



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans

FOPO • NUMBER 009 • 2nd SESSION • 41st PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Wednesday, February 5, 2014

—
Chair

Mr. Rodney Weston

Standing Committee on Fisheries and Oceans

Wednesday, February 5, 2014

• (1535)

[English]

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

I must inform members that the clerk of the committee can receive motions only for the election of the chair. The clerk cannot receive other types of motions, cannot entertain points of order, and cannot participate in debate.

We can now proceed to the election of the chair.

Mr. Robert Chisholm (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, NDP): I have a point of order. Oh no, you said you can't entertain a point of order. Sorry, I didn't quite catch that.

The Clerk: Pursuant to Standing Order 106(2), the chair must be a member of the government party.

I am ready to receive motions for the election of the chair.

Mr. Robert Chisholm: Does it say “must” or “may”?

The Clerk: “Must”.

Mr. MacAulay.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay (Cardigan, Lib.): I nominate Rodney Weston for chair of the committee.

I worked as hard as I could, but I couldn't muster up enough....

The Clerk: Are there any other further motions?

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

The Clerk: I declare Mr. Rodney Weston elected chair of the committee.

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

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

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

Mr. Robert Chisholm: You're sure that says “must”, not “may”?

The Clerk: Mr. Kamp.

Mr. Randy Kamp (Pitt Meadows—Maple Ridge—Mission, CPC): I nominate Mr. Robert Chisholm.

The Clerk: It has been moved by Mr. Kamp that Mr. Chisholm be elected first vice-chair of the committee. Are there any further motions?

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

The Clerk: I declare Mr. Chisholm elected first vice-chair of the committee.

Mr. Robert Chisholm: I was up all night last night, and then we do the same thing.

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

I am now prepared to receive motions for the second vice-chair.

Mr. Chisholm.

Mr. Robert Chisholm: I'll nominate Mr. MacAulay.

I was going to let him sweat a little bit. He was looking around for somebody to nominate him.

Mr. John Weston (West Vancouver—Sunshine Coast—Sea to Sky Country, CPC): I just think it should be said, for his kids, grandchildren, and others, that even if there were hundreds of others, we'd still be nominating Lawrence MacAulay.

Mr. Robert Chisholm: Don't burst his bubble. That's not fair, John.

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

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

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Motion agreed to)

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

I now invite Mr. Weston to take the chair.

• (1540)

The Chair (Mr. Rodney Weston (Saint John, CPC)): Thank you very much.

It's nice to be back. I trust everyone had a good holiday and a productive beginning to the new year.

I want to take a moment to welcome a new member to our committee. Mr. Stewart, it's nice to have you here. I certainly look forward to your involvement and input in this committee.

I want to pass along thanks through the official opposition to the two members who have left the committee, Mr. Toone and Mr. Donnelly. We certainly valued their input over the last while. Thanks also to Mr. Kerr. He was only with us for a short time, but we certainly did appreciate his input as well.

Mr. Robert Chisholm: I'll pass that along.

The Chair: Yes, please.

I've already told Mr. Kerr, but I do appreciate the input from all committee members, and I look forward to continuing the same very collegial type of attitude we've had on this committee. I certainly look forward to continuing to move forward on the issues that we take on as a committee.

Today, as you probably saw, there's only one item on the agenda, the election of the chair and the vice-chairs. I do look for consent to move to routine motions at this point in time. We'll do committee business at this point in time to deal with routine motions.

Mr. Chisholm, you mentioned before the meeting that there has been some discussion in other committees around the routine motions and the order.

Before I go there, I thought it would be a good opportunity to do that today rather than putting it off until the first of the week. That will be the only other item of business that we'll do today, the routine motions.

I'm going to start it off and circulate copies of the routine motions that outline the speaking order and the designation of speakers.

In the text it's "Allocation of Time for Questioning". I'm not sure who wants to start off the discussion around this today. I'll wait until we get the routine motions distributed.

Mr. Chisholm.

Mr. Robert Chisholm: Mr. Chairman, I see that the order we're going to be doing is 10 minutes, seven minutes, and then five minutes, which I think is a good idea. I've been consulting with some of my colleagues. I see that we give Mr. MacAulay 10 minutes in the first round and then seven minutes in the second round.

