



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 031

PUBLIC PART ONLY - PARTIE PUBLIQUE SEULEMENT

Tuesday, May 4, 2021



Chair: Mr. Sean Casey

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

Tuesday, May 4, 2021

• (1640)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Sean Casey (Charlottetown, Lib.)): Welcome to meeting number 31 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities. The committee will now proceed in public to the consideration of matters related to committee business, and I will remind the—

The Chair: Yes, Ms. Dancho.

Ms. Raquel Dancho (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC): On a point of order, Mr. Chair, I am just wanting to confirm you are going back to Mr. Vis following your opening remarks.

The Chair: I'm sorry, what was that again?

Ms. Raquel Dancho: I just wanted to confirm that you are going to go to Mr. Vis following your remarks.

The Chair: No, I wasn't going to go to Mr. Vis.

Mr. Brad Vis (Mission—Matsqui—Fraser Canyon, CPC): No, that's not the way it works.

The Chair: I will go to Mr. Vis when we resume consideration of the draft report.

Ms. Raquel Dancho: That's what I was referring to.

The Chair: We're not resuming consideration of the draft report, but are now going to committee business, so I will go to the speakers list of the people who have put their hands up.

The committee will now proceed to the consideration of matters related to committee business. I will remind members that we are in public, not in camera.

Colleagues, when we were last on committee business, there was a motion on the floor presented by Mr. Turnbull and an amendment proposed by Mr. Vaughan. There is a speakers list now queued up, so I propose that we continue with the amendment. The debate is on the amendment, and I recognize Mr. Vaughan.

Mr. Adam Vaughan (Spadina—Fort York, Lib.): Thank you very much.

First of all—just a point of order with the chair—we are currently discussing the motion that Mr. Turnbull moved on doing a social finance study. Is that not correct?

The Chair: Yes, as amended by you to order some other studies as well.

Mr. Adam Vaughan: Right, and if I withdraw my amendment, does Mr. Turnbull have the floor?

The Chair: No. You're welcome to withdraw your amendment. The fact that you withdraw your amendment doesn't mean that you necessarily cede the floor, if that's what you intend to do.

Mr. Adam Vaughan: I will withdraw my amendment in the hope of reaching consensus on the schedule, and return the speaking order to the chair.

(Amendment withdrawn)

The Chair: That means we are now back to the main motion, as unamended, and the next person on the speakers list is Mr. Johns.

Mr. Johns, I expect that you're aware of this, but the motion that has been presented is that, as it's first order of business, the committee will dedicate six meetings to a study on social finance. I am paraphrasing, but that was—

Mr. Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): I'm sorry, Mr. Chair. I put up my hand to speak after Mr. Turnbull's motion is debated.

The Chair: Mrs. Falk, you have the floor.

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

I appreciate this opportunity to speak to Mr. Turnbull's motion. I just want to read an original notice of motion that was moved, debated, amended and unanimously agreed upon on February 2. That was the motion that I tabled and that had the consensus of the committee.

I'm just going to read the original motion, if that's okay:

That, pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the committee undertake a study on the impact of COVID-19 on the financial, social, health and overall well-being of seniors; that the committee review existing and announced programs for seniors and make recommendations to improve support for seniors; that the study be comprised of no less than six two-hour meetings; that the committee invite the Minister of Seniors and departmental officials to appear for one hour each; that the committee, pursuant to Standing Order 109, present its findings with recommendations to the House; and that the committee request that the government provide a comprehensive response.

When we debated this on February 2, it was amended.

• (1645)

Mr. Ryan Turnbull (Whitby, Lib.): On a point of order, Mr. Chair, I totally respect Ms. Falk and her remarks, but I just want to check whether this is relevant to the motion I put forward. I think we're debating that motion, so I'm just not sure whether this is relevant.

I totally appreciate the importance of the study and the notice of motion Ms. Falk put forward. I too share concerns about seniors, but I just wonder about the relevance of this, given the current motion on the floor.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Turnbull.

I take your point, but I think Ms. Falk is probably leading up to it. My expectation is that she's going to say that we should be talking about seniors rather than that.

