



House of Commons
CANADA

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

HUMA • NUMBER 041 • 3rd SESSION • 40th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Thursday, February 3, 2011

—

Chair

Ms. Candice Hooppner

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

Thursday, February 3, 2011

• (1110)

[English]

The Chair (Ms. Candice Hoeppner (Portage—Lisgar, CPC)): I call the meeting back to order. We're going to resume, committee members. You all have copies of the motions. To avoid confusion, we'll begin with the first one, which we actually were in the middle of discussing.

It was the motion that was moved by Monsieur Lessard, and it was: That the committee rescind the decision made on November 23, 2010 which figures in paragraph 6 of the report on page 3 and that the report be based solely on the testimony heard by the HUMA committee and on the briefs submitted to it.

We were in the middle of speaking and we had some speakers who were on the list, so we'll see if they still wish to address this.

Mr. Komarnicki, you were on the list to speak to this motion.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC): I was.

The Chair: You were. Wait, let me just see who's on—

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: Well, I will continue.

Before we left, I was certainly quite concerned with the motion. I would ask Monsieur Lessard to rethink his motion, at least in part if not wholly. I know in our past committees—and I've been on the human resources committee for quite some time, and on the immigration committee before that—it has not been unusual at a very minimum to take the reports of the other committees that have already studied a particular issue and, if nothing else, table them with this particular report and at times to make reference to it.

Now I know that we specifically said it should be also considered as part of the study. It would only make sense to do that, but to say that we would not append the evidence of the witnesses of the previous committee, whether or not we refer to it in the report, is an injustice, and it shouldn't happen. I think it's wrong. It clearly sets a wrong precedent going forward, and I would even argue so far as to say that if it's appended, then really, we should consider it as we would.

More particularly, I know that during the course of my examination of witnesses, I specifically referred to testimony given in the previous hearing in my questioning of the witnesses. One of the reasons I did that, among others, was that it played in respect of this report, and I quoted substantially from the various witnesses who gave testimony and questioned the witnesses who appeared here with respect to those particular pieces of evidence.

How do you extract that from this study? It would be nearly impossible. Obviously I'll argue that matter later, but it seems to me that I have every right to have that considered, because I brought it before the witnesses here, and they actually testified with respect to it.

Rather than getting into that kind of nicety, I think it would be well advised if Mr. Lessard would rethink his motion and allow it to be for what it is. As a very minimum if he can't go that far, he should at least go so far as to have the evidence appended to the report, even if he feels the analyst shouldn't refer to it. I'll argue that point later, because I don't know how they cannot, given that I used pieces of it.

Having said that, I would hope there would be reconsideration, and obviously I'll be opposing this motion. I think it's in wrong in principle. It's wrong in precedent, and it certainly strikes at the very heart of openness and transparency before committees and how we conduct business here and in other committees.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Komarnicki.

Before we go to the next speaker, I just want to be prudent before we really get going in all of our committee meetings. In the last session we had some trouble when sometimes individuals would argue out against what someone was saying. They would be talking back and forth. I think we all agree we don't want to do that.

I want to remind everyone that if you're asking questions of each other on your side or you're asking your staff something, we absolutely have tolerance for that sort of activity, but when someone has the floor, I don't think any of us want to tolerate someone arguing from across the other side. I thought I would just clarify that at the very beginning of all of our meetings. I think we all agree with that, and that's what I will be enforcing.

Mr. Savage, you have the floor.

Mr. Michael Savage (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, Lib.): Thank you.

When we left off, I was just about to wish everybody a merry Christmas and a happy new year. Allow me to do that retroactively.

The issue we have here is that we did a report on the impact of the long-form census on those populations that are meant to be served by this committee and by the human resources department. There had been other studies done by the status of women committee and by the industry committee. This was about our fiduciary responsibility as a committee.

The problem was that when the report came back in draft form, it cited evidence from other committees in the report—not appended to the report, not attached to the report, but in the report, and not in the proportional way. In other words, almost all the evidence in the other committees was that we need the long-form census, but in a disproportionate way it was evidence supporting the decision of the government that made its way into the report. It just wasn't an accurate or sensible report that way.

Now we're at loggerheads. We got talked out through Christmas; here we are seven weeks later, and what are we going to do about it? Maybe we need to have a little bit of movement on both sides.

If it's the case that we could have a report that cites the evidence that was heard by us, which is appropriate and which is how committees work, I don't have any problem with a reference to the other committees or even inclusion of those studies at the end of our report, but the report that comes from the human resources committee should reflect what this committee heard. That's not new; that's how things are done. If you want to refer to the other reports at the end of it, I don't have a problem with that, but we can't pick and choose in a disproportionate way to bring evidence into our committee that is contrary to what we heard here.

Thank you.

• (1115)

The Chair: We did have Mr. Martin on the list, but he's not here.

Ms. Davies, did you have anything?

No? All right.

Mr. Vellacott, you wanted to speak.

Mr. Maurice Vellacott (Saskatoon—Wanuskewin, CPC): I was a little puzzled in talking to our colleague Tony last week in the elevator, and I think he did concede that this could be the other approach. We would have not wasted all the time that we did if we had just simply got into it. If you want to extract as we go along the way, we do those votes and you excise parts or portions of it. You remove it, and we could be well on the way through the report already.

That would have been another approach, rather than dealing with this rather larger generic motion in respect to it. If this would waste too much more time, then I would certainly press back to that particular method or manner of actually getting into the report and excising it as we go along the way.

The other thing in respect to what my colleague Mr. Savagementioned is that as I recall the committee report—I don't have it before me right now—it's actually a reference. It's noted as to where that particular quote was from, and from what committee. Although I might partly concede that we colour the report by all of that, it's very clear that we're either citing testimony that was heard here in our

own hearings or that was cited and quoted elsewhere, so you can make the distinction pretty obvious in that way.

My contention would be that it's water under the bridge, in part, but if this extends at any great length, I would suggest that we get right into it, and as we go point by point or recommendation by recommendation, we excise those parts that people are not happy with. The net effect would be the same as moving this kind of motion that we have here.

The Chair: Mr. Watson, you're next, and then Mr. Lessard, because it's his motion. I'll let Mr. Watson speak first.

Mr. Jeff Watson (Essex, CPC): Thank you, Madam Chair.

I have just a couple of brief comments. I won't belabour this.

In principle, I think the motion represents a very serious mulligan, if you will, for the committee, and one that shouldn't be approached lightly. I agree with Mr. Vellacott that the committee, in a less serious way, can amend the draft report as they see fit before adopting it. That's another sensible way of doing it without using this rare type of motion.

