



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 074

Wednesday, October 4, 2023

Chair: Mr. Ron McKinnon



Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security

Wednesday, October 4, 2023

• (1630)

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley (Barrie—Springwater—Oro-Medonte, CPC)): Everyone, seeing that it is 4:30 and I am definitely a stickler for punctuality and attendance, I'll call this meeting to order.

First of all, I would like to mention that I will be chairing this meeting today. Mr. McKinnon is unavailable due to very unfortunate circumstances. I've only been vice-chair for one week and I'll be chairing today. It's my first time doing it, so let's all be patient here today. I promise I'll do my best.

Welcome to meeting number 74 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security. We will start by acknowledging that we are meeting on the traditional unceded territory of the Algonquin people.

Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format, pursuant to the Standing Orders; therefore, members are attending in person in the room and remotely by using the Zoom application.

I would like to make a few comments for the benefit of the witnesses and members.

Please wait until I recognize you by name before speaking. For those participating by video conference, click on the microphone icon to activate your mike and please mute yourself when you are not speaking. The clerk and I will manage the speaking order as best we can. We appreciate your patience and understanding in this regard.

For interpretation, for those on Zoom, you have the choice at the bottom of your screen of floor, English or French. Those in the room can use the earpiece and select the desired channel.

Although this room is equipped with a powerful audio system, feedback events can occur. These can be extremely harmful to the interpreters and can cause serious injuries. The most common cause of sound feedback is an earpiece worn too close to microphone. We therefore ask all participants to exercise a high degree of caution when handling the earpieces, especially when your microphone or your neighbour's microphone is turned on. In order to prevent incidents and safeguard the hearing health of interpreters, I invite participants to ensure that they speak into the microphone into which their headset is plugged and to avoid manipulating the earbuds by placing them on the table, away from the microphone, when they are not in use.

I will give a reminder that all comments should be addressed through the chair.

With that, we left off last week—and hopefully everyone had a good long weekend—with a debate going on. I will read where we left off to remind everybody, if that's okay. I do have the exact wording here.

The chair said:

That's what we're probably going to have to do, unless we can vote on what we have now.

I think we have to adjourn. We will resume at this point in the debate and begin again on this matter when we resume on Wednesday.

With that understanding, we are adjourned.

We will start off where we were. I'll go to Mr. Lloyd.

Mr. Peter Julian (New Westminster—Burnaby, NDP): I have a point of order.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Go ahead.

Mr. Peter Julian: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thanks for taking this on as well. I promise to be as well-behaved as possible during this committee.

I just wanted to know who you have on the speaking order.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): I've just been informed by the clerk that we don't have an ongoing list from Wednesday.

The opposition had the floor at the time. We're going to continue on from there, as per—

Mr. Peter Julian: Now the clerk will be taking a speaking list...?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Yes.

Go ahead, Mr. Lloyd.

Mr. Dane Lloyd (Sturgeon River—Parkland, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Given that we left off on an amendment and that over the time we had to review this over the weekend there have been discussions, I think we will find support for a subamendment, which I will be reading into the record now and which should be distributed to the committee in both official languages.

I'll read it into the record now. It is that the committee hold a three-hour meeting, immediately after the committee's study of Bill C-20, on the rights of crime victims and the security reclassification and transfer of offenders within federal corrections and the transfer of Paul Bernardo from a maximum-security prison to a medium-security prison; and that the committee invite the Minister of Public Safety; the commissioner of Correctional Service Canada, Anne Kelly; the deputy minister, Shawn Tupper; the corrections investigator; the federal victims ombudsperson; representatives of the victims' families, particularly Tim Danson; and officials of the departments of justice and public safety to appear.

I think we've hit on a good compromise here, Mr. Chair. It's always been the Conservative position that we need to have some sort of representation from victims' perspectives or victim representatives' perspectives in order to see this from all angles so that we can ensure that we can at least recommend some changes so that, hopefully, an event like this doesn't happen again.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (1635)

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Thank you, Mr. Lloyd.

The clerk has indicated that he has sent it out in both official languages. Does everybody have that in writing? Can I just confirm with a couple of nods around the table that we do have that, or should I wait a minute?

Now that all—

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell (Pickering—Uxbridge, Lib.): On a point of order, I'd just like to get clarification that this is actually in order and not just a notice of motion, because when we left off, we adjourned the meeting. Therefore, this would be a motion, not a subamendment.

I'd like to get clarification if this is actually in order, given that we adjourned and now this would be the first time it's introduced, which would require notice because it wasn't part of the meeting before we adjourned.

This meeting was called for Bill C-20. That's what the agenda was put out for, so this isn't a continuation of the last meeting. I just question if this is actually in order without notice.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): On that point of order, Chair, it seems like the member is questioning whether it was in order to resume consideration of debate on the motion, a motion on which I would have some separate points to make. However, once debate has resumed on the motion and debate is under way on the motion, it is, of course, in order for somebody to move an amendment or subamendment to the motion.

There's no requirement to provide notice to amend an item that is on the table and is being debated, and this motion was on the table. You said it was on the table and gave the floor to my colleague, and he used the floor to then move a subamendment. I think that is procedurally pretty clear.

