



House of Commons  
CANADA

## **Standing Committee on Official Languages**

---

LANG • NUMBER 001 • 2nd SESSION • 40th PARLIAMENT

---

**EVIDENCE**

**Thursday, February 5, 2009**

**Chair**

**Mr. Steven Blaney**

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

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

## Standing Committee on Official Languages

Thursday, February 5, 2009

• (0915)

[English]

**The Clerk of the Committee (Mrs. Isabelle Dumas):** Pursuant to Standing Order 106(2), the chair must be a member of the government party. I'm ready to receive motions to that effect.

[Translation]

**Mr. Royal Galipeau (Ottawa—Orléans, CPC):** Madam Clerk, pursuant to Standing Order 106(1), I move that Steven Blaney be elected chair of the committee.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Galipeau moves that Mr. Blaney be elected chair of the committee.

[English]

Are there any further motions?

[Translation]

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

(Motion agreed to)

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

We can now proceed to the election of the first vice-chair.

[English]

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

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

[Translation]

**Mr. Royal Galipeau:** Mr. Chair, I read here that:

The clerk of the committee can only receive motions for the election of the chair.  
The clerk cannot receive other types of motions, cannot entertain points of order...

It is perhaps the role of the chair to preside over the election.

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez (Honoré-Mercier, Lib.):** Let us check with the clerk.

**The Clerk:** It is the clerk who presides over the election of the vice-chairs.

Are there any nominations for first vice-chair?

Mr. Rodriguez.

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** I would like to nominate Ms. Zarac, who is absent today but gave me a letter certifying that she agreed to be nominated to the position of vice-chair. Her letter is in both official languages.

**The Clerk:** I would like to remind committee members that they can elect a first vice-chair even if the nominee is absent.

Are there other motions?

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

(Motion agreed to)

**The Clerk:** I declare Ms. Zarac duly elected first vice-chair of the committee.

We can now proceed to the election of the second vice-chair.

Pursuant to Standing Order 106(2), the second vice-chair must be a member of the opposition from a party other than the official opposition.

I am now ready to receive motions.

**Mr. Richard Nadeau (Gatineau, BQ):** Madam Clerk, I nominate Yvon Godin, member for Acadie—Bathurst.

[English]

**The Clerk:** It has been moved by Mr. Nadeau that Mr. Godin be elected second vice-chair of the committee.

[Translation]

Are there other motions?

(Motion agreed to)

**The Clerk:** I declare Mr. Godin duly elected second vice-chair of the committee.

**The Chair (Mr. Steven Blaney (Lévis—Bellechasse, CPC)):** Madam Clerk, thank you for presiding over the election.

Thank you for your trust. What a surprise you have given me this morning, in this -21°C cold.

Congratulations as well to our two vice-chairs.

The goal of this meeting is to adopt the routine motions, some of which were passed during the last Parliament. I am now ready to receive proposals for routine motions, the first of which is for "Services of Analysts from the Library of Parliament".

We will have the routine motions distributed so that everyone can work from the same document. In the meantime, I would invite the analysts of the Library of Parliament to join us at the table.

Mrs. Glover.

**Mrs. Shelly Glover (Saint Boniface, CPC):** Good morning. I am a new member and was wondering whether there was a speakers' list. Everyone is talking at the same time, and I cannot hear what some people are saying. I was wondering whether we were using a speakers' list or if everyone spoke at the same time.

**The Chair:** It is the role of the chair to ensure compliance with the speakers' list. Normally, the chair invites a member to speak to the committee.

I am ready to hear your comments, but let us take a few minutes to make sure that everyone has the document containing the routine motions.

Mr. Petit, do you have the document? There is a table of motions.

The first motion, moved by Ms. Boucher, reads as follows: "That the committee retain the services of one or more analysts from the Library of Parliament, as needed, to assist the committee in its work."

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Last time, the committee felt it would be useful to have a subcommittee on agenda and procedure. It is up to the committee members to decide if they wish that to remain the case. If not, we can move on to the next motion.

**Mr. Richard Nadeau:** Excuse me, Mr. Chairman...

● (0920)

**The Chair:** Mr. Nadeau, during the last Parliament, the committee had decided to strike a steering committee.

**Mr. Richard Nadeau:** Ah, I see.

**Mr. Yvon Godin (Acadie—Bathurst, NDP):** I would like to move that this be done again.

**The Chair:** You are moving that we form a steering committee?

**Mr. Yvon Godin:** That is right.

**The Chair:** I am ready to hear your comments.

**Mr. Yvon Godin:** We have always had a steering committee.

**The Chair:** Before hearing any comments on the motion, I must see if there is a mover. I would like to remind you that when I was chair, there was no steering committee, but that afterwards, the committee decided to create one. This morning, we are free to strike one or not.

I give the floor to Mr. Rodriguez.

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have been a member of this committee for five years. We have almost never had a subcommittee. We created one that lasted for a certain period of time last year because the committee had become too partisan and we were arguing all the time during our debates. We decided to eliminate the partisanship and set up a small group that would decide on the agenda and find a way to make it work. I do not want to be unkind, but I would say that if the parliamentary secretary is a little less partisan than in the past—and I believe this will be the case—it may be easier to work as a team, and therefore, to not have to strike a subcommittee. That is my point of view.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Rodriguez. We will now have to see if there is a mover.

Mr. Godin?

**Mr. Yvon Godin:** I agree with Mr. Rodriguez. It does not bother me at all to work as a team. We can see if we are able to do so. We will see what the will of the committee is. If things go the way they did last time, we will review this motion and deal with it accordingly. We are saying that we want to work out an agenda, but devoting a lot of time to that and requiring a second meeting makes no sense. That was a reality and that is why we were obliged to strike a smaller committee. Personally, I support doing this work all together. If it doesn't work, we will do what we have to do.

**The Chair:** Madam Parliamentary Secretary for Official Languages?

**Mrs. Shelly Glover:** In a spirit of cooperation, I move that we do not strike a subcommittee and that we work together.

