



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

43rd PARLIAMENT, 2nd SESSION

Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 001

Thursday, October 8, 2020



Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food

Thursday, October 8, 2020

• (1530)

[English]

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Aimée Belmore): Honourable members of the committee, I see a quorum.

I must inform members of the committee that the clerk of the committee can only receive motions for the election of the chair. The clerk cannot receive other types of motions, cannot entertain points of order, nor participate in debate.

We will now proceed to the election of the chair.

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

I am ready to receive motions for the chair.

Mr. Francis Drouin (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, Lib.): Madam Clerk, reluctantly, I nominate Pat Finnigan, and I say “reluctantly”, reluctantly.

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

Are there any further motions?

Pursuant to the House order of Wednesday, September 23, I will now proceed to a recorded division unless there is agreement.

Do I see agreement?

I declare the motion carried, and Mr. Pat Finnigan duly elected chair of the committee.

I invite Mr. Finnigan to take the chair.

The Chair (Mr. Pat Finnigan (Miramichi—Grand Lake, Lib.)): Thank you, Madam Clerk, and thank you for the confidence of the committee.

Francis, you do have a way with words, and I appreciate it.

Madam Clerk, please proceed with the election of the vice-chairs.

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

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

Mrs. Lyne Bessette (Brome—Missisquoi, Lib.): I'd like to propose Mr. Perron.

The Clerk: I apologize, Ms. Bessette, but it's for the first vice-chair, which must be a member of the official opposition.

Mr. Steinley.

Mr. Warren Steinley (Regina—Lewvan, CPC): I would propose Ms. Lianne Rood.

The Clerk: Are there any further motions for the first vice-chair?

It has been moved by Mr. Steinley that Ms. Rood be elected as the first vice-chair of the committee.

Pursuant to the House order of Wednesday, September 23, 2020—

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Perron (Berthier—Maskinongé, BQ): Pardon me, Madam Clerk. I have a question about how we operate.

I thought that someone was going to nominate me to be second vice-chair.

[English]

The Clerk: Currently, we're doing the first vice-chair. The second vice-chair will be in a moment.

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Perron: Okay.

I am sorry. I thought that you had moved on.

The Clerk: Okay.

So we can proceed.

[English]

For the position of first vice-chair, are there any further motions?

Is there agreement?

Seeing agreement, I declare the motion carried, and Ms. Rood is duly elected first vice-chair of the committee.

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

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

• (1535)

Mrs. Lyne Bessette: I'd like to propose Mr. Perron.

The Clerk: Are there any further motions for the position of second vice-chair?

It has been moved by Ms. Bessette that Mr. Perron be elected as second vice-chair of the committee.

Is there agreement?

Seeing agreement, I declare the motion carried, and Mr. Perron duly elected second vice-chair of the committee.

[Translation]

Mr. Richard Lehoux (Beauce, CPC): Admit it, you were scared, Mr. Perron.

Mr. Yves Perron: I was terrified, my friend.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you, Madam Clerk.

I would first like to congratulate the vice-chair, Ms. Rood and the second vice-chair, Mr. Perron.

Now we can go to the routine motions.

Mr. Blois, go ahead.

Mr. Kody Blois (Kings—Hants, Lib.): I'd like to move routine motions, which I will read for you.

Analyst services

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.

Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure

That the Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure be established and be composed of five (5) members; the Chair, one member from each party; and that the subcommittee work in the spirit of collaboration.

Meeting without a quorum

That the Chair be authorized to hold meetings to receive and publish evidence when a quorum is not present, provided that at least four members are present, including two members of the opposition and two members of the government; and that in the case of previously scheduled meetings taking place outside of the Parliamentary Precinct, the Committee members in attendance be required to wait for 15 minutes following the designated start of the meeting before they may proceed to hear witnesses and receive evidence, regardless of whether opposition or government members are present.

