



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs

PROC • NUMBER 001 • 1st SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Thursday, June 9, 2011

—
Chair

Mr. Joe Preston

Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs

Thursday, June 9, 2011

• (1110)

[English]

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Michelle Tittley): Honourable members of the committee, I see a quorum. We can now proceed to the election of the chair. I am ready to receive motions to that effect.

Mr. Lukiwski.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski (Regina—Lumsden—Lake Centre, CPC): I nominate Mr. Joe Preston.

The Clerk: It has been moved by Mr. Lukiwski that Mr. Preston be elected chair of the committee.

Are there any further motions?

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

(Motion agreed to)

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

Before inviting Mr. Preston to take the chair, I'll proceed to the election of the vice-chairs.

I am now prepared to receive motions for the position of first vice-chair.

Ms. Charlton.

Ms. Chris Charlton (Hamilton Mountain, NDP): I nominate Joe Comartin.

The Clerk: It has been moved by Ms. Charlton that Mr. Comartin be elected first vice-chair of the committee.

Are there any further motions?

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

(Motion agreed to)

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

[Translation]

I am now ready to receive a motion for the election of the second vice-chair.

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

[English]

I am ready to receive motions.

Mr. Toone.

[Translation]

Mr. Philip Toone (Gaspésie—Îles-de-la-Madeleine, NDP): I nominate Marc Garneau.

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

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

(Motion agreed to)

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

I now invite the Chair, Mr. Preston, to take the chair.

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Joe Preston (Elgin—Middlesex—London, CPC): Thank you for your support. It has been a lot of fun chairing this committee in the past. I expect that this time it will be even more fun.

As a rule, this committee has worked through consensus, usually, and we will continue to try to work that way.

I welcome our new members this year, the many new members who were not with us last year.

Thank you very much.

With your indulgence, we'll move to the routine proceedings of this committee and have some discussion as to what rules we will work under as a committee.

You have two documents in front of you. One is called "Routine Motions of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs". Those are the motions we used during the last Parliament. You have another one called "Principal Routine Motions", which is a standard template of what routine motions may be used. I think we'll follow the one that's marked "Routine Motions" of procedure and House affairs from the last Parliament and either make changes to them or accept them as they are.

First is analyst services. We need to pass a motion to accept our analysts as supplied by the Library of Parliament.

It is moved by Mr. Kerr.

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: Boy, we get the best analysts by moving fast. That's great.

May I ask you to join us at the table, please?

The next motion on the list is on delegated authority to the whips. This committee does delegate authority to the whips of all of the parties to work on our behalf on the appointment of committees for the most part, so that we don't always have to meet to do it. That's the next routine motion. I think you have a copy of that exact motion with you.

Yes?

Ms. Chris Charlton: I note that the motion before us refers to “four Whips”. Should that now read “three Whips”?

The Chair: On the delegated authority, it does say that “the three Whips be delegated”—

Ms. Chris Charlton: Mine says four.

Mr. Joe Comartin (Windsor—Tecumseh, NDP): You're both wrong. It says “three” in the first sentence and then—

The Chair: Ah, it does: it says “three” in the first and “four” in the second.

We're just covering all our bases.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Chair: You'll find we're pretty good at doing that here.

Thank you, Ms. Charlton. We'll make sure it says “three” in all spots.

Is there any discussion on that motion as quickly changed?

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

The Chair: Great. We've got that done.

The next motion concerns the subcommittee on private members' business:

That, pursuant to Standing Order 91.1(1), the Subcommittee on Private Members' Business be composed of one (1) member from each recognized party and a Chair from the government party; and

That Harold Albrecht be appointed Chair of the Subcommittee.

That was what we did last time, so I'm just reading.... I see that Harold's still here. We always want to grab on to experience when we can.

Mr. Lukiwski, your comments.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: I would like to amend that, Chair. I would like to suggest that we have, in addition to the chair, two members from the government side.

The Chair: Okay.

To that amendment, all in favour?

(Amendment agreed to)

The Chair: Great.

Turning to the separate part, we now must appoint a chair for that.

Do I have any nominations for chair?