Ms. Falk, I'll leave it to you to draw the connection between the topic you've raised and the motion at hand.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I thank you for indulging me with a little bit of patience, because I will get there. It is relevant.

We debated this motion. It was amended by the Liberals. MP Vaughan actually was the one who wanted to make it a little bit more amicable for the whole committee, which was agreed to.

I'm just going to read the motion as amended by Mr. Housefather. This was on the same day, February 2, 2021.

That, pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the committee undertake a study on the impact of COVID-19 on the financial, social, health and overall well-being of seniors; that the committee review existing and announced programs for seniors, including federal transfers to provinces and territories and Indigenous governments, and make recommendations to improve support for seniors; that the study be comprised of no less than six two-hour meetings; that the committee invite the Minister of Seniors and departmental officials to appear for one hour each; that the committee, pursuant to Standing Order 109, present its findings with recommendations to the House; and that the committee request that the government provide a comprehensive response.

I just want to highlight the amended part. Nothing was taken out, but something was just added. What was added by MP Housefather was that the committee review existing and announced programs for seniors, "including federal transfers to provinces and territories and Indigenous governments". It was something the whole committee agreed to unanimously.

We know it was as important a study then as it is now. We know that whether it is an issue of health, social isolation or financial security, this particular year, 2020-21, has been very difficult for seniors.

We know that seniors have also been disproportionately impacted by COVID-19 and the pandemic as a whole since the beginning of the pandemic. It wasn't something that evolved over time or just popped up in the middle of the pandemic, as we experienced with some other groups of people. They literally have been the ones who have been impacted the most, and for some of them, it cost them their lives.

We know that seniors are in a higher risk category, which can depend on where they live. Some seniors have the ability to age in place. Others live in retirement facilities. Others live in long-term care facilities. It puts them in a higher risk category, depending on where they are.

There are also financial impacts, of course. I remember that at our committee meetings before Parliament was prorogued and all of the work we had done was wiped away, we heard from seniors who were only able to take out one prescription a month from their

local pharmacy. Paying dispensing fees more than once was a real issue for seniors, as was driving in from rural and remote communities to their local pharmacies, which sometimes is an hour or more away, costing them more money. It was definitely affecting seniors from the very beginning, and it had a financial impact.

Studying the impacts of the pandemic on seniors, the efficiency of federal supports and the existing gaps, is timely and important. I think every single one of us would agree with that. I think each one of our parties in the House has also talked about the importance of our seniors.

I'm going to remind the committee again, and Canadians who are watching, that seniors helped build this country. Whether it was through their contributions to our small businesses or our infrastructure, they helped create what Canada is today. At the very minimum, we owe them honour, respect and acknowledgement for what they've done.

It was very disheartening and upsetting. I wasn't at the last committee meeting. Unfortunately, I had family things that had come up, and it was a kerfuffle anyway. It was postponed, delayed and then extended, and a new time was given for the meeting. I was disappointed to know that members of the committee who previously indicated their support for prioritizing this study no longer saw seniors as a priority. It was very disappointing to see that happen.

Again, I'm going to refer to Tuesday, February 2 a lot, and I hope everybody else has looked at the transcripts from that day. I know it was mentioned at our meeting last Thursday, but it was clear to me and to other members of the committee that the will of the committee, following Madame Chabot's motion on employment insurance, was that a study of seniors was to follow.

• (1650)

I just wanted to remind some committee members of what they said that day, because our meeting was in public. I was grateful for the support from across the aisle. I think the team Canada approach is something that we're in for on this side. We in the official opposition understand that we're here to represent those constituents who sent us here to do this work.

I know that it was great to have support from MP Long, for example, and I'm going to quote what he said:

I would certainly want to be on the record as supporting MP Falk's motion. I think it's very relevant. Certainly EI and seniors are top of mind for all Canadians right now.

I know the subcommittee report prioritized MP Chabot's motion, but I'm certainly in favour of MP Falk's motion after we study MP Chabot's motion.

MP Long, I really appreciated your support then, and I hope I have your continued support, especially since your support was on record.

