



House of Commons
CANADA

Legislative Committee on Bill C-20

CC20 • NUMBER 001 • 2nd SESSION • 39th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Monday, March 3, 2008

—
Chair

The Honourable Albina Guarnieri

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

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

Legislative Committee on Bill C-20

Monday, March 3, 2008

• (1540)

[English]

The Chair (Hon. Albina Guarnieri (Mississauga East—Cooksville, Lib.)): Seeing a quorum,

[Translation]

Welcome to you all.

[English]

I'd like to welcome everyone to the first meeting of the Legislative Committee on Bill C-20. Any warm welcome requires a script full of standing orders for a sitting committee, so it is my duty to inform the committee that I have received the following communication from Speaker Milliken:

Pursuant to Standing Order 113, I am pleased to confirm your appointment as Chair of the Legislative Committee on Bill C-20, An Act to provide for consultations with electors on their preferences for appointments to the Senate.

It is my role to attempt to be a Peter Milliken look-alike, neutral in all things and I hope helpful in most matters. But I'm going to rely on my trusty clerk, who has extensive committee experience.

While I will be neutral, I expect and believe this committee wants to be in full gear very quickly. Our mission is to examine a bill about consulting Canadians on Senate appointments, and I know we will want to consult with the most able minds in the country to guide us in this effort.

I look forward to working with all committee members to complete this effort expeditiously.

I would like to move to routine procedures, but first let me introduce the clerk of the committee. I gather she's no stranger to most of you. Christine LaFrance has extensive experience, and she'll be guiding us through our proceedings. The legislative clerk attached to this committee is Marc Toupin, who's also no stranger to you. They are at your service if you have questions related to the process we are about to undertake.

First we have some housekeeping to attend to. A number of routine motions have been recommended. You have been provided with a list, and perhaps we can run through the list and determine which motions you'd like to adopt.

Do I have a mover for the first one? Are you moving a motion, Madame Folco?

Ms. Raymonde Folco (Laval—Les Îles, Lib.): I just want to get started on the routine motions, Madam Chair.

The Chair: We are in a hurry, aren't we? Excellent. I like to see us work expeditiously.

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

Ms. Raymonde Folco: I so move.

(Motion agreed to)

• (1545)

The Chair: I'd like to invite Mr. Jack Stilborn to our table. Welcome, Mr. Stilborn. I'm sure we'll be drawing on your services.

The second motion before you is that the subcommittee on agenda and procedure be established and be composed of the chair and a member of every party.

Do I have a mover for this motion?

Ms. Raymonde Folco: I so move.

The Chair: Debate?

Mr. Reid.

Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, CPC): Thanks, Madam Chair.

This is not a standing committee but a legislative committee, and hence we're unlikely to get a wide variety of different items of subject matter before us, which is what a subcommittee on agenda and procedure tends to deal with.

On that basis, I think there's an argument to be made that we can simply deal with such matters as a full committee, sitting as necessary in camera, and avoid a certain level of bureaucracy. I don't anticipate our having a lot of these meetings. It seems to me that rather than being a help, they might very well be a hindrance and slow us down. I recognize that if you were trying to call special meetings of the full committee that would be a problem, but I think we can deal with scheduling items at the beginning of a meeting, go in camera as necessary and then come out of camera when we're finished.

So my suggestion would be that because the motion has been put on the table, the appropriate way of dealing with it would be for us to vote against this, and I would encourage members to do so. The default position, therefore, would be that we would simply deal with things as the whole committee, as I've suggested.

The Chair: Any further discussion?

Madame Guay.

[Translation]

Ms. Monique Guay (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ): We can do that, but we need to know how many members Mr. Reid wants the committee to have, because that will slow the whole process down. I would like him to suggest how many members from each party should sit on the committee, so that we can make a decision. We have to be in agreement.

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Reid, are you suggesting that the entire committee determine...?

Mr. Scott Reid: There would be no subcommittee on agenda and procedure to debate matters; we'd simply do so as a full committee. Of course, as one does when dealing with these things, it would be in camera as opposed to being an open session.

