



House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on International Trade

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

EVIDENCE

Thursday, November 15, 2007

—
Chair

Mr. Lee Richardson

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

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

Standing Committee on International Trade

Thursday, November 15, 2007

• (1535)

[English]

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Chad Mariage): Honourable members, I see that we have quorum.

Before we proceed, I want to introduce myself for those of you who don't know me. My name is Chad Mariage. I'm going to be the clerk of the committee. This is Erica Pereira, a new colleague and a new clerk, who will be shadowing the work of the committee.

With that said, pursuant to Standing Order 106(2), I am now ready to proceed to the election of the position of chair. I should note that as the clerk I will be presiding over the proceedings but I am not able to receive any other motion, other than that for the election of chair, or to entertain points of order or to participate in debate. With that said, I'm ready to receive motions.

Mr. Allison.

Mr. Dean Allison (Niagara West—Glanbrook, CPC): I'd like to nominate Lee Richardson for chair.

The Clerk: Mr. Allison moves that Mr. Richardson be elected chair.

Mr. Brian Pallister (Portage—Lisgar, CPC): Is there debate? There's no debate allowed, is there?

The Clerk: Are there any other motions? Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

(Motion agreed to)

The Clerk: I declare Mr. Richardson duly elected chair of the committee.

Before I invite Mr. Richardson to take the chair, if it's the committee's wish, I'll proceed to the election of the vice-chairs.

That said, the first vice-chair must be a member of the official opposition. Do I have any motions?

Mr. Temelkovski.

Mr. Lui Temelkovski (Oak Ridges—Markham, Lib.): I nominate John Maloney as vice-chair.

The Clerk: Mr. Temelkovski moves that Mr. Maloney be elected first vice-chair. Are there any other motions? Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

(Motion agreed to)

The Clerk: I declare Mr. Maloney duly elected first vice-chair.

[Translation]

I can now proceed with the election of a second Vice-Chair. Pursuant to the Standing Orders, the second Vice-Chair must be a Member of an opposition party other than the Official Opposition.

I am ready to receive motions to that effect.

Mr. Malo.

Mr. Luc Malo (Verchères—Les Patriotes, BQ): Mr. Clerk, I would like to nominate Mr. Serge Cardin for election to the position of second Vice-Chair of the Standing Committee on International Trade.

The Clerk: Mr. Malo moves that Mr. Cardin be elected second Vice-Chair.

Are there any other motions?

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

(Motion agreed to)

The Clerk: Congratulations to all of you.

I now invite Mr. Richardson to take the chair.

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Lee Richardson (Calgary Centre, CPC)): Thank you.

We will begin. The meeting is in order, so we will just commence with the orders of the day.

We've done the first one, election of the chair, and if it is the wish of the committee, we can proceed to discuss agreed routine motions. Is there an interest in doing that? Have I some consensus? All right, then I'd like to proceed.

We have had distributed to us by the clerk a format for agreed routine motions. That is CHIT-39/1. Has everyone received a copy of that? If not, would the clerk see to it?

Just to be sure, we're going to issue additional copies to everyone and we'll proceed from there.

It would be my suggestion that we proceed in a clause-by-clause manner with this, following the format that has been in fact distributed by the clerk.

If that's agreeable to everybody, the first one would be services of analysts from the Library of Parliament. Can I have a motion? Okay, we have a motion to accept that one as it is. Is there any discussion?

Monsieur Cardin.

• (1540)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Serge Cardin (Sherbrooke, BQ): Mr. Chairman, I merely have a suggestion. Far be it for me to instruct you on how to direct the committee's proceedings, but I was wondering if possibly your first question could pertain to the extension of all routine motions passed by the previous committee. If everyone is in agreement on this, then we can proceed in this fashion. Otherwise, we will have to address each individual item.

[*English*]

The Chair: I think that's a good suggestion, but my sense is there may be some difference of views. We can proceed rather quickly, but I think there is going to be some discussion on a couple of them.

If it's agreeable, I think we'll have to go through them. We can go through them quite quickly, I think, but there may be some changes that some members may wish to bring up before the committee.

The suggestion from Monsieur Cardin was that we would in fact just agree to them all without discussion. It occurs to me from previous discussions that there may be some views that some members may wish to discuss—specifics of individual clauses—so I think we're going to have to go through them one by one. I think we can proceed rather quickly.

We have a motion on the floor to accept the motion on services of analysts from the Library of Parliament as it is. Is there agreement?

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

The Chair: Next is the motion on the subcommittee on agenda and procedure: that the subcommittee on agenda and procedure be composed of the chair, the two vice-chairs, and a member of the other opposition party.

Mr. Maloney moves that.

Is there discussion?

Go ahead, Mr. Pallister.

• (1545)

Mr. Brian Pallister: Folks, my previous experience was with the finance committee, so some of my suggestions are just going to emanate from what we did on the finance committee, and we can discuss whether we like that or not.

On the steering committee we also had the parliamentary secretary, a second member from the Liberal Party, and a member from the NDP as well, so it was a little different from this. I think the advantage is it makes it easier to get quorum for the steering committee, and it also beefs up the committee a little bit in terms of broader discussion.

Do I have to propose an amendment, Mr. Chairman, or what procedure would you like?

The Chair: That's how we want to proceed; sure. What would your amendment be?

Mr. Brian Pallister: As opposed to what we have here, I'm just adding the parliamentary secretary and one member from the Liberal Party to the make-up of the steering committee.

The Chair: As I take it, the subcommittee would then be composed of the chair, the two vice-chairs, and a member of the other opposition party.

Mr. Dean Allison: That's already there. All you'd be adding is the parliamentary secretary and another Liberal.

The Chair: It's that the subcommittee on agenda and procedure be composed of the chair—

Mr. Dean Allison: I'm sorry, I stumbled over that.

The Chair: —the two vice-chairs—

Mr. Dean Allison: Yes.

The Chair: —the parliamentary secretary—

Mr. Dean Allison: Right.

The Chair: —a second member from the Liberal Party—

Mr. Dean Allison: Right.