Thanks.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Kristina Michaud (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, BQ): I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

I thank my colleague Mr. Genuis for his clarifications, but I think it's up to the chair to respond to Ms. O'Connell based on the clerk's recommendations.

I just want to know whether we think the committee will debate this for a long time. It must be said that we kept the legislative clerks waiting for two hours last week. Out of respect for them, if the committee intends to debate this for a long time, we should warn them. I imagine they have something better to do than to watch us debate this.

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Thank you for those points of order.

I have been instructed by the clerk that it is in order. We will carry on with what's on the floor right now.

We will continue with Mr. Julian.

• (1640)

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I'm sorry, but I had indicated to the chair to be second on the list.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): I've been given the list by the clerk, and you are next after Mr. Julian.

Mr. Peter Julian: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This is different from what we've spoken about off-line. I think the intention here, hopefully, is to move forward with Bill C-20. We've now had the witnesses here twice, and we thank them very much for coming. It's time to get to this important legislation.

I think there may be the seed of a solution to the filibuster we saw a few days ago, but one of the things I indicated very clearly was that I felt the Minister of Public Safety should be coming before this committee to discuss both this issue and a range of other issues as well. I actually think the subamendment is less helpful, because what we are actually talking about is a three-hour meeting with so many witnesses that we can't have the ability to question the Minister of Public Safety in the way I certainly would like to see, not only on this issue but on a range of public safety issues.

He's a new minister. I know he's eager to come to committee. There's a whole range of questions we're going to be asking him. I had flagged this and I had thought we had some consensus around this idea that the Minister of Public Safety would be invited with his officials as part of a separate meeting.

[*Translation*]

For the reasons I just mentioned, I can't really support the subamendment as currently worded. In my opinion, the minister should appear before the committee for two hours, along with department officials, to answer all our questions.

I don't know whether we will be able to agree in the next few minutes, but I agree with Ms. Michaud: We don't want to make the legislative clerks wait again while we discuss this motion rather than doing the clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-20. I hope that we can quickly find a solution to adopt wording written to reflect what I had understood, because what's just been presented to the committee doesn't quite do that.

[English]

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): We will go to Ms. O'Connell.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I move that we now proceed to clause-by-clause study of Bill C-20. It's a dilatory motion. There's no debate. We can come back to this later if we have agreement, but we are here for Bill C-20.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, would it be possible to request a brief suspension?

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I'm sorry. There's a motion on the floor—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I know.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: —and there's no debate.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): I think we are going to have to go to a vote, from what the clerk is telling me, so we will call the vote.

Are we going to do it verbally?

• (1645)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Let's have a recorded vote.

(Motion agreed to: yeas 7; nays 3)

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): The clerk and I discussed this before we were going to go ahead. If we can just have a short recess, we can get set up for Bill C-20.

Take no more than five minutes, please.

• (1645)

(Pause)

• (1650)

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Are we good to get started again?

Everyone, let's get back to business.

I'll tell you what: If anybody else wants to keep the chair informed of the score once we get going, feel free. The Blues Jays are on at 4:30. I see a thumbs-up in the back of the room.

Thank you, everyone, and thank you very much to the witnesses.

Go ahead, Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you.

I move that the committee not proceed with clause-by-clause on Bill C-20 until it has disposed of the motion respecting the Paul Bernardo transfer and the invitation to representatives of the victims' families.

Chair, I am gravely concerned about what has just taken place and what we see happening in this country in general. It would seem at a minimum level of reasonableness that the public safety committee would be able to have one meeting—

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: On a point of order—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm not talking about multiple meetings. We're talking about one meeting—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): We have a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —to hear from the families of victims of Paul Bernardo.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I have a point of order.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Mr. Genuis, just one moment, please.

• (1655)

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Mr. Chair, I would ask to see if this is in order. It's a direct conflict with the motion that was just passed.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Let me check on that.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Chair, could I maybe just speak to the point of order as you're deliberating? Thank you.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Just give me one moment.

Through discussions with the clerk, we did leave off last time in a very precarious area, and I do know that the clerk of that day did want to carry on. It is my decision to make, and I will hear you, Mr. Genuis, so carry on.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you—

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I'm sorry. On a point of order, Mr. Chair, are you ruling that his motion is in order?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Did you want me to speak to the point of order?

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: No, I have the floor. I've asked a question of the chair, not to you.

Mr. Chair—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On a point of order, Mr. Chair—

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Excuse me. Do I have the floor, Mr. Chair?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Yes, Ms. O'Connell.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I'm asking if you ruled that the motion is in order.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): I have ruled that I would hear Mr. Genuis because I did get information—

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Sorry, the—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): May I speak? I did get confirmation from the clerk that the final decision is up to me, and I'm making that decision now to hear Mr. Genuis.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: On a point of order, Mr. Chair, I'd like to challenge the chair's ruling.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Just on a point of order, he hasn't made a ruling yet. I think he was inviting me to comment on the point of order before making a ruling, so he hasn't made a ruling—

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Mr. Chair, I just asked if you ruled on his motion—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): I ruled to let him speak—

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I wasn't finished with my question. He made a motion and then began to speak to the motion—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On a point of order, Chair, you don't have to let her finish. You're the chair of the committee, and she is under the impression that she is the chair of the committee at this meeting—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): One at a time, everybody.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Chair, who has the floor?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): I do right now, Ms. O'Connell. I do.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Sure.