The Chair: I see Madame Folco's hand.

[Translation]

Ms. Raymonde Folco: Madam Chair, Mr. Reid has just said that he does not anticipate this committee having a lot of meetings. I know that it is difficult to say how long it will go on, but can we say approximately when we will be able to have the job done?

If it going to be a very long time, I will stick with my motion. But if it going to be quite short, Mr. Reid's motion is acceptable.

Can we estimate about how many meetings there will be?

[English]

Mr. Scott Reid: That's not for me to say.

The Chair: It will depend entirely on the will of the committee.

[Translation]

That will depend on how fast we work and on how many meetings per week we have.

[English]

I am totally at your mercy on direction.

Madame Guay.

[Translation]

Ms. Monique Guay: I would not want to hold the committee up. I want it to be done quite quickly. I have seen bills studied for three years and then sent back to the House. I suggest that it should be limited, and it should have fewer members than an ordinary committee, but I have no objection to adding a few. But a full committee is a lot of people. There is a lot of chit-chat and a lot of time is wasted.

I feel that each party can have its say if it has representatives, without the need to have goodness knows how many.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Guay.

Mr. Paquette.

Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ): I appreciate the point that is being made. But the subcommittee has to report to the main committee. So for questions of logistics—like this one today—

having one representative per party allows us to do the groundwork without long discussions.

Personally, I would be tempted to keep the subcommittee for insurance. We would not need it often, I feel, but it might be useful for solving logistics problems and avoiding the kind of discussion we are having now. I think that we all agree on the basics.

Let us keep it. Let us just not use it too much, just when it could shorten the discussion and prevent us from spending too much time reinventing the wheel.

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Murphy.

[Translation]

Mr. Brian Murphy (Moncton—Riverview—Dieppe, Lib.): I support the idea of a subcommittee because it has worked for the other legislative committees I have sat on.

We support the motion for a subcommittee.

• (1550)

[English]

The Chair: Would you like to put it to a vote?

Mr. Scott Reid: That's the easiest way of dealing with it.

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: The next motion before us is that the chair be authorized to hold meetings to receive evidence and to have that evidence printed when a quorum is not present, provided that at least three members are present, including one member of the opposition.

That is moved by Mr. Murphy.

Is there any discussion?

Madame Guay.

[Translation]

Ms. Monique Guay: We would like to make an amendment to the motion. We would like to have at least five members present, including two members of the opposition, rather than three members, including one member of the opposition.

[English]

The Chair: We have an amendment before us. Is there discussion on the amendment?

Mr. Shipley.

Mr. Bev Shipley (Lambton—Kent—Middlesex, CPC): Madam Chair, could I have some clarification on the wording, on what it actually means, on who is present and who isn't?

The Chair: The chair is not included in a legislative committee, so the numbers that Madame Guay is recommending are that five members be present, including two opposition members, not including the chair.

Mr. Moore.

Mr. Rob Moore (Fundy Royal, CPC): Can Madame Guay's amendment be amended by adding as well, "at least one member of the government", if you don't mind?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: So we have agreement on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. Bev Shipley: Madam Chair, that was my point. I didn't understand what the breakdown was, because it said "of the opposition". I was taking that as the opposition being the official opposition and the other parties, and the rest would be made up of the government.

The Chair: That's right.

So we have agreement, and we'll proceed with the next motion, right?

Ms. Raymonde Folco: Could we have that read again, just to see where we stand?

The Chair: The amendment reads that the chair be authorized to hold meetings to receive evidence and to have the evidence printed when a quorum is not present, provided that at least five members are present, including two members of the opposition and at least one member being a member of the government.

An hon. member: That makes seven in total.

Ms. Raymonde Folco: No, that makes eight.

The Chair: That makes a total of five members.

Are we all clear on the math? Thank you.

(Motion as amended agreed to)

The Chair: Our next motion is that only the clerk of the committee be authorized to distribute documents to members of the committee and only when such documents exist in both official languages.

Do I have a mover?

Monsieur Paquette moves the motion. Do we have agreement?

