



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

## **Standing Committee on National Defence**

---

NDDN • NUMBER 001 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

---

**EVIDENCE**

**Thursday, February 18, 2016**

—  
**Chair**

**Mr. Stephen Fuhr**



## Standing Committee on National Defence

Thursday, February 18, 2016

• (0855)

[English]

**The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Philippe Grenier-Michaud):** Honourable members of the committee, welcome to the Standing Committee on National Defence.

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

We can now proceed to the election of the chair.

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

[Translation]

I am ready to receive motions for the chair.

Mrs. Romanado, you have the floor.

**Mrs. Sherry Romanado (Longueuil—Charles-LeMoyne, Lib.):** I nominate Mr. Stephen Fuhr.

[English]

**The Clerk:** It has been moved by Ms. Romanado that Mr. Fuhr be elected chair of the committee.

Are there any further motions?

Seeing none, is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

(Motion agreed to)

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

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear!

**The Clerk:** I invite Mr. Fuhr to take the chair.

**The Chair (Mr. Stephen Fuhr (Kelowna—Lake Country, Lib.)):** Good morning, everybody. Thank you for your support and for being here this morning.

I would like to move forward with the election our vice-chairs, if that's agreeable to everybody.

Mr. Clerk.

[Translation]

**The Clerk:** 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 first vice-chair.

[English]

**Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC):** I nominate Cheryl Gallant.

**The Clerk:** It has been moved by Mr. Bezan that Ms. Gallant be elected as first vice-chair of the committee.

Are there any further motions?

**Mr. James Bezan:** You're just doing Conservative right now?

**The Clerk:** Yes.

Seeing none, is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

(Motion agreed to)

**The Clerk:** I declare the motion carried and Ms. Gallant duly elected first vice-chair of the committee.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear!

**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.

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

Mr. Bezan.

**Mr. James Bezan:** I nominate Mr. Garrison.

**The Clerk:** It has been moved by Mr. Bezan that Mr. Garrison be elected as second vice-chair of the committee.

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

(Motion agreed to)

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

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear!

**The Chair:** We'll move forward with adopting the routine motions. The clerk will hand them out, and then we'll get started.

**Mr. Darren Fisher (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, Lib.):** Are we moving motions now?

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** Mr. Chair, I would move the first motion:

That the Committee retain, as needed and at the discretion of the Chair, the services of one or more analysts from the Library of Parliament to assist it in its work.

**The Chair:** Is there any discussion on this?

• (0900)

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC):** Do we get to choose our analysts?

**The Chair:** That's not what it says. I believe they've been provided.

There doesn't appear to be any discussion.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Ms. Romanado, could you please proceed with the second routine motion?

**Mrs. Sherry Romanado:** Certainly. I move:

That the Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure be composed of five (5) members, including the Chair, the two Vice-Chairs and two (2) government members; that the quorum of the Subcommittee consist of at least three (3) members; that each member of the Subcommittee be permitted to have one (1) assistant attend any meetings of the Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure; and that, in addition, each party be permitted to have one (1) staff member from the Whip's Office attend any meetings.

**Mr. James Bezan:** I have a point of order. The document that was just handed out says that routine motions were adopted by the committee in the previous session, and what's on here is not what was adopted by the national defence committee in the previous session.

In both sessions 1 and 2 of the 41st Parliament, the motion that we had was that the subcommittee on agenda and procedure be composed of five members, including the chair, the two vice-chairs, the parliamentary secretary—oh, I guess it's because there's no parliamentary secretary.

I think we actually modified that, because it was just the parliamentary secretary, the chair, and the two vice-chairs that made up the steering committee.

**The Chair:** Are we just talking about amending the word from “adopted” to “proposed”? Is that going to make it work for you?

**Mr. James Bezan:** I'm not going to split hairs on this—

**The Chair:** I know what we're trying to achieve, so let's come up with a way forward.

**Mr. James Bezan:** Okay, let's just go forward. I'll have more concerns when we get down to the fourth motion.

**The Chair:** Okay.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Rioux.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean Rioux (Saint-Jean, Lib.):** The next motion concerns the reduced quorum. It reads as follows:

That the chair be authorized to hold meetings to receive evidence and to have that evidence printed when a quorum is not present, provided that at least four (4) members are present, including one member of the opposition and one member of the government.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Is there any discussion on motion number three?