Even for Mr. Turnbull, I'd like to quote him as well from that February 2 meeting:

Along the same lines, I just dug up an old document here that's dated October 21, 2020. [It's] a subcommittee report that clearly indicates that the EI study would be next in line after the rapid housing initiative work. I want to express my support for that and not go back on what the subcommittee said, yet I really want to show support for [Ms.] Falk's motion. I think it's a great study. I like how [it's] worded.

Again in the meeting, he also said:

Based on today's conversation so far, we've committed to 11 meetings past February 18. That would be my calculation, with Ms. Chabot's motion implying five meetings, and [Ms.] Falk's motion, which is six meetings.

Here we have a Liberal member who then moved a motion on Thursday, after his February 2 remarks, stating that he was under the understanding that it would be a study on EI and then a study on seniors.

I would also like to quote MP Vaughan, who also had consensus for studying seniors after the EI study and said:

Looking at a couple of different motions we have on the page together around seniors, there's a clear consensus within the committee to act on seniors....

At the same time, MP Falk...brought forward an important concern. When you take a look at the prior motions that were passed on it and try to package them together, if we were to change the motion to...a bit more specific and...have it follow on the EI study, I think we could get both done in a timely fashion.

I just want to note, Mr. Chair, that I had agreed to an amendment, a friendly amendment. Mr. Vaughan had suggested the amendment to make it broader and a little more specific in areas, so that we could have consensus as the team HUMA, and he thought we could get them both done in a timely fashion.

He also said, on that February 2 meeting:

As I said, MP Falk brought a motion forward, and I think the consensus of the committee is to support it, but it needs to be a bit broader to capture some of the additional points that were raised by other MPs in...conversation.

There, I think, we already have three MPs who were under the understanding that we were going to have a seniors study after the EI reform study, which, I would agree, was very much needed, as MP Chabot has been advocating for.

Mr. Chair, I want to also mention your words in the remarks you made:

Mr. Turnbull made the point, but it's worth reminding everyone that separate and apart from the 11 meetings to which we've committed, there may very well be things referred to us from the House by way of legislation, by way of examination of supplementary estimates and the like.

I just want to say, Mr. Chair, that I totally agree with you. We've seen Bill C-24 and we actually have seen the Liberals in the House try to mis-characterize Conservatives and say that we were holding up Bill C-24, which of course was not the truth. I know that when you reported back to the House, you did mention how collegial we were and how well we worked together.

Conservatives understood that this was timely legislation that needed to get through the door quickly to make sure that Canadians who needed help, who were struggling because of the COVID-19 pandemic, would get the assistance they needed.

I want to make it clear that we totally understand the team Canada approach, and we want to be part of the team and not undermine it.

• (1655)

I do want to make a note, too, Chair. You did say:

Colleagues, we now have a motion that has been amended with the acceptance of the mover. Do we have consensus to adopt [the] motion?

It reads:

(Motion agreed to)

You said then:

I believe we also have consensus that the next item for us to study is the EI motion presented by Madame Chabot and that [it's] broad enough to encompass the themes that we have now laid upon the analyst in a somewhat haphazard fashion to have her put together the background documents, and thereafter, a study on the motion that was just presented. I think that's where [we're at] now.

I do want to just mention that Madame Chabot was also supportive of the motion at the time. I know that she had a motion as well regarding seniors, and it was on seniors and poverty. She had agreed that the seniors one should be next after her employment insurance study, and the motion that I tabled, debated, agreed to amend and unanimously was passed would encompass financial security for seniors as well, which is something that Madame Chabot was interested in studying before we debated.

For the NDP, I'm going to quote our member Ms. Gazan:

I want to share that I certainly support the motion coming from MP Falk. I know that we had agreed [to] an order, and I know that we all know that seniors are in a really dire situation during the pandemic.

What's frustrating for me is that on February 2, with the acceptance of a friendly amendment, this committee unanimously had agreed to study the motion on seniors, yet I understand that the discussion at the last committee meeting we had, on Thursday, which I was unable to attend—I know that now MP Vaughan has removed his amendment—was considering studies that hadn't even been tabled yet, which I actually find disrespectful, frankly, not only to Her Majesty's loyal opposition, but also to the committee members who said at the February 2 meeting that they were looking forward to doing the seniors study and having that up next on the roster.