• (1545)

The Chair: It's 10 minutes for the witnesses.

Mr. Robert Chisholm: I'm sorry?

The Chair: When you read the routine motions, the 10 minutes that are referred to are for the opening statement.

Mr. Robert Chisholm: I'm sorry, so it's seven.

The Chair: It's seven minutes and five minutes.

Mr. Robert Chisholm: Let me start again, because I was wondering whether we wanted to start with a 10-minute round as our first round, and then maybe go to five-minute rounds. I also wondered, given that we seem to have had of late a number of witnesses in for only an hour, whether we want to continue with this order, or whether we want to push the Liberals back to the third

round. What happens, of course, is if we do the one hour, then it's kind of out of proportion in terms of the participation.

Those are two things. One is the question of 10 minutes and then five minutes, and then the question of party order.

The Chair: Just to be clear, what you're suggesting, Mr. Chisholm, is that the first round would last 10 minutes, and it would remain the same for speakers: Conservative, NDP, Conservative, and Liberal. They would have 10 minutes each. In the second round, it would be NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, and Conservative, for five minutes each.

Mr. Robert Chisholm: That's right.

The Chair: Then a third round would be a five-minute round as well.

Mr. Robert Chisholm: For all of us, yes.

The Chair: For all of us again. Okay. It would be Conservative, NDP, Conservative, and Liberal. Is that what you're suggesting?

Mr. Robert Chisholm: That's right.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. MacAulay.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: It's the same as it was in the previous committee, is it? Or have the order and the times changed?

The Chair: What the order is right now—

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: The order is the same.

The Chair: The order is the same. What he's suggesting is changing the first round. Rather than it being a seven-minute round, it will be 10 minutes. In the second round, it would be removing you, quite frankly, from the second round and moving you to the third round, and it would be a five-minute allotment as well.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: Who was suggesting that?

The Chair: Mr. Chisholm.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: Well, I oppose for sure.

The Chair: Mr. Kamp.

Mr. Randy Kamp: I'm not sure that I have an opinion yet on the second half.

This committee for many years has had 10-minute opening rounds. One advantage of it was that you could split that effectively with two members if you didn't want to do 10 minutes with one speaker. A seven-minute round is hard to split, because you think you're going to split, but you get four and a half minutes into it and you don't leave very much time, depending on what kinds of answers are coming back from the witness.

I think we would be okay with that.

Also, with respect to the first round, if we're going to change that, we might be interested as well in having the Conservatives go last in that round and moving the Liberal up into the third spot. That's just our preference, I think.

The Chair: You're suggesting to just change the bottom two. Are you suggesting changing the whole order so that the NDP would lead off, or would you still lead off with Conservative, and then have NDP, Liberal, and Conservative? Is that what you're suggesting?

Mr. Randy Kamp: I'm just talking about the first round, which would be Conservative, NDP, Liberal, and Conservative.

The Chair: Sorry, I missed that.

Mr. Randy Kamp: It would be Conservative, NDP, Liberal, and Conservative.

The Chair: So the Conservatives would be first and last, and the NDP and Liberal would be in the middle. All right.

Are you okay with the 10 minutes?

Mr. Randy Kamp: I wouldn't mind hearing others, but I don't think we'd be opposed to that.

The Chair: Okay. Let's focus our discussion at this point on the first round. At this point it's a combined proposal from Mr. Chisholm and Mr. Kamp for 10 minutes. When I say combined, I mean that Mr. Chisholm is suggesting 10 minutes for each questioner, and Mr. Kamp is just suggesting a change in the order of speakers. He's suggesting going Conservative, NDP, Liberal, and Conservative for that first round.

Are there any questions on that?

Mr. MacAulay.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: I would support what Mr. Kamp is proposing.

Can I ask a question? Would the first round be Conservative, NDP, Liberal, and Conservative?

• (1550)

The Chair: Yes.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: The second round would be what? Or will we deal with the first round first?

The Chair: We'll just deal with the first round, if that's okay.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: I'm in a game of survival here.