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Can I get the analysts to come up and have a seat with us, please?

I'll ask the gentlemen to introduce themselves to the committee.

**Mr. Martin Auger (Committee Researcher):** My name is Martin Auger, and I'm an analyst with the Library of Parliament.

**Mr. James Lee (Committee Researcher):** Good morning. My name is Jim Lee, and I'm with the Library of Parliament as well.

**The Chair:** Mr. Gerretsen, can I ask you to move item number four, please?

**Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.):** I move:

That the witnesses from any one organization be allowed ten (10) minutes to make their opening statement; that, during the questioning of witnesses, six (6) minutes be allocated to each party in the first round in the following order: Conservative Party, Liberal Party, New Democratic Party, Liberal Party; and that for the second round the time be allocated as follows: Liberal Party six (6) minutes, Conservative Party six (6) minutes, Liberal Party six (6) minutes, Conservative Party five (5) minutes and New Democratic Party three (3) minutes.

**The Chair:** I suspect there's going to be some discussion on this one.

**Mr. James Bezan:** Yes. Again, going back, the document says that this was adopted by this committee in the previous session. It was not. The motion was actually that the first round had seven-minute rounds, the second round had five-minute rounds, and then there was a third round at five minutes.

The way it worked was that the first round was.... I would propose that each party get seven minutes for the first round; then in the second round, we would all go to five minutes and rotate back and forth until every member has had a chance to ask one question. We'd finish off with the NDP at the end of the second round, and go back to the third round, in which each party would get another five-minute round. We'll find that most of the time, we have more than enough time to get three rounds in, unless we have multiple witnesses sitting at the end of the table.

However, in the interests of fairness and having time allocated on an equivalent basis per member on this committee, I see that in the number four spot in round two, you're dropping the Conservatives down to five minutes, whereas everyone else is getting six. That, to me, is not fair.

I would suggest that the first round be at least seven minutes. The second round would then be a five-minute round, and then you'd go to the third round after that.

• (0905)

**The Chair:** In the third round, we'll just repeat one and two until we are out of time—or just one?

**Mr. James Bezan:** The second round should be back and forth until everybody has had a chance to get a question. It's the principle we've always had at this committee.

Cheryl's been on this committee since 2000. I've sat here for the last five years. In the interest of fairness, every committee member should have a chance to speak before we start into a second rotation.

I believe the NDP, in the fairness of time allocation, should get that last speaking spot in the second round after every other member has had a chance to put their questions to the floor.

**The Chair:** Is there a discussion?

Go ahead, Mr. Gerretsen.

**Mr. Mark Gerretsen:** In the interest of fairness, the motion is laid out in such a way that it actually provides more than a fair balance of the time to the opposition parties.

Consider that with the three parties, when you subtract the ministers and the parliamentary secretaries, it leaves you with 327 MPs. The breakdown, with 184 of those 327 being Liberal, is 56.3%—that's what the percentage works out to—yet the Liberals are only getting 24 minutes to speak, which is actually 48%. The Conservatives are at 30.3%, yet they are getting to speak for 34% of the time.

In the interest of fairness, there's actually a disadvantage to the Liberals in that in the final analysis we will end up getting less time to speak. The motion I've put forward, as such, provides an unbalance in the direction of the opposition parties.

**The Chair:** Mr. Garrison.

**Mr. Randall Garrison (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke, NDP):** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I guess in my experience, which is only the previous Parliament, the idea was not the balance in the House as a whole but fairness within the committee. Had we applied your rules last time, we would have had to take a lot of minutes away from the Liberal Party in the last Parliament.

It's creating some kind of new precedent whereby what happens at committee is judged in terms of the larger chamber. I don't know of any committee where parties were given different amounts of time in the rounds. I think that's a bad and dangerous precedent in the long term for Parliament. Yes, of course it's in my interest to argue that, but in the last Parliament we certainly defended the rights of the Liberal Party, as the third party, to have equal time in the rounds.

The second thing I would say is that with regard to the proposal to have seven minutes in the first round, six minutes is very, very short. I know a lot of you on that side are new.

It's not about equity among parties; it's about the fact that you might like to ask more than just one or two questions in your round. Seven minutes works fairly well for that. If we drop to six, we'll all find it very constrained in that first round of questioning. Maybe we can separate out those two questions as we're considering this issue, because I think the seven minutes is important in the first round. I'd like to not have that mixed up in the other proposal to shorten time.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Bezan.