The Chair: —and a member from the other opposition party. In this case that would be —

Mr. Lui Temelkovski: They don't have another one. They only have one.

The Chair: No, in this case another member from the Bloc.

Mr. Brian Pallister: Essentially, it would be the chair and the vice-chairs, so it would end up with two Conservatives, two Liberals, one Bloc, one NDP.

The Chair: Yes, right.

We have a motion on the floor for discussion.

Mr. John Maloney (Welland, Lib.): Mr. Chair, the parliamentary secretary represents the government and represents the minister. I take exception to him or her being on the steering committee, so I would oppose the motion.

The Chair: Is there any further discussion?

Mr. Brian Pallister: I would have to remark that this hasn't been the Liberal Party's position; it certainly wasn't last year in the Standing Committee on Finance. One year before, when the Liberals were in power, it wasn't their position. I have to make that observation. The parliamentary secretary was on the steering committee.

The Chair: Okay. You can make that observation when the chair recognizes you, Mr. Pallister.

Monsieur Cardin.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Serge Cardin: Mr. Chairman, I would like to keep the same wording that we had last year for the previous committee.

The motion clearly states that the committee shall elect a Chair, who shall be a Member of the government party, two Vice-Chairs, one of whom is a Liberal and the other a Bloc Member, and a Member of the other opposition party, potentially an NDP Member. Keeping the same wording ensures that the four parties are represented. Thus we can hope that discussions in committee are less protracted if all parties are already aware of what has been discussed and of what is going on.

[*English*]

The Chair: Any further discussion?

Mr. Miller.

Mr. Larry Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC): Yes.

I don't want to waste a lot of time on this, but if this amendment were to pass, this in no way puts the opposition parties at a disadvantage. They're still outnumbered. It lets the chairman do his job; it's as simple as that. So I speak in favour of the motion.

• (1550)

The Chair: I see.

Mr. Miller takes it that the chairman is neutral, so we would not have a Conservative Party representative at the subcommittee. Nice point.

Mr. Masse.

Mr. Brian Masse (Windsor West, NDP): What I found in the other committees I've been part of is if the subcommittee becomes too large it almost defeats the sense of the subcommittee. So I'm opposed to this as well. Although I appreciate the suggestion, I can't support it.

(Amendment negated)

The Chair: Is there any further discussion on the main motion?

Mr. Cannan.

Mr. Ron Cannan (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC): I'd like to comment, Mr. Chair.

Last time, the subcommittee actually didn't work. We ended up having a committee of the whole. Hopefully, it will be a little bit more functional this time.

The Chair: The motion is to accept the subcommittee as was distributed by the clerk.

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: We are now on reduced quorum: 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, and if no member of the opposition is present ten minutes after the designated start of the meeting, the meeting may proceed.

The motion is moved by Mr. Maloney.

That's pretty routine and usual. Is there any discussion?

Yes, Mr. Allison.

Mr. Dean Allison: I'm once again drawing from my experience in another committee. I know that when we were out of town for the

human rights committee it was difficult sometimes to get quorum to hear witnesses. So I'd like to add to it that should we be outside the parliamentary precinct the committee not be required to wait any more than 15 minutes before it can receive evidence and hear witnesses. That would be my suggestion.

When we were in Montreal we were not able to hear witnesses as a result of having only half of our committee travelling and not having all the members there at the time. Leave it the way it is, but when we're off the parliamentary precincts I would recommend that we would be able to hear witnesses, and that we start after 15 minutes if we don't have a quorum to hear the witnesses.

The Chair: The clerk has just brought to my attention here a draft clause. Let me read it out, because I think it may capture what you're trying to achieve.

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

Is that what you had in mind?

Mr. Dean Allison: Yes, that would be good.

The Chair: Fine. Is everyone clear there?

Monsieur Cardin.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Serge Cardin: At first glance, I have no objections. However, I would like to say one thing. When committees make arrangements to travel to certain regions of Quebec or Canada to hear from witnesses, I would hope that, out of respect for the witnesses, there would always be at least a few members on hand to hear their testimony. If only half of the members of the committee travel, then that represents a sizeable number of people. I can't imagine a situation where fewer than three members of the committee would travel to a community to hear from witnesses. That's all I wanted to say. I can't imagine that there would ever be a shortage of members at these meetings.

[*English*]

The Chair: I think there may have been experiences where a meeting started and someone was delayed in getting to the meeting or something. Maybe they slept in. I think that's one of the problems you get on the road.

Mr. Miller.

Mr. Larry Miller: I just want to point out that Mr. Cardin was there, and I'm sure it was just an honest mistake, but he said Quebec or Canada. Quebec is part of Canada, so I presume he meant anywhere in Canada that we're at a meeting. I'm sure that's what he meant.

The Chair: I'm sure Mr. Cardin knows what he's talking about.

Okay, with that amendment from Mr. Allison, the amendment as I've just read, I'll call the vote.

(Amendment agreed to)

(Motion as amended agreed to)

•(1555)

The Chair: On the distribution of documents, the motion is that only the clerk of the committee be authorized to distribute to the members of the committee documents, and only when they exist in both official languages, and that witnesses be advised accordingly.

It is moved by Mr. Cannan.

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: On working meals, the 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.

It is moved by Mr. Bains.

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: We're moving to witnesses' expenses, and again, this is pretty routine: 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.

It is moved by Mr. Miller.

Am I correct—I just want to clarify this with the clerk—that there is a format and agreed upon amounts for reimbursement of flights, meals, that sort of thing? Okay. And those are statutory?

The Clerk: They're established by the liaison committee.

The Chair: Okay.

Is everyone clear on the motion?

(Motion agreed to)

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

It is moved by Mr. Maloney.

Did you have some discussion?

Mr. Larry Miller: Yes, I did.

I'd like to propose an amendment to it and speak a little bit on it beforehand.

I'd like to add in there that a member of the whip's office of any party be allowed to have a representative included in that. You'd want to wordsmith that better than I just said it, but I think you get the intent of where I'm coming from.

It's just a suggestion, because at regular meetings I believe each leader's office usually does have a representative here, and that would cover that. That's all.