Time for opening remarks and questioning of witnesses

That witnesses be given ten (10) minutes for their opening statement; that, at the discretion of the Chair, during the questioning of witnesses, there be allocated six (6) minutes for the first questioner of each party in the following order: Conservative Party as follows: Conservative Party, Liberal Party, Bloc Québécois, New Democratic Party.

For the second and subsequent rounds, the order and time for questioning be as follows: Conservative Party, five minutes (5), Liberal Party, five minutes (5), Conservative Party, five minutes (5), Liberal Party, five minutes (5), Bloc Québécois, two and a half minutes (2.5), New Democratic Party, two and a half minutes (2.5).

Document distribution

That only the clerk of the Committee be authorized to distribute documents to members of the Committee, and only when the documents are available in both official languages and that witnesses be advised accordingly.

Working meals

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

Travel, accommodation and living expenses of witnesses

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

Access to in camera meetings

That, unless otherwise ordered, each Committee member be allowed to have one staff member at an in camera meeting and that one additional person from each House officer's office be allowed to be present.

Transcripts of in camera meetings

That one copy of the transcript of each in camera meeting be kept in the Committee clerk's office for consultation by members of the Committee or by their staff.

Notice of motion

That a 48 hours notice, interpreted as two nights, shall be required for any substantive motion to be considered by the Committee, unless the substantive motion relates directly to business then under consideration, provided that (1) the notice be filed with the clerk of the Committee no later than 4:00 p.m. from Monday to Friday; that (2) the motion be distributed to members in both official languages by the clerk on the same day the said notice was transmitted if it was received no later than the deadline hour; and that (3) notices received after the deadline hour or on non-business days be deemed to have been received during the next business day; and that when the committee is travelling on official business, no substantive motions may be moved.

Orders of reference from the House respecting bills

That, in relation to Orders of Reference from the House respecting Bills, a) the clerk of the Committee shall, upon the committee receiving such an Order of Reference, write to each member who is not a member of a caucus represented on the Committee to invite those members to file with the clerk of the Committee, in both official languages, any amendments to the Bill, which is the subject of the said Order, which they would suggest that the Committee consider; b) suggested amendments filed, pursuant to paragraph a), at least 48 hours prior to the start of clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill to which the amendments relate shall be deemed to be proposed during the said consideration, provided that the Committee may, by motion, vary this deadline in respect of a given Bill; and c) during the clause-by-clause consideration of a Bill, the Chair shall allow a member who filed suggested amendments, pursuant to paragraph a), an opportunity to make brief representations in support of them.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (1540)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Blois.

Go ahead, Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, NDP): Thank you very much, Chair. Off the bat, it's great to see everyone. Welcome to the new members of our committee.

I know there were some discussions among the parties at procedure and House affairs. I think 99% of what was read in is good to go. Some slight amendments were made. Kody has read out all of them so I'll start from the beginning.

If we go to the section that's dealing with the subcommittee on agenda and procedure, my first amendment would be that instead of it saying "each party" it would be "each recognized party".

The substantive amendment I have to make would be going to the section dealing with the time for opening remarks and questioning for witnesses. Before I move my amendment, let me explain the rationale.

As we know in this committee, we've often lost a lot of time to opening statements. We haven't got around to as many questions as we would have liked. I think we've lost some witness testimony as a result. Following the example that was made at procedure and House affairs committee, I suggest the following amendments to the routine motion that was just proposed.

That first sentence would read, “That witnesses be given five minutes for their opening statements; that whenever possible witnesses provide the committee with their opening statements 72 hours in advance.”

The other amendment I would like to make is in the section dealing with second and subsequent rounds. Here, I'd like the order to be changed so it goes Conservative Party, five minutes; Liberal Party, five minutes; Bloc Québécois, two and half minutes; New Democratic Party, two and half minutes; Conservative Party, five minutes; Liberal Party, five minutes.

That concludes the amendments I want to make. Again, if you're looking for precedents, this was established at procedure and House affairs.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. MacGregor.

Go ahead, Mr. Drouin. Is this related to the amendments?