Speaking more specifically to the legitimacy of including the testimony, I do recall—and I stand to be corrected, which is fine, because maybe my recollection's a little foggy in the new year here—at least one witness, if not others, who actually quoted from Minister Clement's testimony in terms of taking exception to some of the things the minister had said. I think that if witnesses have quoted it, then there's an argument that it's germane. In other words, they were rearguing, if you will, the bona fides, or lack thereof, of a voluntary survey. I don't see why it's inconsistent to include it in the committee's report when the minister's testimony is actually presented in its full context as well.

That's about all I have to add on it, but I will be opposing the motion.

• (1120)

The Chair: Mr. Lessard is next.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Lessard (Chambly—Borduas, BQ): Madam Chair, no one here is taken in by this. The Conservative government unilaterally terminated the long form in favour of the short form, despite major objections from the civil society. With that in mind, we now see an attempt to impose the short form, contrary to the views of all concerned, including organizations, cities and individuals with civil responsibilities who have to make decisions based on these facts. Facts are stubborn. A fact is something that survives. There are also statistics. All the testimony we heard in this committee is along the same lines, as is also the case from what we heard from the civil society, through the media or in other ways. The long form is essential, in order for people to base themselves on actual facts when making decisions.

If, by some chance, a contrary opinion is expressed in front of another committee, it will be up to that committee to analyze it and make the relevant recommendations. However, that is not what we heard. We heard unanimous testimony to the effect that the long form must be reinstated for the reasons I just mentioned.

Our colleague, Mr. Watson, says that this type of motion is rare. That is true, but it's because the Conservative one is pretty well non-existent. That motion passed accidentally, because Mr. Martin, who supported it, stated before the holidays that this was not his intention at the time he supported the motion. Unfortunately, Mr. Martin of the NDP is absent this morning. The Liberals and myself were opposed to this motion, because when you start incorporating testimony from another committee into your own report, you compromise the rigour that is needed.

When we refer to our work, to statements or to assertions that have been made, we are able to test them, ask questions, carry out an analysis and so forth. The Conservatives are seeking to introduce a virus into our report, because it contradicts all the testimony we heard here.

It's possible that it wouldn't be a virus for the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology, because it reflects the testimony they heard. The fact remains, however, that it is only a partial result. I understand that Mr. Clement is in favour of this, because he is the one that made this decision. I would be the most surprised person in the world were he to say the opposite today. That is a well-known fact, but we did not actually have an opportunity to question him about this.

One of our colleagues, Mr. Komarnicki or Mr. Vellacott, said that someone had quoted Mr. Clement. That is obvious. We occasionally quote him as well when we are saying we disagree with him or when we are rebutting arguments as fallacious as claiming that asking a family how many bedrooms there are in the home is indiscreet and constitutes a violation of their privacy. It is important to put this back in the proper context.

Our motion is intended to reinstate a credible mechanism that will retain the rigorous nature of the process. Our report will not be biased by a reference we have been unable to test, and which happens to suit some of the people who are here today. There is something very troubling about that.

● (1125)

Mr. Komarnicki talks about transparency, Madam Chair. Well, if he is seeking transparency, then he should be carrying around with him the report of the Standing Committee on Industry, Science and Technology. Once it is made public, everyone will have a chance to read it. In my opinion, it should not be incorporated into our report, because it will bias our process.

I think we should come back to the essential condition to be met if our work is to be of high quality. We must base ourselves on what we heard, what we have tested and what has prompted us to reach a certain conclusion. That conclusion can be none other than maintaining the long-form census, because every person who testified before the committee was of that opinion.

I make this request of my colleagues and of my colleagues who are members of the opposition. If, by some chance, our Conservative

colleagues have a moment of clairvoyance, they will show some common sense, pass this and get back to the matter at hand. I am asking them not to continue along these lines. It seems to me it a very poor way to occupy a committee. The Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities has a reputation for using its time effectively. In my opinion, trying to force Mr. Clement's position down our throats — a position which makes no sense whatsoever — is not the right approach.

[English]

The Chair: Before I go to the next speaker, I would like to make a couple of comments as chair of the committee, based on observations from Mr. Lessard.

I do think we have to be very careful. We have a staff here. We have analysts and clerks who are doing their job based on the instructions and the motions we pass. Mr. Lessard, you said that Mr. Martin accidentally adopted this current motion. I believe it's a dangerous precedent if one of our members does something accidentally, realizes it several weeks later, and then because of the majority is able to change it. In the House of Commons, if you accidentally stand up and vote, you cannot change your vote unless you have the consensus of the entire House.

I realize, ladies and gentlemen, that you have the majority and that you can overturn this. I would caution that we are setting a dangerous precedent, and I would think that for the sake of our analysts and our clerks it's something we really don't want to make a habit of. I would just make that comment. It has nothing to do with the content of this motion. It has to do with the precedent of accidentally passing something and then several weeks later, having the ability to overturn that accident, finding that everybody else has to pay the consequence. I will leave that with you and hope that you consider it.

We'll go on now with Mr. Komarnicki and the list of speakers. You are on the list, Mr. Lessard, so you'll be able to speak.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Lessard: On a point of order, Madam Chair.

[English]

The Chair: I'm sorry; is that a point of order?

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Lessard: I'm sure you will agree that I have a right to comment on this since you mentioned me by name, and referred to a specific term that I used.

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Lessard, please. You are on the list, and I will absolutely give you your turn, but otherwise we'll get very mixed up, so if you don't mind....

● (1130)

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Lessard: I am the second one on the list. If that's the way you intend to proceed, Madam Chair, I will wait for my turn.

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Lessard. Thank you very much.

Go ahead, Mr. Komarnicki.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

Obviously this is a very serious matter. I think you've hit the nail on the head on that point. Having said that, just before I left for holidays, I hoped that perhaps the members opposite would have their consciences pricked by what they were about to do. I see that this has been somewhat the case with respect to Mr. Savage, but Mr. Lessard has taken a rather hard approach, and I would ask him to still reconsider.

I know he said that Mr. Martin's support of the motion I made was somewhat of an unintended accident, if you want to call it that, but that's just not the case. Let us look at the motion. Let me read the motion. It says:

That the HUMA Committee request a written copy of all the transcripts of all the Standing Committees which have conducted a study on the Long Form Census

There is nothing to be misunderstood there.

Part of it included another committee, because Mr. Martin wanted to include another committee and specifically argued that the status of women committee had considered this thing. He wanted to be very specific that it was there. There was no accident there.

It said, "in both official languages, and that these transcripts be tabled..." There's no difficulty understanding what that means in ordinary English. It was not an accident. It was not unintended. It was specifically intended "...as part of the HUMA Committee's study on the Long Form Census".

