



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

43rd PARLIAMENT, 2nd SESSION

Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 002

Wednesday, October 28, 2020

Chair: Mr. Sean Casey



Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities

Wednesday, October 28, 2020

• (1635)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Sean Casey (Charlottetown, Lib.)): I call the meeting to order.

Welcome, colleagues, to meeting number two of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities.

Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format. We have Mr. Kent in the room, and everyone else is appearing virtually.

The meeting is pursuant to the House order of 23 September, 2020. Proceedings will be made available via the House of Commons website.

Just so you are aware, the webcast will always show the person speaking rather than the entirety of the committee.

To ensure an orderly meeting, I'd like to outline a few rules to follow. First, members—in this case only members, because we don't have any witnesses today—may speak in the official language of their choice. Interpretation services are available. You have the choice at the bottom of your screen of “Floor”, “English” or “French”.

For Mr. Kent, proceed as you would when the whole committee is meeting in the committee room.

Before speaking, please wait until I recognize you by name. If you are on the video conference, please click on the microphone icon to unmute yourself.

For Mr. Kent, your microphone will be controlled as usual by the proceedings and verification officer.

I remind you that all comments by members should be addressed to the chair, and when you are not speaking, your microphone should be on mute.

With regard to the speaking list, please use the “raise hand” function.

For you, Mr. Kent, please signal to the clerk, and he will text me, and we'll get you in and get it coordinated.

Colleagues, we have four items that I hope to get to today, and we are in committee business, so the floor will be open to any items you may wish to add. To give you some sense of what we hope to accomplish, Ms. Kwan has given notice to the chair of a question of privilege. We will also, I hope, discuss and adopt the subcommittee report. We will discuss the plan of action for the indigenous hous-

ing study and appearances by ministers on the main estimates, and anything else you may wish to add.

I want to raise this before I cede the floor to Ms. Kwan.

You are first on the speakers list, Ms. Kwan, so I am inclined to recognize you in order to address the question for which you have given the chair notice. Mr. Vaughan isn't here, but you absolutely have the right to raise it in his absence. It may be more expeditious if it were done while he was here in case he wants to respond.

Mr. Han Dong (Don Valley North, Lib.): On a point of order, Chair—

The Chair: Not yet, Mr. Dong. She has her hand up on a point of privilege, so hang on.

With that, I recognize Ms. Kwan.

Ms. Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I see MP Vaughan on my screen here via video conference through Zoom, so he will be able to hear my comments.

Thank you very much to the committee members for letting me have this opportunity.

I wish to raise a point of privilege. As the first meeting dealt with the election of the chair, this is the first opportunity for me to raise this question of privilege, since I'm not a permanent member of the HUMA committee.

At the last HUMA committee meeting, prior to the prorogation of Parliament on August 17, MP Vaughan specifically named me in a completely misleading claim, which I was not able to correct since I was not a sitting member of that meeting. It was misleading to the witnesses and to the members of this committee. He said the following, Mr. Chair:

We have been asked by some of the opposition parties to end Reaching Home and to send the dollars straight to provincial capitals and not to front-line services, particularly in B.C., by the member for Vancouver East, Ms. Kwan. What would the impact of that be on some of the prairie provinces—Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta—where support for homeless services, in particular harm reduction, has been very slow to meet the front-line needs of a COVID response?

Mr. Chair, I want to be very clear to the committee members that at no point have I ever said that the government should end the Reaching Home program, nor has that ever been the NDP position, for that matter. What I have said repeatedly is that the program is not enough, that it is deficient in addressing the homelessness crisis. I have, on numerous occasions, called on the government to do more than the Reaching Home initiative. I have called on the government to provide capital funds, in collaboration with the province, NGOs and with municipalities, to provide support to address the housing crisis.

I'm also on the public record, Mr. Chair, in support of the "Recovery for All" six-point plan. As well, I have written to the minister on these points. The correspondence clearly states that the government is not doing enough, and as well calls on the government to expand the Reaching Home program.

Mr. Chair, suggesting that I've called on the government to cancel the program is blatantly false. It's misleading the committee members. It's misleading the witnesses. I wish to correct that record.

Mr. Chair, for your information and for the information of committee members as well, I have attempted to resolve this issue. I have made two attempts to reach out to the minister himself to talk about the housing crisis. The minister, over the course of the summer, came back to me and suggested that I should talk with Parliamentary Secretary Vaughan. My office reached out to MP Vaughan's office to say that in my meeting to speak with him, I wish to address this issue. Since my office has reached out to him with respect to that, we have not had any response from him or his office.

This brings us to where we are today. I think it is absolutely essential that the record be corrected.

Mr. Chair, I would ask, through you, to ensure that the witnesses who were present at that meeting receive the correct information so we can ensure that people are not misled.

● (1640)

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Kwan.

Go ahead, Mr. Vaughan, please.

Mr. Adam Vaughan (Spadina—Fort York, Lib.): [*Technical difficulty—Editor*] staff to search our databases for any contacts for outreach from the honourable member's office or from her personal account to my personal account or to the office account. I, unfortunately, have no record of any outreach.

What I will speak to is her position that we flow the money directly to the provincial government and bypass the community entities and the community advisory boards—

[*Translation*]

Ms. Louise Chabot (Thérèse-De Blainville, BQ): Mr. Chair, there is no interpretation.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Chabot.

Mr. Vaughan, you don't have a headset there, do you?

Mr. Adam Vaughan: No. Unfortunately, my office computer has collapsed, and IT is on its way to figure out what happened. I apologize; I don't have a headset with me right now. This is the best I can do from an audio perspective.

If I speak closer, does it help?

[*Translation*]

Ms. Louise Chabot: I want to make sure I have interpretation. It's not the interpreters' fault, but your comments, Mr. Vaughn, have to be understood by French speakers.

[*English*]

Mr. Adam Vaughan: Should I continue, or is the translation not picking up my voice?

The Chair: Hold on one second, Mr. Vaughan.

Mr. Clerk, is there any way...?

It was better when he was closer to the microphone. Okay, move closer to the microphone and we'll see if we get translation there. Please be as concise as possible.