Mr. Francis Drouin: No, Mr. Chair, I want to speak to the routine motion. I thought this was a done deal. I don't think we have an issue with Mr. MacGregor. I'm not speaking to the motion.

Merci.

• (1545)

The Chair: We'll hold your place there.

Mr. Perron.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Perron: I want to talk about the housekeeping motions as well. I believe I will support Mr. MacGregor's amendment, if I am right in understanding that, in the second round, the Conservative Party would have five minutes, the Liberal Party would also have five minutes, the Bloc Québécois would have two and a half minutes, the New Democratic Party would also have two and a half minutes, the Conservative Party would have five minutes and the Liberal Party would have five minutes.

Did I hear what you read earlier correctly, Mr. MacGregor? I might have suggested that we ensure that every party can participate in every round, but it is six of one, half dozen of the other. So I am going to approve this proposal.

[*English*]

Ms. Lianne Rood (Lambton—Kent—Middlesex, CPC): I'm okay with the 10-minute rounds. I think my colleague was referring to the COVI committee when we had a ton of witnesses we had to get through in a very short time. They were stacked. We did not have sufficient time to hear from them. I think that, with the studies going forward, 10 minutes is a good amount of time. We have a lot of information to get through in this committee from our stakeholders. I don't believe that five minutes is enough time.

I would like to stay with that 10 minutes.

The Chair: We have a motion and an amendment on the table. If there are no more interventions, we will vote on the amendment.

Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor: I appreciate Ms. Rood's comments about the five minutes. I'm willing to meet her in the middle. We

could go to seven and a half. I'm really interested in making sure as many MPs as possible get to that second round.

Ms. Lianne Rood: Yes, I'm fine with that, Alistair. That's a good compromise.

The Chair: Any other comments on the amendment?

If not, we shall vote on the amendment.

Ms. Lianne Rood: Mr. Chair, could you clarify the speaking order that was suggested?

The Chair: Mr. MacGregor, would you like to clarify exactly what you're proposing?

Mr. Alistair MacGregor: Yes, and this is also for the clerk's benefit as well. In the first sentence, it would read, “That witnesses be given seven and a half minutes for their opening statements and that whenever possible, witnesses provide the committee with their opening statements 72 hours in advance.” That concludes the substantive amendment.

Going down to the section dealing with the second and subsequent rounds, the new order, as proposed by myself, would now read, “Conservative Party, five minutes; Liberal Party, five minutes; Bloc Québécois, two and a half minutes; New Democratic Party, two and a half minutes; Conservative Party, five minutes; Liberal Party, five minutes.”

The Chair: You've all heard the amendment. We're going to have to have two votes, one by one.

The first amendment was to add the word “recognized”, so that it reads “recognized party”.

Madam Clerk, do we need to vote on each individually, or can we get a consensus?

The Clerk: If the desire is to pass all of the amendments, then you could pass them all in one shot. Otherwise, each amendment would need to be made separately, and voted on separately.

I'll leave it to your discretion.

The Chair: Are we all in favour to pass everything in one vote, the total amendments that were proposed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Good. Those in favour of the amendments, raise your hand.

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

• (1550)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Perron: Mr. Chair, could you clarify something?

You say “raise your hand”, but is that on the screen?

The Chair: Yes, it is on the screen.

Mr. Yves Perron: Very good.

[English]

The Chair: Right. We've got to vote on the motion now.

The Clerk: Mr. Chair, the amendment is adopted. If it is the desire to pass all the routine motions as one, indeed the motion as amended.

The Chair: We now need to vote on the motion as amended.

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

The Chair: Before I move to Mr. Drouin, I want to welcome the whole committee. I'm really looking forward to helping our ag sector, and good co-operation from all. Welcome to the new members. I'm really excited to move on to some of the things we want to do in agriculture.

Mr. Drouin.

Mr. Francis Drouin: Mr. Chair, first, I want to congratulate Ms. Rood as vice-chair. I know she's not new to this committee, so it's great to have her here as well.

[Translation]

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Mr. Perron as well.