The only issue Mr. Martin had a concern with—and we argued it at great length—was what the words "and considered" meant. I added those words "and considered" in my initial motion, because the term has some meaning. It means more than just appending it to the report, and that's where we spent a lot of time.

So to say that Mr. Martin's support was an unintended accident is totally off base.

Having said that, I would ask that members opposite defeat the motion or that Mr. Lessard withdraw the motion. Members can exercise the power of the majority by going through the report and excising those parts they think are not pertinent or relevant or that somehow shouldn't be in the report. We can then include them if we wish to. That would be the proper way to do it, and it doesn't do injury or insult to democracy, to the committee, to the motion, or to the integrity of the members who put the motion and supported it. There's a way to do that, but doing it in this fashion is a very grave and serious injury to the committee, to its members, and to the work they do.

You may disagree with me on that, and that's fair, but I would ask Monsieur Lessard to remove the motion; if he does not, I would ask that the members opposite at least not support it and that we deal with the report as we normally do.

That is my submission, Madam Chair.

The Chair: Thank you.

We'll go to Mr. Vellacott.

I would like to remind members that hopefully you have something new to add. If it's repeating something we've already discussed, I would ask that you not ask to be on the speaking list.

Mr. Vellacott, you have the floor.

Mr. Maurice Vellacott: Right.

I'll pick up on the comment you made, Madam Chair, in regard to this instruction to our analysts to do some very interesting work to extricate all of that stuff or pull it out of there. They're commendable and wise people. They probably will have some way through to doing that, but I think we need to be very clear, because it's no easy task for them. We're creating some extra work for them, obviously, because some of it's embedded a little more seriously; other parts can probably be extracted or removed with greater ease.

I quickly want to speak to motive before I make a final comment. I think the idea of that particular amendment or motion to make it part of the report was to get some balance on the issue. We had limited time. We couldn't spend inexhaustible time in this committee looking at the issue. I think the true intent, or the sincere intent, was to get some balance on the issue.

I think it was in order that way. The intent was to temper our report by way of that. That, I think, speaks to the motive and the intent of why we were trying to have that—in quotes—"considered".

In conclusion, yesterday we had the privilege of hosting some Swedish parliamentarians in the room off the parliamentary restaurant. It was interesting; we got on to a number of topics, as you do on these occasions. We were learning from them, and they from us. This long-form census scenario came up, and how they handle this kind of thing. Well, they don't do it any more in that country, I was told. They're a government that has a history and a succession, if you will, but they don't do it because they don't require to do it. There are other ways to collate that information and draw it together, and I think that within our Canadian context it's not a great deal different.

But that was the point. Actually, the individual sitting to my left—to my left on a political scale of things as well, from a centre-left party, if you will—was the one who remarked on this, and not in any negative way at all. She said they didn't need to do that: they collate, they gather, they collect that information without the need to do a long-form census submitted with questions like that. We had a quick little discussion on it, and it wasn't put down by her. She is in fact a member of the opposition and a member of a more left-leaning party, if you will.

Anyhow, I just offer that. I think we have to be very clear.

The other thing I have here is a request to Mr. Lessard.

Does he want to remove any references to statements relating to something said in the industry committee, or remarks made by the minister? Is he wanting that? It might have been made by a member opposite or by somebody in testimony here, maybe in a disparaging sense, in reference to the industry committee testimony. It might have been remarks made there or remarks by the minister. Is that what is meant to be removed as well?

Those things were actually said. They were germane and they were said right at this very committee. At some point, maybe in his earlier remarks, he would want to respond to us and to the analyst and clerk on whether he wants those references removed. There were a few of those remarks made by people in the witness chair or by members opposite. They were somewhat disparaging remarks, possibly; nevertheless, are they to be removed as well by our analysts and clerk in their redrafting of the report?

• (1135)

The Chair: Mr. Lessard, you're next on the speaking list.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Lessard: Thank you, Madam Chair.

The way in which you and Mr. Vellacott are using my comments is shocking and completely out of place, in my opinion. At no time did I question the quality of the work done by the team of writers and analysts who support us here. They know how much I respect them.

I believe Mr. Komarnicki accurately summarized Mr. Martin's position with respect to what he told us in December. It was not Mr. Martin's intention to support this motion, which would have us use a report from another committee. That is what that motion proposes that we do.

This is not a question of interpretation on our part. That is what Mr. Martin realized when he told us in December that he had changed his mind, because of the way this motion was going to be used. We had understood the intent, and so had the Liberals. And the reason we voted against it was precisely because we were concerned about how it would be used.

Now, when I say that Mr. Martin accidentally voted in favour of the motion, that may not be the correct way of putting it, Madam Chair. I go back to the explanation given by Mr. Komarnicki, who believes that he changed his mind after realizing there was another intent behind the motion. That is possible.

Furthermore, Madam Chair, there is no need to lecture us as you did earlier, or to say that this is not a kindergarten. You gave the same lecture to Ms. Folco before the holidays. Now you have just repeated it for my sake. We are all adults here. There is no need to treat us in that manner, Madam Chair.

In terms of pointing out to me that a term may not be appropriate, I can accept that because it happens from time to time that the correct term is not used. I accept that and I think it is perfectly appropriate to make that point.

The real issue is whether the long-form census is a useful, indeed critical, tool for the people and organizations that use it. And the answer is yes, it is, according to all the testimony we heard.

If the Conservatives want to try and find contrary testimony somewhere else, then they themselves can refer to that contrary testimony presented elsewhere. However, that is not what we heard here. We must preserve the authenticity of our work, by relying on what we heard here.

• (1140)

[*English*]

The Chair: Madam Minna, you're on the speaking list.

Hon. Maria Minna (Beaches—East York, Lib.): Thank you, Madam Chair.

I want to make two points.

First, we can take apart the meaning of the previous motion, but to me the word “table” means that you table; you don't integrate into the whole report. Tables can be considered as appendages, but not integrated as into the report. We're all interpreting it differently. We're saying that's how we're interpreting it. It's not revisiting or changing; we're saying that's what it should be.

Second, I think if we were—

The Chair: There's a point of order.

Mr. Maurice Vellacott: I think very clearly the word is “considered”. I don't see—

Hon. Maria Minna: There's also “tabled” in the motion. It says both. There are two words in the motion.

The Chair: Madam Minna is talking about “tabled” at this point.

Mr. Maurice Vellacott: Actually, “tabled” is not part of the motion at all.

Hon. Maria Minna: That's what Mr. Komarnicki just read.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: I read, “to be tabled and considered”.

The Chair: Okay.