**Mr. James Bezan:** Mr. Chair, I've had the privilege of chairing this committee as well as two other standing committees over an eight-year span. I can tell you that the one thing that committees have always tried to implement is equality and fairness for every member sitting at the table. I would ask that we come to a consensus that we should follow the same process we had in the previous

Parliament: a first round of seven minutes, a second round of five, and a third round of another five minutes, time permitting.

● (0910)

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Fisher.

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

If you look at it in terms of equity within the committee, between the two rounds, all Conservative members will have an opportunity, the NDP will have an opportunity twice, but only four of the five Liberals will have an opportunity. I think in terms of equity within the committee, it's actually still to the advantage—

**Mr. James Bezan:** You haven't done the count. We should have one more Liberal in there. I believe in the principle that every member should have a chance to speak before another member gets to go a second time.

**The Chair:** Just for the record, I looked at the last committee. I think the Liberals were shut out of round two, brought back in round three, and then shut out completely.

**Mr. James Bezan:** It was on the principle that...but they got up again in round three.

**The Chair:** That was if we ever got there. They were shut out of round two, they were brought back in round three, and then we repeated one and two until the time expired.

**Mr. James Bezan:** Yes, but I would suggest we adopt the principle that everybody gets a chance at questioning before we head back to round three, which again puts the NDP, Liberals, and Conservatives back in the mix for second questions.

**The Chair:** Mr. Fisher had a comment.

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

With member Bezan's suggestion, is it still 50 minutes?

**Mr. James Bezan:** I'm not sure why you guys are so tied up on 50 minutes.

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** I'm asking because I know what the environment committee did, because I sit on that. I know what PROC's done, and I know what a couple of others have done, but what you're suggesting isn't one I've heard of this year.

**Mr. James Bezan:** So....

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** Could you could explain to some of us newbies over here how that works as far as total minutes goes?

**Mr. James Bezan:** I haven't done the math.

**Mr. Randall Garrison:** It's 53.

**Mr. James Bezan:** That means we're adding three more minutes. I would suggest.... Knowing what this committee has done historically, and the principles, we don't have to have the exact same Standing Orders and routine motions as the other committees.

The principle has always been that everybody brings value to this table. Everybody should have an opportunity to question any witnesses we have and feel that they are a full member of the committee.

What I recommend is that we go with the first round being seven minutes, and then every member gets to ask their second-round questions. In the process you guys have here, one Liberal is not going to get into the second round. To me, that doesn't sound fair either.

I would say the second round should be five minutes, and then we go to the third. That round would start with the NDP, and then we would go back to the other two parties after that, at five minutes.

We will find that we have two hours for questioning unless we put a lot of witnesses at the end of the table. Traditionally there are only a couple of witnesses at a time. They are done after 20 or 25 minutes in making their presentations, and we have an hour and a half for questions.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Ms. Romanado.

**Mrs. Sherry Romanado:** Can I make a suggestion that perhaps we look at the speaking rotation that was adopted by PROC?

Round one would be a seven-minute round, as you had suggested, member Bezan. It would be Liberals, seven minutes; Conservatives, seven; NDP, seven; and Liberals, seven.

We would then go to round two, where Conservatives have five, Liberals five, Conservatives five, Liberals five, and the NDP three, for a total of 51 minutes. That will allow everyone to have an opportunity to speak in both rounds.

**Mr. James Bezan:** You would have to have one more Liberal on there, though.

**The Chair:** How about, in the second round, Liberals five, Conservatives five, Liberals five, Conservatives five, Liberals five, NDP three?

**Mr. James Bezan:** Or we could start the third round with the NDP at five again, and then Liberals and then Conservatives.

**The Chair:** It is quite a bit more generous than what the third party got the last time around. Then we would just repeat that. We would go around until we ran out of time.

**Mr. James Bezan:** Usually what we did on third round—I'll leave this up to your discretion—was that we would go around one more time to each party in five-minute rounds.

**The Chair:** I'll repeat this again, because there are numbers all over the place now. I'll suggest this, so you might have to get your pencils ready.

Round one would be Liberal, seven; two would be Conservative, seven; three would be NDP, seven; four would be Liberal, seven. That would be the end of round one.

