



House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration

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

EVIDENCE

Thursday, November 15, 2007

—
Chair

Mr. Norman Doyle

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

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

Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration

Thursday, November 15, 2007

• (1535)

[*English*]

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Andrew Chaplin): Honourable members of the committee, I see a quorum.

We can now proceed to the election of a chair. I'm ready to receive motions to that end.

Mr. Telegdi.

Hon. Andrew Telegdi (Kitchener—Waterloo, Lib.): I move that Mr. Doyle be the chair.

An hon. member: I second that.

The Clerk: It has been moved by Mr. Telegdi that Mr. Doyle be elected as chair of the committee.

Are there any further motions?

(Motion agreed to)

The Clerk: I declare the motion carried and Mr. Doyle duly elected chair of the committee.

Before inviting Mr. Doyle to take the chair, if the committee wishes we will now proceed to the election of vice-chairs.

Mr. Batters.

Mr. Dave Batters (Palliser, CPC): I'd like to nominate Mr. Telegdi as a vice-chair of this committee, sir.

Hon. Jim Karygiannis (Scarborough—Agincourt, Lib.): I'll second that, Mr. Clerk.

The Clerk: It has been moved by Mr. Batters that Mr. Telegdi be elected as first vice-chair of the committee.

Are there any further motions?

Ms. Chow.

Ms. Olivia Chow (Trinity—Spadina, NDP): Yes, as second vice-chair, I move Meili Faille.

The Clerk: Could we deal with the first vice-chair?

Ms. Olivia Chow: Do them one at a time?

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Do you want a seconder to that motion?

The Clerk: Seconders are not required in committee.

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: No, for the motion for the vice-chair.

The Clerk: No.

The committee has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

(Motion agreed to)

The Clerk: I declare the motion carried and Mr. Telegdi duly elected first vice-chair of the committee.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

The Clerk: I am now prepared to receive motions for the election of the second vice-chair of the committee.

Monsieur Carrier.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Robert Carrier (Alfred-Pellan, BQ): I nominate Meili Faille.

The Clerk: It is moved by Mr. Carrier that Ms. Faille be elected second vice-chair of the committee.

Are there any further motions?

[*English*]

The committee has heard the terms of the motion. Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

[*Translation*]

(The motion is carried.)

The Clerk: I declare the motion carried and that Ms. Faille is duly elected second vice-chair of the committee.

[*English*]

I'd now invite Mr. Doyle to take the chair.

The Chair (Mr. Norman Doyle (St. John's East, CPC)): Well, thank you for the opportunity to serve as chair again. It's a pleasure. I think it's a pleasure—I'm not absolutely sure, but that will be determined by you.

I want to congratulate Andrew and Meili for their re-election.

I want to welcome the new clerk, Andrew Chaplin, and to thank him for acting as our clerk.

I believe we have some new members on the committee. I want to welcome to the committee the Honourable Maurizio Bevilacqua, who is the official opposition critic on the committee.

Is Colleen here? Is Colleen Beaumier on the committee? I think she is.

Robert Carrier is on the committee as well.

Olivia Chow is a new member, as is Wajid Khan.

Welcome, all of you, to our first meeting.

All we have on the agenda today is the election of a chair and the vice-chairs. I don't know if we have anyone who wishes to say anything before the meeting is officially adjourned until tomorrow.

I saw Mr. Karygiannis' hand up first. Mr. Karygiannis, then Madam Chow.

• (1540)

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Mr. Chair, I would seek unanimous consent that we follow the rules as we had them in the committee in the past, and if there are any new rules that we have to discuss that we should either bring them up today or bring them up at the next meeting.

However, since we've lost so much time, as we had an agenda—it was an aggressive agenda, and we lost all that time—I would say that we bring back everything we had before we rose in the summer and prorogued and that all our motions and all the work we have done should be brought forward again, and for us to have the steering committee come up with the agenda we had and to re-engage this committee so we can go on with our work.