[English]

I'm trying to seek the committee's willingness. When we last ended the committee, we were speaking about BRMs. Through luck, I would say, Saskatchewan is now in an election and this actually gives us an opportunity to establish and finish the business risk management report.

I'm trying to get a sense of whether the committee would be willing to get the draft report back to committee, so we can finish as soon as possible.

I'm not moving anything now. I'm just trying to see whether the committee would be in agreement to do that over the next few weeks while we are back. Perhaps, at a later date, and depending on what we decide after that, we could discuss other matters and perhaps even the subcommittee could decide on what it wants to do later on.

The Chair: Thank you.

[Translation]

You have the floor, Mr. Perron.

Mr. Yves Perron: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Actually, that is sort of tied into my question. I was wondering if we could introduce motions today. I believe the clerk said earlier that we could not. Of course, I would agree with Mr. Drouin.

If we can introduce motions, I have some too.

The Chair: Mr. Perron, I believe that it was not possible to do so until the chair and vice-chairs were elected.

Now we can receive motions.

Madam Clerk, is that right?

[English]

The Clerk: Yes, sir, that is correct.

[Translation]

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Yves Perron: First, I support Mr. Drouin's idea. It is one of the motions I wanted to put forward. The clerk has the three motions that I wanted to propose to the committee.

May I read them now?

The Chair: It is up to you, Mr. Perron. We can also pick up the discussion about continuing the study on business risk management programs. It is up to you.

Mr. Yves Perron: I do not want to lose my turn. So I will present the other two motions.

The Chair: You have the floor.

Mr. Yves Perron: Okay.

Here is the first motion:

That, pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the Committee undertake a study on the issues faced by and impacts on the affected sectors (supply managed commodities under the last three free trade agreements, the Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA) between Canada and the European Union, the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership (CPTPP) and the Canada–United States–Mexico Agreement (CUSMA)); and that it focus on those to which the government has not paid all due compensation.

The second motion is as follows:

That, pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the Committee undertake a study with witnesses on the measures the Government of Canada could implement to recognize and fund agricultural practices that are beneficial in terms of the environment, land use, local economies and regional development, among others; and that the Committee report its recommendations to the House.

I believe that the second motion, in particular, may address the concerns of several members from a number of the various parties present.

The third motion simply asks that we do what we intended to do before prorogation.

Thank you.

• (1555)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Perron.

Mr. MacGregor has the floor.

[English]

The Clerk: Can I just clarify something?

Are you moving the other motion for the BRM?

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Perron: I understood that Mr. Drouin had recommended that we take up the report again and continue the study. That is essentially what my motion says.

I can read it again. Here it is:

That, pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the Committee undertake a study on the business risk management programs; that the evidence and documentation the Committee received for the study during the 1st Session of the 43rd Parliament be considered by the Committee during the current session; and that it finalize the nearly completed report.

The Chair: So we have a motion on the floor.

[English]

Mr. MacGregor, please go ahead.

Mr. Alistair MacGregor: Yes. That's what I was wondering about. The procedural part of me is now happy because I believe we finally have a motion before us about formally continuing the BRM study. I think it includes all the language we need to include and all the witness testimony we've heard.

The majority of us have that draft report, so if this motion is authorizing us to pick up where we left off, I'm good with it.

Ms. Lianne Rood: I think we would be in agreement as well to pick up where we left off on the BRM study, provided that the language has all of the necessities in it to be able to take into account all of the previous testimony and the draft report that's already written.

The Chair: I see other hands up. We do have a motion on the floor. Put your hand up if it's to discuss this motion, and then we can vote.

Mr. Blois, do you want to comment on this motion?

Mr. Kody Blois: I'm just seeking a little bit of clarity. What I understand is that we have a motion right now to basically bring back the BRM study from where we were in the last session. Is that correct? Am I fair in saying that's what Mr. Perron just brought forward?

The Chair: That's correct, yes.

Mr. Kody Blois: Okay.