On a point of order, Mr. Chair—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): I'm not done talking. I'll give you that when I'm done.

We have gone back and forth on points of order. I have heard yours, Ms. McConnell. Mr. Genuis mentioned he had a point of order. Mr. Genuis, what was your point of order?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

I wanted to comment on the rules that govern whether motions are in order or not, because Ms. O'Connell said that—

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: On a point of order—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —my motion was not in order.

I believe—

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I have a point of order.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Ms. O'Connell, we'll hear his point of order first, and then I'll come back to you.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's a well-established rule of committees that if a motion is on the matter at hand, notice is not required. Any motion can be moved on the matter at hand, provided there is not another motion on the floor. There was no other motion on the floor. The matter at hand was what it was, and I moved a motion in accordance with that matter at hand.

Furthermore, there is no direct conflict with the motion that was previously adjourned. Even so, you can propose to resume consideration of a previously adjourned motion, provided that something has happened in between.

Anyway, that's not what my motion was.

I wonder if the clerk can provide more clarity on the issue of "matter at hand" to the committee. That might be helpful for Ms. O'Connell in understanding how these things are typically adjudicated.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): It's not appropriate for the clerk to be part of the debate.

Go ahead, Ms. O'Connell.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: My question asked if you had ruled on whether the motion was in order. The motion was read, and then Mr. Genuis began debate. I recognize if you want to hear his debate, but that was not my question. I questioned if the motion was in order, and he finished his motion and began debate.

I'm asking if his motion, as read, was in order.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): According to the clerk, through his information to me, because I'm not an expert, Ms. O'Connell, yes, I have the right to take that motion as being in order.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Thank you.

With that, I challenge the chair's ruling.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): We'll go to a vote on that.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Mr. Chair, before the vote, can you have the clerk clarify that if you support the challenge, the vote is yes? Is that correct? If you don't support the challenge to the chair or if—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Just on a point of order, the member moves a dilatory motion and then wants to debate it further—

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: No, I am asking if the clerk can provide clarification for the vote.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Maybe the member should have sought clarification about whether it's in order. She appears to be confident that she knows the rules better than the chair and the clerk.

• (1700)

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Just because you're sad that you lost the vote—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Oh, I'm not sad at all.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Everybody, let's keep order here. Please, let's get through this as amicably and as best we can.

Ms. O'Connell, you have the floor. Are you finished?

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I just asked if the clerk could do the clarification that happens in most committees when there's a vote to challenge the chair's ruling. You clarify for all members that the challenge is to your ruling. If you support the chair's ruling, you would vote yes, and if you don't support the chair's ruling, you would vote no.

Thank you.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): We'll get the clerk to verify that.

Go ahead, Mr. Clerk.

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Simon Larouche): To answer Ms. O'Connell, we return to the matter at hand, the item on the agenda that the committee decided to deal with. It would mean that we would come back to clause-by-clause study of Bill C-20 at the end of the decision.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): What does a yes vote mean and what does a no vote mean? What are you voting yes to or no to? Can you just clarify that, not where we're going after that?

The Clerk: Right now there's a motion to challenge the ruling of the chair, which was that the motion is in order.

If the motion is adopted, we return to the item that was decided by the committee to deal with, which is clause-by-clause study of Bill C-20.

If the motion is defeated, we return to the previous discussion.

[Translation]

Ms. Kristina Michaud: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Go ahead, Ms. Michaud.

Ms. Kristina Michaud: I'm not sure I understand. What does it mean if we vote yes and what does it mean if we vote no? That's what we'd like to know.

The Clerk: If the answer is no, we will resume debate on the motion introduced here for a return to—

[English]

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I'm sorry. If you vote no, it means you do not support—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): I have to recognize you first.

If someone votes yes, are they agreeing with Ms. O'Connell that...?

A voice: No.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Voting no is agreeing with Ms. O'Connell.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: On a point of order, this is why.... Do I have the floor?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Go ahead. You have the floor.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: This is why I asked for this. It's because it's a reverse order of motion, and every committee always has this issue.

If you vote yes, it means you're supporting the chair's ruling. If you vote no, it means you are not supporting the chair's ruling. Then, as the clerk said, we'd go back to Bill C-20.

Mr. Peter Julian: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

The question is this: Shall the decision of the chair be sustained? If we're supporting the chair's decision, we would vote yes. If we are not sustaining the chair's decision, we would vote no.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): That's correct. Is everybody clear on that now?

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Yes.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Did I hear a request for a recorded division?

We will have a recorded division.

(Ruling of the chair overturned: nays 7; yeas 3)

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Go ahead, Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you.

I move that the committee not proceed any further with clause-by-clause on Bill C-20.

The reason I'm moving that motion at this time is that I do not think we should proceed with clause-by-clause on this bill until the matter previously before the committee is disposed of. That matter is the desire of this committee on our side to allow victims and family members—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Mr. Genuis, wait just one moment. There's a point of order.

Go ahead, Ms. O'Connell.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Unfortunately, the members opposite don't recognize that it's actually not appropriate to introduce the same motion we've now voted on effectively twice.