The Chair: You've heard the motion. Do we have discussion on that motion, or is it something we could agree on? Is there any discussion on the motion?

First of all, before we have discussion on the motion, just to bring you up to date and to help Mr. Karygiannis here, we had a number of studies on the go.

Before we broke we had a motion adopted on May 1 to do a study on undocumented temporary foreign workers, including the point system. I believe the committee was going to travel on that. On June 19 the committee decided to travel to accommodate all the witnesses we were going to have coming forward on undocumented and temporary foreign workers. That was one that was on the floor.

We also had a motion adopted on May 29 for Iraqi refugees. That study didn't start as well. The committee decided to hear from organizational representatives about policy options rather than individual experiences, and we had over 160 individuals and organizations requesting to appear.

We also had a motion on June 7 for immigration consultants. That didn't start. The motion specified which witnesses. Several witnesses were requested to appear.

The most important one—I think you'd agree with me, Mr. Telegdi, in particular—was loss of Canadian citizenship. We had a draft report. Consideration of the draft report did not start.

So I guess the motion would be related to that, to bringing these back.

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Chair, I think we also had another motion about hearing Joe Taylor's.... We had given the department 30 days. Those 30 days are up, and we should have that material in our hands by now.

The Chair: The Taylor application and the related documents were requested from CIC and given to members, so the members would have that, I do believe.

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Do we have them? Are they available to us?

The Chair: Yes, they were given to us over the summer in the form of two CDs.

Did you get the CDs?

In the meantime, the motion is on the floor, and the call for discussion of the motion.

Ms. Chow, you are next.

Ms. Olivia Chow: I have a separate motion on a separate matter. I want to speak on this motion in front of us.

Wouldn't it make more sense for us to say yes, we adopt the rules of this committee? Then we establish a subcommittee where we would determine the upcoming agendas and the timing of all studies of all motions. I would think that the subcommittee would need to be established. Thirdly, we would then take all the items in front of us—because there are many—and set a timeline as to when we will deal with which issues. Some we have to discuss; others are just in the form of motions. And then let's do it systematically.

If we just say yes to all the things in the past, I am not sure if we are putting the horse before the cart, or vice versa.

• (1545)

The Chair: I think the motion that we're discussing right now... Correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Karygiannis, but the motion you put was to continue on with the agenda that we started just prior to leaving here. Right?

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Mr. Chair, I believe the committee should bring back all the motions that we had at the end and have the steering committee set a new plan on the aggressive travelling plan we had, in order to hear these motions. If I may add, Mr. Chair, to leave any motion or to drop anything of the work that we had done I think will be a slap in the face to the people we were working with, and a travesty.

The Chair: Yes.

Okay, I think Mr. Komarnicki is next on the list.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Not to get ahead of ourselves, I think it's fair to say we didn't complete the report on the lost Canadians, which is something we probably ought to do as a priority, but I do agree that it probably should go to the subcommittee to have a look at where we've gotten to. There has been some time intervening and some changes that have taken place. I know on the Joe Taylor one, for instance, a court decision has been rendered and it has come back.

We may, in light of the items we have here, want to have the committee look at the big picture to decide what would be feasible to do before the end of this term, before Christmas, and what should be moved over to the new year because it may involve a more extensive agenda.

Also, in terms of the rules of the last committee that we had, I think they worked quite well. We had a speaking order there that we finally settled on that I think was okay. But I know I had asked to be on the subcommittee setting the agenda, for a variety of reasons, and one of the motions we had proposed included that. So I would like the members opposite to consider that the parliamentary secretary be one of the parties to sit on the subcommittee in setting the agenda.

My view would be that today would not be the day to deal with bringing back the rules as we had them before or to talk about the agenda, except to say that we take today as being notice that we would deal with those issues on Tuesday. It would give us an opportunity to discuss these issues as between us and make a couple of amendments to our rules or not, and also strike a subcommittee that could deal with the variety of matters and that Tuesday be dedicated to that. And I would suggest that at that point we can start with the report we haven't completed but have put together on the lost Canadians.

