppe:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Sorry. There may have been confusion. So we can keep that 48 hours' section, and the proposal here is to add the section that you referenced?

**Mrs. Susan Truppe:** That's right.

**The Chair:** I believe this also is very much connected to the work the clerk has to do, and I understand that this is a reasonable proposal.

Is there discussion on this proposal? All in support of the new number ten with the additions?

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

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

With regard to number eleven, on BlackBerrys, there was a motion in the last round and the last Parliament pertaining to BlackBerry use out of respect to witnesses. We are not obliged to maintain the same proposal.

Is there discussion, perhaps an indication of the wishes of the committee in this matter?

**Mrs. Susan Truppe:** In regard to BlackBerrys, I'm not sure if we really need anything specific in there to say that we should all be respectful of any witnesses. There are some members here who might have to have a BlackBerry on for whatever urgent business they might have. I would probably just keep it off, and we should all just be mindful that when witnesses are up there speaking, we shouldn't have them on unless we really need to.

Does everyone agree?

**The Chair:** That's excellent.

Mr. Holder.

**Mr. Ed Holder:** I would add that I like the idea of not having it in there and of just showing some class and respect to our guests and treating them properly. I like that very much. It would make this committee unique amongst all committees, I will tell you. We've had witnesses on the international trade committee who have said it's refreshing to come to a committee where people are not all talking

amongst themselves and distracted by other things and on their BlackBerry all the time.

I'm absolutely glad to support that we take it out. I love the refreshing candour. I think it's very nice.

**The Chair:** Thank you for the contribution, Mr. Holder.

I understand that there is a will to keep the section out but to show respect and class. I like the use of the word nonetheless. Is the committee okay with that change?

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

**The Chair:** That's excellent. Thank you very much.

That concludes our discussion on motions. We do have a few minutes before the bells start ringing in anticipation of the vote. I would like to open the last moments that we do have to any discussion that members would like to bring forward.

Ms. Sgro.

**Hon. Judy Sgro:** Thank you, Madam Chair, and congratulations...[*Technical Difficulty—Editor*].

I'd like to suggest that...[*Technical Difficulty—Editor*]...the areas of study that we do...[*Technical Difficulty—Editor*]...was extremely important and something that everybody agreed to. Just to keep it short, I would like to suggest to the committee that we continue... I'm not necessarily talking about the travel issue, but I think we need to look at that study and where it might go when we resume in September.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Sgro.

Is there discussion on the motion being brought forward?

Mr. Holder.

**Mr. Ed Holder:** With respect—and I appreciate that this is my first time on this committee, and I say this with great respect for the importance of that issue amongst a number of issues that are very important and with absolute interest in this as a topic—it strikes me that, as we flesh out subcommittee or not subcommittee but more importantly the agenda and the issues that we are looking forward to taking, it might be more helpful to look at what the first several issues are going to be once we're ready to deal with them. I suspect that would be one of the first priorities we'd consider in the fall. I would be shocked if that wasn't among them because of its importance. I think doing more of a collective as opposed to one-offs from an organization standpoint will get our heads around how we want to organize our key areas for the fall.

So I would respectfully suggest that it be a topic but as part of the whole, if you're all right with that.

Also, since we're in the Promenade and we have a little farther to go, I might ask you to be mindful of the clock, Madam Chair.

And congratulations on your election as well.

•(1620)

**Mrs. Susan Truppe:** I would like to make a motion to adjourn, unless anyone has anything else.

**Ms. Françoise Boivin:** I had just something brief.

**The Chair:** Given that Ms. Boivin previously wanted to contribute to the discussion, we'll go to her before we go to the motion.

**Ms. Françoise Boivin:** It's very brief.

[*Translation*]

I appreciate Judy's comment in that...

[*English*]

The only thing I want to say on that point is that I read the report. There is just a little piece missing, and I know the minister worked very hard on those issues. I think this committee would lose something great that has been done by the previous committee if we didn't at least advance a tiny bit and go into the recommendation stage.

[*Translation*]

I do not know how you say that in English. We could table that now so as to at least be able to continue the work. I agree with Mr. Holder that it could be part of the whole, given the number of issues to be considered, including pay equity and gender-based analysis. There will be many issues that we will be called on to address in September.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** So I understand that the desire is to reconsider in the fall. There seems to be an understanding that this is an important file to continue. I know I was involved with it in the previous Parliament. Much hard work was done on this file.

It seems that we do need to wrap up and move on to our next topic. As many of you might know, Thursday is scheduled to be our last day. Given our time commitments in terms of this week, perhaps we can suggest that we will meet again in the fall and continue our important work then.

Again, thank you very much for your support.

Perhaps we can thank as well our analysts and our clerk, the "clerk team" that will be working hard with us in this effort.

Thank you very much.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear!

**The Chair:** The meeting is 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>