**The Chair:** Very well.

**Mr. Richard Nadeau:** Does that require a vote?

**The Chair:** It is a proposal. If there is unanimous consent, we do not necessarily...

**Mr. Yvon Godin:** We will stick to the proposals and everything will be fine.

**The Chair:** We therefore have a motion on the table. It is moved that we not create a subcommittee on agenda and procedure.

All in favour of this motion?

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Before moving on to the next motion, allow me to welcome our analysts from the Library of Parliament. May I introduce them to you: Mr. Jean-Rodrigue Paré, a loyal servant of the committee, as well as Mr. Julian Walker.

Mr. Godin?

**Mr. Yvon Godin:** Jean-Rodrigue's parental leave was not too difficult. Congratulations!

**The Chair:** We have another motion. It concerns reduced quorum. It reads as follows:

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.

**Mr. Yvon Godin:** I move the following motion:

That the Chair be authorized to hold meetings to receive and publish evidence when a quorum is not present, provided that at least four (4) members are present, including two (2) members of the opposition.

**The Chair:** Thank you for reminding me. You are moving the motion that was passed by our committee during the last Parliament. Very well.

● (0925)

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher (Beauport—Limoilou, CPC):** Therefore, it is four members?

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** Including two members of the opposition.

**The Chair:** All right, we have a mover. I am ready to hear your comments on this motion. If there are none, I will call the question.

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** It is a very good motion.

**The Chair:** Everything seems to be in order. If there are no comments, shall I call the question?

**Mr. Yvon Godin:** Yes, we will vote.

**The Chair:** Those in favour of the motion as moved by Mr. Godin?

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Distribution of documents

Essentially, the motion passed by the committee comes from the standard motion, except that we specifically advise every witness that they must provide documents in both official languages. It reads as follows:

That the Clerk of the committee be authorized to distribute documents to the members of committee only when they exist in both official languages and that no documents provided by a witness be distributed without the Clerk's authorization and, since the documents must be in both official languages in order to be distributed, that the Clerk advise the witnesses of the availability of a translation service.

**Mr. Yvon Godin:** I move the motion.

**The Chair:** We have a mover, Mr. Godin. We do not need a seconder, but I take note of your support, that strengthens the motion.

I see that the members agree. I call the question.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Working meals.

That the Clerk of the Committee be authorized to make the necessary arrangements to provide working meals for the Committee.

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher:** If necessary.

**The Chair:** Are you moving this, Mrs. Boucher?

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher:** I move the motion.

**The Chair:** Mrs. Boucher moves the motion and the committee will deal with it.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Witnesses' expenses

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.

Is there a mover?

**A voice:** I so move.

**The Chair:** Are there any other comments?

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Staff at in camera meetings.

The motion passed by the committee was the following:

That, unless otherwise ordered, each Committee member be allowed to be accompanied by one staff person including a member of the personnel of the office of the whip of each party at an *in camera* meeting.

That means that there will be one staff member for each member of the committee, plus one per party.

Is there a mover?

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** In my opinion, "et incluant" is not good French. It should say, rather: "en plus d'un membre du personnel". I did not draft it; I am very particular.

**Mr. Jean-Claude D'Amours (Madawaska—Restigouche, Lib.):** Mr. Chairman, there are five or six members on the government side, and in the way in which it is drafted, "including" means that the whip should be included among the six.

Even your colleagues agree with me.

**The Chair:** Are you proposing different wording?

**Mr. Jean-Claude D'Amours:** It should say: "as well as a member of the personnel of the office of the whip", instead of "including".

**The Chair:** It would therefore be "as well as a member of the personnel of the office of the whip"?

**Mr. Jean-Claude D'Amours:** Yes.

● (0930)

**The Chair:** You are moving a motion with this amendment.

We are studying this motion. I am ready to hear your comments on it.

Mrs. Glover, go ahead.

**Mrs. Shelly Glover:** I approve of the proposal.

However, I would like to know if it really is necessary to include "of the office of the whip". As far as I am concerned, it could be anyone from the personnel of each party. We could say: "as well as a member of the personnel of each party".

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher:** No, because we already have here...

**The Chair:** Mrs. Glover, you may make comments or amend the motion we are studying, and then we could discuss your amendment.

Do you wish to move an amendment?

**Mrs. Shelly Glover:** Should we not vote on his amendment first of all?

**The Chair:** No, we are discussing the motion that was tabled. First of all, a motion is moved. Normally, we consider one amendment at a time that is intended to improve the motion.

Mr. D'Amours tabled a motion that would change the wording to "as well as a member of the personnel of the office of the whip" rather than "including".

**Mrs. Shelly Glover:** I therefore propose an amendment. I am open to your comments. We will see what happens then. I move that we remove the words "the office of the whip" so that it is simpler.

**The Chair:** You are moving an amendment intended to delete the words "the office of the whip" from Mr. D'Amours' motion.

We have an amendment to the motion. I am ready to hear your comments on the amendment intended to delete the words "the office of the whip".

For procedural purposes, I must tell you that we will deal with one amendment at a time. We will get to the bottom of the issue of the amendment and then decide. Following that, if there are other amendments, we will deal with them in the same manner.

Ms. Guay, you wish to speak to this amendment?

**Ms. Monique Guay (Rivière-du-Nord, BQ):** I wish to point out that the committees are managed by the whips. I therefore believe that we have to keep the mention of “the office of the whip”. I do not think we should exclude it. On the contrary, the committees should not be guided by just anyone, but indeed by the whips. Things have always worked that way.

**The Chair:** We have taken your comments into account.

Mr. Godin.

**Mr. Yvon Godin:** I would like to discuss the amendment to the motion moved by Mrs. Glover.

As Ms. Guay was saying, if we insist on specifying that it must be someone from the whip's office, it is because the committees are guided by the whips. The way it worked caused a problem in the past which was then corrected in all of the committees. Members were allowed to be accompanied by a member of their own personnel. At the same time, the whip's office of certain political parties had enough staff to be available to send a representative to each committee, at any time. For example, as I am the whip, my assistant Theresa could attend any meeting of the committee, even if it was in camera, in order to provide the political party we represent with information.