Round two would be Liberal five, Conservative five, Liberal five, Conservative five, Liberal five, and NDP three.

Is that a fair...?

• (0915)

**Mr. James Bezan:** I think that's fine.

**The Chair:** I know what you're going to say.

**Mr. Mark Gerretsen:** Mr. Chair, I would suggest an amendment be put on the floor to this effect. Then we would vote on that amendment.

**The Chair:** Okay. Do you want to move that?

I'm trying to be cordial here right out of the gate.

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** That's still not technically PROC.

**The Chair:** It's an amended PROC, with an extra Liberal in round two.

**Mr. James Bezan:** I think it doesn't respect the principle that all of us get a chance to speak once, and I don't think it's very fair to all of you as members.

**The Chair:** Is there any more discussion on this?

**Mr. Mark Gerretsen:** Can we just get clarification on it again? I know you've just read it out, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Do you want me to go through it again?

**Mr. Mark Gerretsen:** Yes, please.

**The Chair:** Okay.

The first round is for seven minutes, starting with Liberals, seven; Conservatives, seven; NDP, seven; Liberals, seven.

**Mr. Mark Gerretsen:** You're following what was in PROC, correct?

**The Chair:** Yes, for round one. Then round two is a little bit different, with a third option for Liberals speaking. I'll read it.

Round two would be Liberals, five; Conservatives, five; Liberals, five; Conservatives, five; Liberals five; and NDP, three.

Then I would also recommend that we repeat this until we run out of time, meaning that when we're done with round two, we go back to the speaking order of round one until we're out of time.

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** What are the numbers for round three, then? Is it the same speaking order, but for three minutes?

**The Chair:** No, on round three we go back to...

Go ahead, James.

**Mr. James Bezan:** Just as a suggestion, Mr. Chair, in the past, round three always depended on time, and we divided that time evenly as best we could among the three parties until we ran out of time. If there were 15 minutes left, it would be five minutes each, and if there were 12 minutes, it would be four minutes each, but we left it to the discretion of the chair to determine what the third round would be.

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** Couldn't we just leave the third round to the discretion of the chair on an ongoing basis and not have it in print?

**Mr. James Bezan:** It's nice to have flexibility.

**The Chair:** Yes, I'm happy doing that if everyone else is agreeable to that.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean Rioux:** We are talking about 56 minutes.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** It's 28 and 28.

Mr. Garrison.

**Mr. Randall Garrison:** I'm going to make the obvious point for the grace of the electors that we're establishing the precedent of giving one member of the committee less time, and any of you could end up in that position. I think we're establishing a bad precedent for the future by having a different amount of time per party in the round.

I obviously can't carry the day, but I can't support the motion as it's written.

**The Chair:** As was mentioned earlier, this is still much more generous than it was last time around.

**Mr. James Bezan:** Your total time would be 10 minutes.

**The Chair:** Go ahead.

**Mr. Randall Garrison:** With respect, the third party is larger than it was the last time around—

**The Chair:** Hence, you're getting more time.

**Mr. Randall Garrison:** —by 30%.

**The Chair:** My point is, we're trying to be cordial and give everybody an opportunity. I think this is a great first step forward.

**Mr. Randall Garrison:** All I'm saying is that in the past, in the rounds, parties have had equal speaking time, and it's something we're changing. In the future, as I said, any of you may end up sitting in this spot, and we have a new precedent.

**The Chair:** Okay. That's noted.

Go ahead, James.

**Mr. James Bezan:** With all due respect to my friend, Randall, you already have seven minutes in the first round and three in the second, so you already have 10 versus everybody else getting seven or five. Then you get to go again in the second round, or rather in the third round, time permitting, so you're going to have a lot more time than most other members.

● (0920)

**The Chair:** I think we're getting close here, as far as getting through the order of first and second round is concerned. Is it agreeable that if we go into a third round, we will cut that wood when we get there?

**Mr. Mark Gerretsen:** It would be at the discretion of the chair.

**The Chair:** Okay, and I can divide up the time we have left. All right.

Is there any more discussion on this?

Mr. Fisher.

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** No, it's not real discussion, Mr. Chair, just clarity.

We have a motion on the floor from member Bezan, and we have a point made by member Romanado that we would amend the PROC rules, as discussed.