The Chair: Okay. We're speaking specifically in this regard to in camera meetings. Had you understood that?

Mr. Larry Miller: Yes.

The Chair: Okay.

So Mr. Miller would like an amendment to include one member of the whip's office from each of the official parties.

Is there discussion on that?

Mr. Larry Miller: It would just save the staff who's sitting in on a regular meeting from having to leave the room when you go in camera.

The Chair: Okay. I think we get the point.

Because it's in camera, it's presumed that everybody else would leave, including those other than the staff members.

(Amendment agreed to)

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

The Chair: Next we have transcripts of in camera meetings: that one copy of the transcript of each in camera meeting be kept in the committee clerk's office for consultation by members of the committee.

Mr. Bains moves that.

I want to ask about that one copy that would be retained in the clerk's office. If you wanted to visit it, you would do it in the clerk's office and it wouldn't leave the clerk's office. Copies couldn't be taken from the clerk's office.

The Clerk: Right.

The Chair: Okay, now I'm clear. Is everybody else clear?

(Motion agreed to)

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

It's moved by Mr. Masse.

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: Now we'll consider time limits for witness statements and questioning. I won't go through it; everybody has it in front of them. Is there a mover to that motion?

Mr. Masse moves that motion.

The motion is that at the discretion of the chair, the witnesses be given up to ten minutes for their opening statement; that during the questioning of witnesses, the time allocated to each questioner be as follows: on the first round of questioning, up to seven minutes for the first questioner of each party. So on the first round of questions, seven minutes, beginning with the Liberal Party, followed by the Bloc Québécois for seven minutes, the Conservative Party for seven minutes, and the New Democratic Party for seven minutes. In subsequent rounds of five minutes, the sequence of round one will apply.

Okay, so that's pretty straightforward.

Mr. Miller.

•(1600)

Mr. Larry Miller: I have a question first, and I may have an amendment, depending on what the answer is. I'd ask the clerk: what exactly is the sequence of speakers in the second, third, and fourth round?

The reason I'd ask that is in any other committee I've sat on, no member of the committee gets a chance to ask questions a second time until every member has asked one.

I'll just give you an example of what was in this motion yesterday at agriculture committee. It was exactly like the chair just read, the first four in round two: it would be the Liberal, the Bloc, and a Conservative member. In the third round, it would be Liberal, Conservative, and so on, and then you start all over. Is that the intent of this, and the way it was in previous trade committee meetings?

The Chair: That's not the way it is here. I share your experience with previous committees, so I would welcome some discussion on this.

Mr. Larry Miller: I'm going to move an amendment, then, Mr. Chairman.

The Chair: All right. Well, let's start the ball rolling with an amendment to that.

Mr. Larry Miller: It would read as is for the first round of questions. In the second round of five minutes, it would then be a Liberal, a Bloc, and a Conservative. In the third round it would be a Liberal and a Conservative, and in the fourth round it would be a Liberal and a Conservative. That would complete the first round, and then you start all over again in the same way. That way, Mr. Chairman, every member of this committee gets a chance to ask questions.

Now, for example, if Mr. Maloney asks in all four sequences for the Liberals, that's the Liberals' choice, but at least it gives that opportunity for every member.

The Chair: That would be proportional to the representation of the committee, which is proportionate to the representation of elected members in the House.

Mr. Larry Miller: Exactly.

The Chair: Okay. Does everyone understand the amendment?

Mr. Larry Miller: I have one last comment, Mr. Chairman.

Every one of us—I know I do, and I take it that everyone else does—prepares to come here for a two-hour meeting and to do our jobs, and if somebody on this committee doesn't get a chance to question, they're not representing themselves or the constituents or their respective parties. That's why I proposed this.

The Chair: We have an amendment, but let me just interrupt for one minute to indicate a precedent that I've used in the past as a previous chair of a committee. That is, often when I'm talking to people—for example, Mr. Miller right now—I'm not always able to recognize who has their hand up. So I've taken to turning to the clerk and asking the clerk to keep a list of the order in which people have raised their hands to get the attention of the clerk if they want to be heard on the point on a speakers list. I will not keep a speakers list as the chair. I'm going to ask the clerk to do that in all cases, so that if you want to be addressed or recognized, please try to get the

attention of the clerk, because I may not be able to recognize you if I'm looking this way and there's somebody over there, but the clerk has to.

The next one on the clerk's list then is Mr. Allison.

Mr. Dean Allison: Just to speak to that point, I was on this committee last year and I prepared just like any other member, and there were times when some of my Liberal colleagues as well as myself did not get a chance to speak. If we're going to commit the time to be at a committee twice a week—I know some of us sit on two committees—I think that we should all have a chance to participate at least once before we start the second round.

There may be times when we defer and other people pick up extra rounds, and that's fine. But I think at the very least, for the courtesy of the members who prepare and come to this committee ready to participate, everyone should be given a chance to go at least once before we start a second round.

The Chair: Mr. Masse.

Mr. Brian Masse: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I've also participated in committees in which members have split question time as well. Maybe it's not the intent of the government with this motion, but the result would be an elimination of an NDP spot. I would suggest that when the committees I've participated on made these types of changes, they often created ill will at the start of the actual session, because it really altered significantly what was done in the past. The successful committees I've been on have had that second spot. I'm certainly cognizant of the fact that everyone wants to be able to participate and ask questions during a meeting, but they are able to do so under the current system.

I would suggest that the status quo would be very helpful for the committee to go forward.

•(1605)

The Chair: Is there any further discussion?

Monsieur Cardin.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Serge Cardin: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The arrangements made for the allocation of speaking time by members of the international trade committee worked relatively well. If I understand correctly, Mr. Miller would like each member to be allowed to speak and to put his question. As we know, practically speaking, the number of questions per party takes precedence over the fact that each party member asks a question. Often times, a member may have a special interest in an issue. This question should not necessarily be considered in terms of the number of persons or individuals.