• (1705)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On the same point of order, Chair—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Mr. Genuis, I believe the committee has already made a decision on this matter.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No, it hasn't, Chair.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): We just had a vote on that.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Can I raise a point of order?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): You can raise a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a couple of points.

The motion I previously put forward was, through the committee's decision, deemed not in order. No reason was provided by the member presenting the challenge as to why it wouldn't be in order, but I have, in any event, presented a completely different motion.

If the previous motion wasn't in order, this motion certainly is in order, because it doesn't make mention of any other issues. It says, simply, that the matter at hand is the clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-20, and the motion I moved is that the committee not proceed any further with clause-by-clause on Bill C-20. It is entirely implausible that this motion would be out of order as it is substantially different from the previous motion that was on the table.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Point of order—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Give me one more minute, Mr. Genuis.

Go ahead, Ms. O'Connell.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I believe you ruled the motion—and correct me if I'm wrong—not in order. Is the member opposite challenging your ruling?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): I don't believe he is. I'm going to hear him out. He says that he has a different motion.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Yes, I'm moving a different motion. If I have the floor again, I will just declare that I'm moving the motion that the committee not proceed any further with clause-by-clause of Bill C-20. That is the motion I'm moving.

I don't think any plausible reading of the rules would find that out of order, given that it is on the matter being considered quite directly. It doesn't reference any other matters, and I'll proceed to speak to it.

The previous discussion at the committee dealt with—

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: On a point of order, he can't continue to filibuster while you're consulting the clerk.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): I'm sorry, Mr. Genuis. Just give me one moment here while I speak with the clerk.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: That's totally fine.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Mr. Genuis, I'm being instructed by the clerk on his savvy advice that we've already discussed that matter and your motion is not in order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Okay. Chair, I will move that the committee report to the House that we have reached an impasse on studying the transfer of Paul Bernardo to medium security; and that the chair inform the House that as a result the consideration of Bill C-20 will be delayed.

That motion is I think an important one in a context where this committee should be willing to have one meeting to hear about the transfer of Paul Bernardo. We have victims' families that want to be heard on this matter. We want to have one meeting to allow victims' families—

An hon. member: [*Inaudible—Editor*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It is debate, yes. I just moved a motion. I'm now engaging in debate.

We have victims' families that want to be heard at this committee, that want to be heard in one meeting—

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —and Liberals are insisting that they will do anything to prevent—

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: You have to stop him.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Mr. Genuis, just hold your thoughts for one moment.

Ms. O'Connell, can you just give us one minute here?

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I can just as long as the point of order is recognized. Thank you.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Yes. We have a little huddle going on beside us. We'll figure this out.

• (1710)

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Fair enough. That's fine.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Mr. Genuis, would you be able to provide that to me and the clerk in writing?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I would absolutely. I have the text right here. I could read it again, but I can certainly email it to you as well.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I have a point of order.

There are two issues here. I'd like you to confer with the clerk as to whether this motion is in order.

The first is that we voted on the issue at hand. The second is that I would argue that the motion is out of order because it refers to reporting back to the House, although the motion itself is not on a study or a meeting on the subject matter as was the last motion moved. Therefore, the subject matter we are currently on is Bill C-20. You would need to report back only on a study.

I would argue that his motion is out of order on two fronts.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Thank you for that.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On the same point of order, Chair, I can maybe provide some clarification on the precedent here.

There are many committees that, in the context of their studies of legislation, also provide substantive comments on issues related to the legislation. I've been on at least two committees that have done this. Sometimes, for instance, an issue is raised in the context of the study of a particular bill that is ultimately deemed out of order as an amendment to the bill because it goes beyond the scope, but the committee still wishes to report to the House on what it has learned in the context of the study and to maybe make recommendations for broader consideration. Also, you have committees reporting to the House requesting an expansion of scope related to a bill.

It's actually extremely common for committees to report to the House under the rubric of the study of a particular piece of legislation independent of the actual report on the legislation itself. I can think of examples from status of women, from citizenship and immigration and from justice where this happened.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Mr. Genuis, we'll get more examples from you. Let's get the copy of your amendment first, and I'll confer with the clerk.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Just to respond to that, Chair, I sent it to your personal account as well as the committee's account, so it should be there.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): We'll just grab that. Give us a minute, then.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Okay. Thank you very much.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Ms. O'Connell, go ahead.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Thanks.

On that point of order, if Mr. Genuis is arguing that his motion is part of Bill C-20, I would argue then that it's also out of order because the context of his motion is outside of the scope. It's actually on a motion as amended that is still before the committee, so he's off-topic on numerous fronts.

The irony is that the Conservatives suggested this issue was not just a way to filibuster on dealing with government legislation. I think they've made it very clear to Canadians that they are willing to use the rights of victims to filibuster government legislation. I think they've proven the point.

Mr. Chair, my point of order is that the motion is out of order.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Thank you, Ms. O'Connell. I'll take that into account.

I'll just confer with the clerk once we get a copy of that from Mr. Genuis. We're just getting it translated.

We'll have a five-minute recess while we get that translated.

• (1710) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1725)

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Everyone, I'd like to call the meeting back to order, please.