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: Thank you.

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

Madame Folco.

Ms. Raymonde Folco: I quite agree with that, but my experience has shown me that Perrier is never served.

• (1555)

[*Translation*]

I love the fruit, but I would really like bottles of Perrier as well. Thank you.

The Chair: I think that most members agree with you, Ms. Folco.

[*English*]

So, Madame Folco, you're moving the amendment?

I gathered it was tongue-in-cheek, but we will aim to please.

(Motion agreed to)

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

Mr. Murphy so moves. Is there agreement?

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: Thank you.

The next motion is that unless otherwise ordered, each committee member be allowed to be accompanied by one staff person at an in camera meeting.

Madame Fry so moves.

Is there discussion?

Madame Guay.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Guay: We have an amendment. At the end, we would like to add: "and that each party be allowed to be accompanied by one member of its party staff."

This is very useful because our staff members often do research for us. We sit on several committees. Often, they brief us before a meeting. I think that it is very important that a member of our staff can attend meetings.

[*English*]

The Chair: We'll go to Mr. Murphy.

Mr. Brian Murphy: I apologize, but if the intention of that was to make sure that each party would be allowed to have a member of its whip's office as well, it's what we would like to have.

The Chair: We'll have Mr. Lukiwski.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, CPC): Thank you.

Just for clarification, Brian, are you saying that you're asking for two members, a member from the whip's office and an additional staff member? I'm just trying to find out....

Mr. Brian Murphy: It is one staff member. And I believe—perhaps you could clarify—that it was "and" a member from the whip's office.

No? Was it "or"?

The Chair: No.

[*Translation*]

What did you say, Ms. Guay?

Ms. Monique Guay: I said "and that each party be allowed to be accompanied by one member of its party staff." It could be your assistant or someone you choose to work with you during the study of this bill.

The Chair: Could you read the entire motion so that we can understand what you are proposing?

Ms. Monique Guay: Of course.

That, unless otherwise ordered, each committee member be allowed to be accompanied by one staff person at an in camera meeting and that each party be allowed to be accompanied by one member of its party staff.

The Chair: Fine. I think that is clear.

You have a question, Ms. Folco?

Ms. Raymonde Folco: It is not clear to me. It seemed to me that the intent of this sentence was for each committee member to have a member of his or her staff. The first sentence here reads: "...each committee member be allowed to be accompanied by one party staff person..." We could simply change it as follows: "...to be accompanied by one staff person at an in camera meeting."

I think that is Ms. Guay's intent.

The Chair: Mr. Paquette, you have the floor.

Mr. Pierre Paquette: We have our own staff in our offices. But we might want to be accompanied by someone from the whip's office or someone from research who is not on our staff, but on the party's staff. This is why we wanted to make this broader so that we could be sure that we could be accompanied to in camera meetings at least by someone from the whip's office or the research office.

That is the intent. We do not want to be limited to a member's staff.

The Chair: Ms. Folco, are you making an amendment?

• (1600)

Ms. Raymonde Folco: What I have just been told is not clear to me. I understand the second part moved by Ms. Guay. I agree with that. But, in the first part, it would not be "each member of the committee" but "each party on the committee" who would be allowed to be accompanied by a staff member.

Mr. Pierre Paquette: It is both.

[*English*]

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Lukiwski.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: Chair, to make sure I'm quite clear, what Madame Guay is suggesting is that each committee member can bring one staff, and in addition, the party can assign one staff.

I see a nod from Mr. Murphy.

The Chair: Are we in agreement with the amendment?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: The next motion before us is for in camera meeting transcripts.

[*Translation*]

It reads as follows: "That one copy of the transcript of each in camera meeting be kept in the committee clerk's office for consultation by members of the committee."

[*English*]

Do I have a mover for that motion? Madame Guay.

Is there agreement on this motion?

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: We're proceeding nicely.

This is on notice of motions. The motion is that except for amendments to bills—and the number of hours has been left blank, so it's at the will of the committee—hours' notice be required for any substantive motion to be considered by the committee, that the notice of motion be filed with the clerk of the committee and distributed to members in both official languages.