I had heard talk of wanting to alter procedure. That's why I started to calculate the weighted average. Based on the number of parties, namely four, and the number of members, I came up with a somewhat different result. Unfortunately, according to my calculations, based on four rounds of questions, the Liberals would have been entitled to four questions, the Conservatives, to four questions, the Bloc Québécois, to three questions, and the NDP, to two questions. In this case, I think these expectations could possibly be met. For the first round, the order of questioning would be as follows: the Liberal Party, the Bloc Québécois, the NDP, the Conservative party. For the second round, the order of questioning would be: the Liberal Party, the Bloc Québécois, the Conservative Party. For the third round, the order would be: the Liberal Party, the Conservative Party, the Bloc Québécois, the NDP; and finally, for the fourth round, the Conservative Party, the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party. That would give us the mathematical representation, according to my calculations.

You are always free to challenge my calculations. However, my objective was to ensure that this fair for everyone. According to most calculations, approximately 68 minutes are allocated for questions. By following this order, we also come in at 68 minutes, or thereabouts. Everyone would have an opportunity to put a question, unless, of course, some time is wasted.

Moreover, if people believe that time limits will not be respected, but they will still want to ask a question, then they need only make their questions clearer and more concise. Instead of using up seven minutes initially, they can take up five or six. That way, each party would have time to get through all of the questions it has for the witnesses.

[*English*]

The Chair: I think what we have is a further suggestion. From a tactical point of view here, you are either proposing a subamendment to Mr. Miller's amendment or we will perhaps ask you to hold that until we deal with the first amendment and then you could propose a second amendment if you wanted to have it different from the amendment that's on the floor.

Mr. Larry Miller: On a point of order, Mr. Chair.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Serge Cardin: I was commenting on the motion on the table. From a practical standpoint, I would prefer to proceed in this manner rather than in the manner suggested. I would prefer this order.

[*English*]

The Chair: Okay, and that it wasn't to the amendment, I take that.

Mr. Miller.

Mr. Larry Miller: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

To Mr. Cardin, this is about fairness and equal representation based on elected representation. The decision as to the number of members on these committees is based on the number of MPs elected. So when you don't give everyone a chance to speak before someone else has a second go at it, unless that turn of course is passed over by one of their colleagues, which is possible, although in committees I've sat on in the last three and a half year that does not happen very often.... I don't know what the history of this one is, but to—

• (1610)

The Chair: Sir, can I just interrupt?

We do have a speakers list. I thought you were going to raise a point of order. I'm sorry. We do have a speakers list, and you're not next.

Mr. Pallister.

Mr. Brian Pallister: Thank you for the opportunity to speak for a first time to something others have spoken to a couple of times.

Let me propose something. I believe we all agree with the principle of equality of members. I agree generally with Mr. Cardin's words, so I'd like to suggest what I think would be a better model to achieve what he has proposed.

The fault in what he has proposed is that it allows a second opportunity for both the Bloc and NDP members to enter into the discussion before it allows a Liberal or a Conservative member to speak for the first time. I think it would make more sense to go with the proposal we have spoken about. I would like to suggest in response to his concerns that if we go with the first round as was suggested—Liberal, Bloc, NDP, Conservative—and then the second round as Liberal, Bloc, Conservative, that gives both Bloc members an early opportunity to participate ahead of most other members of the Liberal and Conservative parties. If we were to subsequently go Liberal, Conservative, Liberal, Conservative, that allows every committee member to speak once. Then—and here is my proposal—rather than return to the original order, go Bloc and NDP. Provided there are 70 minutes, that would allow a disproportionate participation by both the Bloc and NDP, which is out of proportion to their membership in the House. If we don't have 70 minutes, I agree it does not, but if we do have that length of time, it does.

The Chair: Again, we're getting into a subamendment. What we're dealing with right now is the amendment by Mr. Miller.

We could go on all day if we don't deal with them one at a time, so we'll just deal with Mr. Miller's. For clarity, I've asked the clerk to put these on the board so we can see the proposal distributed by the clerk and the proposal as suggested by Mr. Miller. We'll deal with those two, and then we'll carry on if there are further amendments required.

Mr. Larry Miller: May I speak to my amendment while he's writing that up?

The Chair: You bet. Mr. Miller, carry on.

Mr. Larry Miller: I apologize, Mr. Chairman. I didn't think there was a point of order any more because Mr. Cardin was arguing in favour of the original.

Mr. Cardin, I think it's important that you hear my comment.

The committees were divided up by the number of MPs from each party for a reason, based on representation. I believe the questioning should go the same way. If you or any other one of us has a problem with the way the committees are divided up, then I would suggest that we have the four House leaders sit down and deal with this. But I believe that at some point the four of them did that, and this was how they decided it.

As Mr. Pallister pointed out so eloquently, it's not fair for anyone to get an opportunity to ask questions before someone else has had that opportunity at least once. If I want to pass my turn to somebody I can, but at least I've had the opportunity. You want to take that away from me, or someone over there. That's what it does. This isn't about trying to pick on the Bloc or the NDP; it's about making it fair all the way through.

Really, anybody from the Bloc, or particularly the NDP, has a chance every committee meeting to be guaranteed seven minutes, where I don't unless I'm the first speaker. I don't have a problem with that, but that's another thing I would point out.

• (1615)

The Chair: I just want to make clear what we're talking about here. Here is the proposal at the top that has been proposed by the clerk, and that is that the first round be seven minutes for Liberal, Bloc, Conservative, and NDP. The second round would be five minutes. The third round would be the same as the second round, and the fourth round would be the same as the second round. So by the time you got through four rounds you would have had each of the parties able to speak four times. But we'd be at 70 minutes, or whatever it is. It's longer. Usually what happens is that we don't get to the fourth round. That's 88 minutes to do the first one.

The fact is that you wouldn't get to the next round, so you'd end up with three opportunities for everybody. So you would have, in terms of the membership of the committee, one Liberal who would not have an opportunity to ask a question, unless his time was split with another member, and it would be the same for the Conservatives. They would not have an opportunity for each member to speak.