Mr. Lukiwski.

• (1115)

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: I would nominate Mr. Harold Albrecht.

The Chair: I thought I saw that coming.

Mr. Albrecht, you'd be happy to have your name stand, yes?

Mr. Harold Albrecht (Kitchener—Conestoga, CPC): Absolutely.

The Chair: All in favour of Mr. Albrecht chairing the subcommittee on private members' business?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: And now the motion.

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

The Chair: That one's carried.

The next motion concerns the procedure on our agenda and procedure subcommittee, our steering committee, to talk about where we're headed:

That the Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure be composed of the Chair, the two Vice-Chairs, a member of the other opposition party and one government member.

Mr. Reid.

Mr. Scott Reid (Lanark—Frontenac—Lennox and Addington, CPC): I might be wrong, but I have a sense that this may come from the last Parliament. It says, “the Chair, the two Vice-Chairs, a member of the other opposition party”. I think that's referring to a situation in which we had more than two opposition parties in terms of status; I think that's right.

So could we strike that part?

The Chair: The part that says “a member of the other opposition party”?

Mr. Scott Reid: Yes.

The Chair: Absolutely.

That would leave us with the chair, the two vice-chairs, and one other government member.

Is that correct, Mr. Lukiwski?

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: Yes, but I would just like to add “the parliamentary secretary”.

Ms. Chris Charlton: Is that in addition to?

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: Yes, in addition to; I'm just counting the numbers here.

The Chair: All right. So it now reads:

That the Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure be composed of the Chair, the two Vice-Chairs, one government member and the parliamentary secretary.

To that motion, all in favour?

(Motion as amended agreed to)

The Chair: Great.

I'm not sure what "Meeting without a quorum" is:

That the Chair be authorized to hold meetings to receive and publish evidence when a quorum is not present, provided that at least three (3) members are present, including one member of the opposition.

Oh, I understand what this is.

Mr. Reid.

Mr. Scott Reid: With this one, I just want to confirm that this doesn't mean that we can't have a regular meeting with a regular quorum for the purpose of hearing testimony.

The Chair: I don't take it to say that, but we'll have that discussion. I take it that if there's a reduced number of people in the room and we have witnesses, we could still hear from them. That's what this is trying to say.

Mr. Scott Reid: So this gives us another option for that purpose only, but does not tie us to that. I suppose, by definition....

Now that I think about it, it's a silly question. Of course we've had witnesses in the past with full membership.

The Chair: Right. It allows us to hear from witnesses with a reduced quorum so that if witnesses are here and we don't have many, we can still hear from them.

Mr. Scott Reid: Okay.

Having just asked this really silly question, I should ask, these aren't televised meetings, right?

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Chair: At the will of the committee, they're all televised meetings.

Mr. Scott Reid: No, I meant this meeting.

That's fine. I should have thought that through.

Thanks.

The Chair: Mr. Comartin.

Mr. Joe Comartin: Just for the record, quorum is 50% normally?

The Chair: Normally.

Mr. Joe Comartin: Thank you.

The Chair: But this allows us a reduced quorum to hear testimony from witnesses.

Mr. Joe Comartin: Yes.

The Chair: On that, meeting without a quorum....

Mr. Lukiwski.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: Perhaps we could have "including one member of the opposition and at least one member of the government".

The Chair: Okay. You want to add that there be at least three members present, including one member of the opposition and one member of the government.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: Yes.

The Chair: All right, so that defines it better. I'm okay with that.

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

The Chair: Next is travel, accommodation, and living expenses of witnesses.

So moved as written, Mr. MacKenzie? Thank you.

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

The Chair: Great. Next is document distribution.

So moved as written.

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

•(1120)

The Chair: Next is working meals. Is there any discussion on that?

We do have our meetings over lunchtime. We found it quite handy for the rest of the members to be able to eat while we're actually getting the meeting done.

An hon. member: So moved.

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

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

An hon. member: So moved.

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

The Chair: Are there any further routine motions for this committee?