Mr. Adam Vaughan: I apologize.

As I was saying, I have searched my database and searched my mail accounts, and I have had my staff searching the general account. We have no record of any inquiry from MP Kwan's office. I have no trouble meeting with her now, today, tomorrow, any day. I think it's an important principle that parliamentary secretaries remain open to all members of Parliament and take that responsibility seriously. I'm happy to chat afterwards to follow up.

In particular, what I would like to take issue with is the assertion that she does not seek to virtually end and functionally end the Reaching Home program. She has repeatedly told me that she would rather see the money diverted to provincial capitals for distribution rather than to community entities or CABs, community advisory boards. She questioned the effectiveness of the CABs. In fact, she said she couldn't pinpoint where the dollars were being spent in which riding. Of course, we understand that CABs and community entities don't serve ridings—

[*Translation*]

Ms. Louise Chabot: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

[*English*]

The Chair: Ms. Chabot, go ahead.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Louise Chabot: It is very unfortunate that, at our first real meeting, we aren't able to understand what the parliamentary secretary is saying in response to the point of privilege because of interpretation issues.

I suggest you slow down when you speak, Mr. Vaughan, so the interpreters can do their job. My ability to follow the discussion is being hindered, and that's unacceptable.

[*English*]

The Chair: Mr. Vaughan, speak slowly and as concisely as possible, please.

Mr. Adam Vaughan: I'm not sure it's a point of privilege, first of all, but secondly, the position I have had expressed to me by the member opposite in meetings with the minister and in other conversations is her preference for the Reaching Home program to fund provincial governments directly and to bypass and eliminate the use of community entities and community advisory boards because she didn't feel that they were distributing the dollars as effectively as she wanted them distributed and she wanted to know what was landing in her riding or not.

• (1645)

Ms. Jenny Kwan: That's just simply untrue.

Mr. Adam Vaughan: That would effectively end the program, because the program is specifically designed to fund front-line services and is done in such a way as to bypass provinces where front-line services have been cut in recent weeks, months, and years.

We think it's too important an issue to be lost in disputes. I will not—

Mr. Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon, CPC): I have a point of order.

The Chair: Just a second, Mr. Vaughan.

Go ahead, Mr. Vis.

Mr. Brad Vis: It seems as though it's going into a debate. I think MP Kwan is raising an important matter, but I think we have other important committee business to get to. Is there a way that we can expedite this process, not in any way taking away from MP Kwan's very relevant point of order?

The Chair: I agree with you, Mr. Vis. Please conclude, Mr. Vaughan. I agree with his point that we are well into debate.

Mr. Adam Vaughan: I appreciate that. I will make every effort to reach out directly to MP Kwan's office to continue this conversation.

On that point, if she has reached out and we haven't responded, I do see that as a valid question of privilege. On the other issue, I agree that it's debate.

The Chair: Are there any further interventions on the question of privilege?

Go ahead, Ms. Kwan.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Seeing as it's my question of privilege, I'll raise two points in response to MP Vaughan.

First off, what he suggested is simply untrue, and that is on the public record all over the place. The issue with the government, I have said repeatedly, is that the support for the homeless population and those facing the housing crisis is deficient, and that's what I have said repeatedly—

Mr. Adam Vaughan: On a point of order, Mr. Chair, this is getting back into debate.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: —over and over again.

I think it is very important, Mr. Chair, that the witnesses who were misled by this—

Mr. Adam Vaughan: On a point of order—

The Chair: Just a second, Ms. Kwan.

Go ahead, Mr. Vaughan.

Mr. Adam Vaughan: If my colleagues—and I agree with them—wish to end the debate, then they would need the co-operation of the member opposite. This is—

The Chair: I'm inclined to agree, Ms. Kwan. Please wrap it up. I'm ready to rule.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: I will wrap it up. I'm happy to wrap it up.

With respect to the second point, Mr. Chair, on which MP Vaughan suggests that I have not reached out, just for his information, the coordination was actually done through the minister's office, and it was the minister's office staff who confirmed his availability. We conveyed back to them that what we wished to discuss was the misinformation that was provided at this meeting. We received zero response thereafter.

From here on in, going forward, Mr. Chair, it would be very important for the witnesses who were at this meeting to receive at least my comments with respect to the misleading accusations made by MP Vaughan, so I would seek for that information to be provided to the witnesses.

The Chair: Okay.

Thank you very much, Ms. Kwan and Mr. Vaughan.

Because Ms. Kwan had given advance notice of her intention to raise a question of privilege, I have been provided with some background materials on which to rule on the question.

Specifically, *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, at page 154, sets out the procedure for a chair to consider a question of privilege in committee, and it reads:

Should a Member wish to raise a question of privilege in committee, or should some event occur in committee which appears to be a breach of privilege or contempt, the Chair of the committee will recognize the Member and hear the question of privilege, or, in the case of some incident, suggest that the committee deal with the matter. The Chair, however, has no authority to rule that a breach of privilege or contempt has occurred. The role of the Chair in such instances is to determine whether the matter raised does in fact touch on privilege and is not a point of order, a grievance or a matter of debate. If the Chair is of the opinion that the Member's interjection deals with a point of order, a grievance or a matter of debate, or that the incident is within the powers of the committee to deal with, the Chair will rule accordingly, giving reasons.

Ms. Kwan, I want to thank you for bringing this matter to the committee and to my attention. As members know, *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, is clear on questions of privilege brought before committee. As I indicated, on page 154 it states:

Unlike the Speaker, the Chair of a committee does not have the power to censure disorder or decide questions of privilege.

It elaborates on the chair's role as follows:

...the Chair in such instances is to determine whether the matter raised does in fact touch on privilege and is not a point of order, a grievance or a matter of debate.

As was evident from the exchange, it is my view that this matter does not touch on parliamentary privilege, and it could very well be either a point of order, a grievance or, most likely, a matter of debate.

Given that, I would suggest that it is entirely within Ms. Kwan's purview to reach out to the witnesses directly to present her side of the debate, and I would like to thank the honourable member for allowing me to clarify this matter.