Very often enough, those representatives are not even here, but they could be. We therefore drafted the motion for that reason, and the four political parties agreed on the issue. It is now the rule in all of the committees.

**Ms. Monique Guay:** Changes made as to the members sitting on a committee come from the office of the whip. It is the whip who must sign a special document for any member to replace another. It is the person responsible for the office of the whip who brings it to the clerk. We need that. It could happen at any point in the day that I might be called to table a bill in the House and I would need to be replaced by one of my colleagues. We have to maintain that possibility.

**The Chair:** Mrs. Glover, you are the one who moved this amendment; do you wish to add something else?

**Mrs. Shelly Glover:** I would like to withdraw my proposed amendment.

**The Chair:** Very well. We can now deal with the original motion as it was moved by Mr. D'Amours, with the mention of a member of the personnel of the office of the whip.

Are there any comments on the motion as moved?

Mr. Nadeau.

**Mr. Richard Nadeau:** Monique, do you wish to raise the issue?

**Ms. Monique Guay:** Yes. It is simply an issue concerning the French.

I move that the motion read as follows: “That, unless otherwise ordered, each Committee member be allowed to be accompanied by a member of their staff”, and not “by one staff person”, “including a member of the personnel of the office of the whip [...]”

**The Chair:** That is “as well as”.

• (0935)

**Ms. Monique Guay:** Yes, excuse me, it is “as well as”.

**The Chair:** It reads “as well as a member of the personnel of the office of the whip of each party.”

**Ms. Monique Guay:** I am sorry, that is quite right: “as well as a member”. My goodness, my writing is so small I cannot even reread it.

**The Chair:** It is a very tiny amendment, but we must consider it as one nevertheless.

**Ms. Monique Guay:** It is “as well as a member of the personnel of the office of the whip of each party.”

**The Chair:** I see that the mover is distracted. Are there any comments on the amendment to the motion?

I will reread the amendment and I will invite you to pay closer attention. We would like it to read as follows: “that each member of the Committee be allowed to be accompanied by one member of their staff”, instead of “one staff member”.

If the members agree, I can call the question on the amendment.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** We may now vote on the motion as amended.

(Motion agreed to as amended)

**The Chair:** We will now proceed with motion number 8 which deals with in camera meetings transcripts:

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.

The motion is moved by Mrs. Glover. I will now call the question.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** We will now move on to the motion dealing with notice of motions. It was the one passed during the last session:

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.

I would like to inform the members of the Committee that I have had a discussion with the clerk regarding this motion. I would like someone to move the original motion. This is because when we are discussing a deadline of 48 hours before the next meeting, according to House procedures, that means that we have until 6:00 p.m. to table a notice of motion, whereas according to committee rules, we have until 4:00 p.m. The problem is not necessarily political in nature, but rather bureaucratic. For the clerk's staff, receiving a notice of motion at 6:00 p.m. creates complications.

I will ask the clerk to explain the point that she raised.

**The Clerk:** It is a logistical issue, more than anything else. If we receive the motion right at 6 o'clock and it is not translated, we have to find someone to translate it. It also depends on whether the motion is in order. If there are problems of that nature, the clerk may not be able to send it out immediately after receiving it. It would have to wait until the next day, so it couldn't be debated at the Thursday meeting. If the motion is received at 4 o'clock, it can be sent out that same evening, and debated at the Thursday meeting.

**The Chair:** This issue is generating a lot of discussion.

I am prepared to have someone move the following suggested routine motion for the opening of a session:

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.

Ms. Guay moves the basic motion. We will now entertain comment on the motion.

We will hear from Mr. Nadeau, Mr. D'Amours and then Mrs. Boucher.

**Mr. Richard Nadeau:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a question about the deadline. I'd like to know whether it's the same on other committees. Has the deadline been moved up to 4 o'clock for all committees?

**The Chair:** I'm going to check.

**Mr. Richard Nadeau:** It used to be 6 o'clock, and that worked.

**The Chair:** Personally, I sit on the Standing Committee on National Defence, and yesterday, we passed the motion that is currently before us to the effect that parliamentary committees follow the parliamentary committees' schedule, not the House schedule. Keep in mind that House staff are here until 6 o'clock or 8 o'clock. They don't have the same schedule.

I can speak for the Standing Committee on National Defence, but do you have any other information?

**The Clerk:** The Standing Committee on Official Languages is the only committee where there is a specific deadline of 6 o'clock. Other committees have not done that. However, it's for the committee to decide.

• (0940)

**Mr. Richard Nadeau:** What are the deadlines for other committees?

**The Clerk:** It was understood that it was by the end of the work day. Forty-eight hours, the way the House counts, means two sleeps.

**The Chair:** Does that answer your question, Mr. Nadeau? If I understand correctly, we're the only committee dealing with this.

Mr. D'Amours.

**Mr. Jean-Claude D'Amours:** The clerk probably answered the question, but I would like clarification for greater certainty. I believe the term you used was sleeps. Two nights' sleep for the House; the House goes through two sleeps and then it's okay. It's not a matter of counting out 48 hours.

**An hon. member:** No.

**Mr. Jean-Claude D'Amours:** Okay, we're agreed on that.

**The Chair:** Give or take a sleep.

Mrs. Boucher.

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher:** I sit on other committees. We didn't use to have this problem because the meetings were on Wednesdays, but does 48 hours mean two work days?

**Some hon. members:** They're sleeps.

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher:** So that means that if I decide to submit a motion today, it won't be considered before Tuesday because there have to be two sleeps. People sleep on the weekend, but so does the House, so you don't count the weekend.

**The Chair:** Mrs. Boucher, it's two calendar days.

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher:** Fine. That's all I wanted to know. Two sleeps.

**Mr. Jean-Claude D'Amours:** That makes no difference.

**The Chair:** If there are no other comments, we can go ahead and vote on notices of motion.

**Mr. Richard Nadeau:** I think Jean-Rodrigue has a very good understanding of sleeps; he spends all of his time doing it.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**The Chair:** Let's vote. The motion reads as follows:

That 48 hours' notice be required for any substantive motion to be considered by the committee, unless the substantive motion relates directly to business [...]