Mr. Harold Albrecht: Mr. Chair, I have a question relating back to the subcommittee on agenda and procedure. We didn't discuss the issue of quorum and the attendance of staff accompanying those members. I'm wondering if that needs to be clarified within the procedures or if that's something we just agree on informally.

The Chair: You're looking for a quorum rule on the subcommittee on agenda and procedure?

Mr. Harold Albrecht: I'm asking the question. It seems to me that we should have at least three members present for the subcommittee to proceed, and that each member be allowed to have a staff member with them.

The Chair: I'm all right with all of those additions.

Is there discussion on those additions?

Ms. Charlton.

Ms. Chris Charlton: That's including one opposition member.

The Chair: You mean that there must be one? Sure.

Mr. Harold Albrecht: The principles are similar to those for the other motion.

The Chair: Are we okay with those changes? Do we need a vote on them, or can we just refer back to them?

Mr. Harold Albrecht: For in camera meetings we often allow one House staff person to be there in addition to the staff of the MP. I'm just wondering if that should be included as well for procedure and House affairs for the agenda.

The Chair: Is that for the steering committee meetings?

Mr. Lukiwski.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: I think what Harold is getting at—and I agree with it—is that in addition to each MP having a staff member, each party should be allowed to have a staff member. If there's a representative from either the whip's office or the House leader's office for each of the parties, they should be allowed to be there in addition to the MPs' personal staff.

The Chair: If you look at the document called “Principal Routine Motions”, “access to in camera meetings” is at the top of the second page. It says:

That, unless otherwise ordered, each Committee member be allowed to have one staff member present from their office or from their party at in camera meetings.

Are you suggesting some modification to that?

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: I am. Rather than saying “or from their party”, it would say “in addition to”. In other words, every MP can have a staff member of their own plus each party can have a staff member represent their party.

The Chair: That's from the whip's office—

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: That's from the whip's office, House leader's office, or whatever.

The Chair: Are we okay with what we've suggested? Okay.

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

The Chair: We'll get that written down for us.

Mr. Lukiwski.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: I would like to add another routine motion, which is on notice of motions: that 48 hours' notice be required for any substantive motion to be considered by the committee, unless the substantive motion relates directly to business then under consideration, and that the notice of motion be filed with the clerk in both official languages and distributed and so on and so forth.

I think that's the standard operating procedure or routine motion that most other standing committees use, that 48 hours' notice be given for motions. I just didn't see it here.

The Chair: Yes, I was looking for it too.

We have a master copy here. It reads:

That forty-eight (48) hours' notice be required for any substantive motion to be considered by the Committee, unless the substantive motion relates directly to business then under consideration; and that the notice of motion be filed with the Clerk of the Committee and distributed to the members in both official languages; and that 48 hours' notice be calculated in the same manner as for the House.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: Yes, we had it here in these principal routine motions, but since you were working back and forth between the two sheets I just want to make sure that we don't miss one.

The Chair: Ms. Charlton.

Ms. Chris Charlton: I have a question. To my knowledge, it's actually not routine among other committees. I'm just wondering what the rationale is for this.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: Well, Chris, at least for all the committees I've sat on—and I haven't sat on all of them, obviously—it has been the routine that we have 48 hours' notice. I just think it's a good way to proceed, if you're going to have a motion to discuss at this

committee, to have notice given, so that all committee members have an opportunity to prepare for the motion under discussion.

The Chair: Mr. Comartin.

Mr. Joe Comartin: Mr. Lukiwski is certainly correct. In the vast majority of committees that I've been on, the 48 hours' notice for motions is standard.

But this committee is different. I guess I'm speaking a bit out of turn, because I haven't sat on the committee, but certainly my perspective on this committee and my perception of it over the years has been that just because of the very nature of the types of matters that come before us—matters of a substantive nature—they oftentimes do come in at the last minute. If we have to give the 48 hours' notice, on those issues that need to be dealt with rapidly by everybody—seeing as it's necessary to deal with them rapidly—we're going to have to wait.

I understand that we can suspend the rule by majority vote at any time, but I'm just going to suggest that rather than start this way, why don't we go back to our regular practice—the committee's regular practice—of not having this? Then, if it's not working out, we can bring this rule forward at that point. I'll pledge on our part that we'll support it if there are reasons for doing so. I just don't see any reason for doing it at this point.