Thank you for everybody's indulgence. It's been a little bit of a trying hour. Let's try to make the second hour not quite as trying. We're all trying.

Through many discussions, it's been decided that perhaps we should, for today, move on—and I will make a ruling on Mr. Genuis's motion on Bill C-20. Do we have unanimous consent?

Ms. Ferreri, go ahead.

• (1730)

Ms. Michelle Ferreri (Peterborough—Kawartha, CPC): I'm new to this committee. I don't normally sit on this committee. This is a very interesting committee to sit on for the first time. I just want to acknowledge the witnesses who have sat very patiently. Thank you.

I think I can find a compromise. I think that actually everybody in the room, based on what I've witnessed, wants exactly the same thing. I think everybody wants to move forward immediately with Bill C-20. Is that right? Let's get that done. We have these lovely people who have been extremely patient—you can come and teach my children how to be that patient—and they want to get on with it.

The reason I came—and I think and hope there is an appetite, especially in my female colleague across the way—is that we have to investigate the Paul Bernardo transfer. That's why we're here, on the rights of victims. If we could have—

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

Ms. Michelle Ferreri: I'm still on my point of order.

If we could have—

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: What's the point? This sounds like debate.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): I'm sure my good colleague will get to her point quickly.

Ms. Michelle Ferreri: Yes, of course.

I'm saying, one hundred per cent, let's move forward with Bill C-20 and get that done, but we cannot defend Paul Bernardo in the House of Commons.

I'm putting forward that we would have unanimous consent to move forward with Bill C-20 right now, but that we should remove what was put forward, that the minister not come, and that we have unanimous consent on the subamendment that was put on the floor originally by my colleague Mr. Lloyd to ensure that the rights of victims are met. I believe that, among my colleagues from the Bloc, the NDP and the Liberals, they didn't want the Minister of Public Safety, so let's just ensure that the rights of victims are here and we're not protecting the child killer and rapist Paul Bernardo.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Ms. O'Connell, go ahead.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I don't know what that was, Mr. Chair. Was there a motion somewhere in there? If so, could she repeat the actual text of her motion so that we can determine whether or not it's in order?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Could you repeat the part just at the end there, where you did say the motion you were looking for, Ms. Ferreri?

Ms. Michelle Ferreri: I can send it to the committee. Revised, it would be that the committee hold a three-hour meeting with the following witnesses: the commissioner of Correctional Service Canada, Anne Kelly; the deputy minister, Shawn Tupper; the federal victims ombudsman; and representatives of the victims' families to discuss the transfer of Paul Bernardo from a maximum-security facility to a medium-security facility.

We could pass that with unanimous consent and go right to Bill C-20 and get on with this.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I have a point of order. Mr. Chair, the motion isn't in order. We already voted on it. The member opposite's motion would need to be.... This could be a notice of motion, but it's not in order since we are currently on Bill C-20.

An hon. member: I have a point of order.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Just wait a second on all of these points of order.

The clerk has informed me that if there is unanimous consent on that, we could go forward with that.

Ms. Michelle Ferreri: For clarification, Mr. Chair, I am asking this committee for unanimous consent—

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: On a point of order, we already voted.

Ms. Michelle Ferreri: So you want to protect Paul Bernardo—just for the record.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair. If we are going to play that game, and the member opposite.... We had the motion before us previously. In fact, it was our members who brought it forward. We were working collectively.

Mr. Chair, if the members opposite didn't come prepared to deal with Bill C-20, then they should just let everyone know instead of trying to make a political show of horrific—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): This is sounding like debate now. Is this your point of order?

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: In fairness, Mr. Chair, if you're going to allow other members to make very derogatory accusations about some members....

Isn't that right, Mr. Chair? We are trying to get to a place—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Let's debate this issue.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Let's not.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Mr. Chair, the motion was ruled out of order.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): I understand that.

We have not received unanimous consent, so we will move on.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On the same point of order, Chair...?

• (1735)

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Make it quick, Mr. Genuis, please.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: My colleague put forward a good-faith attempt to come to a compromise. If we don't have a compromise, then I have a motion that's on the floor, so I'm happy to speak to that.

If we could have some clarity about exactly where we are...? Our goal is to get to a point—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Just a minute, Mr. Genuis, because we're losing track a bit.

That was the one, just before we were going to take our break, that we were getting translation for. Everybody has received that in their emails.

You are correct, Mr. Genuis. That is on the floor, effectively. We left that off to get translation. Would you like to speak to that?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

The goal of the Conservative Party—

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I have a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —at this committee is to allow representatives of the families of Bernardo's victims to come and tell their stories.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Mr. Genuis, we have a point of order.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I question whether this motion is in order given that we already voted on the subject of it.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On the same point of order, on what possible basis could this be out of order?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): I have not recognized you yet, Mr. Genuis, please.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm sorry. I have a point of order.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): The clerk is informing me that because this is a motion to report back to the House, this is a different and new motion. I have not ruled on this one yet. I will say that it's in order.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Mr. Chair, I challenge your ruling.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): I'm not surprised by that.

We will call the vote.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: For clarification, again, a “no” is that you do not support the chair's ruling, and a “yes” is that you support the chair's ruling.

Is that correct, Mr. Clerk?