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** We now come to the motion on questioning witnesses. This motion varies from one committee to another. You can see the original motion that was proposed. Basically, the motion has to do with how the committee works.

Is there someone who would like to move the motion?

Mr. Godin.

**Mr. Yvon Godin:** I move that we adopt the status quo, that we follow the same procedure we followed at our last meeting.

**The Chair:** So you move the motion—

**Mr. Yvon Godin:** The one that was agreed to in the second session of the 39th Parliament.

**The Chair:** I will read it out in full:

That witnesses be given ten (10) minutes for their opening statement; that during the questioning of witnesses, there be allocated:

for the first round, seven (7) minutes for the first questioner of each party in the following order: Official Opposition, Bloc Québécois, New Democratic Party, government;

for the second round, five (5) minutes be allocated to each subsequent questioner from each party in the following order: Official Opposition, government, Bloc Québécois, New Democratic Party;

for the third round, five (5) minutes be allocated to each subsequent questioner of each party in the following order: Official Opposition, Bloc Québécois, government, New Democratic Party;

for the fourth round, five (5) minutes be allocated to each subsequent questioner of each party in the following order: Official Opposition, government, Bloc Québécois, New Democratic Party.

Mrs. Glover.

**Mrs. Shelly Glover:** Are we at comments?

**The Chair:** Yes, we're now at comments on the motion.

**Mrs. Shelly Glover:** Good. Personally, I took a very close look at this. I really like everyone to have a chance to participate and to speak. I was wondering how this could be changed to give everyone a chance to speak. I know that other committees have chosen other ways of questioning witnesses. So I have a proposal to submit; I'd like everyone to be given a copy so that we can discuss it.

• (0945)

**The Chair:** You will be moving an amendment.

**Mrs. Shelly Glover:** It would not be a complete amendment, but if you want to call it an amendment, that's fine.

**The Chair:** I take it that you wish to amend the motion. In order to do that, you are moving the amendment that you are distributing to us. That will be the basis for our discussion, which will enable us to move forward.

Would you like to explain your amendment?

**Mrs. Shelly Glover:** Did everyone get a copy?

**Some hon. members:** Yes.

**Mrs. Shelly Glover:** On the first round, all parties would be allowed to take the floor and to ask questions.

On the second round, it would continue—

**The Chair:** Excuse me. Do you want us to suspend the meeting for five minutes? Committee members are talking and there is a lot of—

I would ask committee members to pay attention to the discussion we're having. If the committee wishes to suspend the meeting for five minutes in order to discuss things, that can be done. Otherwise, I would encourage you to pay attention to the comments.

Mrs. Glover, you have the floor.

**Mrs. Shelly Glover:** Thank you very much. On the first round, all parties would have a chance to speak. On the second round also. According to what we are presenting, all other committee members present will have a chance to ask one question. Then, we will go to the third round. You can see that all parties would again have a chance to take the floor.

I'm sorry, on the second round, it's so everyone will have a chance to take the floor. On the third round, all parties would have the chance to speak.

I discussed this with someone who told me it was rare for there to be a fourth round. I'm just putting this out for discussion.

**The Chair:** According to your amendment, Mrs. Glover, on the first round, all four political parties would have a turn. On the second round, you are proposing that all committee members be given a chance to take the floor.

**Mrs. Shelly Glover:** That's right.

**The Chair:** Three members of this committee are from the Liberal Party. Two are from the Bloc, and there is one member from the NDP. So, in the first two rounds, all members would have a turn.

**Mrs. Shelly Glover:** Everyone would have a chance to speak.

**The Chair:** On the third round, it would alternate between opposition parties and the government, starting with the Official Opposition.

**Mrs. Shelly Glover:** That's right.

**The Chair:** You are making this an amendment to the motion.

I am now willing to entertain comments on this amendment.

Mr. Rodriguez, you have the floor.

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** With all due respect, I don't think we'll get very far with this because there are eight opportunities to speak. It's as if the committee were to become the Standing Conservative Committee on Official Languages. You have eight opportunities to speak. As I said before, it's not by individual, it's by party. I would really like everyone to have a chance to speak, but... Perhaps we can find a compromise, but in this case, I don't see how this would be possible, because we do have to be realistic. Despite the number of members who make up the minority, the government is still a minority. That has to be reflected within this committee.

I think this would give the Conservatives a huge predominance, with eight opportunities to speak in three rounds. In my opinion, that's unacceptable. I don't think we can agree to that, Mr. Chairman. We're sorry. We'll have to look for some other way of doing things.

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

Mr. Nadeau.

• (0950)

**Mr. Richard Nadeau:** For all the same reasons, we are going to vote against this amendment, Mr. Chairman.

**The Chair:** Mr. Godin.

**Mr. Yvon Godin:** Mr. Chairman, we had this discussion last time round.

**The Chair:** Excuse me, I would like us to listen to the member.

**Mr. Yvon Godin:** We've had this discussion before, especially on the Official Languages Committee. True, there are other committees with different procedures, but on the Official Languages Committee, we're talking about our language rights in Canada. I think the participation of political parties is good. In the past, it was good. We had some bad experiences last year or two years ago, but I think it worked. There has always been some flexibility when the Conservative government came and asked, if we should happen not to make it to the end... Normally we make it to the end, if you will recall. But when we were asked if a member could ask a question, we always did our best to allow that to happen.

I am going to vote against this amendment. Even when we had a majority government, the procedure of the Official Languages Committee has always been the same.

Thank you.

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

Mr. Petit.



**Mr. Daniel Petit (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC):** Under the former procedure, which I believe we followed, the Conservative Party often didn't get a chance to talk. Under the former procedure, it's one, two, three, four. We're repeating that procedure, one, two, three, four. That way, there will always be two Conservatives who won't get a chance to speak, because we all know the time is limited. That's why I would ask everyone to think this over carefully. We are the party that makes up a minority government, that is true, but we are here all the same. The true opposition is the Liberals, followed by the second and third largest opposition parties. I understand what Mr. Godin wants, I know he's a pillar of this committee, he's a feature of the committee. He is very hard-working and I admire his work, but we're talking here about my right to speak.