Hon. Maria Minna: “Table” does not mean integrate, and the two are together: “table and consider”. It's table, attach, and give it in. It's not to integrate it make it part of our work. That would actually imbalance it.

With all due respect—and I said this the last time—even at that, the quotes integrated in the report are 90% from industry, as opposed to status of women, to give it that kind of slant. Besides that, we're saying that's not what we meant and not how we interpreted the motion. It's table and consider, attach, and move on.

If we are being honest with ourselves, we now need to go past this point. I do not want to see material that was not part of our work integrated into the report to give the report a slant different from what it had or different from what I intended it to have, or that it had as a result of the witnesses who came before us.

Obviously it is in the interest of Mr. Komarnicki and his colleagues to have it in, because that's the slant they want to give the report. That's fine. That's part of what we are about. That's part of politics and who we are. I'm just saying that the motion does not say that and I do not support the report as it is. I will be supporting Mr. Lessard's motion.

I think we need to come to grips with this and move on.

The Chair: Thank you, Madam Minna.

Go ahead, Ms. Davies.

Ms. Libby Davies (Vancouver East, NDP): I'll be very brief, because obviously I wasn't here, so I don't know all the background.

Tony is not here today, obviously, so I'm subbing in for him, but I have been talking to him over email. I think first of all that there are issues about Tony and what he did or didn't do. The chair or others might want to actually speak to Tony at some other time. You certainly should do that.

My understanding is that he originally understood the motion was to append the other committee's report and not actually put it as part of your report. That was clearly his understanding, so if he were here today, he would be supporting Monsieur Lessard's motion, and I will be as well, even though I wasn't there. That's my understanding of where Tony is at, and so he would have been voting that way today.

The Chair: Thank you, Madame Davies.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: I have a point of order, perhaps. I'm not sure if it's a point of order, but that's not what Mr. Lessard's motion says. It actually would not append. His motion is to basically excise it.

Ms. Libby Davies: I understand Monsieur Lessard's motion.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: If you're agreeing with his motion, it's different from what you're saying it is.

Ms. Libby Davies: No, I understand Monsieur Lessard's motion. Thank you.

The Chair: Okay, thank you.

Madame Folco, go ahead.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Raymonde Folco (Laval—Les Îles, Lib.): It seems to me that two proposals have been made, other than the original motion brought forward by Mr. Lessard. The proposals made by Mr. Savage and Mr. Komarnicki are very similar. I see the beginning of a possible compromise that might allow us to move this forward more quickly.

I note that when these options were presented by Mr. Komarnicki and Mr. Savage, the other committee members did not react. I'm wondering whether we could possibly come back to these similar options and try to find a compromise.

The suggestion made earlier by Mr. Komarnicki was to vote against Mr. Lessard's motion in order to then excise — that was the word use — or remove those paragraphs or quotations that currently appear in the report and which are not acceptable to at least part of the committee. We could proceed in that fashion, or we could do the reverse — in other words, begin by deleting those paragraphs.

There is a problem that became apparent in Mr. Vellacott's comments. If the members agreed, we could begin that first exercise, which is to delete the paragraphs. If the report then reflects the content that members feel is suitable, we could come to Mr. Lessard's motion, which would then be null and void. I believe Mr. Lessard would even agree that it would be null and void at that point, since the offending paragraphs would have been excised.

Can we take a few minutes to discuss that option, Madam Chair?

• (1145)

[*English*]

The Chair: Are you proposing a friendly amendment?

Ms. Raymonde Folco: Yes, I am, I guess. Yes, I am. He told me it would be all right.

The Chair: Is Mr. Lessard open to a friendly amendment?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Lessard: It's a question of principle, Madam Chair; I'm against excision.

A voice: There is the word that was used.

Mr. Yves Lessard: That could be an avenue, Madam Chair. If everyone agrees, it might be a way to move this forward. We will see as we go along what we want to incorporate into the report. But we don't want to end up with a motion, at every paragraph, saying that there should be a reference made to another committee. It has to be relevant.

I'd like to put this question to Ms. Folco, because she has been a committee chair and has seen lots of different things. I'm not sure whether doing this would actually speed up the process. If she is convinced it will, I am prepared to go along with it because I would like to move this forward.

[*English*]

The Chair: Chantal is telling me that there probably would be some problem in just taking things out, because then other paragraphs would have to be adjusted and changed. I think what you're talking about, though, is going through the report as it is and, as we normally do, taking out things that you don't like. It would mean, then—

Ms. Raymonde Folco: We would be adjusting what needs to be adjusted.

The Chair: Right.

It would mean, though, that you wouldn't support this motion. Is that what you're suggesting?

Ms. Raymonde Folco: I'm just following Mr. Komarnicki's suggestion, really. It's pretty well the same; I don't see a very big difference. It is that Chantal and her colleague go through it, look at what has come out of the other committees, take it out, adjust it in terms of that, and refer it back to this committee. Then this committee could decide whether this is or is not the report they want.

The Chair: I don't think that's what Mr. Komarnicki was—

Ms. Raymonde Folco: Oh, did I misunderstand?

The Chair: I think Mr. Komarnicki was suggesting that we go through the report as we normally would, as it's written, and that we as a committee would vote on the things we want taken out. This would mean, then, that you would not be supporting this motion.

Ms. Raymonde Folco: Well, no, actually—

The Chair: Okay.

Ms. Raymonde Folco: I don't have a problem with that, because I think the principle is the same whether the committee does it or the research team does it. Of course, if the committee does it, I can see a lot of problems, but I'm not against the idea per se.

The Chair: Okay. If that is the understanding, then I think maybe you need to indicate that you will not be supporting this motion; you would prefer to go through the report and take out things you don't want as you go along.

Is that what you're saying, Madam Folco?

Ms. Raymonde Folco: Yes, but I would like to see it *en deux temps*, as we say in French; that is, the first thing done would be to work on the report. Then, if everyone is satisfied, I would not support the motion. I think Mr. Lessard seems to understand that.

• (1150)

The Chair: The motion is already tabled. I mean, we're already dealing with it.

Ms. Raymonde Folco: Well, it's tabled, but we can put it aside for the time being.

The Chair: Do you know what I'll do? I'll continue with the speaking list, and we'll see what the feedback is on that.

Mr. Savage, you're next.

Mr. Michael Savage: Thank you.

My first comment is just for reference to my friend Mr. Vellacott, who spoke about the fact that there needed to be some balance in the report.

It's not for committee members to determine the balance; it's for us to listen to what we hear. It's what people come to talk to us about that should be in our report. It's not for us to put our personal views in, in order to balance anything. That's not what a committee does.