•(1125)

The Chair: Mr. Reid.

Mr. Scott Reid: In response to that, Joe, just looking at it from the point of view of the equality of the parties, our party, having the majority here, could actually push anything on the committee anyway in the absence of this rule, so that should provide some protection for the opposition. We could stop anything because of a unanimous consent requirement; anybody could stop it coming forward.

We all have the ability to stop something that's not based on some kind of consensus under the 48-hour rule from hijacking the committee, whereas in practice, one party only, if we have the no-notice rule, can dictate what gets put in and what supplants the normal course of action that has been agreed to.

As a practical matter, the other thing in my experience of being on this committee now for a number of years is that when we have something coming before us unexpectedly, it's not normally initiated by us; it's actually the Speaker saying “I'm referring this to the committee”—matters of privilege and that sort of thing. So you don't need to have someone introducing it from here to accomplish that.

The Chair: Is there further comment on this addition to this motion?

Seeing none, are all in favour of it as I've read it, including that the 48-hour notice be in there and calculated the same way as it is in the House?

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

The Chair: Mr. Reid.

Mr. Scott Reid: Just to confirm, the 48 hours will be calculated in what fashion? I think it's important that people—

The Chair: In the same manner as in the House: I call it the two-sleep rule, so when two days pass. That's not a strict 48 hours. If a motion came forward to the House even this afternoon, by the time we meet next, two days from this afternoon, you could have it at eleven in the morning. It's not a strict 48 hours. It's that we've gone to sleep twice—or at least most of us have.

Mr. Scott Reid: Just with that in mind, I have one further question.

Our clerk served at one point in a subcommittee I chaired and we sometimes would get motions right when the clerk was leaving. This is an important question.

As a practical matter for our clerk, when are you not going to see these things any more? There's a certain point at which we can't submit these things without requiring that you stay here until midnight. What would be a reasonable hour?

The Clerk: That would be at the discretion of the committee.

One of the reasons why the text in bold was added—that 48 hours' notice be calculated in the same manner as for the House—is to reinforce the idea of it not being 48 hours in the pure sense of hours, but rather in the sense of two days.

That being said, you are correct, Mr. Reid, in that there are times during the 24-hour day that I'm not checking my BlackBerry—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Clerk: —so there is a practical issue of when the notices come in. It is up to the committee to decide what time, if they would like to put a further amendment to this routine motion stating a time this could be in by.

The only thing I would say to members is that in the House from Monday to Thursday, it's at 6 p.m. and on Fridays at 2 p.m. Also, of course, if the clerk's office is responsible for translation of motions and distribution, there is some delay there. Other than that, it's at the will of the committee to determine a time, if they so wish to stipulate the time on this motion.

The Chair: Mr. Lukiwski.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: If for no other reason than discussion, I'd recommend 4 p.m.

The Chair: I see heads nodding. Are we okay with 4 p.m.?

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: I was kind of hoping we would get a nod from the clerk as well.

The Chair: I understand that would be okay.

Ms. Charlton.

Ms. Chris Charlton: My first preference would be to leave it as is and to leave it as open-ended as possible.

If that is not the desire of the committee, I'm not sure why we would move to 4 o'clock when the House deadline is 6 o'clock.

• (1130)

The Chair: Mr. Reid.

Mr. Scott Reid: I'll let Tom respond first, and then I'll—

The Chair: Mr. Lukiwski, you were still up. We'll go back to you.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: Quite frankly, it's just to give the clerk a little bit of extra time.

The Chair: Mr. Reid.

Mr. Scott Reid: I think this is what we are trying to juggle here: first of all, we are trying to be nice to our clerk, and we're trying to juggle that with being as open as possible. If our clerk never had to sleep, we would say midnight.

So if we were to go to the 6 p.m. four days a week and 2 p.m. on Fridays rule, would that create problems for you? If something were submitted, for example, in one language and you had to get it translated, would you still be able to get that done in time so that everybody would get a day's notice of what's coming up, or would that be a problem for you?