The last time I attended a committee meeting, in the last session, I was almost never able to speak. Why? Because I was always the fourth. That doesn't work. It cannot work any longer. We have to find a compromise. The proposed compromise respects the true opposition and us. If they want to trade their speaking time with other opposition parties, that's their business, but what we're trying to get across is that they are the true opposition. They represent the most Canadians, so they are the true opposition. That is what I wanted to say. If we keep the old procedure, two committee members, in this case us, we'll not be allowed to speak.

**The Chair:** This morning, you're not the fourth, you're the fifth. Thank you, Mr. Petit, for your intervention.

Mrs. Boucher.

**Mrs. Sylvie Boucher:** You all know that as usual, I will be quite honest with you. I remember how difficult I found this committee when I was Parliamentary Secretary for Official Languages, because there was a lot of partisanship on all sides. I didn't say there was more on one side than on the other; it came from all parties. On the Standing Committee on the Status of Women, despite some divisions, we tried to work together to create a committee that, without being apolitical, got along well. I do understand that she is a new member of Parliament and would like everyone to be able to speak. And that's understandable, because this is a very emotional file. It is extremely emotional, Yvon, you know it, on all sides. Personally, I want things to work well on this committee. I didn't experience it last year, but I did get some unofficial feedback from here and there, from all parties. I think we need to set this up all together so that everyone has an opportunity to speak, out of respect for individuals and for the French language. We are all fighting for the same thing here.

If we can manage to do that, I hope it goes well. We are adults advocating for Canadians and Quebecers. We are advocating on behalf of the French language. I want this to be done respectfully, because I sat on this committee for a year and never wanted to come back. Now, I'm back, so I want things to go smoothly.

• (0955)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mrs. Boucher.

I already note some changes. I am going to hear a few more comments on this to see if there is any movement.

Mr. Godin.

**Mr. Yvon Godin:** Mr. Chair, people are using the word partisanship and saying that the committee didn't work properly, but I would not take responsibility for that. I have been here for 12 years and I have never, in Parliament, seen a minister refuse to appear before a committee. Let us hope it does not happen again. I spoke with the new minister and he told me that he intends to appear before the committee. It will be interesting to talk to the minister in charge. The former minister refused to appear. We had another chair previously. The reason you are sitting there today is because the other chair had to be let go. We had invited witnesses from Manitoba to appear before the committee, and the chair decided to cancel the meeting. The member for Manitoba might be happy to hear that, but the fact remains that witnesses were not heard from; they had to get back on their plane and go back to Manitoba, all because of the chair's decision. We won't even talk about legal challenges.

Mrs. Boucher just said that things were emotional. It always is when people attack the francophonie or minorities in our country. That is what happened in committee, Mr. Chair. I hope that attitudes will change. We are going to do our job, fulfil our responsibilities as a standing committee, work on files openly, call witnesses and have the sensitivity to listen to them. We must not cancel meetings as was done the last time. We are going to report back to the House of Commons and call ministers before the committee to question them. Not a single report on official languages has been tabled in Parliament since 2006. Yet, this is the law in Canada. I hope, Mr. Chair, that things will change and that we will work together.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Mr. Godin, on the contrary, the committee tabled an excellent report on the vitality of official languages.

**Mr. Yvon Godin:** That has nothing to do with reports from the government. It is the government's responsibility. It's the law.

**The Chair:** I thought you were referring to the work of the committee. In fact, the committee tabled a number of excellent reports.

My goodness, there are many side conversations.

**Ms. Monique Guay:** I think we have had sufficient discussion on the issue; we should call the question and make a decision instead of simply heating up this room. In fact, Pablo needs to go lie down.

**The Chair:** I understand your opinion, Ms. Guay. There are three speakers on the list. I think that we can call the question on the amendment and then come back to the main motion.

Ms. Guay, I think that it is important, this morning, to take the time to look at this motion from all the angles, because systematically, we will have to live with our decision in our future meetings. I am well aware of your perspective, but I am still going to hear from the other members of the committee.

I would ask you to limit your comments, even if you obviously have all the latitude you need as committee members.

Mr. Galipeau.

**Mr. Royal Galipeau:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I have kept silent during all the other comments and interruptions, and the reason was to propose exactly what Ms. Guay did. I think that we are ready to call the question.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** They are calling for the question.

Mr. Chong.

[English]

**Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I don't think adopting the routine motion from the last Parliament on the question of witnesses is fair, because if we do that, it will mean that one of our members will never get to speak on the committee—never.

There are four rounds, and on each round one Conservative gets to speak, but there are five of us on the committee. It means that at every committee meeting, one of us is not going to be able to ask even one question. But Monsieur Godin will be able to ask four questions, and each member of the Bloc will be able to ask two questions, and one of the three Liberals on the committee will be able to ask a second question. It's not fair.

How can you have one member of the committee allowed to ask four questions, and then have the fifth Conservative member of the committee not even get to ask a question? It's not fair. I'm not suggesting that we split it right down the middle, that we get half the questions. But splitting it 25-25-25 is not fair, because it means that one of us is going to come to this committee for four hours a week and not be able to ask one question. Meanwhile, a member of the New Democrats will be able to ask four questions at each committee meeting, and each member of the Bloc will be able to ask two questions. I don't see the fairness in that.

You know, committee seats are apportioned so that each member gets to participate, but the routine motion, as we adopted it in the last Parliament, is not going to work, seeing as the seats in the House have been completely redistributed, and consequently, the proportionality on the committee has been redistributed.

• (1000)

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

May I just suggest that we are now about to take—as it looks on the speakers list—a vote on that motion. So if any other motion or subamendment is proposed, you can seek support from the committee and move it.

Madam Glover.

[Translation]

**Mrs. Shelly Glover:** I don't want to get this room overheated. Thank you, Mr. Godin, for telling me what happened last year. I am from Manitoba, where linguistic harmony is a reality we experience every day. So, I would like us to live in harmony too.