The Chair: I understand.

The proposal for the first round is to move from seven minutes to 10 minutes for time limits, the time allocation for each party. As Mr. Kamp said, it does make it easier to split the time if you want to split with another member as well. The only change would be moving from seven minutes to 10 minutes, and then the order would be Conservative, NDP, Liberal, and Conservative, as opposed to the present order.

Mr. Chisholm.

Mr. Robert Chisholm: I'm sorry. I just wanted to say that it is the case in some committees that the NDP starts off, but I'm neither here nor there on it. I'm quite happy with the way it's been going here and the way we seem to usually.... I mean, Sopuck gets out of hand from time to time, but that's usually after I speak, not before.

Mr. Robert Sopuck (Dauphin—Swan River—Marquette, CPC): That's why I wanted him to go first.

Mr. Robert Chisholm: Yes, I'm happy with the idea. If the Conservatives want to start and finish the first round, that's fine.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Kamp.

Mr. Randy Kamp: I think Mr. Chisholm raises a good point. In fact, it used to be that way here for most of my career on this committee. The opposition would begin the questioning round.

I don't think we would be opposed to the Conservatives going second and fourth, instead of first and fourth.

The other thing I was going to say, because Robert is right in that we seem to have a lot of one-hour witness panels, and when you go to this 10 minutes and it's a 10-minute presentation, and it's starting a little bit late, this fits in a little better, I think, with that one hour. Then it's up to us, as the parties, to figure out how we're going to split up that 10 minutes.

The Chair: I think I'm hearing consensus here on the first round, that we move to 10 minutes for each time slot, and the order would be NDP, Conservative, Liberal, and Conservative. Okay? Good.

The second question is on the second round. At this time, the order is NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Liberal, NDP, Conservative, and Conservative. Now we're losing two members from the committee, so the suggestion at most committees has been that we drop one NDP and one Conservative from the time slots. That would leave it as NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Liberal, and Conservative.

Mr. Chisholm's suggestion was that we go with NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, and Conservative in the second round.

The third round, if there is a third round, would be a five-minute round as well. It would move through the same order, beginning again as we did with the 10-minute round. It's probably getting confusing, but it would be Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Liberal.... I'm sorry. It would be NDP, Conservative, Liberal, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, and Conservative. That would be the third round.

Mr. MacAulay.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: Basically the third round makes very little difference. If you have to dump me, why don't you dump me on the third one, because basically I'm out of play after the first round if you do that.

I just ask for the—

Mr. Randy Kamp: You get 15 minutes, though: 10 plus 5.

The Chair: You're suggesting—

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: To stay where we are.

The Chair: Okay. So you're suggesting—

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: Don't take the NDP's suggestion.

The Chair: Okay. I think it's clear.

Mr. Chisholm, do you have a comment?

Mr. Robert Chisholm: I love to sit here and listen to Mr. MacAulay, with his vast experience and so on, but the only point I'm raising here is that in terms of the amount of time, it's way out of proportion, that's all, if we have a short period of time. That gives Mr. MacAulay 15 minutes in those two rounds and gives us 20 minutes.

It would balance out over a two-hour stretch. That's certainly what I've seen in other committees. I've just noticed it over the last few hearings. I think we need to get a little more of a whack at things and then bring him in on the third round. Then he's good to go.

• (1555)

The Chair: Basically, when you look at total time, what Mr. Chisholm is suggesting is that in the first two rounds you would be reduced from 12 minutes to 10.

That's what you're suggesting.

Mr. MacAulay.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: Basically, that would be my input. All I can do is beg for the committee's indulgence to leave it as it is.

The Chair: Mr. Kamp.

Mr. Randy Kamp: Could I just ask for clarification on the second round being proposed? Were we shortening the second round or having this long list as per the clerk's sheet here?

The Chair: We're shortening the second round. The timeframe will remain the same at five minutes per questioner, but now the second round would consist of NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, and Conservative, as per Mr. Chisholm's suggestion, rather than what we've had in the past, which was NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Liberal, NDP, Conservative, and Conservative.