What motion is actually on the floor that we will be...?

**The Chair:** Procedurally, it sounds like it's an amendment to PROC by Mr. Bezan.

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** Do we want to have clarity from the clerk on exactly what we're voting on now, and then have a vote?

**The Chair:** I'll read it out now that it sounds like the discussion has wound down, and we'll go from there.

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** Thank you, Chair.

**The Chair:** This is an amendment to PROC regarding speaking rotation, as moved by Mr. Bezan, and it is as follows:

Round one: Liberals seven (7), Conservatives seven (7), NDP seven (7), Liberals seven (7). Round two: Liberals five (5), Conservatives five (5), Liberals five (5), Conservatives five (5), Liberals five (5), NDP three (3).

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** As well, there would be a third round at the discretion of the chair.

**The Chair:** I think that has to be separate.

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** Do we want to include this in the amendment?

**Mr. James Bezan:** All right.

**The Chair:** Okay, then we'll put it in the same thing. If we go to a third round and subsequent rounds, it will be determined by the chair, based on the time remaining.

**Mr. James Bezan:** That's perfect. I move, then, the amendment, as follows:

That the motion be amended by replacing the words "six (6) minutes be allocated to each party in the first round in the following order: Conservative Party, Liberal Party, New Democratic Party, Liberal Party; and that for the second round the time be allocated as follows: Liberal Party six (6) minutes, Conservative Party six (6) minutes, Liberal Party six (6) minutes, Conservative Party five (5) minutes and New Democratic Party three (3) minutes" with the words "seven (7) minutes be allocated to each party in the first round in the following order: Liberal Party, Conservative Party, New Democratic Party, Liberal Party; that for the second round the time be allocated as follows: Liberal Party five (5) minutes, Conservative Party five (5) minutes, Liberal Party five (5) minutes, Conservative Party five (5) minutes, Liberal Party five (5) minutes and New Democratic Party three (3) minutes; and that, if time permits, further rounds be at the discretion of the Chair"

**The Chair:** Are we all in agreement?

(Amendment agreed to: yeas, 8; nays, 1)

**The Chair:**

Are we all in favour of the motion as amended?

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

**The Chair:** Moving on to the fifth motion, I don't think we'll have too much of a problem with this one.

Ms. Romanado, can you please work us through this motion?

**Mrs. Sherry Romanado:** Certainly. It is:

That only the Clerk of the Committee be authorized to distribute documents to members and only when such documents exist in both official languages; and that the Clerk inform the witnesses of this requirement at the time of the invitation to appear.

**Mr. Mark Gerretsen:** Is that incorrectly numbered?

**The Chair:** That didn't look like motion number five to me. In mine, motion five is on working meals. That was distribution of documents, and it's not numbered in mine.

Is there discussion on the motion for distribution of documents?

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Motion number five is on working meals.

Mr. Gerretsen.

**Mr. Mark Gerretsen:** Mr. Chair, it's my pleasure to move what is arguably the most important procedural matter of this committee.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Mark Gerretsen:** It is:

That the Clerk of the Committee be authorized to make the necessary arrangements to provide working meals for the Committee and its subcommittees.

**The Chair:** Is there discussion?

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Mr. Spengemann, would you present motion number six, please?

**Mr. Sven Spengemann (Mississauga—Lakeshore, Lib.):** Mr. Chair, I move:

That, if requested, reasonable travel, accommodation, childcare, attendant care and living expenses be reimbursed to witnesses, not exceeding two (2) representatives per organization; and that, in exceptional circumstances, payment for more representatives be made at the discretion of the Chair.

**The Chair:** Is there discussion?

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Mr. Fisher, would you do motion number seven?

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I move:

That, unless otherwise ordered, each Committee member be allowed to be accompanied by one (1) staff person at an in camera meetings and Whip staff.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Garrison.

**Mr. Randall Garrison:** I guess I find the wording a bit unclear. It might be better to say “and one whip staff person from each party”. I think that has been the practice.

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** I don't think it needs to say “one”. I'd be fine with the change if it just said “and whip staff”. I see what you're saying, though.

How about saying “and staff from the whip's office for each party”? I agree with the intent.

● (0925)

**The Chair:** Previously it was just one.

Is there discussion on this?

Go ahead.