The Clerk: It is still feasible. It can certainly still be done. There might be a longer delay after 6 p.m. in terms of securing translation services, but if the committee desires to keep it at 6 p.m., as in the House, certainly all services will be made available to make that happen.

The Chair: Currently we are at 4 p.m. or 6 p.m. Which are we suggesting?

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: Chair, again, one reason I suggested 4 p.m. is that we've seen a few examples in previous committees in previous Parliaments of something coming in literally at the last moment, just at 6 o'clock, which proved to be very problematic for the clerks and the staff. Frankly, that was the only reason I suggested 4 p.m. It was to give them a little extra breathing room to get things done.

The Chair: As a helpful piece of information, the government operations committee met this morning in this room and chose 4 p.m. Just to be different, we're going to go with.... No, that's okay.

Mr. Comartin.

Mr. Joe Comartin: The reason I would push for 6 o'clock is that sometimes issues arise out of question period, and having only an hour to prepare a motion, between 3 o'clock and 4, is really tight, but having from 3 to 6 gives us time to prepare. Especially if it's a really significant substantive issue, trying to put a motion together in an hour is really difficult.

The Chair: Mr. Lukiwski.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: I have no problem, Joe. I'm not hard on 4 o'clock. The motivation I was coming from was to give the clerks a break, but if you want 6 o'clock, that's fine.

The Chair: Okay. All in favour of 6 o'clock?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: We have to return to the private members' business piece of this motion.

The Clerk: I will just draw members' attention to Standing Order 91.1, which I will read:

91.1 (1) At the beginning of the first session of a Parliament, and thereafter as required, the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs shall name one Member from each of the parties recognized in the House and a Chair from the government party to constitute the Subcommittee on Private Members' Business...

I highlight that simply because previously we've had some amendments to the routine motion that was just adopted concerning the membership of the subcommittee on private members' business, so we have to keep in mind the standing order that stipulates the membership of that subcommittee.

The Chair: Mr. Lukiwski.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: I don't think we're prepared to change the standing order to accommodate my request, so we'll certainly agree to the standing order as written.

The Chair: Then what do we do? Will we vote on the new motion, remove the old motion, or just move forward because we're good people? You can argue the last point.

Can we have a motion to accept it as it is written in the Standing Orders?

Mr. Lukiwski.

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: I so move.

The Chair: All in favour of that motion as it is?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

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

The Chair: Thank you. Now we've covered every end of this, whichever way we want to go.

Is there anything else on our routine proceedings?

I have a suggestion, and it is rare that it is coming from the chair, but I have a rotation list on questions for witnesses, because we have had some difficulty. I have this in both official languages, English and French. Can we distribute this?

I have calculated percentages in a given hour with a witness who has a five-minute opening statement. Based on members of the committee, we've had some difficulty in this committee in the past in ensuring that all members of the committee got to ask questions of a witness. So I have broken this down into a seven-minute round to begin with, followed by subsequent four-minute rounds in which every member at the table would get at least one chance to ask questions. When that is done, the total minutes allotted breaks down to almost exactly the percentage of the seats in the House and the percentages by party in the House. As you get that in front of you, you will be able to see that.

If it were two hours' worth, we would simply double this or do it twice, at the will of the committee.

We had some difficulty last time in this committee trying to make sure that we shared with all members and that all members got a chance. You can always pass, and then of course someone else from your own party can pick up.

Are there questions on this?

Mr. MacKenzie.

• (1135)

Mr. Dave MacKenzie (Oxford, CPC): I have just one minor question for clarification. On page 16 of the binder that was handed out, on the time for opening remarks and questioning of witnesses, I

don't know how what is laid out there reflects in practice for this committee.

The Chair: I think ten minutes is an excessive amount for opening comments for individual witnesses, and I'm not sure we've ever given that, though that is what it says here. I will also recognize that there have been witnesses who have taken ten minutes when asked to give a five-minute opening statement, but—

Mr. Dave MacKenzie: I'm not debating that part, Mr. Chair. All I am asking is how this document that was given to us reflects the standing practice of the committee.