We're losing two members, so we're taking out one NDP and one Conservative from the second round. Mr. Chisholm's suggestion was to remove the Liberal as well from the second round.

Mr. Chisholm.

Mr. Robert Chisholm: I think it's especially important that we revise that, given that we're shortening it. Right?

The Chair: The second round is going to be considerably shorter.

Mr. Robert Chisholm: Then we'll have 15 minutes, and he'll have 12 minutes.

The Chair: No.

Mr. Robert Chisholm: No, we'll have 20 minutes, and he'll have 15.

The Chair: Yes, 20 and 15 is what it would be.

Mr. Robert Chisholm: That's just a suggestion.

As I said, this is what I've seen in other committees. I think it works a little better and it's fairer in terms of the proportion of members on the committee.

The Chair: It would mean the Conservatives would have 25 minutes in the first two rounds; the NDP would have 20 minutes; and the Liberal would have 10 minutes. Is that correct?

Mr. Randy Kamp: I think we would have 30 if it's NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, in the second round. Is that what you said?

A voice: No, there are two Conservatives.

The Chair: No, there are three Conservatives in the second round.

Mr. Randy Kamp: We have two 10-minute blocks in the first round.

The Chair: Oh, you're right. It's 35. I said 25. It is 35.

Mr. Kamp.

Mr. Randy Kamp: Would it help to make the second round quite abbreviated—just four slots again: NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative—and then start a third round, perhaps with a Liberal leading that round, or one of us? I'm not sure. There is no Liberal in the second round, but it's a shorter second round.

The Chair: You're suggesting the Conservatives would drop one, so the second round would consist of only five minutes, NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, and then the third round would be —

Mr. Randy Kamp: It's just a thought.

The Chair: — a five-minute round, and it would start with the Liberal. Okay.

Mr. MacAulay.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: This is just a suggestion, but what if I had five minutes in the second round at the end instead of the seven? Then it would be fair.

Mr. Randy Kamp: Well, that's what you have.

The Chair: That's right.

An hon. member: Nice try, Lawrence.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: I'm sharper than I thought.

The only thing is that if I am removed from the second round, then basically I have one turn. That's mostly what will happen. There could be an odd time, if I lead on the third round, that the chair might...or if I end the second round. It could happen. But if not, then basically it's one round for the Liberals and that's it. It would be a bit unfair.

• (1600)

Mr. Randy Kamp: But we gave you an extra three minutes—

The Chair: That's on the first round.

Mr. Randy Kamp: It went from seven to ten, and there's nobody for you to split that with.

The Chair: Mr. Chisholm.

Mr. Robert Chisholm: We've not only given you three more minutes, Lawrence, but it's common among the other committees for the Liberals not to be in the second round. That's the practice. We're not cutting the Liberals off; we're giving them a little more and moving them to the next round.

The proposal that Randy raised about shortening the second round is an interesting one. I mean you're giving up 10 minutes.

The Chair: It's five.

Mr. MacAulay.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: It's all right to talk about the other committees, but this fisheries committee has been more than cordial, more than accommodating over the years. All of us had a spurt, even the governing party, where I... I would ask you to be a little considerate before you make your final decision. You need to leave me in the second round. I think it's fair. I've been on fisheries, when I haven't been in the ministry, from the time I came here, and this is the first time the likes of this has happened. Just consider fairness, please.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. MacAulay.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: If you end the third round with me on it, that's fair, but I think you have to give me the second round. If not, I'm not in it. You can say the third round, but 90% of the time we'll have no third round.

Sure we've had differences around here the odd time, but really not. This has been a very cordial affair.

And I hate getting the shaft.

The Chair: To your point, Mr. MacAulay, yes, I don't recall us having a third round in any questioning here.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: That's right, Mr. Chair. Essentially, I'm off.

The Chair: I would just add that comment, that I don't remember us having a third round. I'll just throw that out.

Is there anything further on that?

Yes, Mr. MacAulay.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: All I'll say is that if you leave me on the second round, on the end, with five minutes, then I do have more than one turn. If you go to the third round, I'm out.

That's the decision. I'm sitting here, myself...but it's a decision the committee has to make.

The Chair: Mr. Chisholm.