The Chair: I think what we're dealing with—and again, correct me if I'm wrong—is not the routine motions that we will be discussing next week. We're dealing with the motion that came to us from Mr. Karygiannis that we continue on with the various studies and motions that have been adopted from the last session.

I would imagine that we'll deal with the routine motions at Tuesday's committee meeting, but I think it would require unanimous consent to go ahead with this particular motion that we have on the floor right now, the one that Mr. Karygiannis—

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: On a point of order, Mr. Chair, we need to get the routine motions set in place first before we deal with other motions, because that sort of sets the framework within which you—

The Chair: I see your point.

Mr. Karygiannis.

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: If I may, I believe I started as saying that on routine proceedings we should continue as we have, and if there are any difficulties, we can bring them up at the next meeting. That was part of my motion. I did say those words.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: That's what I thought you were saying, that we have the rules as they were—

• (1550)

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: And if there are any difficulties, that we discuss them at the next one—you can give us enough notice—but that we set the agenda to take it to the subcommittee in order for the steering committee to have the aggressive plan that we did. There are people out there waiting.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: I appreciate that, but I think we should settle the routine proceedings and strike the subcommittee on Tuesday and have them bring back what we should be looking at on a priority basis after we've had an opportunity to study what's there.

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Mr. Komarnicki, I hope it's the signal from the department that the department is serious about the work we were doing, and the steering committee certainly could be something we could discuss today, who's going to be on it, and should you be on it or not as the parliamentary secretary. But there are people out there who are looking at us, and this is the first meeting we've had, and we have to send a signal to these folks that

we are serious about the work we did and we want to continue in that fashion.

If we were to say that we're going to look at it at another time, I think we'd be sending a signal that certainly the ministry is not supporting the work we did and the government is not honouring the commitment from before the House prorogued.

The Chair: We're going to hear from Mr. Telegdi on this.

Hon. Andrew Telegdi: I think the clerk's office has probably phoned and made arrangements for the tour we're going to undertake.

The Chair: I think we should.

Hon. Andrew Telegdi: And I would imagine that would have been done.

I know I have received a number of calls, and I have suggested to a number of people the process that they undertake so that they can attend the tour that was going to take place across Canada. I'm sure members of the Conservative Party that were on the committee also let people know that the tour was coming. I know we tried to accommodate members of the committee as to what locales we were going to attend.

I think it's fairly important that we fulfill the expectations that we raised through this committee across the country, so I think we have to move expeditiously, given that we don't have a whole lot of time left. We've got a month, and then we go on break. Perhaps we can take the tour in January, as well, but I think it's important that we not disappoint the folks that were told we were going to do a fall tour.

The Chair: Okay.

Could you restate your motion, Mr. Karygiannis, so the clerk can get it on the record at least?

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: If I can paraphrase, Mr. Chairman, the way we went about it was that should there be any changes to our rules and regulations, the committee would take care of that in our next meeting, and people can give notice of what changes they want to make; that the committee immediately bring back to the agenda what we had before we prorogued, the items that we had; and that the steering committee engage and put an agenda in for us to fulfill those commitments we had before we left and the House prorogued.

The Chair: Okay, you have heard the motion. I won't dare try to repeat it.

Ms. Olivia Chow: A point of order.

The Chair: Is it to the motion?

Ms. Olivia Chow: Yes. So is this routine proceedings?

The Chair: Yes.

Ms. Olivia Chow: So this motion is in order, right?

The Chair: We don't have our routine motions in place yet, so this motion, as a consequence of that, would be in order.

Ms. Olivia Chow: I see. So all motions that are moved before routine proceedings do not require unanimous consent?

The Clerk: When there is no notice requirement established—

Ms. Olivia Chow: So this is not a routine procedure. Not that I'm necessarily against it. I just want to be clear.