• (1650)

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Mr. Chair, if I may just follow up on that, I have already reached out to the witnesses, but I do think that at the very minimum, the witnesses should be presented with an official document from the committee to say that I have raised this point and dispute what MP Vaughan has said, to correct the record. They should, I think, at the very minimum receive that information as a matter for the record.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Kwan. You've made that point, and I've ruled on it.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Are you saying then, for my clarification, Chair, that you will not undertake to send that information to the witnesses?

The Chair: That's what I said.

Ms. Jenny Kwan: Okay, I'd like to challenge the chair on that point, please.

The Chair: Mr. Clerk, I understand that a motion to challenge the chair is not debatable and that I am now to ask the committee—

Mr. Anthony Housefather (Mount Royal, Lib.): I have a point of order.

The Chair: Who's raising a point of order?

Mr. Anthony Housefather: It's me.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Housefather.

Mr. Anthony Housefather: I understand Ms. Kwan's desire to challenge the chair, but she's not a member of the committee. Ms. Gazan is the NDP member. I think before we get into a debate further on, that if somebody needs to challenge the chair, it should be Ms. Gazan, not Ms. Kwan.

The Chair: Right.

Mr. Clerk, I have two questions. As Ms. Kwan substituted in for Ms. Gazan, does she therefore have the right to do this? That's my first question.

If her motion is in order, then I seek your advice on how we procedurally work through it.

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Andrew Wilson): She is substituted for Ms. Gazan, and the motion is non-debatable and non-amendable.

The Chair: The question then is, shall the ruling of the chair stand?

I take it we require a recorded—

Ms. Jenny Kwan: I seek a recorded vote.

The Chair: Could we have a recorded division, Mr. Clerk?

The Clerk: Absolutely.

The question is this: Shall the chair's ruling be sustained?

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 10, nays 1)

The Chair: Thank you.

Next I propose to deal with the subcommittee report—

Hon. Peter Kent (Thornhill, CPC): Mr. Chair, on a point of order, I'm just wondering, given the delays caused by the vote and technical issues and so forth, whether we have resources here in committee to go beyond our scheduled 5:30 time.

• (1655)

The Chair: I've been assured in advance that we do, although I don't know how much beyond that we could go.

Can you shed some light on that, Mr. Clerk?

The Clerk: I inquired regarding the full two hours of time and was given assurances that this was not a problem.

The Chair: Hopefully we won't need it all. Thank you, Mr. Kent.

Colleagues, you have before you the report of the subcommittee. I can tell you that the committee worked very well and harmoniously to come up with this report, so if we could deal with that, it would be in order for someone other than me to move adoption of the report, and then we'll entertain debate.

The floor is open.

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, I would move adoption of the motion.

The Chair: I was hoping you would.

The motion is in order. Are there any further interventions?

Seeing none, I guess we're ready for the vote. All those in favour of adoption of the—

Mr. Brad Vis: Chair, sorry; I couldn't get my microphone on. I just wanted to intervene before we vote.

The Chair: Yes, go ahead.

Mr. Brad Vis: I had a very friendly conversation with Parliamentary Secretary Vaughan yesterday. I did note in the subcommittee report that my motion would be studied after the indigenous housing motion—I'm sorry, but I forget the specific name—and what I'm asking today is if we can obtain further resources from the House of Commons to have more than one meeting per week. I am simply and reasonably asking for one hour of committee time—not even a full meeting, but one hour of time—to discuss my study at HUMA before Christmas.

There was already \$500 million allocated by the minister to specific projects, and I believe another \$250 million or so in the supplementary estimates (B). I just want to provide some scrutiny to that in a reasonable way. If the resources are available, maybe I need to have an amendment to my motion to have one one-hour meeting before the Christmas break.

Thank you.

The Chair: Ms. Gazan is next, please.

Ms. Leah Gazan (Winnipeg Centre, NDP): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

After speaking with the subcommittee, I think part of the reason it was put after the study on employment insurance was that the program is really just rolling out in November. We'll have a lot more data in the new year, at which time we'll be able to make a clear assessment. It's hard to research how a program is going when we don't have all the information.

I think the intention of the subcommittee was to understand the importance of your study and to really do a good job at it by pushing it a little bit forward.

The Chair: Mr. Vaughan is next.

Mr. Adam Vaughan: Just to clarify, the member opposite is looking for an update and a sort of check-in to see where it's going. We are aware that having two meetings a week is critical, just because of estimates and the studies that we have forecast. I am in agreement on a check-in for a one-hour component of a meeting if we get those two meetings a week and if we have time to bring in the minister and CMHC officials to update the committee on where we stand heading into the new year. We hope to do that. We want to do that. I have no problem trying to get that done, but I am fully aware and respectful of the fact that the subcommittee and now the committee have chosen to stage the urban and rural northern study, the EI study and a thorough study of the rapid housing initiative.

We will make every effort, if there is time in the schedule, to bring the minister and CMHC forward to update the committee on where that program stands, how the dollars are being spent and who's being supported. We think that's consistent with the will of the committee. If it can't be worked out, I respect the decision of the subcommittee, but I also respect the good intentions that Mr. Vis has brought forward to have a check-in as soon as we have data. We will endeavour to do that.

I can come back to the committee when we have that. I certainly can come back to the committee and bring the minister if an hour can be made available in a very tight schedule. The real enemy here is the schedule. Our intent is to honour his request.

• (1700)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Vaughan. Thank you for retrieving a headset.

[Translation]

Ms. Chabot, you may go ahead.

Ms. Louise Chabot: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

First, as the subcommittee on agenda and procedure discussed at its meeting, we should be trying to find a way to meet twice a week after the break week. That is essential given the workload.

Second, on the motion to have an extra hour with the ministers, could someone please remind me, for my own benefit, what explicitly was sought.

Last, I didn't want to bring this up, but who is formally representing the NDP today, for the purposes of the committee's proceedings? Is it Ms. Gazan or Ms. Kwan?

[English]

The Chair: Okay.

[Translation]

On your second point, I believe Ms. Kwan replaced Ms. Gazan. Now that Ms. Kwan has left, the person representing the New Democrats is Ms. Gazan.

Is that correct, Mr. Clerk?