The Clerk: That is correct. The question is, shall the decision of the chair be sustained?

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Thank you.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair. Just on a point of order, the member opposite was able to ask a question of the clerk about procedure and the clerk answered directly—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): I'm sorry. That was my fault. I should have jumped in there more quickly, Mr. Genuis.

Thanks for pointing that out. I'll try to do a better job.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: In past—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Mr. Genuis, I haven't recognized you yet either.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Okay. I have a point of order.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Go ahead, Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On committees that I've been on in the past, it's been relatively routine for committee members to be able to raise questions of procedure. With the chair's permission, the clerk has weighed in. I don't think there's anything—

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I have a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —inappropriate about the clerk's weighing in. I just question the fact that.... The fact is that we have a situation in which some of the—

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: This is a point of order, Ms. O'Connell.

We have a situation where—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Mr. Genuis, thank you. I've heard your point.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —the chair's rulings are being overruled even when they're obviously in order and the clerk's not been able to weigh in. That's a concern.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Mr. Genuis, please respect the chair.

Go ahead, Ms. O'Connell.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: There's a motion to challenge the chair. There is no debate on that.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Let's go to that vote. Is it the will of the committee to have a recorded vote?

An hon. member: Yes.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: We can adopt the motion on division.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): No, we'll go to a recorded vote.

An hon. member: [*Inaudible—Editor*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm glad you can laugh at this.

An hon. member: Relax.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Mr. Bittle and Mr. Genuis, it's been a long afternoon, gentlemen. It's going to be a longer afternoon. Let's try to keep it civil. We all have our differences of opinion here. Let's not be talking back and forth across the table, please, both of you. Thank you.

(Ruling of the chair overturned: nays 7; yeas 3)

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): That fails, so we will now move to Bill C-20.

An hon. member: Point of order....

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): I have Mr. Genuis on another point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's not a point of order, Chair.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): I thought you said "point of order". I'm sorry.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I have a point of order.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): We have a point of order over here.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Mr. Chair, can I just get some clarification? Who are the members on the Conservatives? Mr. Genuis voted last time, but Mr. Motz is the regular member. Who is being subbed in?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): I'll confer with the clerk.

• (1740)

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Thank you.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Ms. O'Connell, there has been notification sent that Mr. Genuis is replacing Mr. Motz right now.

Mr. Genuis, do you have a point of order?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No, I'm requesting the floor.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Okay. Go ahead very quickly.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

I'd like to move that the committee invite additional witnesses to appear in regard to Bill C-20 and that any new amendments to the bill be submitted to the clerk within 48 hours of the completion of the agreed-upon witness meetings.

This motion is being put forward in the hope that we can do further study on Bill C-20. I think further study would be useful to set the stage on this bill, but also to allow committee members to have broader conversations about some of the other issues in terms of the committee's agenda.

As we get into this discussion of what the agenda of the committee will be going forward, it's important to note that it is always the tendency of government to want to prioritize the advancement of government legislation. That's obviously understandable. It wouldn't be government legislation if the government weren't supportive of it. It's the job of parliamentary committees to scrutinize that legislation, to review it, to consider amendments and possible improvements, to hear from various experts and to determine its agenda in terms of how many experts it hears from, on what matters and on what timeline.

However, the committee also needs to prioritize other issues before it. In particular, some members of this committee have been seized with the hope that we will actually be able to honour the desire of representatives of the families of the victims of Paul Bernardo—

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —to come and tell their stories before the committee. These are the—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Just wait one moment, please, Mr. Genuis.

Go ahead, Ms. O'Connell.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

If the member's motion is about expanding the study on Bill C-20, then he's outside of the scope of his motion. I'd ask that you rule that he stay on the subject matter of his motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): I will keep that in mind.

We are discussing Bill C-20 right now, Mr. Genuis. If you could keep your comments to that, it would be appreciated by all.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, with great respect, I'll certainly fully stay within the rules that are established. I suspect there will be other members who will want to speak to this motion as well.

The rules prescribe that there's a certain breadth in terms of the ability of a member to address the topic of the motion. In that context, I do want to be clear about the rationale for having brought forward this motion. Why have Conservatives put forward this motion? Fundamentally, what is our goal in terms of trying to shape the agenda of this committee?

Mr. Peter Julian: I have a point of order.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Mr. Genuis, wait just one moment, please.

I'm not sure, but Mr. Julian might have the same point of order. I was just talking with the clerk.

Go ahead on your point of order, Mr. Julian.

Mr. Peter Julian: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

If the intention is to provoke a filibuster to delay consideration of Bill C-20, I think there are two considerations, Mr. Chair.

First, of course Mr. Genuis would be aware of both the rule of repetition and staying within the scope of his motion, and that will mean repeated points of order, because he does have a tendency to repeat and to fall outside of his motion.

Second, though, we've now had the witnesses before us for two consecutive meetings. If his intention and the Conservatives' intention is to filibuster the rest of the meeting, it would seem to me it's being inconsiderate of the witnesses and that we should contemplate releasing them again. The cost of this meeting and the previous meeting, both of which were filibustered by Conservatives, has been in the tens of thousands of dollars. All of our witnesses before us have important jobs they are taken away from to become witnesses for this committee and for clause-by-clause on Bill C-20. I find it very unfortunate that their time is being wasted, the public's time is being wasted and resources are being wasted on this filibuster that really could be resolved off-line, I think, over the next few days.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Thank you.