So this is the proposal as suggested by Mr. Miller, I take it. Mr. Miller, is that correct? In the first round you would have Liberal, Bloc, NDP, and Conservative for seven minutes each. In the second round you would have Liberal, Bloc, and Conservative for five minutes each. The third round would be Liberal and Conservative. The fourth round would be Liberal and Conservative.

What you would get there is every member, because you have four Liberals, four Conservatives, two Bloc, and one NDP. Everybody has a chance to speak once before we revert to the top again. That's the difference between the two proposals as—

Mr. Larry Miller: You have eleven questioning times laid out.

The Chair: This one would be 63 minutes long, so it's essentially an hour.

That is the proposal we have before us. So everybody is clear, the motion is the top one and the amendment that is currently on the floor is the second one. The difference is that it is based more on the individual member of the committee getting an opportunity to speak, as opposed to a division with regard to the number of party members, whether the party has 19 members or 126.

Go ahead, Mr. Cannan.

Mr. Ron Cannan: I'm ready to go. Let's call the question.

The Chair: We have people who want to address the amendment.

We'll go to Mr. Masse.

Mr. Brian Masse: Quickly, to my colleagues, we can go through several different machinations of models, but if something works, keep it. Sometimes you'll be late. There are votes. Witnesses could be going on a little extra time at the discretion of the chair. All these things end up mucking it all up. I would say that we should defeat these amendments and go with the regular motion that's on the paper.

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

Mr. Brian Pallister: I'd suggest that those are relative comments. If members don't show up, they've clearly disqualified themselves from positioning themselves to speak in the debate, regardless of what order of speaking we choose. That's an irrelevant point.

The point is this: either we choose to treat the parties equally or the members equally. There's a reason committees are configured the way they are. They're a reflection of the will of the Canadian people. The members on this committee reflect the percentages, roughly, of the support we receive in the House of Commons from the Canadian people. No member of this committee should be disqualified from speaking in advance of another member or another party that was not so blessed with support.

The fact of this proposal is this: it would give the Bloc three opportunities to speak and deprive both the Conservative and Liberal parties from having a member participate in the debate. It would give the NDP a disproportionate opportunity to speak. Of course speaking three times with one member on committee is clearly not fair to other members of the committee.

I would suggest to my colleagues in the Liberal Party that if they support this, they are showing a real disinterest in participating in the debates of this committee. It precisely reveals that fact. The fact remains that they are giving their opportunity to speak in debates pertinent to the issues of international trade to other political organizations so they can have a disproportionate voice at committee. That is precisely and exactly the effect of supporting this particular proposed model.

To argue that this has somehow been here before so it should continue is of course also a foolish argument to make. It's an argument that... I've heard conservatives defined as people who believe that nothing should ever be done for the first time. Well, I would tell you that you're showing the worst of that conservative definition if you support the status quo and the status quo is wrong.

Clearly, this is not fair to the members of this committee. So I would strongly urge you not to support a continuation of something that is so blatantly unfair to the very members who should be concerned.

• (1620)

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Miller.

Mr. Larry Miller: On the point that Mr. Masse made, and Mr. Bains, about the status quo and don't change anything, this is not a precedent. The committees that I have sat on go by this model. I couldn't believe it when I heard yesterday that this committee didn't operate under the same way. Like, how long has that gone on? It's not right.

If you do your homework, there are very few committees that operate like this. Any of the ones that I actually checked into operate by the model that I have proposed. It's fair. I mean, it's the same speaking arrangement as the way that the committees have been divided up.

So it is not a precedent, if that's what you think.

Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. Bains.

Hon. Navdeep Bains (Mississauga—Brampton South, Lib.): I appreciate the comments made, and the passionate plea made by Mr. Pallister.

With respect to the status quo, in the past our experience in this committee has been very clear. This process has worked very well. Time was shared. This committee on the whole has tended to be less partisan, and it's worked very well.

Based on that experience, my opinion is that the status quo makes sense—on experiences as opposed to the argument on representation.

That's my position.

The Chair: As a new chair, and having not been on this committee, I presume from what you've said, Mr. Bains, that the status quo is the method proposed by the clerk. That's number one on our chart here?

Hon. Navdeep Bains: That's my understanding, yes.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Cannan.

Mr. Ron Cannan: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I just wanted to comment on Mr. Bains' comment to the effect that it was working well. I totally disagree. As one of the members who sat over here and prepared, it was very frustrating. Many days I didn't have the opportunity, when, as Mr. Pallister articulated, the NDP had three questions and we had one chance, sometimes not even as a member sitting here unless we shared the time and got half of a question. And I don't think that's fair.

So if this isn't going to work, we have to come up with some other reasonable compromise. I won't be supporting the specific speaking order that's proposed.

Thank you.

The Chair: We are still on Mr. Miller's proposed amendment.

Mr. Pallister, do you have a question?

Mr. Brian Pallister: Yes, just a quick comment.

Is it all right to refer to colleagues by name? Is that okay? All right.

With regard to Navdeep's comments, look, I'm all for non-partisanship, but I think it's a bit of a contradiction to say that it's somehow more partisan to allocate speaking opportunities based on party.

Don't you see the contradiction in this? We are all members of the House of Commons here, and we should all have the opportunity to participate in debates equally. To allocate speaking opportunities based on party is in fact a partisan criterion that you're using. It doesn't make sense.

So I would hope that some compromise can be reached that would accommodate the possibility that all our members will have the chance to participate in debates fairly and equally.

The Chair: I have no further members on the speaking list...

I'm sorry, Mr. Maloney.

Mr. John Maloney: What is the speaking order of debates in the House of Commons? Is there such a thing?

The Chair: It's just the lead speakers in each case, in debate, and then it's at the...

Mr. John Maloney: No, in practice, how does the Speaker recognize those wishing to participate? In my recollection, they seem to go through—

The Chair: It's negotiated by the House leaders at each Parliament. It's based on proportional representation in the House. It is fair, based on the numbers of elected members that each party has. The official opposition gets more questions, just like question period, than do the other opposition parties.

Mr. Miller.