The Clerk: Yes, that's correct.

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Vis, go ahead.

Mr. Brad Vis: First, just as a point of clarification, I believe my motion came before the EI study. Second, to MP Gazan's point, in terms of the data available, it's in the estimates. In supplementary estimates (B), there is \$253 million, and the government announced \$500 million. That's already three-quarters of the allocated \$1 billion. The data is there. Now is the time to provide scrutiny.

I want to thank MP Vaughan for agreeing to have, at least from the Liberal bench, a one-hour update from officials on the progress related to this important project if we go to two meetings a week before the Christmas break. I'm asking for one hour. I think it's very reasonable. I also support the work we're doing on indigenous housing as well. I believe strongly in this program and I want to see that hour so we can set a good foundation going into the new year.

Thank you so much.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Vis.

Go ahead, Ms. Gazan.

Ms. Leah Gazan: Mr. Chair, I'd like to thank my colleague, MP Vis, for his comments. I am in support of the committee. I just want to clarify the intent behind the decisions that were made in the subcommittee. I am open and I support one hour.

The Chair: All right—

The Clerk: Mr. Casey, Mr. Kent would like to speak.

The Chair: Yes, go ahead, Mr. Kent.

Hon. Peter Kent: I appreciate the collegial acceptance of Mr. Vis's hour. I'm wondering if we have any more information on when we will get to two committee meetings a week.

The Chair: It's my understanding that we will get to two committees a week after the break week, meaning the week of November 16, although we still do not have a schedule to indicate what days or what times.

This is the information that I have been provided. I invite the clerk, if he has anything more illuminating than that, to chime in.

The Clerk: I don't, I'm afraid.

The Chair: That's the information I have. It's that it will be the week of November 16, with a schedule to be provided.

Go ahead, Mr. Vis.

Mr. Brad Vis: Subject to that information, can I raise a friendly amendment to the subcommittee report, if that's allowed by this committee? It's that we honour one hour of study for the rapid housing initiative before the Christmas break, subject to the committee moving to two meetings per week after November 16.

• (1705)

The Chair: That amendment appears to be in order. In order for it to be considered friendly, I guess we'd have to go to Mr. Kent as the mover.

Hon. Peter Kent: I would certainly accept that amendment, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Very good.

Do we have consensus for this amendment to the motion to accept the subcommittee report? I believe I see consensus in the room.

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

The Chair: Do we have consensus with respect to the motion for the adoption of the subcommittee report as amended? I see consensus on that.

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

The Chair: The second item I would like to raise is with respect to that first study called for in the report, the indigenous housing study. I believe it says so in the report, but if not, we would ask that witness lists be provided to the clerk by this Friday. You probably have witness lists that were submitted in the last Parliament, so if they could be updated and submitted by Friday, that will allow us to be productive early.

The analysts can also provide a suggested witness list if that is the will of the group. They are also in a position to provide a draft work plan, organize witnesses thematically and deal with any other suggestions that the committee has. The suggestion we have from analysts is that we would start with departmental officials from ES-DC, Canada Mortgage and Housing, Crown-Indigenous Relations, and Indigenous Services.

It would be normal for us to allow for the submission of written briefs. Perhaps we could have a discussion around a deadline for those briefs. The standard deadline is by the last meeting of the study, and the limit is typically 1,500 to 2,000 words. The Parliamentary Budget Officer has offered to submit a document outlining the scope of their analysis for our consideration.

It appears that with the technical limitations and the fact that we're going to be inviting ministers on main estimates, tabling before the Christmas break isn't feasible or likely. I guess that's to manage your expectations or to pass along to you the advice that I've been given.

With that by way of setting the—

[*Translation*]

Ms. Louise Chabot: Sorry, Mr. Chair, but the interpretation has stopped. I'm not sure what's going on today.

The Chair: Is there interpretation now?

Ms. Louise Chabot: The issue is that you're speaking French.

[*English*]

The Chair: Madame Chabot, are you getting my voice in French now? I'm speaking English.

Ms. Louise Chabot: No, it's all right.

The Chair: Okay.

Go ahead, Mr. Vaughan.

Mr. Adam Vaughan: In the spirit of trying to realize the update that MP Vis is seeking, are we meeting during the break week at all, virtually, or are we just meeting while Parliament is in session?

The Chair: It is open to us to meet during the break week. I'm in the committee's hands on that.

Mr. Adam Vaughan: If we have results to share with the committee, would it be possible to have a one-hour meeting during the break week to update the committee on the rapid housing initiative? That way we don't disrupt the work of the committee.

I am as focused on the urban, rural and northern study as many of the members are, but would it be possible to convene a very quick meeting during the break week to facilitate that one-hour update so we don't interrupt regular business?

• (1710)

The Chair: To me, that sounds eminently reasonable.

Mr. Adam Vaughan: Let me get back to the chair as soon as we have data. That way we can accommodate the meeting, if it's possible. I recognize that it's not always possible with complex and busy schedules, but it's in the spirit of trying to find that special hour to throw in that update.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk (Battlefords—Lloydminster, CPC): Thank you.

Just to that point, to MP Vaughan, could that date be solidified as soon as possible? It is a break week, and some of us do live in rural ridings. As well, not all of us are in the thick of the second wave. I especially have the responsibility to get to the other part of my riding, and if that time and day could be solidified ASAP, I would greatly appreciate it.

Thank you.

The Chair: That's very reasonable.

Is there any further discussion with respect to proceeding with the indigenous housing study? Are there any further interventions on that point?

The next thing I'd like to inform the committee about is with respect to the main estimates. Ministers Qualtrough and Hussen have been invited and have indicated their availability to appear before the committee on November 4, but we have a couple of challenges that we should probably address.

One is that we adopted a motion by Ms. Kusie in the last parliament and have continued it into this one. It calls for these ministers to appear separately for two hours each, and for us to have one hour with the minister and one hour with departmental officials, and that they appear before Sunday, November 15. Because of the constituency week and the technical limitations that we have right now, it won't be possible to have them each for two hours on November 4, so we have a couple of options.