The Clerk: When there's no routine motion in place, as is the case following a prorogation and the re-establishment of committees, until such time as the committee again adopts a motion to restrict notice in some way, unanimous consent is not required for the proposing of any motion.

Ms. Olivia Chow: So if I propose another motion two minutes later, it does not require unanimous consent?

The Chair: No, and she needs that.

Okay, let's deal with this motion first.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: Just a point or order, Mr. Chair, and maybe a clarification: can you bring a motion that's outside the specifics of the agenda? The agenda said we'd call this meeting for the specific purpose of choosing the chair, which we've done, and it's completed. Now, can we go beyond that without notice?

The Chair: Yes, this is the impression I'm getting from the clerk, that you can, given the fact that—

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: Well, there are two different questions, though.

The Chair: —we haven't put in place yet the rules for routine motions and what have you.

• (1555)

Hon. Andrew Telegdi: If I can be of service, Mr. Chair—

The Chair: Yes, somebody, please.

Hon. Andrew Telegdi: —I thought what Mr. Karygiannis proposed was that we adopt the routine that we had previous to—

The Chair: Yes, that's the motion.

Hon. Andrew Telegdi: So as soon as that passes, those rules apply.

Ms. Olivia Chow: No, that's not the motion that's in front of us.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: This motion was that we approve routine proceedings on Tuesday.

The Chair: The motion that Mr. Karygiannis put forward was to continue on with the agenda that we had established before prorogation, which included some of the items that I read out here a few minutes ago; that we would continue with these various studies; and that at Tuesday's meeting we would go to proposals for routine motions—

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: To see if there are any changes required.

The Chair: —if there are any changes required.

Hon. Andrew Telegdi: But then do we operate on the present one? Didn't you say that?

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Yes, and we—

Hon. Andrew Telegdi: So then we'd be adopting the present—

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Mr. Chair, if I may, it's very simple and doesn't require rocket science for us to understand this. Either every member of this committee supports the work that we have done up to

date and wants us to continue, or they don't. And if they don't, then let's have a recorded vote, and put your name out there, so people out there—

The Chair: I'm going to—

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Excuse me, Mr.—

The Chair: Since unanimous consent is not required on this, I'm going to call for the vote.

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: A recorded vote, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: A point of clarification, Mr. Chair, and perhaps the clerk can deal with it. Part of the motion deals with two separate things. It deals with bringing forward the routine motions from last time, which is one issue. Perhaps we should deal with that or not; we could argue that. The second motion deals with the second subject area of bringing—

The Chair: Proposals for routine motions.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: No, bringing forward the business from the last session. They're two things, because routine proceedings are different.

The Chair: No, I think the motion that Mr. Karygiannis put on the floor was to bring forward the motions we were dealing with at prorogation, which were the ones that I read out here, and that we would continue with those various studies.

Am I correct in saying that?

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Mr. Chair, as I said, it does not take rocket science. We had routine proceedings, and unless there are some big reasons why we need to change any of those routine proceedings—we can give notice and deal with this matter on Tuesday—the agenda that we had is for us to continue on that agenda and the steering committee to come up with a proposed travel plan, as we had set. Anything beyond that, sir, is sending a clear signal to the people with whom we are working, to the people who've come and want to be witnesses to this committee, that those individuals who are not supporting this motion are certainly not supporting the work that we have done to date.

The Chair: Mr. Batters.

Mr. Dave Batters: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Under the conditions of Mr. Karygiannis' motion, he starts by saying that we're going to adopt, for today, the routine proceedings that were in place before. That's what he said, that we're going to go today with the routine proceedings, speaking order, etc., that we had previously.

If we follow that logic, previously we had a notice of motion requirement of 48 hours. So if we assume that is what Mr. Karygiannis is saying, that we're going to keep the rules in place exactly as they were before, then in effect his second motion to bring back all the different matters before the House would require a 48-hour notice period, which we haven't received. The committee has not received that.