That is exactly what was going through my head, Mr. Julian, as you raised your hand.

Now, I can't read minds—I wish I could—so I don't know exactly what the intentions are.

I am going to speak to the witnesses right now.

I tried to speak to you earlier, but we got distracted. Thank you. Thank you very much for being here again today. I haven't even had a chance to introduce you all yet. Thank you for being here last time. Thank you—I'm going to mention it again—for missing the Blue Jays game for this great work you're doing here tonight. It is much appreciated. I know it must be frustrating to sit here.

I don't know what to do exactly, Mr. Julian, because I don't know the intentions.

Mr. Genuis, go ahead.

• (1745)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Mr. Chair, I can speak to that and hopefully shed some light for Mr. Julian. I don't think his intervention was a point of order, but I didn't object. I didn't have a problem with allowing him to—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Do you have some information perhaps towards that?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Yes, absolutely. I have the floor, so I'm happy to address my intentions.

On this side of the House, our intention is to firmly insist that the representatives of the family members of Paul Bernardo's victims not be silenced by parliamentarians who think that their—

Mr. Chris Bittle (St. Catharines, Lib.): I have a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —voices' coming to committee is inconvenient.

That is my intention today, and that is our intention.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Thank you. I'll give you the floor again because it is your turn.

I am going to make a decision because it's my decision to make. Just seeing how this has gone for an hour and 15 minutes, I will let the witnesses go today. If what you're looking for is consensus, I don't think we're going to get it today with, I think, 45 minutes. We haven't been able to reach it in an hour and 15 minutes.

I apologize very much to the witnesses.

Ms. Michelle Ferreri: I have a point of order.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): If anybody strongly disagrees....

Before you pipe up too quickly, Ms. Ferreri has a point of order.

Ms. Michelle Ferreri: I just thought, as one more chance and one more lost hope, again, as a new person, is there...?

Mr. Chris Bittle: I'm sorry. I was the first one.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): You're right.

Ms. Ferreri, I'm sorry.

Mr. Bittle, you are correct, and I apologize to you.

Mr. Chris Bittle: Thank you so much, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Chair, as we're going through what is now hour four of using a horrific situation in my community, I'm curious if it could be answered for us—and it would shed some light on things—whether anyone has spoken to Mr. Danson or the victims' families.

An hon. member: Yes, they have.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: This is not a point of order.

Mr. Chris Bittle: I know we've heard from friends of friends, but—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): This is turning into debate, everyone.

Mr. Bittle, thank you for your point of order.

Ms. Ferreri, do you have a point of order?

Ms. Michelle Ferreri: I have a quick point of order.

If I could call one more time for unanimous consent that we approve that we're going to study this so that we can have the rights of victims..., then we can go right to Bill C-20. It's a unanimous consent motion. I'm putting it on the floor for the second time. I think we all want the same thing because Mr. Julian is exactly right.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Thank you, Ms. Ferreri.

Do we have unanimous consent?

Some hon. members: No.

The Chair: No, we do not.

Thank you, witnesses. I wish one of you had my phone number so that you could text me the score. Enjoy what's left of the game. We'll see you soon. Have a nice Thanksgiving weekend.

Let's get back to.... I'd say, "Let's back to order", but we really haven't had a lot of order, so let's get back to something.

Ms. O'Connell, I think we left off with you on a point of order.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I move that we adjourn this meeting.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm sorry, Mr. Chair. I have a point of order.

Can you move an adjournment motion on a point of order? My understanding is that you need the floor to move an adjournment motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): I don't know about that Mr. Genuis. I'm going to check with my friend to the left here, and I'll let you know.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: In fairness, I didn't say that it was a point of order. I asked to be added to the list.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I had the floor, and I never ceded it.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Mr. Genuis, you did have the floor.

I'm sorry. I thought it was a point of order, Ms. O'Connell, but he did have the floor.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Am I on the list?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): I can definitely get you on the list.

Let's just check the list. Right now, Mr. Genuis has the floor. Mr. Lloyd has raised his hand, wanting to speak, and then we have Ms. O'Connell.

Is there anybody else at this point in time? Okay. Thank you.

We'll continue with Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Although I've been trying to move various motions, I feel that I've actually barely had a chance to speak for an extended period to put on the record what the case we're making is. Notwithstanding the call for adjournment, I would like to be able to very clearly do that.

Conservatives have been putting before this committee the view that, following the transfer of Paul Bernardo to medium-security—

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I have a point of order.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Mr. Genuis, if you could stick to Bill C-20, please, that would be appreciated.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Yes, I will speak to the motion, and I will speak to the rationale for why the motion is important.

• (1750)

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

First, could we have the most current motion in terms of extending the study for Bill C-20, which is what I understood?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): We'll be able to sit around and chat some more because we'll ask Mr. Genuis if he could send us that motion, please—the latest one that we don't have.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I could. I've read it out verbally, so there's no requirement for it to be—

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I would like to know what the motion is on the floor.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Shall I just read it again?