Anybody could have been invited to be a witness. Minister Clement could have come as a witness. Anybody could have been invited by any member to be a committee witness and bring that point of view forward.

I made this suggestion probably 45 minutes ago, which I think Madame Folco and Mr. Komarnicki have followed up a little.

To be clear, I don't think it makes sense, although I'm not totally against it, but my preference would not be that we go through the report and vote on taking out things that aren't appropriate in it, because there's language before and after all those things that is then going to have to be changed. We have perfectly good writers and researchers who could take this report back, if this were the determination of the committee, and just reflect what we heard at committee. Then we could append the other two documents, meaning the evidence from the industry committee and the status of women committee. It would all be included in the report, but it wouldn't be the "virus", as Mr. Lessard so accurately referred to it, of

taking evidence that had nothing to do with our study and putting it in the middle of our study.

Again, just to remind people, the reason we did this study in this committee is in many ways different from the reason people in the industry committee or other committees might look at it. The purpose of this, and the original wording of the motion I brought forward to the committee, was specific to the people who are affected by the decisions of this committee and this department. That's why it's so important that we not take other evidence, particularly evidence brought forward in a disproportionate way from other committees, and put it in the middle of our committee report.

I know we're discussing a motion, but Mr. Komarnicki—you can give me a nod or shake your head—would you be okay with our asking the writers of the report to go back and take out any references from other committees and then append both of those entire studies to the back of our report?

Thank you, Chair.

The Chair: Is that something you'd agree with?

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: Do you want my response?

The Chair: Yes. Before we go on, let's just hear whether you would support that approach.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: Okay. First of all, when one decides what witnesses are called or not—for instance, Minister Clement—if you're going to include their testimony, examination, and cross-examination—make it part of your report and consider it. You don't need to call them again. You could, but you wouldn't need to.

We had, I think, two meetings set aside for this, with the majority of witnesses being called from Mr. Savage's perspective on the point he wished to make. The same witnesses who were called before the industry committee could have been called here, if we had wanted to do another meeting or two; we could have called them, but we didn't. When you take everything into context, to say now that we'll just excise the negative part, as far as you're concerned, because it was heard somewhere else, and Mr. Clement could have been called, but wasn't.... There was a reason all of that happened, so consider that.

Two, when we consider the question of the analysts' doing another report, they need to have some idea and instruction as to what this committee—

The Chair: Yes, they would need another motion to do anything different—

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: —but, going a little further, they would need instruction as to what this committee considers should be in or shouldn't be in.

I for one had specifically understood that we would be relying on the evidence that was before the other committee and would use that evidence with respect to the examination and cross-examination of other witnesses—the Ipsos Reid comments and reports, the comments of the health minister from Saskatchewan or Alberta—with respect to the integration back and forth.

Having done that, it would be difficult for the analysts to go back and excise everything that has reference to the previous committee, because it's not that simple. There has been use of it in this committee, and we would have to go through this report and say what should be in and what should be out. Obviously, anything I examined on or cross-examined on with the witnesses is totally pertinent and relevant and is evidence and should not be excised. How the analysts deal with that, I don't know.

I'm saying that it's not a simple matter. I'm in agreement that we could delay Mr. Lessard's motion, because that seems reasonable, and that we go back to the report and have a good, wholesome debate about what should be in and what should not be in. Then the analysts would have a basis upon which to bring a final draft before us, I would say.

• (1155)

The Chair: Okay.

Madam Block, you're next on the list.

Mrs. Kelly Block (Saskatoon—Rosetown—Biggar, CPC): Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

I'm really pleased to be here today. While I wasn't a member of the committee in December, I believe I subbed and was here for the previous discussion on the motion.

I don't want to challenge the member's position regarding including only what was heard at committee meetings, but rather would encourage the committee to consider that it is not unusual, in my experience, to refer to, include, consider, or append other reports as part of a study.

My case in point would be my very recent experience on the ethics committee. As we were reviewing access to information legislation as well as privacy legislation, I believe it was Madame Freeman who brought forward a motion that we consider almost every other study that had been done previous to our study on the access to information legislation. I perhaps need to go back to check that I'm remembering correctly, but my point is simply to say that I don't think it's unusual to consider other reports when considering a study or writing a report on a certain issue.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Komarnicki, you were on, but you....

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: I'm done.

The Chair: Okay.

Go ahead, Mr. Lessard.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Lessard: First of all, I would like to welcome Ms. Block to the committee and tell her that she has a very nice family name.

Ms. Raymonde Folco: It's in English, as you may have noticed, Mr. Lessard.

Mr. Yves Lessard: Mr. Komarnicki's arguments have convinced me not to amend my motion. Together we very briefly examined the suggestion made by Ms. Folco. Even if we were to engage in that exercise, we would ultimately end up in exactly the same position for the following reason. Mr. Komarnicki's motion talks about incorporating reports. Even if we went through this clause by clause, we would still have to dispose of this motion. I don't believe there is any way around this other than to actually rescind the motion passed on November 23rd. We must protect the authenticity of our work, which is based on what we heard, what was presented to us — including the briefs — and carry out a proper analysis.

A little earlier, I talked about a virus, in the sense that we must preserve the authenticity of our work. Otherwise, we will compromise that authenticity. It would colour our conclusions in a way that does not reflect what we took from the testimony and briefs we received. I think that would create a dangerous precedent. I understand that it is possible, on occasion, to include references to other briefs, when those references are relevant to what we have heard, but that is not the case here. We are therefore going to leave our motion on the floor and are asking all our colleagues to support it, so that we can finally work on things we have heard and have been asked to deal with, rather than issues assigned to other committees.

[English]

The Chair: Go ahead, Madam Minna.

Hon. Maria Minna: What I was going to say a few minutes ago doesn't matter any more, but I just wanted to say that at many other committees I've been at, we have considered other reports, and the committee then decides if and when to integrate anything, if they choose to or not. In this case it was done by a motion, so there was a certain interpretation given to it. I don't interpret it that way. For me, "table and consider" means that we would consider whether we wanted to. We'd have discussed it, but we didn't; we just integrated it immediately and that's unfortunate. Now we're saying that it's not what we meant. We want it out.

I'd like us to go on with other work. I don't see any real change among my colleagues, unless I'm wrong, but certainly I haven't changed my mind. I can only speak for myself, but I think we need to move on, Madam Chair. Otherwise we'll be spending the whole of this meeting on this issue, and then probably the next several meetings.

• (1200)

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Komarnicki.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: I have to address that point. It is so critical and important that it's not for ulterior motives that we've extended this thing, because it is that important.