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Let me be more specific, if I may, Chair.

That we adopt the agenda that we had and the steering committee comes up with the plan for us to travel. And as far as routine proceedings are concerned, if there are any changes that we need to make, people can give us notice and we'll discuss them on Tuesday.

I couldn't be more clear, sir. Clear as a bell. We adopt the agenda, and anybody who does not want to give that signal out to the people who are listening to us, be it over the Internet or over the radio or watching the proceedings of this committee, it certainly does not inspire them about the work that we're doing.

Mr. Dave Batters: I'll respond to what Mr. Karygiannis said.

With due respect, sir, we have a number of new members to this committee. I'm a relatively new member to this committee, but we have brand-new members to this committee who really can't sit here today and make informed decisions to continue to study issues that were brought forth in the first session of the 39th Parliament, make informed decisions when they've sat in the chair for the very first time in what was to be a very simple meeting and elect a chair and a vice-chair and a second vice-chair.

We have brand-new members to this committee. Maybe I'm wrong, but I can speak for some of the members, I think, at this committee. They must be saying "I don't know what I'm signing up for here if I agree to study absolutely everything that was brought up in the last Parliament." I think I could say it of Ms. Chow and Mr. Carrier. They're brand-new members of the committee. Even your colleagues, Mr.—

• (1600)

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: No, it's not the same. With all due respect, when somebody's a parliamentarian, gets elected, and is going to go to a committee, it's up to him or her, as well as their whip, to examine what was done and make themselves familiar before coming in here. So I think due diligence was done by everybody. And yourself, sir, you were here last time and you—

The Chair: Order, please.

Please address the chair. It keeps it a whole lot more simple.

Andrew.

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Mr. Chair, put the question.

The Chair: I'm waiting on the clerk to get some advice on this, because I'm certainly at a loss myself to know what is the proper way to proceed. I'm depending on the clerk here to give us some advice on this.

Mr. Telegdi.

Hon. Andrew Telegdi: I think the way we should proceed is to adopt the procedures from the last time the committee was together—that doesn't take any particular reading on the matter—with the full understanding that operational procedures can be changed by the committee at any time. Therefore, we'll have operating procedures to go by, so we're not arguing that point. Therefore, that should be the first item of business.

Then I would suggest that from that we have a steering committee. That steering committee can then meet and go through some of this information, and it goes to all the new members as well. And I would

suggest that you, as the chair, convene that steering committee as quickly as possible, hopefully maybe Monday.

The Chair: Quite frankly, I don't see any problem with this at all, because we did these reports last time around and are in the middle of most of them. It was my understanding, rightly or wrongly, that we would probably pick up some if not all of these and continue, because we're right in the middle of all of them already, such as on the loss of Canadian citizenship.

I fail to see the controversy surrounding this, unless it's argument for the sake of argument. It seems to me we should be able to arrive at a conclusion at some kind of midway point on this, given the fact that we were all involved in these various studies and that we were in the middle of most of them and haven't had the chance to actually sit down and put to paper what should have been put to paper in the last Parliament, had it not been prorogued.

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Mr. Chair, may I withdraw part of my motion to make it clearer, then?

The Chair: I think we'll just wait on the clerk for a moment, and I'll go to Mr. Komarnicki to see whether we can get some resolution to this without getting into too much more debate on the thing.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: The clerk can certainly indicate whether we can get into routine motions or not today.

The Chair: It might be a good idea to wait on routine motions until Tuesday when we come back. But this particular...

Anyway, go ahead, Mr. Komarnicki.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: The other point is that there has to be some law or some regulation that says you can't tie two motions together into one motion. One is a routine motion, and it should be dealt with.

The Chair: I think this is what the clerk is trying to determine right now.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: Whether we deal with it today or the next day is another...