I am finding it truly difficult to understand why there was partisanship when we voted on the subcommittee, because you have assured me that you are not partisan. I would like to set all that aside. We are going to be hearing from witnesses and hearing ideas that

will stimulate debate. If one person asks four questions, there will be some repetition. I would like to know whether there are any other ideas. The more of them we have, the more witnesses will have an opportunity to express their opinion. This is an inclusive process, and we need to collaborate.

I don't want the atmosphere to get any more heated than it already is. I was not here last year. Whatever the case may be, I would like everyone to have the opportunity to participate. That is what I want, and not to get the parties overheated. That is my personal and professional opinion.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mrs. Glover. You made an amendment and there was an exchange.

I am now ready to call the question on the amendment by Mrs. Glover.

(Amendment negated)

**The Chair:** Mr. Galipeau.

**Mr. Royal Galipeau:** Mr. Chair, in light of the discussion that took place on the amendment that was just defeated, and also in light of the questions of proportionality that are in my opinion quite important in the operation of all committees, I would like to make another proposal, which reads as follows:

That witnesses be given ten (10) minutes for their opening statement; that during the questioning on witnesses, there be allocated:

for the first round, seven (7) minutes for the first questioner of each party in the following order: the Official Opposition, the second opposition party, the third opposition party and finally the government;

for the second round, five (5) minutes be allocated to each subsequent questioner from each party in the following order: Official Opposition, the second opposition party and the government;

for the third round, five (5) minutes be allocated to questioners from the following parties in this order: the Official Opposition and the government;

for the fourth round, five (5) minutes to a questioner from the government;

for the fifth round, time permitting and if members so wish, the first round will be repeated with three (3) minutes per questioner.

That is my proposal.

• (1005)

**The Chair:** It is essentially identical with regard to the 10 minutes allocated to the witnesses as well as the first round with questioners from each of the four parties. With regard to the second round, you have indicated the following order: the Liberal Party, the Bloc and the government. In the third round, it would be the Liberal Party and the government.

**Mr. Royal Galipeau:** Mr. Chair, I withdrew references to the names of the political parties and only mentioned their ranking as determined by voters. So this could apply in any other circumstances.

**The Chair:** In the second round, it would be the official opposition, the second opposition party, the government. In the third round, it would be the official opposition, the government. In the fourth round, it would be the government. In the fifth round, it would be...

**Mr. Yvon Godin:** We would go back to the order in the first round.

**The Chair:** With three minutes each. Okay. Mr. Galipeau's amendment is on the table. I am now prepared to hear your comments on the amendment.

Mr. Jean, you have the floor.

[English]

**Mr. Brian Jean (Fort McMurray—Athabasca, CPC):** I know I'm a visitor to the committee, but I'm just curious about which constituencies, which geographic areas, and which residents the members of the opposition want not to be heard at this committee. I have three francophone communities—

**An hon. member:** It's up to you.

**Mr. Brian Jean:** No, actually it's up to you, because you're suggesting that one of the government members.... So somebody in Canada is not going to be represented properly, is what you're suggesting; they should be ignored. Should my residents be ignored this time, in this series of questions, this day, on this particular issue? Should my francophone residents in my area be ignored, my three communities that are not being heard here because you're not allowing one person to ask questions?

Shouldn't everybody in a democracy be heard, or at least be able to put forward the position of their constituents? What you're suggesting is that my constituents' positions are not important. That's what you're suggesting by this amendment.

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

Mr. Chong.

**Hon. Michael Chong:** I feel very strongly that we cannot adopt the routine motion as it was adopted in the last Parliament in this committee, because when you look at the timing of the rounds, you'll see that the first round would take 28 minutes, the second round would take 20 minutes, the third round would take 20, and the fourth round would take 20. Typically we are not even going to get to the fourth round, because when you add 28 plus 20 plus 20, after three rounds we'll have gone through about an hour and a quarter of questioning. If you add, in addition to that, the witnesses who are going to testify, and often committee business that we discuss, we're not going to get to the fourth round; we're only going to have three rounds.

So what's going to happen if we have three rounds? Each of the Liberals will have one question. The Bloc, between the two members, will have three questions. The one New Democratic member on the committee will have three questions, and out of the five members here, only three of us will get to ask a question and two of us are sitting here, week in, week out, unable to ask a question. It's not fair.

If one of us misses it, fine. But to have one member on the committee ask three questions and have two other members of the committee not able to ask a question, week in, week out, is simply not fair.

I suggest the amendment proposed by Mr. Galipeau is a good compromise because it allows everyone a chance to ask a question. Mr. Galipeau has proposed an order that would allow each member of the Liberal Party to ask a question. It would allow each member of the Bloc to ask a question. It would allow the member for the New

Democrats to ask a question, and it would allow a chance for each member of the government to ask a question.

We then have this fifth round in there, where the other members of the committee, if they want to ask a question, will get a chance.

I think we should go with that; I think it's fair. I certainly don't think the motion that was adopted in the last Parliament is at all fair.

• (1010)

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chong.

I am going to take advantage of the chair's prerogative and suspend the meeting for five minutes. Rather than accepting motions and hearing comments...

**Some hon. members:** Call the question.

**The Chair:** Mr. Godin, we have lots of time this morning. We want to adopt the routine motions. We can vote on the amendment, but I must tell you that, before the motion can be adopted, I am going to suspend the meeting for five minutes. I agree that we should vote on the amendment.

(Amendment negated)

**The Chair:** Meeting suspended for five to ten minutes.

[English]

**Hon. Carolyn Bennett (St. Paul's, Lib.):** We have to go to the Auditor General's lock-up. Come on. What are you doing?

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Fives minutes is fine. We are suspending because, instead of having sterile conversations in committee, we could actually come to an agreement.

[English]

**Hon. Carolyn Bennett:** You don't have a consensus for that. We have to go to the.... Vote on it.

• (1010)

\_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (1020)

**The Chair:** Welcome back.

I would like to thank the members for taking.... I think it's good to have the time to discuss in an informal manner, as a committee.

Now we have a motion on the table.

[Translation]

Mr. Chong.