**Mr. Mark Gerretsen:** I'm just trying to understand Mr. Garrison's point.

Are you trying to limit it to one, or are you just trying to add clarity to the wording that's there?

**Mr. Randall Garrison:** It's both.

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** As the mover of the motion, I'm fine with the clarity, but I'm not fine with numbering the whip staff. If you want to have more whip staff here on your behalf, I'm fine with that.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Is there any more discussion on this?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC):** Perhaps we should make sure that we do not have interns, but only official members of staff.

I will repeat it for my friend James. I suggest that this not include interns, but only official staff.

[*English*]

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** I'm fine with Mr. Garrison's amendment. We can stick with “one whip staff per party”.

**The Chair:** Mr. Garrison, can you move that amendment, please?

**Mr. Randall Garrison:** Mr. Chair, I would move that the motion on staff at in camera meetings be amended by replacing the words “and whip staff” with “and one Whip staff from each party”.

**The Chair:** Mr. Garrison has moved an amendment.

(Amendment agreed to)

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus:** In my opinion, it is important that staff be hired in accordance with House of Commons contracts. Interns may have divergent political affinities. In committees, I think it is important that we have official staff who have signed a work contract. That is what I want to ensure.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** How do members feel about this?

**Mr. Mark Gerretsen:** Sorry, Mr. Chair, are we voting to amend the motion to put the word “one” in there?

**The Chair:** That's done. Now we're voting on it as amended.

**Mrs. Sherry Romanado:** What about instead of being accompanied by one staff member, maybe it could be one “official” staff, meaning it can't be an intern?

**The Chair:** I'm going to check to see what was done previously. I don't think it was defined.

I think they're going to decide who is value-added here and who is not. I'm not particularly concerned about who they send. It hasn't been defined before. The number was defined, yes, and we've already passed that. I think those people can manage their staff accordingly, and I think we should just leave it.

Can we move on? We're going to vote on the motion as amended. It now reads:



That, unless otherwise ordered, each Committee member be allowed to be accompanied by one (1) staff person at in camera meetings and one (1) Whip staff from each party.

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

**The Chair:** Mr. Rioux, could you move number eight, please?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean Rioux:** The next motion deals with in camera meeting transcripts, and reads as follows: That one copy of the transcript of each in camera meeting be kept in the committee clerk's office for consultation by members of the committee.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Is there any discussion?

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Ms. Romanado, could you move the next motion, please?

[*Translation*]

**Mrs. Sherry Romanado:** The next motion deals with notices of motions. It reads as follows:

That 48 hours' notice be required for any substantive motion to be considered by the committee, unless a substantive motion relates directly to business then under consideration; that the notice be deemed defective if received electronically by the clerk of the committee by 4 p.m. on the second business day prior to the date of the meeting; and that it be distributed to members the same business day.

● (0930)

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Is there any discussion?

Mr. Fisher.

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have a question on policy.

Normally a notice of motion is not something you can debate or talk about. Someone moves forward a notice that at the next meeting they will be moving a motion. However, at the environment committee the other day we had a notice of motion from the NDP member, and then there was a discussion on it.

I am seeking some clarity from the clerk. If someone comes forward with a notice of motion, based on this, according to *Robert's Rules*, I believe, there's no discussion. I just want to confirm that at the federal level it's the same case. Certainly it is in municipal politics.

**The Chair:** Is this a discussion, or do you want to put forward...?

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** I apologize, Mr. Chair. My question was in relation to procedure on future notices of motion. It doesn't actually pertain to what we've moving here now. I'll seek that clarity at a later date from the clerk, as it doesn't totally pertain to this exact motion.

Thank you. My apologies.

**The Chair:** Okay. Is there any more discussion?

**Mr. James Bezan:** Just read chapter 20 in O'Brien and Bosc.

**The Chair:** Is it in the Standing Orders?

**Mr. James Bezan:** No, it's in O'Brien and Bosc.

**The Chair:** The question is on the motion for notice of motions.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Mr. Gerretsen, will you move motion number nine, please?

**Mr. Mark Gerretsen:** I'll move, on distribution of draft reports:

That draft reports be distributed to members of the Committee no less than one week prior to beginning their consideration.

**The Chair:** Is there discussion?

Mr. Bezan.

**Mr. James Bezan:** I want to make sure that this is treated the same way as distribution of documents, in that they have to be in both official languages. It's one week, and it has to be fully translated.