Do we have someone moving that?

Go ahead, Mr. Martin.

Mr. Pat Martin (Winnipeg Centre, , NDP): I'd like to recommend that the notice of motion be 24 hours rather than the customary 48. Many of us have found it useful to have that more reasonable burden, viewed as one sleep. I think 24 hours plus an hour is roughly enough time to give adequate notice and to allow the clerk and staff to circulate it to the other committee members.

The Chair: Madam Fry.

Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.): I would like to speak against that and go for the 48 hours. I think quite often it doesn't give a member's office staff time to circulate that to the member and for the member to consider it.

I am not speaking for you, Mr. Martin; I am speaking for some of us. We find that makes it quite difficult, especially if the member is at committee all day and doesn't have the opportunity to come in. I would like to go with the 48 hours. It's the usual.

The Chair: Are you moving an amendment?

Hon. Hedy Fry: No, it's 48 hours.

The Chair: Monsieur Paquette.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paquette: As this is a legislative committee studying a bill, it may very well be that, at the end of this process, we will be sitting several days in a row. We would then be squeezed by the 48 hours notice required for motions. Our party thinks that 24 hours is perfectly reasonable in the case of a legislative committee studying a very specific bill. This is different from a standing committee. We would agree to a period of 24 hours.

The Chair: You know that, with unanimous consent, you can make motions at any time.

Ms. Monique Guay: Yes, but you cannot always get that.

[*English*]

The Chair: Mr. Lukiwski.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: Thank you, Chair.

Just for the record, we have no difficulty with Mr. Martin's motion for 24 hours. If the vote is for 48 hours, we'll live with that as well, but 24 hours is not a problem.

The Chair: Are there any other comments or observations? Seeing none, I guess we'll vote on the 48 hours. We have a subamendment, right? We have an amendment to the amendment.

We have to vote on the 48 hours first. All those in favour of 48 hours?

Some hon. members: No.

The Chair: That's defeated.

I guess we have to vote on the 24 hours. We're voting in favour of 24 hours.

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: The next motion before us is on rounds of questioning. The clerk has been kind enough to provide us with three different examples of rounds of questioning. Is there a preference?

Mr. Murphy.

• (1605)

Mr. Brian Murphy: I would look at some of these legislative committees...and even though I'm relatively new here, it seems I was on most of those, and they seem to have worked pretty well. I don't think other members of this committee have been on some of those committees. The first one seems to be a good way of questioning. It sets out how the legislative committees on Bill C-2, the second Bill C-2, Bill C-27, and so on worked. They seemed to work well. I have no argument with them, and I would therefore propose example A by way of a motion.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Murphy.

Mr. Reid.

Mr. Scott Reid: I have to admit I'm not a big fan of that one. I've been on committees where that's done too.

The way it works here is that on the first round it's one for each party, and on the second round it goes opposition, government, another opposition party, government. Is that essentially the idea?

The Chair: That's the third one.

Mr. Scott Reid: Right, the first round is one from each party, and the second and all others....

The Chair: Sorry, the first round is—

Mr. Scott Reid: On the second round it's not one speaker from each party; it's actually that the government is going to get every second question. Is that correct?

The Chair: Yes, through the chair, please.

Monsieur Paquette.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paquette: It is seven minutes for all parties, including the government, but the opposition parties ask the first three questions. Then we alternate between the government and the opposition parties. I imagine that it would be the Liberals first, then the Conservatives, the Bloc, the Conservatives and then the NDP.

The Chair: That is correct.

[*English*]

Is there any further discussion?

We're voting on the first motion. Do we have agreement on A?

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: The other business at hand is how many times a week the committee actually wants to meet.

Madame Guay.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Guay: I for one sit on three committees, no, four committees. So I suggest that we meet once a week. That would be reasonable. It should not be a Tuesday or a Thursday. We should find another time because committees often sit then. It could be Monday or Tuesday, we will see. I move that we meet once a week.

The Chair: Mr. Paquette.