**Hon. Michael Chong:** I would like to make the following amendment:

That witnesses be given 10 minutes for this opening statement and that during the questioning of witnesses, in the first round, there will be five minutes allocated to the first questioner of each party in the following order: Liberal, Bloc Québécois, NDP, Conservative. In the second round, five minutes be allocated to questioners from the following parties in the following order: Liberal, Bloc Québécois, Conservative, NDP. In the third round, five minutes be allocated to questioners from the following parties in the following order: Liberal, Conservative, Bloc Québécois. In the fourth round, five minutes be allocated to questioners from the following parties in the following order: Conservative, Liberal, Bloc Québécois, NDP. In the fifth round, time permitting and if the members agree, the first round will be repeated with three minutes per questioner.

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

I am prepared to hear comments from Mr. Chong's amendments.

Mr. Nadeau.

• (1025)

**Mr. Richard Nadeau:** Mr. Chair, we are going to opt to keep the status quo. We really like having seven minutes in the first round and we want to keep them. So we will be voting against Mr. Chong's amendment.

**The Chair:** Are there any other comments on the amendments?

Seeing none, I call the question.

Mr. Rodriguez.

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** Since the NDP is losing a turn, could we not, in all fairness, put them higher in the suggested order during the previous round?

**The Chair:** In which round? Hold on a moment. I have here, for the first round, the Liberal Party, the Bloc Québécois, the Conservative Party and the NDP. No, pardon me, that is for the second round.

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** It is the same as usual, the Liberal Party, the Bloc Québécois, the NDP and the Conservative Party.

**The Chair:** Okay, we will leave it as is.

Just a moment, let's let Mr. Rodriguez finish.

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** It is Mr. Chong's amendment. We will let him continue.

**Hon. Michael Chong:** The order of the first round, which is a five-minute round, is as follows: Liberal Party, Bloc Québécois, NDP and Conservative Party. The second round, which is a five-minute round, is as follows: Liberal Party, Bloc Québécois, Conservative Party and NDP. The third round, which is a five-minute round, follows this order: Liberal Party, Conservative Party and Bloc Québécois. The fourth round, which is a five-minute round, is as follows: Conservative Party, Liberal Party, Bloc Québécois and NDP. If times allows, the fifth round, which is a three-minute round, will be as follows: Liberal Party, Bloc Québécois, NDP and Conservative Party.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I now give the floor to Mr. Galipeau.

**Mr. Royal Galipeau:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I heard what my colleague Mr. Nadeau said and I would like to ask my friend Mr. Chong if he would take Mr. Nadeau's comments as a friendly suggestion. Would it be acceptable to keep the seven minutes he is proposing?

**Hon. Michael Chong:** No, because we do not have enough time.

[English]

If we go through the first four rounds on my time, as I've proposed in the amendment, we will use up an hour and 15 minutes, and then if we get a chance at the fifth round, then we have an extra 12 minutes. So it's an hour and 27 minutes—an hour and a half—which then gives each member of the committee a chance to ask a question at least once.

If we give seven minutes to the first round, we'll never make it to the fifth round; there is just not enough time to do that after you hear witnesses and the like. So I do not want to change the first round to seven minutes.

[Translation]

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Chong. Your comments are always extremely clear.

Thank you also to Mr. Galipeau.

Are there any other comments on the amendments? We will now call the question on the amendment.

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** I would like to keep Mr. Chong's motion, but move up the NDP in the fourth round so that it is not the last party. This will guarantee them a turn.

• (1030)

[English]

**Hon. Michael Chong:** Are you suggesting changing the order of the fourth round?

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** Since the NDP is losing a round, I want to make sure he's able to speak in that round, so I want to put him higher.

**The Chair:** Just a moment.

[Translation]

Order please. Just to be clear, this would be a subamendment.

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** A subamendment to Mr. Chong's amendment.

**The Chair:** Ultimately, you are suggesting we flip the names of the Liberal Party and the NDP. Is that right, Mr. Rodriguez?

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** Why not the Conservative Party, while we are at it?

**The Chair:** In your subamendment, what order are you suggesting for the fourth round?

Mr. Rodriguez, are you moving a subamendment?

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Mr. Rodriguez, Mrs. Glover would like to speak.

Mrs. Glover.

**Mrs. Shelly Glover:** I understand what Mr. Rodriguez is doing. To make things easier, I move that the second round be as follows: Conservatives, NDP, Liberal Party and Bloc Québécois. Would that work? I think that this would be the most fair.

**The Chair:** Mr. Rodriguez, are you there?

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** My subamendment is as follows: NDP, Liberal Party, Conservative Party and Bloc Québécois.

**The Chair:** NDP, Liberal Party, Conservative Party and Bloc Québécois.

So to summarize, we have a subamendment to Mr. Chong's proposal. We will first vote on the subamendment.

We are going to vote on the subamendment, to clarify things. I want to hear comments on the subamendment.

Mr. Godin, do you want to speak to the subamendment?

**Mr. Yvon Godin:** Instead of the NDP, the Bloc would be last. I don't think that the Bloc will agree to this, which I can understand.

**The Chair:** Are we ready to vote on the subamendment?

**Mr. Yvon Godin:** I am not talking about individuals but rather about parties. We need to set the record straight when they say that it's always the same—

**The Chair:** Mr. Godin, according to this motion, the Bloc will have an opportunity to speak three times before the fourth round. It's a simple fact.

Are you prepared to vote on the subamendment?

Mr. Rodriguez, do you want to speak to the subamendment?

**Mr. Pablo Rodriguez:** No.

**The Chair:** Okay. Before we vote on the subamendment I will summarize. Mr. Chong had moved that all the rounds be five minutes per questioner; that the order of the first round be the same order the committee currently respects, meaning the Liberal Party, the Bloc Québécois, the NDP and the Conservative Party; that the second round be as follows: the Liberal Party, the Bloc, the Conservative Party and the NDP; that in the third round, it be the Liberal Party, the Conservative Party and the Bloc, and therefore there will only be three questioners in that round; and that at the fourth round, it be the NDP, the Liberal Party, the Conservative Party and the Bloc, rather than the Conservative Party, the Liberal Party, the Bloc and the NDP.