What you're saying is in essence correct. Other committees do consider reports and append them. What Mr. Lessard's motion says is not that. His motion says to take out all reference to it and to take that report and not append it, not add it, and treat it as if it were not there. That's the motion you're thinking of supporting. That motion is contrary to everything you believe in. It's contrary to everything you know to be true at other committees. If you support that motion, you are going against that principle. It's a very important principle that we've seen time and time again, and one we will see again.

You cannot support that motion if you believe what you're saying to be true.

Hon. Maria Minna: If I could...?

The Chair: Go ahead.

Hon. Maria Minna: Mr. Komarnicki, that's only happening partly because you are refusing to agree to change the motion to say we would append. If you disagree to append and insist on integrating, then that's where we're at.

If Mr. Lessard wants to add "append", as opposed to—

The Chair: I've just been advised that we can't append it, because this is a motion to revoke. Is that correct?

I'm being told it is.

Hon. Maria Minna: Are you saying it's a motion to revoke the previous motion?

The Chair: That's right, so it implies that nothing is appended. It would have to be a brand new motion.

I'm clear on the advice the clerk is giving me.

Mr. Michael Savage: If it's in Mr. Komarnicki's interest, I would be prepared, after this motion has passed, to bring forward another motion suggesting the other committee reports be appended to our report. They would be included with our report, but appended—noted separately—so that people could see what was evidence here, and then what was evidence at other committees.

I think that was the nature of what Mr. Martin wanted in the first place.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: They're inconsistent.

Ms. Libby Davies: They're two separate motions.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: It doesn't matter. You can't have contrary motions.

The Chair: Okay, I could explain why we can't append this one.

Because Mr. Lessard's motion changes an earlier motion, if we now append it, it changes the actual intent of the motion. What we could do is...there are two options, if there is some agreement. First of all, Mr. Lessard could, with unanimous consent, withdraw this motion, and you could introduce a new one that hopefully you would all agree on; if not, we could vote on it. You need unanimous consent to withdraw it if he wishes to do so. If he doesn't, then we would have to vote on it and then, depending on that result, have a brand new motion.

Those are the options.

Mr. Lessard, what are your thoughts?

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Lessard: Madam Chair, we are putting the cart before the horse, in a way. I think the first step is to pass my motion. As you said, it disposes of the motion passed on November 2 in a different manner.

If we believe there is a need to append other reports to our own, we can assess that at the end. For the time being, it's important, in order for our writers to have clear instructions, that we not incorporate these other reports into our own. In order to make that happen, the motion passed on November 2 must be rescinded.

Once that has been done, we can go back to dealing with the work associated with drafting the report, without incorporating the other reports. At the end, once we have evaluated our work as a whole, as well as our conclusions, we can determine whether or not it would be relevant to append the other reports.

It is possible that we may decide to support that idea, but we can determine the relevance of doing that when the time comes. For now, the important thing is to pass my motion. That will give very clear instructions to our writers and will not compromise our ability to append the other reports, if we feel it is necessary subsequently.

• (1205)

[English]

The Chair: All right.

Mr. Lessard is not going to be withdrawing his motion, and therefore we will be voting on it.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Lessard: Madam Chair, I would like a recorded vote.

[English]

The Chair: All right.

(Motion agreed to: yeas 6; nays 5)

The Chair: The motion passes.

Go ahead, Mr. Savage.

Mr. Michael Savage: May I ask for unanimous consent, then, to bring forward a motion that the other reports from other committees on the long-form census be appended to the back of this report? We still have to work out the language.

The Chair: I will see first of all if you have unanimous consent to present a motion. I think that because it pertains to the business in hand, you wouldn't need 48 hours' notice. I think everyone is in agreement that Mr. Savage can now present a motion.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: He doesn't need that.

The Chair: He doesn't need it because it's pertaining to this.

Chantal mentioned that direction would be needed if it pertained to the reports of other committees and/or the testimony, so could you, in your motion, clarify whether you're speaking just about reports or about reports and testimony?

You're indicating it's just reports. All right.

Let's take a moment so that we can look at what motion we're dealing with, and then we can discuss it.

Ms. Raymonde Folco: Madam Chair, could I suggest a few minutes for us to get some food?

The Chair: Sure. Why don't we just suspend for a moment?

- _____ (Pause) _____
-
- (1220)

The Chair: We're ready to resume.

We have a motion that Mr. Savage is moving. The motion reads as follows:

That the Reports of the other committees which are tabled with regard to the impact of the changes to the long form census be appended to the final report of the HUMA Committee.

I'll explain that we had to put "which are tabled". Actually, there are no reports currently tabled; technically, we have no reports right now to append, so we have to say "reports...which are tabled" at the time when we adopt our report on the impact of the long-form census. Mr. Savage has been made aware of this, but I want to make sure you all know about it as well.

We have a motion on the table.

Go ahead, Mr. Savage.

Mr. Michael Savage: So as to avoid any confusion about this motion down the road, by "committees", we're talking about House of Commons committees.

As for "appended", can the clerk just indicate what "appended" means, since we've had probably about six hours' discussion of what "considered" means? Can you explain to the committee what "appended" means?

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Travis Ladouceur): If I understand your question correctly, Mr. Savage, you're referring to the precise meaning of the word "appended" in the course of this particular motion. It basically means that this particular motion, once adopted, will render it important that reports that have been submitted by other committees of the House with regard to the long-form census issue be appended in their integral form, as they have been presented to the House, at the end of the report. Appending any documentation to a report of the House of Commons basically implies that it's done at the end of the process, so it would be done once all paragraphs and all recommendations have been agreed upon by the committee. "Appended" in this particular case refers to, more specifically, the report of the status of women committee, which I believe is currently working on a report pertaining to this particular issue.

Mr. Michael Savage: The intent here is that our report not be held up waiting for any other reports. It just means those reports that have been tabled by the time we are ready to do ours.

The Clerk: Once the committee on human resources decides to table the report, if other reports on this issue have been tabled by that particular time, they will be appended to the committee's report.

Mr. Michael Savage: Thank you, Chair. I appreciate the staff's assistance. Thank you very much.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Komarnicki.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: For whatever it's worth, to be "appended" is certainly clear in its intention. It's not to be tabled and considered, as was in the first motion, which has been rescinded. If all of the other committees are going to file their reports in the House, as they will, we will then duplicate the filing by appending the reports but not considering them, which in my mind defies a certain amount of logic. If the sole purpose is to add a piece of paper to the report, a piece of paper that's already going to be tabled in the House and filed by another committee, it doesn't achieve very much, and that's where we've come to. It points out with particular clarity what was intended in the first motion and why this one is contrary to it, and lacking.

The other interesting thing is that it comes after people have relied on the first motion, which I've always maintained, and conducted themselves accordingly, and that's most unfortunate.