The second point deals with where this committee is to go. We're intending to strike a subcommittee, as Mr. Telegdi has said, to review what's happened. Time has passed, and other issues have arisen. It may be we end up studying the same thing we left off, and that may be fine. But it may not be, and that's why we have a subcommittee that needs to be established to determine this.

We shouldn't combine those two; there has to be something wrong with combining those two together. I think if we're going to deal with a motion, we should deal with routine proceedings. I don't think it's right to do so, but if we're going to, let's deal with it. Then, if we're going to strike a subcommittee, let's do that, and let them review this and come back to this committee. Then we can decide whether we're indeed going to be where we left off.

The Chair: I think we should do routine proceedings on Tuesday.

Is that what you're saying?

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Let me revisit the motion I made and drop off the routine proceedings.

The motion should read that this committee immediately bring back the agenda we had, and that every motion that was in there or every study we had on the table before we prorogued be brought back again, and that the steering committee immediately engage in the plan for us to execute that.

• (1605)

The Chair: Would that be sufficient? Then the steering committee would engage in a plan as to how these studies should be put in place, whether it's—

Ms. Olivia Chow: Mr. Chairman, is the motion just to adopt routine proceedings? If so, can't we have a motion just to adopt routine proceedings? Isn't that the first order of the day?

The Chair: No, we are not dealing with routine proceedings. That's not on the agenda, in any event. What we are dealing with is the motion that was put forward by Mr. Karygiannis to pick up the various studies that were done the last time around.

Ms. Olivia Chow: Mr. Chairman, just on a point of order, are you allowing this motion to stand?

The Chair: Yes.

Ms. Olivia Chow: So in about 30 seconds, I will move another motion that does not require unanimous consent, because any motion can stand, basically, right?

The Chair: That would be the case, if we haven't adopted routine proceedings.

Ms. Olivia Chow: So am I the speaker immediately after Mr. Karygiannis?

The Chair: I will recognize you at that time.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: I think the clerk needs to rule whether we can do any other business before we get the routine proceedings established. We should know that. You can't start conducting business without having some basic rules of the road. Otherwise, it's anarchy.

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Mr. Chair, if I may...

The Chair: Let's just hang on for a moment. We have your motion and we know what it is. I will ask the clerk if it is in order.

I'll give the clerk some time to write up the motion and then determine whether or not it's in order; then we'll vote on it. If not, we'll be here all night.

Ms. Olivia Chow: I have a motion immediately after this one, if you accept this one.

The Chair: I'm well aware.

Mr. Dave Batters: Jim, your motion now separates the routine proceedings—you took those out. You now just have the studies that we were covering previously. You want us to study those.... You took the routine proceedings part out of your motion and you want to bring back the stuff we were studying before. You're moving that we study that again immediately, or to put that back on our plates.

The Chair: Mr. Karygiannis, as we're all aware, put a motion in front of the committee, and now he's amended the motion. But he

does need unanimous consent to amend this motion. He made it clearer.

Does he have unanimous consent to amend the motion?

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: All right, then I guess the first motion I made stands.

The Chair: Because if not, the first motion will stand and then we're into a lot of confusion.

So let me ask again. It's a fairly simple motion that we have here right now from Mr. Karygiannis. Does he have unanimous consent to amend his motion?

The motion would read: that the committee resume all studies under way at the time of prorogation....

The Clerk: I need to get the rest of the bit about the steering committee.

The Chair: So does he have unanimous consent to do that?

Hon. Andrew Telegdi: Mr. Chair, just so I understand this, Mr. Karygiannis said we should adopt the routine proceedings, and then he had the other stuff. So why don't we split the motion?

The Chair: Well, I think the clerk was trying to determine if we could split the motion.

Hon. Andrew Telegdi: Well, of course we can split the motion.

The Chair: Let's just say we can split the motion.

The motion is before us.

Ms. Olivia Chow: Which one?

Mr. Chair, are we just adopting the routine procedure, or are we adopting the routine procedure and something else?