The Chair: This is a suggestion from the point of view of a principle, as a starting point. I'm suggesting going a little differently.

Mr. Reid.

Mr. Scott Reid: Maybe the way to handle this would be to have someone just move this as a motion that would replace everything in that particular motion we just adopted after the second line in the English version, after the words "questioning of witnesses, there be allocated" and then the example laid out here.

The Chair: Did you just move that, Mr. Reid?

Mr. Scott Reid: Yes.

The Chair: Thank you.

Is there further discussion on this?

Mr. Joe Comartin: I'm not understanding.

Mr. Scott Reid: That's on a motion we adopted earlier that says something different from this.

The Chair: We have not accepted a motion that says.... We're just amending what's counted as routine.

Mr. Scott Reid: We can't discuss this without having two separate sets of rules, unless we try to introduce.... Even to introduce it for discussion, I think you have to have it as comprehensible. We'd have either what we have here, the fourth motion on that page, "Time for opening remarks and questioning of witnesses"—

The Chair: We're not anywhere near that. We've accepted nothing from that page.

Mr. Scott Reid: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm all muddled up.

Mr. Joe Comartin: No, that was on the suggested list.

Okay, that's great.

The Chair: Since it hasn't been passed yet, we can say this will be our routine proceedings for questioning of witnesses if someone moves a motion to that effect. The chair has only suggested that at this moment.

Mr. Scott Reid: I'll move that.

The Chair: I do have a motion now to accept it.

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

The Chair: Great. It is unanimous. We've done good work here today.

Are there any other routine motions that the committee sees the need for, besides one on the travelling of the chair to certain far-off places? Okay, so no one moved that one.

Are there any other routine motions for this committee?

Seeing none, we are adjourned for the day. There will be an agenda steering committee at the call of the chair.

I recognize that we will normally meet Tuesdays and Thursdays from eleven to one. We will normally meet also in the...

Mr. Reid.

Mr. Scott Reid: I think we normally pass a motion about working meals. You may have forgotten to do that.

The Chair: We did it.

Mr. Scott Reid: Oh, boy, am I out of touch.

The Chair: Excuse me, but I'm not certain I would forget about the meals.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

The Chair: I think it's a given.

Yes, Mr. Comartin.

Mr. Joe Comartin: For those of us on the steering committee, perhaps we could be thinking about agenda items for the full committee. I'm thinking in particular of the report on the outcome of the election, and a couple of other reports I would like to have.

I'm just throwing these out as suggestions.

The Chair: I was just about to get to it—

Mr. Joe Comartin: Oh, okay.

The Chair: —that we would ask our analysts to put together some suggestions for the steering committee as to where we can go forward.

Mr. Comartin, you just mentioned the report back from the Chief Electoral Officer, his report on the 41st election. By practice, it will be sometime in the fall before we receive it. But we will get to it the minute he does give it to us.

I would suggest that we ask our analysts to come up with some issues to discuss with the chair and that we call the steering committee meeting based on those.

Mr. Lukiwski.

● (1140)

Mr. Tom Lukiwski: To further go along with what Joe was saying, and particularly for the benefit of those members who are new—actually, the majority of members are new—when the analysts do the report, I would suggest that perhaps they could do it... I don't know if they could prioritize it or not, but certainly they could perhaps put out what might be considered to be unfinished business from the last procedure and House affairs committee.

For example, there was the study we were doing on Mr. Chong's motion to improve question period, and there were a few other studies we had engaged in. Perhaps we could show, for the benefit of the new members, well, here's what we were studying. And perhaps there are some other new issues that we may want to bring to the attention of the steering committee.

The Chair: We'll let the analysts speak to this.

Mr. Michel Bédard (Committee Researcher): Sure.

I would bring it to the attention of committee members that section five of the briefing book already contains information as to possible subjects of studies.

Also, we'll bring to the next meeting of the steering committee a list of possible studies with just that kind of prioritization: unfinished business and business that ought to be addressed by the committee.

The Chair: Great.

Is there anything else for this committee today?

Seeing nothing else, we are 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>