**The Chair:** Is there any more discussion on this motion?

**Mr. Randall Garrison:** Since the clerk made a comment to you and we don't officially hear that—and I can't actually hear it—on the question of both languages, what was the determination?

**The Chair:** Yes, the drafts will be distributed in both official languages.

**Mr. Randall Garrison:** So there's no necessity of repeating that?

**The Chair:** No, because it's covered previously.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** I think that's it.

Is anyone here pinched for time? Is there any further business?

Go ahead, Ms. Romanado.

**Mrs. Sherry Romanado:** For motion number two on the subcommittee on agenda and procedure, shall we move to a vote to name the government members on that subcommittee?

**The Chair:** We don't have to do that here. It can be done by the whip.

Ms. Gallant.

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant:** I know we aren't allowed to decide among ourselves who is going to be on the subcommittee, but I propose that the subcommittee establish a time to meet so that we can get on with business forthwith.

**The Chair:** Okay. I'll have to do that electronically, because I don't know what the schedules are, but I will put something out quickly with regard to when we're going to do it.

It will probably be early next week. I'll have to look at the schedules to see what's going on, but it'll be done very quickly.

● (0935)

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant:** Traditionally it's been at the same time as our standing committee meeting. Could you look into establishing that and giving us the notice, so that we'll be ready?

**The Chair:** You'll have lots of notice.

Mr. Bezan.

**Mr. James Bezan:** I'd like to move a motion.

While we're waiting here until the subcommittee actually sets up the agenda, the rest of us would like to.... Maybe we can start having some committee meetings while the work is getting organized.

I would suggest that we invite the minister to appear at committee on the supplementary estimates (C) and on the mandate letter he received from the Prime Minister.

**The Chair:** Is there discussion?

**Mr. James Bezan:** I would ask our parliamentary secretary, Mr. McKay, whether he is aware of the minister's availability.

**Hon. John McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood, Lib.):** I'm not aware of the minister's availability, but certainly on supplementary estimates (C) he would be expected to appear, and I think would covet the chance to appear.

On the secondary issue of his mandate letter, I can't speak for the minister at this point, but I don't know why he wouldn't as well. I think the minister wants to establish a good working relationship with the committee and make himself as available as possible under the circumstances.

**The Chair:** That's to be determined, then, but it will happen quickly, by Tuesday of next week. We'll get a subcommittee together and we'll figure out the way forward.

Obviously the thing that's on the agenda for sure is supplementary estimates (C) and then the direction that this committee is going to go in the future. Supplementary estimates (C) is the only thing on the agenda that we have to get through prior to the new budget. We haven't received them yet, but we're going to get them.

Mr. Garrison.

**Mr. Randall Garrison:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

My contacts with the minister have been quite generous, and I know he wishes to be transparent and appear at committee.

I support Mr. Bezan's suggestion that we ask the minister to appear. Given the minister's schedules, the earlier you get a request

in, the more likely you are to get the minister and to find a convenient time for the minister to appear.

I think the suggestion that we invite the minister to appear and discuss his mandate letter is a good one. I don't think we need to wait for the steering committee, if there's agreement around the table, to issue that invitation to the minister, which would allow him to arrange his schedule.

**The Chair:** Yes, I think that's wise. We can put the request in to have the minister come at the next scheduled committee meeting. Prior to that we'll meet as a subcommittee/steering committee and figure out which direction we're going to go in moving forward.

**Mr. Randall Garrison:** I'll move we invite the minister to appear at his earliest convenience to discuss his mandate letter.

**Mr. James Bezan:** And supplementary estimates (C).

**Mr. Randall Garrison:** And supplementary estimates (C), once they're presented.

All right. I move:

That the Committee invite the Minister of National Defence to appear at his earliest opportunity for a briefing session on his mandate letter; and that, should the Supplementary Estimates (C) 2015-16 be referred to the Committee, the Minister be also invited in relation to the study of the Supplementary Estimates (C) 2015-16.

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Hon. John McKay:** It will go from your mouth to my ear to the minister's.

**The Chair:** All right. Is there any more discussion on that?

All in favour?

(Motion agreed to)

**Mr. Darren Fisher:** I move that we adjourn.

**The Chair:** Yes. The meeting is 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>