Now, the secondary ones, I think, have merit, but I wonder whether or not they would be best suited.... We've just established the subcommittee under routine motions. Obviously, we have work to do right now on the BRM for the next couple of sessions in preparation for the ministers conference in November. I wonder whether or not that can be best established in the subcommittee, so that we can work collaboratively to set an agenda.

I think Mr. Perron raised some good measures, but perhaps they can be tabled for now, and we can deal with those in subcommittee and come back with more.... I don't have it in front of me either; that's part of the challenge.

The Chair: Only one motion has been moved. The other ones right now have been read. I think we could deal with this one right now. I think it would be appropriate if we get that out of the way, and then we could move on to other business. Are we good on that?

[Translation]

Mr. Perron, do you have anything else to add?

Mr. Yves Perron: Yes, Mr. Chair, I would like a clarification.

You say we have one motion. We are actually voting to resume the supply management study. Is that right?

• (1600)

The Chair: Yes, that is right.

[English]

We shall vote on that motion.

Monsieur Perron, can you read your motion again for the group?

[Translation]

Mr. Yves Perron: Yes, of course, and perhaps I can read it slower. So I move the following:

That, pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), the Committee undertake a study on the business risk management programs; that the evidence and documentation the Committee received for the study during the 1st Session of the 43rd Parliament be considered by the Committee during the current session; and that it finalize the nearly completed report.

[English]

The Chair: You've all heard the motion. Are we ready for the vote?

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: Thank you, Monsieur Perron.

Now we can move on to other business.

Kody, do you have anything else to add on to your intervention?

Mr. Kody Blois: Mr. Chair, I would suggest that we've now set the course, thanks to Mr. Perron and his motion, and that BRM is going to be our focus for the next couple of weeks in terms of getting that report ready.

This committee has a great history of working together, all members on here. Of course, Ms. Rood is now the shadow critic, and I believe whoever would be on our side and you, Mr. Chair, along with Mr. Perron and Mr. MacGregor.... I think we should leave that work to them to decide if we can come to some type of agreement and then basically move forward on any additional work from there.

I would recommend that we've done our part here. We should focus on working with the clerk on what our schedule could look like in terms of the drafting of where we left off. I think that the additional motions that Mr. Perron has put out have merit. I'd like to see them in more detail. This is the hard part of meeting virtually; it's difficult.

I like that he mentioned the environment. There were some elements in the Speech from the Throne that members might want to do, but I think it's best to deal with that in the subcommittee where it's a little bit tidier and easier to exchange ideas and information.

Mr. Tim Louis (Kitchener—Conestoga, Lib.): Just on a point of technical clarity, Mr. Steinley had raised his hand on camera and did not get recognized. When we want to speak, would you suggest we use the participants menu—the raised hand or the lowered hand—or would you like us to raise our hands?

I just want to make sure Mr. Steinley gets in there.

The Chair: The only time I ask for a raised hand is when we vote. That's how I recognize everyone in favour or not. If you want to get into the speaking order, use the "raise hand" function, if you can.

Mr. Tim Louis: Perfect. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

Monsieur Lehoux.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Richard Lehoux: I will yield to Mr. Steinley for the time being and wait for my turn, because I believe he raised his hand before I did.

The Chair: All right. Thank you, Mr. Lehoux.

[*English*]

Mr. Steinley, you have your hand raised. Go ahead.

Mr. Warren Steinley: It's along the same line of thinking that Mr. Blois had. Should we bring forward motions that we want to study now or send those to the subcommittee so that the members have them before we start this meeting? I am a new member. I know that we have been talking about the BRM programs from the last committee that was sitting before COVID-19, and we do have some motions we'd like to bring forward.

Would everyone like them ahead of time, or should we put some on the record now so that we know what direction we'd like to go in, moving forward?

The Chair: It's up to the committee. As Mr. Blois said, we can all submit the motions and then take them to the subcommittee, where we can look at each of them and then prioritize the ones we want to move forward with. That's one way of doing it. We can also deal with them right now, if that's what the committee wants. It's up to the committee.