Mr. Larry Miller: Just to comment on that, Mr. Maloney, I believe Mr. Richardson is absolutely right; to my understanding and reading of it, that's decided and laid out by representation.

I have just one last point to make, Mr. Chairman, and then I'll shut up on this.

With regard to "any" member, whether from this side or from the Liberals, when you're passing on your time or your opportunity to speak to someone other than in your party, and delegating it, you're shirking your duty. I would feel it would be the same way here for me to miss it. I haven't got a chance to do my job here as a member of this committee.

I just throw that out as a last comment.

● (1625)

The Chair: We have no further discussion on the amendment.

(Amendment negated)

The Chair: We will now move to the original motion as described here. Is there any discussion?

Mr. Cannan.

Mr. Ron Cannan: I'd like to move another amendment.

The Chair: Oh, I'm sorry. We have another amendment. Yes.

Mr. Ron Cannan: Similar to Mr. Cardin's idea, of Liberal, Bloc, I was going to put the NDP and then the Conservatives; Liberal, Bloc, Conservatives; Liberal, Conservatives; Liberal, Conservatives; and then the Bloc and the NDP.

The Chair: We have another amendment on the floor.

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

The Chair: We have a new format. It will be this format as described and suggested.

We have a vote on the motion as amended. Is there any further debate on the motion as amended? Thank you.

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

The Chair: That brings us to dissenting or complementary opinions, the final of the proposals suggested by the clerk for routine motions.

That any member of the committee have the right to attach, as an annex, a dissenting opinion on any report to be presented to the House of Commons by the committee within the conditions imposed by the committee and in accordance with the Standing Orders of the House of Commons.

First of all, Mr. Pallister, will you move that motion?

Mr. Brian Pallister: I will, and I'd like to move an amendment to it.

The Chair: We have a motion by Mr. Pallister, and we're prepared to have a discussion on this motion.

Mr. Pallister.

Mr. Brian Pallister: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

We would probably categorize this as more of a housekeeping thing, but I've found it useful to put a timeframe on the dissenting reports, just to assist, I think, in the preparation of the documents for the chair and so on.

So I would just propose adding "72 hours" and some wording, I don't know how, but just to give time for parties who wish to dissent from any reports. And of course I'm not anticipating any disagreement whatsoever on anything here at committee, but should it occur—

The Chair: Would you like to make the amendment before you have this discussion?

Mr. Brian Pallister: Yes, okay. Thank you, sir.

The Chair: What is the amendment?

Mr. Brian Pallister: "To be submitted to the clerk of the committee within 72 hours of the passing of the report by the committee".

• (1630)

The Chair: Then in fact I think it might be just as easy to take that as a motion, because you were moving the first motion anyway, so you don't have to amend your own motion. So let me read the complete motion as suggested by Mr. Pallister.

That every party shall have the right to attach, as an annex, a dissenting opinion on any report to be presented to the House of Commons by the committee, and that this dissenting opinion shall be submitted to the clerk of the committee within 72 hours of the passing of the report by the committee.

Is that clear to everyone? It's just that it does put a time limit on the submission of dissenting reports.

I would take it that this would be before the report is tabled in the House?

Mr. Brian Pallister: That's right, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Yes, okay. It's unlikely that a report could get tabled

Mr. John Maloney: Mr. Chair, could you read that again, please?

The Chair: I'll give it to you, because it is a new motion.

That every party shall have the right to attach, as an annex, a dissenting opinion on any report to be presented to the House of Commons by the committee, and that this dissenting opinion shall be submitted to the clerk of the committee within 72 hours of the passing of the report by the committee.

Mr. John Maloney: Well, we've left out one of the most important standing orders of the House of Commons.

The Chair: I'll just confer with the clerk.

Why don't you just give the committee the same information you're giving me?

The Clerk: Standing Order 108(1), which is the standing order that's referred to, essentially just explains that a committee has the power, if it so chooses, to append dissenting or complementary opinions to any report it chooses. So it's not binding. There's no standing order that governs this per se. It just tells the standing committee that it has the power to annex that if it chooses to do so. And what this motion does is gives that right without having to adopt a motion every time, if a certain party wants to append a complementary or dissenting opinion.

The Chair: So that I'm clear, you're saying in response to Mr. Maloney's question that having added the phrase "the conditions imposed in accordance with the Standing Orders", there aren't any standing orders to refer to it. So why did you do it in the first place?

The Clerk: That was the motion that was adopted in the last session. The standing order simply says that the committee

shall be...empowered...to report from time to time and to print a brief appendix to any report, after the signature of the chair, containing such opinions or recommendations, dissenting from the report or supplementary to it, as may be proposed by committee members

So it just gives the committee the right to do it if it wants to do it.

The Chair: Well, you know what, I don't see any problem, and I think for clarity I'll ask Mr. Pallister if he would be able to accept as a friendly amendment just to add—

Mr. Brian Pallister: Sure, to give further authority to it, I'm fine with that.

The Chair:—"in accordance with the Standing Orders of the House of Commons".

I have another suggestion of the clerk, and that is to add "dissenting or supplementary opinions". It just broadens it to allow members to add additional minority reports if they want to, as long as they're within 72 hours and as long as they're in accordance with the Standing Orders of the House of Commons.

I think it's basically the same as we have here. The only thing it does is it adds 72 hours.

Mr. Brian Pallister: And as the clerk has suggested also, not just dissenting, but "or supplementary".

You suggested adding "or supplementary", didn't you?

The Chair: Excuse me, we do have a speakers list. I just think we're on a point of order here to clarify what we're actually debating.

Mr. Bains, did you have a point of order?

Hon. Navdeep Bains: I have a question. What's the difference between a supplementary and a dissenting report? Aren't they one and the same, effectively? Can you explain the difference to me?

The Clerk: Essentially the difference, Mr. Chair, is that a dissenting opinion essentially differentiates from what the committee has decided on, and a supplementary opinion is essentially just going a little bit further, not necessarily disagreeing with what's in the report, but adding certain elements to a report.

• (1635)

Hon. Navdeep Bains: And is it common practice to add a supplementary or dissenting report?