That is the subamendment.

We will now vote on Mr. Rodriguez's motion to change the order of the fourth round.

All those in favour of Mr. Rodriguez's subamendment?

**Mr. Richard Nadeau:** Mr. Chair, no one raised their hand. Can we now vote against the subamendment?

**The Chair:** I think there is some confusion. Are we now ready to call the question?

**Some hon. members:** Yes.

**Mr. Royal Galipeau:** We are voting on Mr. Rodriguez's motion.

**The Chair:** Right. Are you prepared to vote on Mr. Rodriguez's subamendment?

**Some hon. members:** Yes.

**The Chair:** May I have your attention? All those in favour of the subamendment? Very good. Those who are... Wait, people are confused.

We will call the question on the subamendment once more.

•(1035)

**Mr. Yvon Godin:** Mr. Chair, point of order. You are the one who is causing confusion. You called the question, those who were in favour raised their hand, and now you want us to vote again. It's almost like asking members if they haven't changed their minds.

**The Chair:** Mr. Godin, your point of order is noted. I will call the question one more time, and this time it will be as clear as day.

**Mr. Yvon Godin:** Call the question again? We already voted.

**The Chair:** We are now voting on Mr. Rodriguez's subamendment. Everyone look towards the clerk and I. All those—

**Mr. Yvon Godin:** Mr. Chair, we already voted.

**The Chair:** I heard your point of order, but here I am applying—

**Mr. Yvon Godin:** We already voted, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** No, the vote isn't over. It was interrupted when you called your point of order.

**Some hon. members:** No!

[English]

**Hon. Michael Chong:** Mr. Chair, could we seek unanimous consent just to pause for one minute? Can we seek unanimous consent? I think there's unanimous consent just to pause for one minute.

**An hon. member:** No, we can't.

**An hon. member:** No, no, no.

**An hon. member:** It's not unanimous.

**Hon. Michael Chong:** Fair enough.

We need an agreement on this.

**Mr. Yvon Godin:** Okay, let's vote, then.

[Translation]

**The Chair:** We are now going to vote on Mr. Rodriguez's subamendment.

(Subamendment negated)

**The Chair:** We are now going to vote on Mr. Chong's amendment.

(Amendment negated)

**The Chair:** We are now calling the question on the motion, unless other members would like to speak.

**Hon. Michael Chong:** I move another amendment.

**The Chair:** He is entitled to present an amendment, as long as it is not the same as the one he already moved.

**Hon. Michael Chong:** It's the same amendment I already made, except I move the following order for the fourth round: Conservative Party, Liberal Party, NDP and Bloc Québécois.

**Ms. Monique Guay:** It's the same amendment.

**The Chair:** It's not the same thing.

**Hon. Michael Chong:** The NDP doesn't agree?

**The Chair:** It's different. We have a subamendment.

Shall we vote on the subamendment?

**Mr. Yvon Godin:** I would like to call a point of order. We voted on the subamendment earlier, and it was defeated. We then voted on the amendment, which was also defeated. So it cannot be a subamendment.

**The Chair:** The amendment is slightly different, so we will vote on Mr. Chong's amendment to the main motion.

(Amendment carried)

**The Chair:** We will now vote on the main motion. Is everyone ready for the question?

Mr. Godin.

**Mr. Yvon Godin:** The main motion remains unchanged, except for the change to the fourth round. There are no other amendments.

**The Chair:** I am going to reread the motion as amended. It's Mr. Chong's entire motion, which refers to all the rounds being five minutes each. We will ask the clerk to read the entire motion that we are voting on.

• (1040)

**Mr. Royal Galipeau:** It's the original amendment.

**The Chair:** Mr. Chong moved, originally, the following motion:

At the Chair's discretion, witnesses will be given 10 minutes for their opening statement. That during the questioning of witnesses there be allocated, in the first round, five minutes for the first questioner in each party in the following order: Liberal, Bloc Québécois, NDP, Conservative. In the second round, five minutes to questioners from the following parties in this order: Liberal, Bloc Québécois, Conservative, NDP. That in the third round, five minutes be given to each questioner from the following parties in the following order: Liberal, Conservative, Bloc Québécois. In the fourth round, five minutes be allocated to questioners from the following parties in this order: NDP, Liberal, Conservative, Bloc Québécois. The fifth round will respect the order of the first round, but questioners will only have three minutes each.

That is the motion on which we are now voting. We voted on the amendment, now we're voting on the motion. Discussion on the main motion.

I want to thank you for your cooperation. I know that it is time consuming, but once it's done, we won't have to do it for a long time.

Mr. Nadeau, do you have an amendment?

**Mr. Richard Nadeau:** Yes, Mr. Chair.

The amendment to the main motion provides seven minutes in the first round for all the questioners.

**The Chair:** The amendment is on Mr. Chong's motion, except that the first round would be seven minutes instead of five. We will vote on this amendment.

(Amendment negated)

**The Chair:** Mrs. Glover.

**Mrs. Shelly Glover:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

When you read the motion on which we already voted, you made a mistake regarding the fourth round. You repeated the motion that we already voted on, and it hasn't yet been adopted. With regard to the fourth round, it would be the Conservative Party, the Liberal Party, NDP and Bloc Québécois.

• (1045)

**The Chair:** The motion we are about to vote on should be final. Are committee members ready to vote on the motion?

I will say it one last time, as amended. All the rounds remain five minutes in length. The first round, Liberal Party, Bloc Québécois, NDP and Conservative Party; the second round: Liberal Party, Bloc Québécois, Conservative Party and NDP; the third round: Liberal Party, Conservative Party and Bloc Québécois; fourth round: Conservative Party, Liberal Party, NDP and Bloc Québécois; finally, the fifth round would be three minutes in length, and we would return to the order of the first round.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** I want to thank the committee members. It was a difficult motion. I am prepared to hear a motion to adjourn. Next week, bring your proposals regarding the work of the committee, so that we can distribute them.

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.**