I just want to also say that with the team Canada approach, I'm not sure if the committee members remember, but after the Prime Minister decided to prorogue Parliament, for whatever reason that was, we had that meeting and we just brought all those motions forward from the previous Parliament to this Parliament, with Conservatives very much against doing that because we didn't think that a lot of that was relevant at the time.

I just want to say that one of those motions that was brought forward was from MP Vaughan. This was on February 27, 2020, so it was pre-pandemic. That study was to be a study on the Canadian grandparents who became guardians of their grandchildren, and it was to be the second study of the committee, which.... You know what, Conservatives absolutely understand that, yes, that is a priority. It is important to study that, but there are things of more a pressing nature, like studying our seniors and how they're being affected by this pandemic.

I'm using this as an example to show that we actually understand that things come up and that there is give-and-take, absolutely. I guess what it seems like is that Liberal members of this committee have said one thing out of one side of their mouths, and now the rubber is hitting the road and there's something else that's being proposed, with no acknowledgement of what was agreed to before, at our meeting of February 2, 2021.

• (1700)

Mr. Chair, I would like to move an amendment to Mr. Turnbull's motion. I would like to move that the motion be amended to add after the words "no less than six meetings" the following: "and that the study take place after the completion of the seniors study that was unanimously agreed to on February 2, 2021".

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Falk.

The only question I would have is that I believe Mr. Turnbull's motion begins with the words "as its next order of business", or something to that effect. To give the full effect to what you intend to do, I would suggest that you add another clause to your amendment to delete those words or something. Otherwise it's inconsistent. He has, in the first few words, as its first order of business, and then at the end, its second order of business....

Ms. Falk, can you hear me?

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Yes, I can. I'm just trying to pull up Mr. Turnbull's motion at the moment, that's all.

The Chair: Okay.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: I'm sorry, Chair, I'm just not sure where I can see that in his motion. I see it reading as follows:

That the committee undertake a study on Social Innovation and Social Finance, outlining how these strategies can contribute to building a more inclusive, resilient, and sustainable economy as we look towards economic recovery, and that this study shall take no less than six meetings.

I don't know if I'm.... Maybe I don't have the accurate motion, but I just don't see it.

The Chair: Mr. Turnbull, can you help us out here?

Mr. Ryan Turnbull: Yes. The motion read: "I move, as the next order of business: That the committee undertake..." etc., which was the motion I read into the record last time. The one that Ms. Falk might be referring to is the notice of motion, which was put forth on October 15.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Can we change a motion after we have tabled notice of it? I guess that's a question for the clerk.

Can we just change what the motion is?

The Chair: In committee business, you can present whatever motion you wish, without notice, and that was what happened. Again, I would invite you simply to delete the first few words so that your amendment achieves—

• (1705)

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Chair, that's not reflective of what's in the minutes. I guess what I'm concerned about now is that we have the motion that was given notice, but then something else that was said.... Unless that was deliberately to deceive the committee members.... I guess I just think that we should do the seniors study next, especially with the words from the committee members from our February 2 meeting.

The Chair: We're both trying to get to the same place.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: I sure hope so. I sure hope so....

Ms. Raquel Dancho: Mr. Chair, on a point of order, my understanding—and please correct me if I'm wrong—is that we adjourned on Thursday, correct?

The Chair: Yes.

Ms. Raquel Dancho: Is that not the case, then, that the next committee meeting we have in fact does not pick up where we left off and in fact starts afresh? So Mr. Turnbull would have had to get the floor and put forward his motion first for us to be debating it right now; otherwise, technically this is not in order, so how is it that we are just picking up where we left off, even though we adjourned last meeting?

The Chair: It's because we adjourned the meeting; we didn't adjourn debate, so—

Ms. Raquel Dancho: If we suspend or adjourn the meeting, those are the same thing, and then we pick up where we left off. Is that what you're saying?

The Chair: Right.

Ms. Raquel Dancho: Are you sure? You don't sound sure.

The Chair: Are you done?

Ms. Raquel Dancho: I'm just wondering if you're sure, Mr. Chair, because it doesn't sound like you are.