[*Translation*]

You have the floor, Mr. Perron.

• (1605)

Mr. Yves Perron: Of course, I would not object to us meeting as a subcommittee to improve a proposal, especially one that deals with the environment and support for farm workers. I believe that each of the political parties, in its own way, has its own particular concerns in this regard. It might be a good idea, but I would like us to hold on to it until we implement it.

On the other hand, with regard to the motion on the supply-managed industries and companies that have not yet received any compensation, a decision was already made in the last Parliament. You may tell me that it fell through, but we have just decided that we are going to continue with the business risk management program. So it would make sense to undertake the study that we were going to undertake two days after prorogation and that was already set up. I am asking my colleagues how they feel about this. We could vote on it and agree to meet as a subcommittee to properly develop the environmental proposal. I feel that is a good idea.

The Chair: Mr. Perron, so you are suggesting that we complete our study, because we have already voted to continue work that we had already begun, but if I understand correctly, you also want to

put forward a motion that we continue the study that we were supposed to do on supply management.

Did I understand what you said correctly?

Mr. Yves Perron: Yes. I am well aware that my motion on support for agriculture, environmental protection and an analysis of the real effects is completely new and that this is our first meeting where, as an exception, we are allowed to introduce motions without 48 hours' notice. I am well aware that this merits some discussion, and I am happy to agree. Compromise is my middle name, as you know.

With respect to the study on supply management and the producers who have received no compensation, we were supposed to start it on August 21 or August 22, if memory serves. I feel that we could do what we intended to do before prorogation, because we had approved it.

I move that, if my colleagues agree.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Lehoux, you raised your hand?

Mr. Richard Lehoux: I had raised my hand because I wanted a clarification. We agreed to start again with the study on risk management programs. We had already filed a preliminary report.

My question was more related to the clerk's question about when we can ultimately proceed. I know there was a meeting, but you can understand, with the election in Saskatchewan, things have changed a little. However, we should not unduly delay tabling our final report for too long.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Lehoux.

Mr. Drouin, you have the floor.

Mr. Francis Drouin: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We all agree on the urgency of setting up risk management programs and we want to give you the mandate, Mr. Chair, to table the report in the House as soon as possible.

If the committee agrees, I suggest that we begin the study as soon as possible. As soon as the report is completed, we should schedule a subcommittee meeting. I know that Mr. Steinley had some studies to suggest. Mr. Perron has mentioned another one. So I think we could all talk about it in subcommittee. My suggestion does not mean that I do not respect all the members here, but when there are seven cooks in the kitchen, things move slowly. So I feel that this should be sent to subcommittee. Then we would inform the committee that we have agreed on the agenda for the next few months.

For the time being, the risk management programs study is most pressing. Let us take the report back to the House. Then, as soon as that is done, the subcommittee can meet and discuss what is going to happen over the next few months.

That is what I suggest, otherwise we will be running around in circles forever.

• (1610)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Drouin.

[English]

Just to clarify, the subcommittee can meet while we're doing the BRM. We could have a separate meeting of the subcommittee to try to look at future business. That can happen at the same time. We don't have to wait until the end of that.

Mr. Steinley.

Mr. Warren Steinley: Yes, thank you very much. That was the clarification I was looking for.

I agree with Mr. Drouin. I think that we should move forward with the BRM and get that done as soon as possible, and then I'll be putting my motion forward to my representative on the subcommittee—or else we can go around in a circle.

I think we can move forward in that direction.

Mr. Kody Blois: I'll echo what's already been said by Mr. Drouin and Mr. Steinley. I think that's the best approach. We've had a productive start and good agreement on this committee. I go back to the history of our working collaboratively to get results for the people we represent in this committee. I think it's best that we leave the motion that was put out, along with the other motions that might be coming, for the subcommittee. We have established BRM.