One would be to amend Ms. Kusie's motion to allow both ministers and departmental officials to come for two hours in total—Minister Qualtrough and officials for one hour, and Minister Hussen and officials for one hour—or to have both ministers appear together and have the officials for the second hour.

The other possibility would be to look at a meeting during the constituency week, subject to the ministers' schedules.

I just want to let you know that they've both accepted for November 4, but we have only two hours on November 4, so we need to figure out how we're going to handle this.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Chair, this is a point I raised in the previous meeting we had, when it was just the adoption of everything we did. I think as long as I've been sitting on this committee, even in the last Parliament, we had a minister for an hour and the department for an hour, and I think that's something we should continue. I would have assumed, when the government brought forward the motion that we would just bring everything over, that this would have been thought through.

At this point, I'm actually not for amending Ms. Kusie's motion.

Thank you.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Ms. Chabot, you may go ahead.

[*English*]

Mr. Wayne Long (Saint John—Rothesay, Lib.): Chair—

The Chair: Do you have a point of order, Mr. Long, or do you just want to get on the speakers list?

Mr. Wayne Long: No, I just want to be on the speakers list.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Ms. Chabot, it's your turn.

Ms. Louise Chabot: I am in favour of meeting with Minister Qualtrough and Minister Hussen on November 4. That is soon, which is good, even if it is a one-hour meeting. I realize that a motion had been put forward when work was being scheduled, during

the last session, and that all the motions were put forward again. However, when it comes to the committee's time for meeting with the ministers, I agree with your suggestion, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Chabot.

[*English*]

Mr. Housefather, go ahead, please.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Anthony Housefather: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

So as not to prolong the debate, I move that Ms. Kusie's motion be amended to indicate that Minister Qualtrough and Minister Hussen, along with department officials, appear before the committee for one hour each before November 15. We know, though, that it will be on November 4.

That is my motion, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Housefather.

[*English*]

We now have a motion on the floor—

• (1715)

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, I understand you missed a text that said I wanted to make an intervention. I'd just like to make the point that I wouldn't support an amendment to Ms. Kusie's motion. I think we should follow the practice of one hour with a single minister and an hour with their officials, meaning we would have two meetings, and if we can find another two-hour slot during the break week, November 4 or whenever, I would support that.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Kent.

Is there any further discussion?

Go ahead, Ms. Falk, please.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Thank you, Chair.

I just want to add to that. Since we're in the middle of an unprecedented pandemic, a lot of programs have been established and rolled out, and I think it would actually do a disservice not only to Canadians but to the ministers to have them here for only an hour together. That's really cutting it down. I am pretty adamant on having an hour for each minister and an hour for each department, just because there are so many programs and there are questions that we all have.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Housefather is next.

Mr. Anthony Housefather: Mr. Chairman, perhaps there was a translation issue when I put forward the motion. I did say that each minister would be given a separate hour. It wasn't to bring both of the ministers together. It was to bring in Minister Hussen, together with his department, for an hour and Minister Qualtrough, together with her department, for an hour.

At this point, we have no assurances that during the break week there will be the technical ability to bring in another two hours, so for the moment I think it would be prudent to agree to this. Then, if there is further time that's allocated and that we're able to get during the break week, and there's a desire to bring in the department officials alone that week for the departments, I would be totally open to that. However, I don't want us to be in breach of a motion that's adopted because we're technically incapable, based on House of Commons resources, to fulfill what's in the motion.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Housefather.

Go ahead, Mr. Vis.

Mr. Brad Vis: Mr. Chair, at the last meeting the Liberal members moved that we adopt all of the previous motions of this committee to expedite our work, and now, when that motion doesn't suit the ministers' interests, they're trying to amend our motion again. We have a responsibility as parliamentarians to understand how government is spending money. Never before in the history of Canada has government spent so much in such a short period of time, and we have to get to the bottom of how money is being spent. People have lost their jobs. They're desperate.

We're not asking for a lot. We're asking for two ministers and two sets of officials. We can make it happen. If in Parliament all of the parties can come together and have only a few hours of debate to dispense of hundreds of billions of dollars, the least we can do is have some short meetings and have some proper questioning. That is eminently reasonable.

I will not vote in favour of any motion that takes away from our capacity to understand, even in the little ways that we can, how money is being spent. We need to get to the bottom—

Mr. Han Dong: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Yes, Mr. Dong.

Mr. Han Dong: I think I have my volume set to a pretty modest—

Mr. Brad Vis: Excuse me, Mr. Dong. I am speaking about a very important matter. If you need to adjust your volume on your technical device, that's not a point of order.

Mr. Han Dong: I have the floor, Mr. Vis, and I'm—

Mr. Brad Vis: Well, you interrupted my speech. If you don't want to—

Mr. Han Dong: It was a point of order.

The Chair: Mr. Vis, I ceded the floor to him with a point of order.

Make your point of order.

Mr. Han Dong: Thank you, Chair.

Mr. Brad Vis: Sorry.

Mr. Han Dong: I'm just considering the interpreters. They listen carefully and very closely through their earpieces. I would suggest that members of this committee could speak with a pretty level tone to help the health and safety of our precious translators.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Dong. That's a fair point, but Mr. Vis is worked up about this subject, and he's welcome to express himself.

Go ahead, Mr. Vis. Please be considerate of the interpretation staff.

Mr. Brad Vis: I'm not worked up, Mr. Chair. I would challenge that assertion. I think every member of Parliament should be worked up about all the money that's been spent, and money that I voted for, but now, as parliamentarians, we have the responsibility to scrutinize how that money is being spent and we need those ministers to appear.

We're trying to do this in good faith together. We cannot amend those motions. We have a right. We agreed to it as a committee and we have to stick to our guns and do the work we were elected to do. If some members don't want to do that, they can have someone else sub in. I want to know how money is being spent. I want to spend time on the estimates. I want to know what department officials are doing. That's why we're here. We can't take more away from that than we already have.

• (1720)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Vis.

Ms. Leah Gazan: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

Thank you to my honourable colleague, MP Vis, for his comments.