Mr. Pierre Paquette: Ms. Guay and I—and I feel that other members are in the same situation—are also often called to sit on the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs. We should really make sure that this committee does not have the same schedule as the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs, which is Tuesday and Thursday from 11 a.m. to 1 p.m. We are open to the idea of meeting on Tuesday or Thursday, but we think that it would be better to avoid a scheduling conflict with the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs.

[*English*]

The Chair: In an attempt to be helpful, the clerk has checked which committees we serve on. The days that seem to be free are Monday and Wednesday. My understanding is that this inconveniences only one member on this committee.

So is it the will of the committee to meet once or twice a week?

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Guay: I move that we meet once a week.

The Chair: Once? Agreed.

[*English*]

Is the preference for Monday or Wednesday?

Some hon. members: Wednesday.

The Chair: Is there agreement on that?

Some hon. members: *Oui*. Yes.

The Chair: Mr. Shipley.

Mr. Bev Shipley: I know this is important to Minister Hill. He has run into some concerns with cabinet meetings. His preference would have been Tuesday and Thursday mornings, because those are open, if we were going to meet twice a week.

Just let me go to a couple of things, if I may, and maybe we could get some assistance as to the day.

You, Madam Chair, and others have mentioned that we want to expedite as much as we can. Just to move ahead on this, if there were acceptable days, I would suggest from this side that if we could make it two days a week, we make that happen; that certainly would be the preference. Rather than extending it out this way, getting it looked after in a reasonable amount of time is likely in the best interests of everyone, so that we can get it off the table in a reasonable time.

The other part of it is, we're just trying to work around a schedule so that Minister Hill can be a part of this. I'm substituting for him today because of commitments he has in cabinet.

I don't know whether Wednesday—

• (1610)

The Chair: Are you making an amendment, then, to Madame Guay's motion? Madame Guay has suggested once a week.

Mr. Bev Shipley: Can I make an amendment that it be on Wednesdays from 3:30 to 5:30?

The Chair: Yes, Wednesday from 3:30 to 5:30 is a good time for most of the committee members. As I mentioned earlier, the clerk checked everyone's schedule for availability. My understanding is that this would just inconvenience one individual in this committee, and I don't think it was your whip.

So the amendment before us, then, if you're in agreement—

Mr. Bev Shipley: It's for Wednesday—

The Chair: Wednesday, once a week?

Mr. Bev Shipley: From 3:30 to 5:30. I think, Madam Chair, if it is...and if something comes up requiring a second one, the committee can deal with that.

The Chair: So we're dealing with Madam Guay's....

You're not moving an amendment, then, if you're in agreement with Madam Guay's motion. You're in agreement, Mr. Shipley?

Mr. Bev Shipley: Yes.

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: The other matter before us is whether or not the meeting should be televised. Do we have a motion to that affect?

Mr. Lukiwski.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: I don't think any of us has a problem, whether it's televised or not. I know that in other committees, from time to time the committee members themselves determined that they wanted to have it televised, when it's not their normal course of business. Maybe that's how we deal with this.

I also don't know what the difficulty would be in getting a room equipped for televising.

Whatever the will of the committee is would be fine with us.

The Chair: Legislative committees do have priority, but perhaps you would like to move a motion?

Madame Guay.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Guay: I do not mind either way. I am going to support the motion, but it is often difficult to book a room equipped to televise a meeting. I have known that for years. Then things get out of hand and meetings do not get held. If it possible to have it televised, fine; if not, we must have the meetings anyway so that we can get the work done.

[*English*]

The Chair: Madame Guay, are you moving a motion that the committee meet every Wednesday at 3:30 and that the meetings be televised if possible?

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Guay: Yes.

[*English*]

The Chair: Or at the will of the committee.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: We need agreement now. Usually, we invite the minister to appear before us. Do we have any insight into whether or not the minister is prepared to come before us?

Mr. Lukiwski.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: If you wanted to bring the minister in this week, he would be available. I would assume it's probably going to take a day or so for most parties to try to assemble witness lists, so if you wanted to start off with the minister, he had indicated that this week would probably be good for him. That's without knowing what day of the week it will be.