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Sure.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Mr. Genuis, can you make sure that you speak only when I'm addressing you, please? Thank you.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's that the committee invite additional witnesses to appear in regard to Bill C-20 and that any new amendments to the bill be submitted to the clerk within 48 hours of the completion of the agreed-upon witness meetings.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I have a point of order.

I would argue again that the debate that is about to happen needs to stick to the motion that the member himself moved, which is extending the meeting for Bill C-20. I would argue that any other committee business is outside of the scope of his own motion.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Thank you, Ms. O'Connell.

I will do my very best to keep it to that. I can't make him move his lips to my...but I will do my best.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: [*Inaudible—Editor*]

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): That is your right and prerogative too, Ms. O'Connell.

I have Ms. Ferreri on a point of order.

Ms. Michelle Ferreri: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm not 100% sure on this. Mr. Bittle asked the committee if we had heard from victims' families, and I do have the letters here from the victims' families. I'm happy to read them into the record. It's why I'm here. I'm not going to stop saying that. I could read that into the record, because he did ask the committee for that.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: On a point of order, that's debate.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): I know.

Ms. Michelle Ferreri: Can I ask to table this with the committee?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): I think that would be out of order, as we're talking about Bill C-20 right now, Ms. Ferreri.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: She can request UC for it.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): She can, but she didn't.

Ms. Michelle Ferreri: Mr. Bittle asked, so I'm saying—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Mr. Genuis has the floor right now. Should we continue on with debate?

There is a point of order from Mr. Lloyd.

Mr. Dane Lloyd: Thank you.

I'm going to request unanimous consent. The witnesses have gone. Discussion on Bill C-20 might be pointless at this point. I think we could use this time. I'm asking for unanimous consent to discuss a potentially revised motion that we can all accept in the remaining 40 or 30 minutes of this meeting. Then we can move on to Bill C-20.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: No.

Mr. Dane Lloyd: Okay. Thank you.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): There's no unanimous consent.

Mr. Genuis, it's back to you.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Chair.

I'll just say briefly that I think—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Mr. Genuis, can I just remind you that we need you to stick closely to Bill C-20, please?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Absolutely, Chair, I will stick within the rules, which are to speak to the motion as well as the context of the motion. I know those rules very well. They don't require me to reference Bill C-20 in, say, every sentence. In debate in the House, you'll see members who draw on philosophical texts and go on at great length to set the stage for subsequent points.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Kristina Michaud: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Mr. Genuis, Ms. Michaud has a point of order.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Kristina Michaud: I want to make sure I understand. Are we talking about a new motion? Have we received it in both official languages? I have to say that I've kind of lost track.

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Yes, and he has read it out twice. Did you get it the last time he read it out?

Ms. O'Connell asked for it to be read out, and he did read it out again.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Kristina Michaud: Do we have it in French?

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): No one has it in writing, but I thought the translation would have come through.

Do you want him to do it one more time, Ms. Michaud? Tell me if the translation comes through.

I'm sorry, Mr. Genuis. Could you read your motion one more time? Hopefully—

[*Translation*]

Ms. Kristina Michaud: If Mr. Genuis wants us to vote on his motion, the least he can do is send it to us in both official languages.

[*English*]

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): We're not voting on it right now. Do we need to get that...?

Procedurally, we don't need it in writing right now. We can just do it verbally. That's what the clerk is telling me, Ms. Michaud.

Go ahead, Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Would members like me to read it again, though? I'm happy to.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Did you want it read one more time, Ms. Michaud, for clarification? Are you sure?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Okay. If there's no need to read the motion again, I'll be brief if I'm not interrupted, but I will be longer if I am interrupted. I would like to be able to quickly get out there the ideas that I want to get out there.

It is simply that my colleagues who are regular members of this committee have been trying to work towards a solution that would allow one meeting before Bill C-20 is completed to allow representatives of victims' families to tell their stories before this committee. We have members of the Liberal Party who are no doubt deeply embarrassed by their failure here and their failures on crime more broadly, so they are trying to silence representatives of the families of the victims. That is a crying shame.

Conservatives will not apologize for standing up for victims' families, for standing with victims' families and insisting that they be heard, and for using the tools and the leverage we have to ensure that they are heard.

• (1755)

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: I have a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: This is the stand we've taken, and we will stand—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Mr. Genuis, we have a point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'm done, actually, Chair.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Ms. O'Connell, go ahead.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Once again, the member is off the subject matter of his own motion, so can we stick to the motion at hand, which is debating whether or not there should be an extension of the study of Bill C-20?

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Thank you, Ms. O'Connell, for your point of order.

I do believe, Mr. Genuis, you said you had finished.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Yes, and maybe just to make it simpler, Chair—

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Keep it on topic, please.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: —since I've now said my piece, I'll happily accept the adjournment.

I move to adjourn the meeting.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Okay.

Ms. Jennifer O'Connell: You should want this.

The Vice-Chair (Mr. Doug Shipley): Trust me—I do.

Do we have unanimous consent to adjourn the meeting?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Seeing unanimous consent, I call the meeting adjourned.

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

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

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.

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: <https://www.ourcommons.ca>

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

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

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 des communes.

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.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante :
<https://www.noscommunes.ca>