The Clerk: I can read the passage that deals with supplementary reports from the book if you like. I'll just read this passage. It might be able to clarify it in the other committee. It's just a quick paragraph.

A committee report reflects the opinion of the committee and not that of the individual members. Members of the committee who disagree with the decision of the majority may not present a separate report. ... Where one or several members of a standing committee are in disagreement with the committee's report or wish to make supplementary comments, the committee may decide to append such opinions to the report.... Dissenting or supplementary opinions may be presented by any member of a committee. Although committees have the power to append these opinions to their reports, they are not obliged to do so.

The Chair: So it appears to give the opportunity without being required to do so.

Mr. Clerk, I wonder if you could read the amended motion and then we'll continue debate. I have Mr. Miller, Monsieur Malo, and Mr. Masse on the speakers list. But before we proceed with Mr. Miller, could I ask you to read the amended motion?

The Clerk: The amended motion reads:

That every party shall have the right to attach, as an annex, a dissenting or supplementary opinion on any report to be presented to the House of Commons by the committee; and that this dissenting or supplementary opinion shall be submitted to the clerk of the committee within 72 hours of the passing of the report by the committee in accordance with the Standing Orders of the House of Commons.

The Chair: Mr. Miller.

Mr. Larry Miller: I don't want to debate it, necessarily, but I'm amazed that we don't have the same format in every committee. In the agriculture committee there was a timeline of 48 hours, but it was increased to 72 hours yesterday. The argument came up for 72 hours versus 48 hours because if this happened on a Friday it would allow time until the first of the week. It's certainly not a precedent. We already had a time in there. It was a little shorter, whereas this one didn't have any timeline.

The Chair: Mr. Malo.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Malo: I would like the regular members of this committee to answer a question for me. In the past, have you encountered any problems with the motion as previously adopted? From what I've observed in other committees, once they have completed their study, members agree amongst themselves on a period of time for dispensing with dissenting opinions. This approach has always worked very well. I simply wonder why Mr. Pallister is today asking that we dispense with dissenting opinions within 72 hours, whereas in practice, members generally agree to allocate time to dispense with these opinions on a case by case basis.

I do not think that this suggestion improves in any way upon the motion previously adopted by the committee.

[*English*]

The Chair: Mr. Pallister, do you want to comment?

Mr. Brian Pallister: I'm not on the speaking order, so I'll wait. I'll let everybody who wants to speak do so.

Mr. Dean Allison: I'll speak to this.

In the last Parliament I believe we were given only four hours to respond with a dissenting opinion on one report we came up with. That clearly wasn't enough time to do it.

If we want to recommend less on a case-by-case basis we could certainly look at it, but I think we need to set the 72 hours so it's fair for all parties to come up with something once they have seen the completed report.

The Chair: Mr. Miller.

Mr. Larry Miller: I'm surprised by Mr. Malo's comment. From his explanation, it sounds like it was just loosey-goosey before. Every time a report came up, the committee of the day set a timeline. For the life of me I can't figure out what the problem is in setting out a timeline. Is 72 hours too long?

• (1640)

The Chair: Mr. Malo.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Luc Malo: To answer your question very briefly, events occur over the course of a year where members can decide together if they will need 24 hours, 48 hours or 72 hours, based on the work of the House, statutory holidays or a number of other considerations. The members can decide amongst themselves, once a report has been completed, how much time they will allow to dispense with a dissenting opinion.

I don't see how we can agree on 72 hours as a firm time period when in some instances, 24 or 48 hours may be sufficient. That is my question to the mover of the motion. We cannot, at the start of a session, predetermine a course of action for the coming year.

[*English*]

The Chair: Mr. Pallister, you have the opportunity.

Mr. Brian Pallister: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'd like to thank Mr. Malo for his comments. I think that's the purpose of Standing Orders: to try to anticipate as best we can what circumstances we will face as a committee and try to set parameters around those very things. I believe that having the 72 hours is fair and reasonable. It will give dissenting opinions time to be developed. We don't know which of our parties may wish to write these dissenting opinions, but it makes sense to give a reasonable amount of time. To have a lesser period might not provide that opportunity.

Any of the work we undertake is important enough that when we disagree, which I'm sure will happen on rare occasions, there will be the opportunity for those expressions of disagreement to be articulated clearly and affixed to the reports we table. This is simply why I'm suggesting we use the 72 hours, rather than try to fly by the seat of our pants. The purpose of the Standing Orders themselves is to give some certainty to the structures we use when we are preparing our work for tabling in the House of Commons.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Cannan.

Mr. Ron Cannan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just wanted to echo my colleague's comments. If there is a sentiment that... Last session that there were some real concerns about coming down to the four-hour aspect, so if 48 hours is more agreeable to the rest of the committee, I think we can work on that. I think a reasonable time is 48 or 72. Whatever they prefer, I'm pretty flexible and I think my colleagues are too, but we need to put something in there.

The Chair: We have a motion on the floor for 72 hours, so let's deal with that first.

Go ahead, Monsieur Cardin.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Serge Cardin: Some are surprised by the existence of this provision respecting dissenting opinions, but as the clerk stated earlier, other committees make no mention of it at all, since Standing Orders 108(1) authorizes the committee to establish different procedures each time around.

I happened to substitute yesterday for a member of the Standing Committee on Government Operations and Estimates and there was no mention of dissenting or secondary opinions in their routine motions. Such opinions are regularly considered in other committees, but I have no problem with the previously adopted wording. I just want to say that I tend to agree with my colleague's position. We cannot predict the future. We may require more than 72 hours, but if that's the case, because the committee is master of its own destiny, members could ask for more time. It's fine if you want to put down 72 hours, but four hours was not a great deal of time during the last session.

[*English*]

The Chair: I have no further speakers on the list. I'll call the question.

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

The Chair: That concludes the proposals of agreed routine motions, unless there are any further motions from the floor before we adjourn.

Is there a further motion?

Mr. Brian Pallister: It's not so much a motion; it's just an offer that we may take advantage of or we may not.