The Chair: Perhaps we can invite the minister and see if that's suitable for his agenda.

Thank you.

The other item before us that we need to reach agreement on is when the list of witnesses will be filed with the clerk. Do we have strong opinions about the timeline to submit that list to the clerk?

Mr. Lukiwski.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: I'm just suggesting that if we have agreed to one meeting a week, that being Wednesday, and if the minister is available to come this Wednesday, then we have a fair amount of time to try to determine who the witnesses will be. I honestly don't know how involved it is getting witnesses to travel to Ottawa from out of the city.

I'm just spitballing here, but if somebody has a better suggestion, please bring it forward. If you want to give committee members enough time to compile the lists of witnesses they'd like to see and still give the clerk enough time to contact the potential witnesses and invite them here for the following Wednesday, would a deadline of noon or 1 p.m. Friday give the clerk enough time?

An hon. member: No.

• (1615)

Hon. Hedy Fry: That wouldn't give people enough time; it's a big country.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: I'm not sure, but that gives them five days.

Hon. Hedy Fry: I would like to suggest that we look at the end of day this coming Wednesday to give the whip the notice. It gives people a week in which to come. Some people are coming not just from Vancouver but also from Fort St. John, and that would give them time to get here, to book a flight, etc. I think a week is good notice, but anything less than that is not really respectful or appropriate.

The Chair: Mr. Martin.

Mr. Pat Martin: Actually, I was thinking that it was lots of time. We would like enough time to be able to really research the list of witnesses we'd like to recommend; we don't want to be rushed in this. Realistically, we'll probably only have one or two witnesses next Wednesday, so there will only be one or two people who would have to travel to Ottawa for that particular date. You could choose them from this immediate area. I think you'll probably want some constitutional experts, who may come from this capital region. You may want some experts on governance, and certainly you'll want provincial premiers and AGs from the various provinces now. The witnesses you choose for that first Wednesday can be people from this close geographic area—Quebec and Ontario.

So I think per Tom's first proposal, we would like at least until Friday to put our witness list forward. I'd like to support Tom's proposal.

The Chair: Mr. Paquette.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paquette: Could we not agree to get as many names as possible on Wednesday and leave room to finish the list on Friday? Some names are easy to come up with, but we will have to scratch our heads to come up with others. If we could identify one or two each for this Wednesday and next, we could complete the rest of the list on Friday and plan our work for the following weeks.

The Chair: That is reasonable, I feel. Any other comments?

[*English*]

We'll build in some flexibility so the clerk can reach witnesses in time.

We have one final matter of business. Who will decide on the list of witnesses? Will it be the subcommittee, or is it your preference to do it in the full committee?

Mr. Brian Murphy: Since the subcommittee will be made up of party representatives, they speak for those representatives, so there

shouldn't be any shocks or surprises. If there are, the subcommittee report can be debated, opened up, and overturned by this committee. So I would prefer that the subcommittee triage the list, or what have you.

The Chair: Mr. Lukiwski.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: I apologize to the committee that I wasn't here when you had the discussion on the subcommittee. I always prefer that the committee as a whole deal with it, but that's a personal preference only. As I say, I wasn't privy to the discussion on the subcommittee.

The Chair: We waited for you as long as we could.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: I know, and I apologize. One of the opposition members made a point of order that I had to respond to. Mr. Szabo was fairly long winded—not that he'd ever be long winded.

The Chair: I think we're in agreement. You'll find me very short winded. I'm not very verbose at the best of times.

Madame Guay.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Monique Guay: I think that the subcommittee solution is best. That will allow us to work quickly. If not, people will come to replace others and they will not know what has gone on. I feel that the subcommittee is all we need.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you, Madame Guay. So we're in agreement.

I certainly want to thank you for all the constructive contributions this afternoon. I hope we've had a record meeting here and that it indicates a spirit of cooperation amongst all of us.

The meeting is adjourned.

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

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

**Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address:
Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à l'adresse suivante :
<http://www.parl.gc.ca>**

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.