I certainly am a very flamboyant person at times myself, but I do feel that in this committee, that respectful conduct.... I didn't come here to listen in a headphone to people screaming. I think it's very clear with the interpreters and the kinds of ear problems they're having that this is an issue, particularly right now. I'd just ask that we have respectful discussions and make our positions really clear. I certainly will do that as well.

That's my point of order. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Gazan.

Ms. Falk, go ahead, please.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Thank you, Chair.

This is something that I, as well as my constituents, am getting sick and tired of, so I'm speaking as the member of Parliament for Battlefords—Lloydminster in Saskatchewan on behalf of my constituents who want government to work together.

Honestly, if the ministers can't make this a priority.... This is one of the most important committees, I would argue. We have everything from babies to seniors, from families to labour and everything in between. Everything that goes through our committee tangibly touches a Canadian at some point in their life, and if the ministers cannot make it a priority to come to our committee and give us the respect to do what we've been elected to do, which is to ask questions and to hold the government to account, this is a new all-time low. I would expect that everybody on this committee is going to work together in the team Canada approach that we hear about in the chamber all the time.

I really hope that the Liberal members on this committee have the ear of their ministers and are able to express to them how important it is that they make the time. I know I can speak for myself. I am beyond flexible, and as long as I have notice in advance, I will be here to do the job that the residents of Battlefords—Lloydminster elected me to do.

Thank you.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Thank you, Mrs. Falk.

You may go ahead, Ms. Chabot.

Ms. Louise Chabot: At least the tone of the Conservative members is keeping us awake at the end of a long day. I appreciate that they are passionate about their viewpoint, and I will be too.

I understand all the reasons for inviting the ministers—including the Minister of Employment, Workforce Development and Disability Inclusion and the Minister of Seniors—to appear before the committee. We all know just how busy those two parts of the department have been in response to the crisis, which started back in March.

I have a different take on the motion. I think that the committee should meet with Minister Qualtrough and Minister Hussen soon, meaning, November 4, and that they should appear for one hour each. That would give us an opportunity to ask them questions. I know that's not an end in itself. If other questions arise along the way, with the motions before the committee, we can always keep going. I think we should meet with the ministers sooner rather than later. Spending an hour with them would be a good start.

I agree with Mr. Housefather, so I will be supporting his motion.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Chabot.

[*English*]

Go ahead, Mr. Vis.

Mr. Brad Vis: When I was speaking earlier, if my voice was too elevated for the translation, I apologize, because I want Madame Chabot especially to be able to hear what I'm saying.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Chabot, if I was too loud for you to hear what I was saying earlier, I apologize. I want you to hear everything I'm saying during the meeting. I'm sorry that was a problem. That was not my intention.

[*English*]

My intention, of course—and I'll express it one more time—was this. The PBO complained just recently, in this month, about a lack of transparency regarding \$422 billion. This is a Canada problem, and it is something that we all need to be concerned about in all of our deliberations.

A lot of that \$422 billion could be spent on aboriginal housing, on urban indigenous housing, on helping a lot of people, so let's get to the bottom of that work and let's help Canadians understand where money is going, because the children of all of us who are electronically sitting around this table today are going to be paying for what's going on right now. Fifty years from now or 100 years from now, they're going to be looking in textbooks and studying what we're doing here today. We have a responsibility to make sure that it's done in the best interests of future generations. What we're doing needs to be sustainable.

Thank you.

• (1725)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Vis.

Go ahead, Mr. Housefather.

Mr. Anthony Housefather: To wrap up, Mr. Chair, I've listened carefully to what my colleagues have said. What I understand from what you've said and from what the clerk has said is that the House resources allow us one meeting a week until the break week. There's no guarantee that a meeting could be organized for the break week. There was no minister who refused to come. Both ministers have agreed to come, and neither minister has refused any request of the committee.

However, we as elected officials cannot dictate to the House of Commons resources what they can or cannot do. We can ask, and if there's a possibility, as I said, of another meeting during the break week being organized, I'm totally open to that. For the moment, in order to ensure that we can hear from both ministers properly for an hour before we go on break week, I think my amendment is a reasonable one and I wanted to clarify that once again.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Housefather.

Go ahead, Ms. Falk, please.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Thank you, Chair.

It's very frustrating, because I brought this up in the meeting that we had a couple of weeks ago when we talked about the agenda and the motions being brought forward. I know that I and my Conservative colleagues said there are ministers who need to be asked to appear, so let's take this into consideration. I know I also said that there are deadlines in the motion that brought all of these previous motions in.

It's super-frustrating that if we'd had a team Canada approach then, we wouldn't be wasting precious time debating this now. We could be working. It's super-frustrating that it looks like the precedent has been set that when somebody from the Conservative team brings up something in a genuine way, it's not looked at seriously, and then here we are.

I'll be voting against your motion.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Falk.

Mr. Kent, you have the floor.

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, I've been informed that there is another slot on November 4 between 6:30 and 8:30 p.m. If it were possible to hold two meetings that day, I wonder whether the committee would consider that.

The Chair: My understanding is that the ministers would consider that, but I'm unaware of what you just said....

Mr. Clerk, go ahead.

The Clerk: Thank you.

Mr. Chair, Mr. Kent is right. There are additional spaces available between 6:30 and 8:30. I could inquire about the availability on November 4.

The Chair: Okay. That would be ideal. There's no indication from the ministers that they want their time limited to an hour. If there's more time available and the committee is willing to sit for four hours to hear from them both, then that could be the resolution.

Mr. Vis, go ahead.

Mr. Brad Vis: I'm in total favour of doing the extended meeting. Thank you.

The Chair: Is there any other discussion?

We have a motion in front of us, but we have this development. If we can deal with it by consensus, great; if not, then we'll be forced to deal with the motion.

Mr. Dong, go ahead.

Mr. Han Dong: Thank you, Chair.

I wasn't at the meeting—not to my recollection—when this discussion was taking place, so this is for my own understanding.

My understanding is that Mr. Housefather's amendment is to bring in both ministers on November 4 for a discussion with the committee for about one hour. Now what Mr. Vis and Mr. Kent are saying is that we can extend that meeting to two hours and have the ministers stay for an additional hour.

Is that correct, Chair?