The Chair: What would you like...?

Ms. Raquel Dancho: In this case, can you confirm that we are in order with Mr. Turnbull's motion even though we adjourned last meeting?

The Chair: I can confirm that.

Ms. Raquel Dancho: I'm just making sure. I'm just learning procedure like everyone else who's new, but that was my understanding.

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

The Chair: Yes, Mr. Dong.

Ms. Raquel Dancho: I'm on a point of order right now.

Mr. Han Dong: No, you've done your point of order. I think the chair just has—

The Chair: Okay—

Ms. Raquel Dancho: I'll decide when I'm done, Mr. Dong.

The Chair: Please—

Ms. Raquel Dancho: If you could just answer me, Mr. Chair, I'll move on from this. I'm honestly curious.

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

Chair...?

The Chair: Go ahead.

Mr. Han Dong: Thank you, Chair.

I was listening to the questions and the answers and it's clear to me, and I think to most of the other committee members, that we ended the last meeting by adjourning it, but that doesn't mean that we adjourned the debate, which means that the debate on the motion that was discussed at the last meeting continues on. I think you were very clear on that point. I just wanted to clarify that.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Chabot, do you have a point of order too?

Ms. Louise Chabot (Thérèse-De Blainville, BQ): I don't know whether it's a point of order. I am actually not sure whether a point of order is necessary.

On Friday, we adjourned the meeting about our work without consensus. So we can resume debate with all the participants and not just on the motions, including Mr. Turnbull's motion. I don't understand the need for a point of order.

In my opinion, the people listening to us would like to know what our next study will be about. I believe that is the important issue.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Chabot.

I think that is the same point as the one raised by Ms. Dancho. I confirmed the decision that I had made previously.

[*English*]

Next on the speaking list, then—

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: I have a point of order, Chair.

The Chair: Ms. Falk, go ahead.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: I'm just wondering, because there seems to be a discrepancy—because what I did read was from the minutes—if the clerk could send out to us maybe what the motion is of Mr. Turnbull, the exact wording.

The Chair: Madam Clerk, do you want to offer a comment here?

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Danielle Widmer): Yes. I reviewed the minutes. I used the motion that was originally submitted to the committee by Mr. Turnbull on.... I'll check the date. Give me a moment. It was October 15.

I see that there was a preamble added to that, and that should have been added to it, so I agree with this. It should be added, because Mr. Turnbull did use the preamble when he did the notice of motion on Thursday, April 29, but I used the notice of motion that was circulated to all members on October 15.

If Mr. Turnbull could submit that to the clerk, that would really be appreciated—with the preamble.

• (1710)

The Chair: Thank you, Madam Clerk.

I think that explains the discrepancy, Ms. Falk. The minutes, it appears, relied upon the notice of motion and not what was actually said at the meeting. What was said at the meeting included the

preamble. Given that you weren't at the meeting, it's entirely understandable that you would rely on the minutes, which, as it turns out, were incomplete.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Can I get that sent around so I could move an amendment?

The Chair: Of course.

Are we relying on Mr. Turnbull to do that or, Madam Clerk, do you have that before you?

The Clerk: If I can get a copy of the motion from Mr. Turnbull, that would be greatly appreciated.

Mr. Ryan Turnbull: I'm sending it now as, or soon as I possibly can.

The Chair: Thank you.

All right, colleagues. The motion on the floor is that the study proposed by Mr. Turnbull be conducted after the study that was put forward by Ms. Falk on February 2 and accepted by the committee in respect of seniors. That is the amendment.

We'll have the exact wording momentarily, but if it pleases the committee, I'm going to now entertain debate on the amendment, beginning with Mr. Johns, please.

Mr. Gord Johns: I'm sorry. I'm actually waiting for my turn to raise my hand after Mr. Turnbull's motion.

The Chair: Okay. Am I back to Ms. Falk or am I out of order here?

Ms. Falk, go ahead.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Chair, I'm just waiting on the actual wording of the motion.

Mr. Adam Vaughan: On a point of order, Mr. Chair, we're waiting for the text of Mr. Turnbull's motion to be circulated to the Conservative member so she can read the full report and knows then how to stage her amendment. Is that the position we're in right now?