The Chair: He doesn't have unanimous consent from everyone to change the motion, so that's the problem.

Hon. Andrew Telegdi: Mr. Chairman, I could make an amendment that we split the motion. I mean, if we split the motion, then we can deal with them individually.

The Chair: Okay, we'll hear the motion in a moment.

Ms. Olivia Chow: Mr. Chair, to make life easier, do you want me to move an amendment to split the motion in two? The first motion would be the routine proceedings, and the second part would be the committee merely bringing back all the items. Would that help?

• (1610)

The Chair: That would help.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: On a point of order, the motion is as the motion is. It was seconded, it's on the floor and it's been debated. The point of order is two things: you either have to have notice for routine proceedings and the other part of the motion to do it or not. The clerk has to decide that. If he decides you don't need notice, my point was that you can't have two subject matters in the same motion, because if one is accepted, you have to give 24 hours' notice. He's tying in another motion.

So I'm saying the motion should fail, period, for that reason. He needs to rule on that specifically. We can't amend it without consent, and there won't be consent to amend it. So you deal with that motion, good or bad, as it is—and I think it's deficient.

The Chair: So the original motion would be that the committee resume all studies under way at the time of prorogation and that the steering committee engage to adopt a program to complete....

We'll give the clerk a moment here, please, and then when the clerk is back at the table, I'll have a little....

Then we will vote on this motion and get under way. This is just totally ridiculous.

Ms. Olivia Chow: Mr. Chair, on a point of order, I tried to submit my motion before the beginning of this meeting—everybody may have received a copy on war resisters—because I wanted to give everybody notice. I understand that there was no routine procedure established at that time and that's why my motion was not accepted.

If we are accepting motions today prior to routine procedures being established, I want to offer to you that my motion that I have duly translated, submitted prior to the meeting, and which may have even met the 48 hours' notice, should also be accepted. I want to say that in advance.

The Chair: Whether or not the rules under routine motions were adopted, you would still require 48 hours' notice of motion.

Mr. Clerk.

The Clerk: Mr. Komarnicki raised a point of order suggesting that it be divided.

The Chair: Let me cite Marleau and Montpetit on the division of a motion:

When a complicated motion comes before the House (for example, a motion containing two or more parts each capable of standing on its own), the Speaker has the authority to modify it and thereby facilitate decision-making for the House.

Or for the committee, I would imagine.

When any Member objects to a motion that contains two or more distinct propositions, he or she may request that the motion be divided and that each proposition be debated and voted on separately.

I guess that puts it to bed. It can be done separately.

The first motion is that the committee resume all studies under way at the time of prorogation, and that the steering committee engage to adopt a program to complete them.

Will I call for the vote?

• (1615)

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: You have to split the motion, choose one to be first, and then vote on it.

The Chair: Part one would be that the committee readopt all routine motions at the time of prorogation. Let's deal with that motion.

Mr. Dave Batters: I thought we were discussing that on Tuesday. Do you want to discuss that right now?

The Chair: That is the motion that was put on the floor and is being dealt with now.

Mr. Dave Batters: We didn't speak to that, then. If we're doing routine proceedings right now, we need to speak.

The Chair: That's fair enough. It's fair that the committee would want time to speak to that motion, so I'm going to allow some discussion on that.

Ms. Olivia Chow: Is it motions or proceedings? I'm sorry, I heard proceedings.

The Chair: It's motions.

Ms. Olivia Chow: So we're not adopting routine proceedings, procedures, all the rules and regulations?

The Chair: The clerk tells me that routine proceedings is the incorrect term in this setting. It's routine motions. It calls for proposals for routine motions.

We will have a brief discussion on that, please.

Mr. Batters.

Mr. Dave Batters: First of all, if we're going to discuss routine motions, routine proceedings, or whatever wording we're going to use, it would be nice to have a copy of that in front of each of us before getting into this debate. Perhaps the clerk can have his assistants circulate those materials.