• (1730)

The Chair: That's my understanding as well.

Mr. Han Dong: Do we have the minister confirmed for that one-hour meeting?

The Chair: Sorry, Mr. Kent; are you seeking to intervene?

Hon. Peter Kent: Yes.

That's not my understanding, Mr. Chair. My understanding is that it is possible to hold two two-hour meetings, one with the ministers and one with officials. There would in fact be a four-hour day that day.

The Chair: Do you mean on November 4?

Hon. Peter Kent: Yes.

The Chair: Has the clerk confirmed that?

Hon. Peter Kent: Yes.

Mr. Han Dong: The clerk has confirmed that there will be four hours of availability for the room—

The Clerk: Sorry; as a clarification, there are additional spaces, but I have to inquire if they are available. There is only one spot available every evening from 6:30 to 9:30, so I will have to look into whether it's available. It's possible that another committee has already booked that spot.

The Chair: Understood.

All right, I'll hear from Ms. Gazan. Go ahead, Ms. Gazan.

Ms. Leah Gazan: Very quickly, in terms of keeping peace and order in this committee, I would support that motion for an extended meeting if it's not going to infringe on other critical studies that we need to complete in this committee and knowing that this is also very important. I say that because this is a real opportunity for us to facilitate research that will help Canadians.

I think that both are equally important. As long as it's not going to infringe on the studies we've committed to, I'd certainly support that motion.

The Chair: Thank you.

Go ahead, Mr. Housefather.

Mr. Anthony Housefather: My goal here was not to not listen to my colleagues; my goal here was to try to find a temporary solution for the situation that I understood we were faced with. I do want to reach consensus and I do want to make sure that everyone understands that we're all trying to work together, so let me state my proposal.

In the event that the clerk is able to book that room, which is a first-come, first-served room, for two additional hours on Thursday night, and if one of the ministers is able to come at that time as opposed to the earlier time, I'm completely happy to have two two-hour meetings with the ministers and with the officials. In the event that for some reason the room is not available and the clerk cannot obtain that room or, alternatively, neither of the ministers and their staff is available at this notice to come at that time, I suggest we go forward with an initial one-hour meeting with each minister. Then, if we're able to find additional time, great. I'm perfectly happy to have them both for two hours instead of one hour if the clerk can make that happen and it's feasible.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Housefather.

I think there are two ways we can proceed here. If we can go forward by consensus that if we are able to secure four hours of meeting time, we will be there for the four hours to have a full hearing from ministers and officials, we can go that route. That's by consensus.

Otherwise, we can go the more formal route. I would ask someone to put forward an amendment, because Mr. Housefather can't amend his own motion, which he has just proposed. We'd vote on the amendment and then vote on the main motion.

The difficulty here is that I see consensus in the room with respect to four hours of time, but if we don't have four hours of time, then clearly there isn't a consensus and it may be necessary to vote on it. That's the predicament the chair finds itself in.

Go ahead, Ms. Falk.

• (1735)

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: When will we find out if space is available?

The Chair: I would expect that if the clerk hasn't already asked for that time, he's going to do so very soon. How long it takes him to get back to us, I'm not sure.

Can you help us with that, Mr. Clerk?

The Clerk: I can. I just hit "Send" on the email.

The Chair: The request is in.

Go ahead, Ms. Young.

Ms. Kate Young (London West, Lib.): Can I move a motion to adopt MP Housefather's amendment?

The Chair: I believe we have an amendment to Mr. Housefather's motion, which is that if additional time is available on November 4, that each minister appear for one hour, plus one hour with officials, for a total of four hours. That's the amendment.

Is there any discussion on the amendment?

Go ahead, Mr. Kent.

Hon. Peter Kent: Mr. Chair, I understand the conundrum you face, but I think on principle I would vote against the amendment to that motion. It's unacceptable, and I think we should pursue and do our best to ensure that we can get two separate two-hour meetings with ministers and their officials.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Kent.

Is there any further discussion on the amendment?

Are we ready for the question? I believe we should probably go with a recorded vote. It doesn't appear that we have consensus in the room.

To be clear, what we're voting on now is an amendment to Mr. Housefather's motion to the effect that if time is available on November 4, that the ministers appear for one hour each, along with one hour with departmental officials, for a total of four hours.

That's the amendment. Go ahead, Mr. Clerk.

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Now we're on the main motion. As you will recall, the main motion is that the ministers appear with their officials for one hour each and, to be clear for context, this would be the case if we only had two hours available to us.

Is there any further debate on the main motion?

Hon. Peter Kent: Again, Mr. Chair, I respectfully suggest that this motion is a slippery slope, which sort of defies full scrutiny and accountability for—again, as my colleagues have said—an historic expenditure over these past seven months.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Kent.

Go ahead, Ms. Gazan.

Ms. Leah Gazan: I just want to be clear here.

My understanding is that we're both trying to achieve the same thing, which is two hours with the ministers—one hour each—and one hour each with the staff, so in both cases it accounts for four hours in total. The issue is around the room space, and there is only one room. Am I clear? Maybe I'm missing something here.

• (1740)

The Chair: We've just—

Ms. Leah Gazan: I'm asking, really, if I'm clear on this. This is what my understanding is.

The Chair: We've just adopted an amendment that indicates that if four hours are available, a full four hours will be used. Now we're voting on the main motion, which basically deals with the situation if four hours aren't available. If four hours aren't available, we would be agreeing to proceed with one hour each. We're now voting on whether, if we're limited to two hours, that is the manner in which we're going to proceed. It's that we're going to deal with what we have.

Mr. Dong is next.

Mr. Han Dong: Thank you, Chair. Through you to my Conservative colleagues, I know that Mr. Kent tried to explain in principle why they were against the motion, but I'm still having trouble understanding what exactly they are asking.

My understanding of this whole motion was that initially Mr. Housefather was suggesting two hours with the two ministers and two ministry staff, and the amendment was to increase it to four hours, to be done on the same day, depending on the availability of the committee room.

I thought that was what my Conservative colleagues were asking, but they voted against it, so I don't understand what they are looking for. Through you to my colleagues, if they can explain that, it would be great.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Very good. Thank you.