Mr. Robert Chisholm: Just a second, I have to wipe away some tears here.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: No, I'm doing no—

Mr. Robert Chisholm: Lawrence, listen. I haven't been around as long as you have, but I've been at this game a little while. My understanding is that when the NDP was the third party, regardless of who was in government, there wasn't necessarily a tendency to be so fair.

All I'm trying to do is to balance things out a little bit better than I think they have been. I think we're talking a matter of a couple of minutes. I don't think we're generating much of a hardship. The big round is the first round of 10 minutes, and I think that makes a big difference.

Before it would have been 12 minutes out of two rounds, right? Instead, the Liberals are getting 10 minutes, which is two minutes less. I don't call that a hardship.

• (1605)

The Chair: Ms. Davidson.

Mrs. Patricia Davidson (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC): Maybe Mr. Chisholm can answer this question, or maybe Georges can.

Several times there's been a reference to other committees that have done this. What other committees have done it, and how did they do it?

The Chair: Do you want to try to address that, Mr. Clerk?

The Clerk: Sure.

I don't have the specifics, but most of my colleagues have reported back in our meetings that most committees have dropped one NDP member and one Conservative member in the second round. Most of the time the Liberals don't have a second round; they are not into the second round.

The Chair: Thank you, Georges.

Is there anything further?

Mr. MacAulay.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: What is the decision? Is there going to be a vote, or how are they going to decide?

I mean, quite simply, if I'm removed from the second round, I have one round and then I'm done. That is not fair.

I don't want to get into addressing what happened previously. I've seen a lot of changes around here, but I can tell you one thing. Being fair didn't hurt me any, and I've always been fair, to the best of my ability.

I'm not sucking around, or crying. All I'm telling you is that I want it to be fair. There are times when....

Now we have to decide. I think if you take me out of the second round, then I come for the first 10 minutes and that's it.

Mr. Chair, you've chaired most of the committees since you've come here, and there are not many times we've gone to the third round. The odd time you might have two minutes for each or something, but as you just said.... So it would look bad.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. MacAulay.

Is there anything further on this?

You asked what the decision was, but there has been no decision at this point in time. Sorry, I meant to say that. There has been no decision. It's still in the discussion stage here. That's where we are.

The only thing there has been agreement on so far has been the first round moving to 10 minutes per, and the changes in the speaking order. That's the only thing that's been agreed to so far.

Is there anything further?

Mr. Kamp.

Mr. Randy Kamp: One other thing we could consider if Mr. MacAulay successfully pleads his case, and I use the word "plead" advisedly, is that perhaps we could change the order of the second round so the Liberal comes last in the round. If we run out of time, Mr. MacAulay doesn't get his final five minutes and if we have the time, he gets it.

I'm not in favour of keeping the second round the way it is, because I think Mr. Chisholm is right. We scramble around on this side—we have five questioners—so everyone will have five minutes. Mr. MacAulay will get at least 10. He's asking for a guaranteed 15. Nobody on this side will get that much exposure to our witness, not even close.

Yes, he's right that historically that's been the way. It used to be that the NDP held that position. The reason was that nobody had the power to change it. When we had minority governments, we discussed it every time to see if maybe we thought the order was fair to all the parties, but we didn't have the votes to carry the day. This has been raised by the NDP.

I think it is a valid question. We've now gone from 12 members to 10 members, so does the speaking order still make sense? I'm not sure how we resolve this, Mr. Chair. You haven't told us yet how this is going to be resolved.

We're not in favour of the status quo. At the very most I think we would be prepared to offer keeping the Liberal in the second round but at the end of the second round, the long second round as usual.

• (1610)

The Chair: To clarify, Mr. Kamp, earlier you suggested removing the last Conservative, so you suggest putting the last Conservative back in and the Liberal at the end of that round.

Mr. Randy Kamp: I think we would put the last Conservative in the Liberal spot, and move the Liberal down into the last Conservative spot.

The Chair: Okay.

The suggestion by Mr. Kamp is that the order in a second round would be NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Conservative, and Liberal if there is time.

Is that correct, Mr. Kamp?

Mr. Randy Kamp: Yes, it could be something like that.