- (1225)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Komarnicki.

We will now vote on the motion before us.

Go ahead, Mr. Lessard.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Lessard: Madam Chair, we are going to amend this motion for the reasons cited by Mr. Komarnicki. It is surprising to hear him express a concern about the environment. As a general rule, the Conservatives are not particularly focussed on the environment. But, in this case, I tend to agree with him.

Madam Chair, I think this would be applicable. We are in the electronic era. We also want to avoid repetition, particularly in writing. We are therefore in favour of an amendment whereby there would be a reference in the appendix to the work done by other committees on the long-form census. The reports would be identified by including electronic references, so that people could then go and consult the reports. That way, people would be free to go and look at what was said. Furthermore, we would avoid a duplicate printing of reports that are already printed—

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Lessard, are you moving an amendment? If you are—

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Lessard: Yes.

[English]

The Chair: Can you please write out that amendment for us so that we know what it is? We'll have to discuss the amendment and vote on it, so we'll give you a moment to write out that amendment.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Lessard: Certainly. Thank you.

Could we suspend the meeting for a few minutes to give me time to put the amendment in writing?

[English]

The Chair: Yes, we'll suspend for a moment so that you can write it down. Thank you.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Lessard: Perfect.

• (1235)

[English]

The Chair: We're going to resume the meeting.

Mr. Lessard, if your amendment is ready, we can consider it. If not, then we will continue with discussion, but if there are further amendments, they would take precedence over yours. Is your amendment ready, Mr. Lessard?

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Lessard: Yes.

[English]

The Chair: All right. Would you please read it?

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Lessard: Madam Chair, just to be sure my amendment is well understood, I would like to read Mr. Savage's motion:

« That the reports of other committees which are tabled with regard to the impact of the changes to the long-form census [...] ». Here we would include the words: « be mentioned as a reference in the final report of the HUMA Committee ». We would therefore replace « be appended » with « be mentioned as a reference ».

[English]

The Chair: Okay. We just need to understand the motion, then, so that we can discuss your amendment in context. It will read, "That the reports of the other committees which are tabled with regard to the impact of the changes of the long-form census be mentioned as a reference in the final report of the HUMA committee."

Basically, you want to change "be appended" to "be mentioned as a reference".

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Lessard: Yes.

[English]

The Chair: It took quite a long time to get that one together.

Now, I understand you're proposing this not as a friendly amendment, but as an amendment to be discussed, so at this point we will discuss the amendment. Instead of "be appended", it would say, "be mentioned as a reference".

Here's the trouble: our analyst is mentioning that "to be mentioned" is not clear. Is it "to be mentioned in the report", or is it "to be mentioned and appended to the report"? We need clarification. I'm sorry, but that amendment is not clear enough.

• (1240)

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Lessard: All right. The idea is to mention that people interested in finding out more about the work carried out by other committees have an opportunity to do that. To that end, there would be links provided. This would be in the appendix. It's clearer that way, Madam Chair.

[English]

The Chair: Chantal is going to tell you *en français*.

[Translation]

Ms. Chantal Collin (Committee Researcher): Mr. Lessard, it would have to read as follows: « be mentioned as a reference in the appendix to the final report of the HUMA Committee ».

Mr. Yves Lessard: I agree with you. It's even clearer that way.

[English]

The Chair: So you're changing your amendment?

Mr. Lessard, if you're changing your amendment, you either need unanimous consent or you need to withdraw your amendment and then reintroduce it. You have now changed your amendment. We could get unanimous consent.

Do we have unanimous consent to change his amendment?

Hon. Maria Minna: Could you read it again?

The Chair: The amendment that he introduced would have the motion read as follows: "That the reports of the other committees which are tabled with regard to the impact of the changes to the long-form census be mentioned as a reference in the final report of the HUMA committee".

Hon. Maria Minna: Can I say something about it?

The Chair: Sorry, but I need to deal with this first. Mr. Lessard, you are changing your amendment. You need unanimous consent to do so, or you need to withdraw your amendment and reintroduce it with those changes.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Lessard: Madam Chair, I think it would be simpler for you if I just changed the wording. Therefore, I will withdraw my amendment and redraft it based on the suggestion made by Ms. Collin, so that it is clearer. The working would therefore be: « be mentioned as a reference in the appendix to the report of the HUMA Committee ».

[English]

The Chair: Thank you very much for that, Mr. Lessard.

All right. Now we can discuss—

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Lessard: I would just like to clarify one thing, Madam Chair.

The rest of Mr. Savage's motion stays the same. We would just be replacing the word « appended » with what I just read out to you.

[English]

The Chair: What I'll do, Mr. Lessard, is read the motion with your amendment, and then you can let me know if it is as you want it to read.

It now reads as follows: "That the reports of the other committee which aren't tabled with regard to the impact of the changes to the long form census be mentioned as a reference in an annex to the final report of the HUMA committee".

So the change would be that instead of saying, “be appended”, it would say, “be mentioned as a reference in an annex”.

Ms. Chantal Collin: That would be “in an appendix”. We’re just going to create an appendix—

The Chair: You’ll have to ask Mr. Lessard.

Ms. Chantal Collin: —and mention that there were two other studies—

The Chair: Okay, so that’s our amendment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Lessard: When you were reading it, I think you neglected to follow the exact wording in Mr. Savage’s motion, which was: « That the reports of other committees which are tabled with regard to the impact of changes to the long-form census be appended to the final report of the HUMA Committee ».

[*English*]

The Chair: Mr. Lessard, I did read the motion as Mr. Savage presented it. I did. Now we’re discussing your amendment.

Go ahead, Mr. Savage.

• (1245)

Mr. Michael Savage: Here we are.

The Chair: Here we are, and pleased with ourselves, I hope.

Mr. Michael Savage: I’m inclined not to support Mr. Lessard’s... whatever it is. Is it an amendment or a motion or a subamendment?

I think what we did was absolutely correct this morning when we supported Mr. Lessard’s motion as we did. Then, in an effort to try to bring many voices around this table together, I suggested we should append the other studies, which I think makes sense. Very importantly to me, I think it reflects what Mr. Martin intended when he voted back in December or November to consider the other reports.

I’m sorry we are where we are. I’m sorry we can’t just move beyond this and get this done, but my inclination at this point would be not to support Mr. Lessard’s amendment. I’m hoping most of us around the table can support the idea of just appending the report, which I think makes sense. Hopefully we can get this done and move on to Bill C-304 and Madam Folco’s bill and some other important work that’s ahead of us.

The Chair: All right. Is there any other comment?