I spoke earlier to Navdeep about this. I have the assurance that if we would want a briefing from departmental officials for Thursday's meeting, I could get departmental officials here to answer questions on any topic we might want to raise. I put that out there, if committee members are interested.

I admit it's a selfish suggestion. As I said to Navdeep, many of you have been on this committee before; maybe you have such a level of expertise that you require no briefings from anyone, but I personally would like to offer that opportunity for us to ask questions if we'd like.

• (1645)

The Chair: Mr. Pallister, are you proposing a briefing by the department officials on Tuesday next, at the first meeting of the committee?

Mr. Brian Pallister: That is if committee members want it. It's just an offer.

The Chair: Yes, I understand it's an offer. I'm asking what the offer is.

Mr. Brian Pallister: The offer is to bring departmental officials to answer questions from committee members on a topic of their choosing.

The Chair: When?

Mr. Brian Pallister: This Thursday, when we have a meeting—or next Tuesday; I'm sorry. It would be the next meeting.

The Chair: Thank you.

Go ahead, Mr. Bains.

Hon. Navdeep Bains: I appreciate the offer.

I indicated that there are a few items we want to complete from the previous committee meetings, a couple of reports. Also, I have a few suggestions on behalf of my colleagues for some of the issues we need to discuss. I don't think it's necessarily important to have department officials give us any additional guidance. I think if we seek it, we can call on them as part of a set of witnesses we may require on certain subject matter, but at the present time I think we need to use that meeting for other purposes, because we have a limited time span in light of the fact that we had to prorogue the House and therefore reset the committees. I think, speaking from my own experience, that this is something for which there is no present need or desire.

The Chair: It would have been helpful for me as chairman of this committee to have an overall briefing just to begin things—we have a number of new members on the committee—and just to get a sense of the department and who they are. But before we prolong this, I should say that in the absence of that suggestion, it would occur to me that the next order of business for the committee would be establishing an agenda for subsequent meetings. That's certainly something we could do on Tuesday. If it is decided on Tuesday that in addition to setting the agenda up to Christmas or something like that, we could include a subsequent briefing by officials—I mean quite broadly, rather than a specific one—to update new members of the committee, it may well be that the committee might have the advantage of even just the new members who would depart from the committee time to get such a briefing, but those are just suggestions.

Go ahead, Monsieur Cardin.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Serge Cardin: My comments are along the same lines as Mr. Bains. Obviously, we need to decide as quickly as possible on an agenda and on the topics we want to discuss. He also alluded to some matters that we had already begun to touch on. We have business to conclude. It is important to bring some members up to speed on international trade files. However, we also need to get an update, to bring all members up to speed members on certain issues and to push ahead with any outstanding business.

Either the clerk or the research analyst could report on the studies in progress and on what remains to be done. Perhaps departmental officials could fill us in as well. We need to have this information in hand before we begin. This would help us set an agenda for the committee. I imagine that by next week, we will have an idea of which issues should be given priority consideration and of what business remains to be concluded.

[*English*]

The Chair: Just so we're clear, there is no past business. We just started this committee today. If there is business that you would like to bring to the committee that has been dealt with in the past.... I'm just explaining this technically; there is no past business. We have a new committee as of today.

I take it then that the direction of the committee is that when we next meet on Tuesday we will commence with discussion of future business. At that time perhaps members could bring matters that they wish to have considered for future business, and that could include things that you may or may not have dealt with in the past. Let's bring that to the table.

I have had the pleasure of dealing with this clerk before, and he reminds me that in our previous experience together we asked the various committee members to submit to the clerk any notions of agenda items or future business that they wish to have considered. I think that's a good point, a good way to do it, and allow the clerk to sort out duplications or whatever and then present to everybody collectively for Tuesday's meeting a list that we might all go over and perhaps agree on which of those matters we wish pursue and in which order, or which precedence.

If this is something that's agreeable, before asking for the consent of the committee I will suggest that we would perhaps submit any notions of future business to the clerk by Monday noon next. The clerk could then have those translated in both official languages and distributed—as best he can—to the committee prior to the next meeting. Is this a suggestion with which I could find concurrence in the committee?

Mr. Maloney.

• (1650)

Mr. John Maloney: I agree with the suggestion. But it might also be productive if the clerk and researchers enumerate those points that we left outstanding before prorogation.

The Chair: I think maybe you have just done that by asking the clerk to do it. But I want to reiterate that this is a new committee, and if there are things you want to bring back the time to do it would be Monday. If you want to pass that suggestion to the clerk to include those, then you've just done it. Is that fair enough?

Mr. John Maloney: I pass that suggestion to the clerk.

The Chair: Okay.

I did have some outstanding names from the previous list, and that included Mr. Masse. Do you have any further comment?

Mr. Miller, any further comment?

Mr. Larry Miller: Just on this here. As a new member to the committee I would at some point like to see somebody from the department here to answer questions. I hope that is a consideration.

The Chair: Okay. We're not going to have that debate today, but we are going to have that debate on Tuesday. That will be one item that you can add to the agenda on Tuesday for discussion.

Monsieur Cardin.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Serge Cardin: Mr. Chairman, the committee has some new members. You have not introduced for the benefit of the members our research staff and analysts.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you very much. I can't do it because I've yet to meet them. So maybe I'll ask them to introduce themselves.

Mr. Michael Holden (Committee Researcher): I'm Mike Holden, one of the researchers for the committee.

Mr. Peter Berg (Committee Researcher): Peter Berg is my name, and I'm also with the Parliamentary Information and Research Service. I'm pleased to be here.

Mr. Michael Holden: We also have Elizabeth Kuruvila here, who is with the law and government division.

Mrs. Elizabeth Kuruvila (Committee Researcher): I am Elizabeth Kuruvila from the law and government division of the Library of Parliament.

The Chair: As I mentioned, Chad Mariage is our clerk.

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Erica Pereira): I'm Erica Pereira. I'm a new clerk who will be shadowing this committee probably until about Christmas.

The Chair: I think that does it.

Thank you very much. I'm sorry we didn't get through sooner, but we'll try to do that in the future. Thank you.

We are 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.