Mr. Robert Chisholm: That achieves the same thing.

The Chair: In that scenario, Mr. MacAulay, you would go from currently having 12 minutes to having 15—

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: If I got the last five.

The Chair: If there is time, you would get an extra five.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: What happens? Is the first round shortened?

The Chair: No, the first round is lengthened. You will get 10 minutes in the first round, the Conservatives will get 20, the NDP will get 10, and the Liberals will get 10. In the second round the NDP will get 10, the Conservatives will get 15, and you will get five at the end if there is time.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: I'm getting short on trips.

The Chair: You're going up in time by three minutes from what you currently have and you move one slot.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: It's the best I'm going to get out of it anyhow.

The Chair: You move one slot. The order changes by one. You can get five extra minutes or you could get two fewer.

Does that make sense?

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Do we have agreement on that?

Here's what I'm asking. In the second round the suggestion is, it's five minutes, NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Conservative, Liberal if time allows. It's hard to write that in a routine motion, but it would be an agreement here that Mr. MacAulay would be at the end.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: The Conservatives would have two consecutive rounds. They'd have a double round.

The Chair: Yes.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: Okay.

The Chair: That gets all the members in for at least one questioning timeframe before you get your extra, if time allows.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: That's a big change.

The Chair: Yes, I agree.

By comparison with the total time we are presently using, we are potentially increasing by three minutes or decreasing by two.

Hon. Lawrence MacAulay: It's a dicey issue, but that's the best I can do in the climate I'm in.

The Chair: Do we have agreement on this?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Robert Chisholm: Did we also agree to change the order of the first round?

The Chair: The first round we have already agreed to at 10 minutes. It would be in the order NDP, Conservative, Liberal, Conservative, with 10-minute slots.

The second round now would be five-minute slots: NDP, Conservative, NDP, Conservative, Conservative, and Liberal if time allows.

Mr. Sopuck.

Mr. Robert Sopuck: Doing the math, for a two-hour meeting, that's 120 minutes. We have 70 minutes for questioning, so that's...60 minutes for witnesses. That seems reasonable to me.

The math works, I think.

The Chair: I appreciate everyone's agreement on this. As has been stated here several times today, this committee operates a little differently from others, probably.

We have the witnesses here. We want to make sure that we hear what they have to say as well. We're politicians and like to hear what we have to say; however, the important thing is that the witnesses have their time to share with us the information we're looking to gather.

Are we good with that?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: I thank members for their indulgence here.

Mr. Chisholm, did you have a question?

•(1615)

Mr. Robert Chisholm: Mr. Chairman, I submitted a notice of motion to the clerk earlier this week.

Georges, do you have it with you?

I just want to make sure that I have the opportunity to table it.

Can we circulate it now?

The Chair: Mr. Chisholm, you are providing notice of motion. I know you circulated it earlier, so you're providing notice of motion.

Mr. Robert Chisholm: I'm just providing notice. If I may, I'll quickly read it into the record:

That the Committee immediately begin an examination of the library closure at the Pacific Region Headquarters Library, Vancouver; the Pacific Biological Station Library, Nanaimo; the Eric Marshall Aquatic Research Library, Winnipeg; the Maurice Lamontagne Institute Library, Mont-Joli; the Mere Juliette Library of the Gulf Fisheries Centre, Moncton; the St. Andrews Biological Station Library, St. Andrews; and the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Centre Library, St. John's,

based on accusations that the Department of Fisheries & Oceans destroyed valuable and irreplaceable research, including research papers that were thrown in the dumpster; and, that the witnesses include officials from the Department of Fisheries & Oceans, Library and Archives Canada, and researchers who depend on these libraries for their work.

I want to move that, Mr. Chairman.

I am concerned. I've heard from some of the officials that this is preposterous and so on. If that's so, let's get the information before us and be clear, because it has caused a lot of concern among people I've talked to. If it's not the case, then let's dampen it down. If it is the case, let's figure out how we can correct it.

That's the basis of my motion.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Chisholm. You have provided notice of this motion. Thank you.

There being no further business, this committee stands adjourned.

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.

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.

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