Go ahead, Mr. Komarnicki.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: I have a question to Mr. Lessard. Does the way his motion reads mean that you could not make a report to the House until the other reports were done?

The Chair: No. We could make our report, and once the other reports are tabled, they would be appended to our report.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: Do you mean we would do it in two stages?

The Chair: No, it would be done in one, but we couldn’t—

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: You would refer to a report that doesn’t yet exist?

The Chair: No, we wouldn’t, but then we would maybe have to hold up the....

What’s the timeframe? We have a timeframe problem, because we’re going to be sitting on this report.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: If you mention something, it has to exist. I mean, it’s not complicated, Michael. If you’re referencing something, it has to exist, so you’ll have to hold this report until it exists.

Mr. Michael Savage: No, no. I made that clear.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: No, but his motion—

Mr. Maurice Vellacott: Yours is clear, but his is not.

Mr. Michael Savage: I can’t answer for that.

The Chair: To answer your question, Mr. Komarnicki, we will not be holding up our report based on whatever may or may not be tabled by other committees in the House of Commons. Whatever we decide, once we complete our long-form census report and are ready to table it, we will append whatever has been tabled already. If for some reason there are not any other reports tabled, then they won’t be appended.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: With deference to whoever is making those decisions, I don’t understand Mr. Lessard’s motion to read that way. If you read his motion, it says that those reports need to be referenced in an appendix. Until they exist, they can’t be referenced in an appendix, nor can you proceed without them, in my view.

The Chair: I see.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: Mr. Savage’s motion is different, but Mr. Lessard’s motion is very inconsistent. They are different motions, totally.

Ms. Raymonde Folco: Totally.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: If you’re going to support Mr. Lessard’s motion, you need to know that you have to wait for the other reports to come in.

Mr. Maurice Vellacott: Mike’s doesn’t necessarily assume other reports, but his does.

The Chair: Right. Yes, we’re on our amendment, so we’ll just wait.

Go ahead, Mr. Lessard.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Lessard: Madam Chair, I was careful to indicate it every time I was using exactly the same wording as our colleague, Mr. Savage. It’s important to take the time to read the beginning. Unless I don’t have the same wording in French, which I doubt, it reads as follows:

[...] the reports of other committees which are tabled with regard to the impact of the changes to the long-form census [...] be mentioned in an appendix to the final report of the committee.

So, when we produce our report, we will append the reports of other committees to complement what we have done. I don't know whether someone attributes a different meaning to those words, but that is what it says. I certainly don't give them any other meaning. I'm basing myself on exactly what Mr. Savage said.

Rather than relying on a paper copy of all this, we would create a reference, so that people are able to access the studies done in other committees. I don't think it could be any clearer than that, unless we want to complicate things.

• (1250)

[English]

The Chair: Can we vote on the amendment? Are we ready to vote on Mr. Lessard's amendment?

All those in favour of the—

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Lessard: Madam Chair, I would like a recorded vote.

[English]

The Chair: Do you want a recorded vote again? All right. We will have a recorded vote on the amendment of Mr. Lessard.

(Amendment negatived: nays 9; yeas 2)

The Chair: The amendment is not accepted.

We are now dealing with the motion as it was presented by Mr. Savage.

Is there any discussion on the motion?

Go ahead, Monsieur Lessard.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Lessard: I would just like to issue a reminder to our Liberal colleagues, and particularly Mr. Savage, who tabled the motion.

Does this mean there would be a paper copy of each of the reports appended to the committee report? If that's the case, I would respectfully submit that this is contrary to the commitments made by each of the parties with respect to new environmental policies. That includes the use of paper. Including references is extremely easy to do using new technologies.

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Monsieur Lessard, about an hour ago, if I understand the translation correctly, you chastised me. I'm sure that's not what you meant to do, but you didn't want me to treat anyone here like a child, and I really apologize if I have ever done that.

We are right now, I believe, splitting hairs on whether this is going to be a paper copy or an electronic copy. When we discuss appending, we've never had to deal with this.

Again, Monsieur Lessard, you have the right to speak, as I have the right to speak. I will give you the right to continue in this line, but I do think it's splitting hairs. I think it's beyond what all of us would like to accomplish.

Thank you, Mr. Lessard.

Who's next on this?

Ms. Raymonde Folco: I have a point of order.

The Chair: I might be missing translation.

Ms. Raymonde Folco: I don't think the remarks that you refer to were made toward you. They were actually made toward Mr. Vellacott. I don't go through translation; those were the remarks that were made. They weren't made toward you, Madam Chair.

The Chair: He made remarks to me, but thank you for that, Madame Folco.

Did you have a question, Mr. Casson?

Hon. Rick Casson (Lethbridge, CPC): I'm calling for the question on the motion.

The Chair: All right, I'll call the question.

I don't think there was anyone else on the speaking list. Mr. Lessard did have his.... He's probably going to want to respond.

You did speak, Monsieur Lessard. Did you want to...?

There is no one else on the speaking list. We've been asked to call the question. There was no one else on the speaking list, so I'm now going to call the question.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Lessard: Yes, I asked for the floor.

[English]

The Chair: Sorry, not when he—

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Lessard: When you were talking, Madam Chair, I asked for the floor.

[English]

The Chair: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't see you, but Mr. Casson called the question.

I did not see you, so we are now going to call the question.

• (1255)

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Lessard: I will be very brief, Madam Chair.

[English]

The Chair: We're right in the middle of calling the question, so we'll do that.

Do I need to read the motion again?

Ms. Raymonde Folco: Yes, please.

The Chair: That the Reports of the other committees which are tabled with regard to the impact of the changes to the long form census be appended to the final report of the HUMA Committee.

Mr. Savage: May we have a recorded vote?

The Chair: That's a good idea, Mr. Savage. Let's have a recorded vote.

(Motion agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: We're at the end of our meeting.

For our next meeting, we have Bill C-304 scheduled. We have been told that it would take only an hour, so we'll see. We may continue with committee business.

The meeting is adjourned.

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:
Publishing and Depository Services
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5

*En cas de non-livraison,
retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :*
Les Éditions et Services de dépôt
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5

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

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Additional copies may be obtained from: Publishing and
Depository Services
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5
Telephone: 613-941-5995 or 1-800-635-7943
Fax: 613-954-5779 or 1-800-565-7757
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca
<http://publications.gc.ca>

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the
following address: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

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

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les
Éditions et Services de dépôt
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5
Téléphone : 613-941-5995 ou 1-800-635-7943
Télécopieur : 613-954-5779 ou 1-800-565-7757
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca
<http://publications.gc.ca>

Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à
l'adresse suivante : <http://www.parl.gc.ca>