Ms. Chabot, you may go ahead.

Ms. Louise Chabot: Actually, Mr. Chair, I won't comment since the committee just voted.

As far as the amendment goes, I will just say the idea is to do everything in our power to spend two hours with each minister. I think that is what everyone wants, including the Conservative members. If that is not possible, we at least have the ability to hear from the ministers as soon as possible.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Chabot.

[*English*]

I have Ms. Falk, Mr. Vis and Mr. Kent, in that order.

Go ahead, Ms. Falk, please.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Thank you, Chair.

Through you, Mr. Chair, to MP Dong, I think at the first meeting, which he said he wasn't here for, back previously before the Liberals decided to prorogue Parliament and clear the slate of everything, Ms. Kusie, who was part of the committee before, brought forward a motion to have each minister appear—there are four ministers for this committee—for two hours. It would be each minister for an hour and their department for one hour each.

What Mr. Housefather is suggesting is that we have two ministers come in during the one-hour time block, which actually gives fewer questions to the opposition and to government, and fewer rounds to ask questions to each department and minister.

During that committee meeting we had, I brought this up, because the Liberals brought forward a motion to just transfer all the motions that were on the table previously to this one, even though there were time constraints and deadlines on those motions. I did raise the point that we needed to take this into consideration before we just brought everything over.

Therefore, on principle, I am voting against this motion, because we shouldn't have to amend something when it had already been brought up. The problem was already suggested back then, so on principle I'm voting against this because it was brought up a few weeks ago.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Falk.

Mr. Kent, go ahead, please.

Hon. Peter Kent: Thank you, Chair.

As I look around this committee room, there are a lot of people. I understand the pressure on parliamentary resources and the human beings who actually make those resources work. I appreciate that deeply, but we are standing on the principle that it's not either/or. We are standing on the principle that we should have the standard practice of one hour with a single minister responsible for billions of dollars in expenditures and with the officials from that department to answer the rounds of questions. That is what is normally afforded to committees.

• (1745)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Kent.

Mr. Long is next.

Mr. Wayne Long: Mr. Chair, I just want to be clear again. I don't see where the motion impacts any ministerial time. Yes, there may be an issue with departments, which we can make in a later point, but if you just look at the motion, I don't see where the ministerial time is impacted, unless I'm missing something.

The Chair: Thank you.

Go ahead, Mr. Housefather.

Mr. Anthony Housefather: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to reiterate that nobody, a couple of weeks ago, could have known that there would be the limitation on resources that there seems to be right now. I would not have presumed that we would still be at one meeting a week and I would not have pre-

sumed that the resources would not allow the committee to have more meetings. The resources of the House seem to be outside the control of the politicians and the members of the committee.

I agree that ideally we'd have four hours. There would first be two hours, consisting of one hour with the minister and one with the officials, and then there would be another two hours, consisting of one hour with the other minister and one hour with the other officials.

All my motion says is that in the event that we're unable to get that, we'd hear from each minister for one hour. It does not mean that at a future date we couldn't bring their officials in for an hour each also, but I'm just trying to say that with two hours of resources, I would rather hear from both ministers than from only one minister before we leave for break week. That's it.

I don't understand how this has become politicized or how accusations against Liberals are being made in the way they're being made. I find it quite unfortunate when we're supposed to be collegial at committee, and I think most of us are pretty collegial. I find the tone and the way it's being used to be quite offensive.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Housefather.

Ms. Falk is next.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Thank you, Chair, and through you to MP Housefather, I apologize if I have offended him or he is offended by my tone or my frustration.

I know how hard it is to get ministers here. This is a frustration that I've experienced since I was first elected, and that is part of being in opposition. I get that, but when we're fighting tooth and nail just to get the minimum of what we can, it's very disheartening when motions are moved to limit the time that we already have.

I'm sorry—through you, Chair—to the member for offending him. Again, I'm just doing what I was elected to do, to hold the government to account, and I would like the maximum time possible, which is a precedent that has been set, which is an hour with the minister and an hour with their department for each of the four ministers.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Falk.

Go ahead, Mr. Housefather.

Mr. Anthony Housefather: Thank you.

I want to thank Ms. Falk. Again, it's not personal. I like Ms. Falk. It's just a question of whether we can all just try to stop talking about our parties and the other parties. Let's try to work together. I think what we are trying to do right now is to just do what's achievable in the short term. That's all I wanted to do, and to be practical.

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm sorry to have hogged so much time.

The Chair: Are there any further interventions on this motion? Is there any further debate?

Seeing none, I believe we're ready for the question.

I would ask the clerk to conduct a recorded division vote on this motion—

Mr. Han Dong: On a point of order, Mr. Chair, could you read out the question, please?

The Chair: Mr. Housefather, could I ask you to read out your motion?

Mr. Anthony Housefather: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Basically, the original motion was already amended, as you have heard, by Ms. Young's amendment. It was that if it is possible to have two 2-hour blocks on November 4, we will hear from each minister with their officials, with the minister in the first hour and the officials in the second hour.

My original motion was that in the event that it is not possible to get four hours and we only have two hours with the ministers, that we hear from Minister Hussen for one hour and we hear from Minister Qualtrough for one hour.

That's what the motion is: If we can't get four hours, we do it in two, with each minister getting one hour.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (1750)

The Chair: Go ahead, Ms. Falk, please.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Sorry. I know you've called the question, but I have a question.

If this motion fails, we still have the ministers coming. The motion that we have is that the ministers and their departments will come for two hours before November 15. If the motion on the floor is voted down, we still have the ministers coming to committee for two hours.

The Chair: That's correct. If this motion is defeated, Ms. Kusie's motion stands, and that's what it says.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. Clerk, I will ask you to conduct a recorded division on this amended motion.

(Motion as amended agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Clerk.

Is there any other business to come before the meeting?

Seeing none, colleagues, thank you very much. Have a wonderful evening. We'll see you soon.

The meeting is adjourned.

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

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

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.

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: <https://www.ourcommons.ca>

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

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

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 des communes.

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.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante :
<https://www.noscommunes.ca>