The Chair: That's right.

Mr. Adam Vaughan: Until she gets that and can draft her motion, why don't we suspend and alleviate the need to talk until we have all of the information in front of us?

The Chair: We stand suspended for five minutes.

• (1710)

(Pause)

• (1725)

The Chair: I call the meeting back to order and recognize Ms. Falk to put her amendment.

Mrs. Rosemarie Falk: Thank you, Chair.

I would like to move that the words “as the next order of business” be deleted from the motion and that following the words “six meetings”, we would add “and that the study take place after the completion of the seniors study unanimously agreed to on February 2, 2021”.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Falk.

The amendment is in order. The debate now is on the amendment.

Mr. Vis—

Mr. Adam Vaughan: I have a point of order.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Vaughan.

Mr. Adam Vaughan: Now that the whole motion has an amendment, can we see a copy of that amendment, please? In the same way that she wanted to see what she was amending, I want to see what she has amended.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Louise Chabot: I would like to raise a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Ms. Chabot, I will come back to you as soon as I have made a decision on the first point of order.

[*English*]

Ms. Falk, are you able to provide a copy of your amendment to the clerk so that it can be circulated, please? Thank you.

Madame Chabot.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Louise Chabot: You accepted that request, did you not?

The Chair: Yes.

Ms. Louise Chabot: I am announcing that, at the next meeting, I will come back with my routine motion that you all rejected. My motion was precisely that we should have a written record of our deliberations. Everyone agreed that it was going to slow down the debate, and this is the consequence of that.

I am pleased that you agreed to wait until we had the written record of our deliberations. Let me remind you that the routine motion I previously introduced was precisely so that we should have that written record, in order for our work to proceed properly.

I just wanted to remind you of that, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: I remember.

Ms. Louise Chabot: That's the Quebec motto.

The Chair: I know.

[*English*]

Mr. Vis, please, on the amendment.

Mr. Brad Vis: I have just a point before we start, Mr. Chair. Are the amendment and the original motion up for debate right now or just the amendment?

The Chair: It's just the amendment. Once we dispense with the amendment, we'll debate the motion as amended or not. We're just on the amendment right now.

Mr. Brad Vis: Okay. I will cede my time for the moment. Thank you.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Ms. Chabot, the floor is yours on the amendment.

Ms. Louise Chabot: I agree with the amendment, Mr. Chair.

Here is why I agree with the amendment. I have to say that it is extremely important for our next study to be about seniors. I pointed that out last Thursday, when I reminded the meeting that we had had the debate on February 2 and that we had achieved consensus. You yourself said that you were happy that we had had a good meeting. After our study on employment insurance, we were supposed to begin our study on seniors.

I must also thank the clerk for sending us the transcript of the meeting. To ensure that our work is relevant, and for everyone's benefit, the committee has important responsibilities. We have to work together with four ministers, the Minister of Labour, the Minister of Employment, the Minister of Seniors and the Minister of Families.

I feel that it is perfectly appropriate for us to maintain the consensus on which we have all agreed.

The amendment proposes a study for our committee to follow the one on seniors. It is Mr. Turnbull's proposal, as amended. I agree with it.

• (1730)

[*English*]

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Tochor, please.

Mr. Corey Tochor (Saskatoon—University, CPC): Thank you.

I'm very supportive of launching into the seniors study. I think there's a consensus now that we should be studying the seniors. I believe, after Ms. Chabot's comments on that, I'm fully willing to vote in favour of studying the seniors motion right now.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Tochor.

Mr. Vaughan, go ahead, please.

Mr. Adam Vaughan: Seeing that it's 5:30, I move that we adjourn and continue the debate at the next scheduled meeting.

The Chair: Do we have consensus to adjourn, or do we need to bring that to a vote?

[*Translation*]

Ms. Louise Chabot: No.

[*English*]

The Chair: Madam Clerk, can we please do a standing vote on Mr. Vaughan's motion to adjourn the meeting?

(Motion agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Thank you, colleagues.

We will continue on Thursday. Have a good evening.

We stand 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>