One thing I would like to address with this committee is the speaking order. I'm going to advocate that this committee is reflective of the House of Commons for a reason: the number in the committee, the government members, the Liberal members, the Bloc members, and the NDP members. The committees are struck in a certain way to reflect the number of seats in the House of Commons.

It makes common sense for each and every member of this committee to have a chance to speak if they wish to do so before we go back to another member a second time. In other words, however it's set up, if the Liberals start and it goes to the Conservatives, the Bloc, the Liberals, and back to the Conservatives—

The Chair: That's what the routine—

Mr. Dave Batters: I want to verify that's exactly the way they are, because I don't believe that is the case, Mr. Telegdi.

Hon. Andrew Telegdi: It is the case.

Mr. Dave Batters: I want to be able to verify with the clerk that this is the case, because I've been on—

The Chair: I have it before me right here. That is the case.

The motion would be that the committee readopt all routine motions in effect at the time of prorogation. And this was in effect at the time of prorogation.

Mr. Dave Batters: Mr. Chair, would you answer this question then. Are you going to guarantee that every member is going to have a chance to speak, for example, before Ms. Chow, the lone NDP member, is able to speak twice because it goes back to the NDP turn?

The Chair: Yes, that's what we have.

Mr. Dave Batters: I've been on committees where it hasn't worked that way and it has been a disaster, so I just want to confirm that.

Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Batters.

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Can I call the vote, please?

The Chair: No, you can't. I can.

Hon. Jim Karygiannis: Okay. Can I move that you call the vote, please?

The Chair: Before I call the vote, Mr. Komarnicki would like to speak.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: You've circulated routine motions. I take it from the clerk that is what we were operating from the last time. But I look at the second from the top, which is the subcommittee on agenda and procedure. On the subcommittee on agenda and procedure was the chair, the two vice-chairs, and now it says a member of the other opposition party. In fact we were operating with a member from our party. It was a sitting member of our party who was the other member. We must have changed that somewhere along the way.

I'm not satisfied that these routine proceedings are in fact the routine proceedings as amended over the course of time that brought us to where we left off. If the clerk is prepared to certify they are, that one I think is not correct. Mr. Devolin was sitting in our—

• (1620)

Hon. Andrew Telegdi: Two Conservatives, two Liberals, one Bloc, and one NDP.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: We had two Conservatives. We had Mr. Devolin sitting on the committee and Mr. Doyle. This doesn't read that way. We changed it.

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

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: The two vice-chairs.

The Chair: The two vice-chairs, which would be Mr. Telegdi and Madam Faille, and a member of the other opposition party, which would be the NDP.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: But in fact we had Mr. Devolin sitting there.

The Chair: We had Mr. Devolin, and I was on there as well.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: So we changed something somewhere along the way.

The Chair: I'm going to hear Mr. Telegdi first.

Hon. Andrew Telegdi: I think we should put this off until Tuesday. We've ended up wasting a whole lot of time. I want to get the actual procedures we operated by. I would ask the clerk to make sure we get the right one, and then we'll deal with it on Tuesday.

I move to adjourn.

The Chair: We have a motion to adjourn.

Ms. Olivia Chow: Mr. Chair, since you have not adopted routine procedures, would you not entertain other motions?

The Chair: No, we will require 48 hours to have that motion put before the committee.

Ms. Olivia Chow: But I thought that because you have not approved routine motions—

The Chair: There seems to be some discrepancy in the routine motions in the copy we've been given today. There is a discrepancy here. It's not accurate. We need the clerk to get us an accurate copy so we can look at this in a more lucid way on Tuesday.

Ms. Olivia Chow: Would you not entertain a motion for consideration next Tuesday, which is the war resisters motion that I circulated?

The Chair: Your motion will be considered at that time. Right now I'm entertaining a motion to adjourn. It's on the floor.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: 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.