Mr. Perron mentioned supply management. We never agreed to do a study, and I just want to clarify that for the record. I think he was mentioning an emergency meeting that was suggested to be called. I think there's no problem discussing that. Our priority right now has to be BRM. I have the most supply-managed farms east of Montreal, and I'm happy to have a discussion on that in the months ahead because I think it's an important topic, but let's leave that for the subcommittee. Let's focus on BRM, and then move on.

[Translation]

The Chair: Is your hand up, Mr. Lehoux?

Mr. Richard Lehoux: Yes, I would like a clarification.

I agree with the previous speakers, because I also have a motion to put forward. I will send it to the committee for consideration.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Perron, you have the floor.

Mr. Yves Perron: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This is the last time I am going to say this.

I feel we could even vote on it. I understand my friend Mr. Blois; they may not have voted in favour of the motion, but it was the committee's decision. It was an emergency motion signed by four members of the committee, by our friends in the Conservative Party, to clarify the situation, and that has not changed at all.

I do not want to interfere with the risk management report. This did not interfere with it in August; it should not interfere with it now, and it will not slow anything down either. I believe we can pick up what the committee intended to do and was doing in the first session. Then, for anything new, I agree with everyone; let us meet in subcommittee. We have nothing new here, it is simply a

matter of looking at those supply management sectors that have yet to receive any compensation.

At the very least, I suggest that we vote on it.

[English]

The Chair: To also clarify, Mr. Perron, with regard to the emergency meeting we were supposed to have, we hadn't voted on anything yet. We were going to meet to decide if that was something we were going to support. We can still do that at this time, but just to clarify, there was no motion voted on because we never had that meeting.

Mr. Epp, go ahead.

Mr. Dave Epp (Chatham-Kent—Leamington, CPC): Let me say first of all, I'm looking forward to working with everyone around—I was going to say “the table”, but I guess this isn't the table; it's more of a *Hollywood Squares*.

As far as a BRM motion, I am most looking forward to getting up to speed. I'm sure the clerk will make available the draft motion to us. I haven't had the opportunity...or perhaps it's online; I haven't found it.

I'm looking forward to getting up to speed and to working with all. Thanks.

The Chair: Mr. Epp, welcome to our committee.

Monsieur Drouin.

[Translation]

Mr. Francis Drouin: Mr. Perron, I understand the purpose of this motion, but I will not support it out of respect for my colleagues who also have motions to put forward. We must take into account everything we have to consider over the next few months. We have agreed on risk management. The subcommittee can consider your motion if you choose to bring it forward. However, if you want us to put your motion to a vote now, I will not be able to support it. I want to hear from my colleagues first, and the best way to do that is to go through the subcommittee.

• (1615)

[English]

The Chair: There are no hands raised, so I believe at this time we have a sort of consensus that we get the subcommittee to work. We can certainly call a meeting to that effect.

If everybody is okay with that, I suggest that everyone who has motions forward them, so we can have them all ready to debate at the subcommittee level and then recommend to the main committee.

Before we move on, we could perhaps ask our analyst to tell us where we're at with the report and how soon we will be ready to review it. I believe it is version one that we are at.

Mr. Corentin Bialais (Committee Researcher): Right before the prorogation, we sent the first draft of the report. We could send it back to you so everyone will have this version. We will be ready to work on it after that.

The Chair: Okay. Thank you very much.

For the ones who were not on the committee—I guess you can send it across the board to everyone—at the next meeting, we will look at version one.

Again, we'll make sure we get that report completed. At my discretion, I guess we can call a subcommittee meeting whenever it's convenient. We'll do a Zoom meeting. I assume it will probably be next week.

How soon do you want it? Will we try to get one next week? I know it's an off week.

The Clerk: Mr. Chair, I'm terribly sorry to interrupt. The meetings are available based on the scheduling agreed to by the whips. I believe next week is very full with a lot of other committee meetings. They are only allowed so many meetings per slot. I think that meetings are called, at least at the start, based on the agreement by the whips.

The Chair: Okay. We can certainly contact our whips to get into that scheduling, and at the first available time, we can have a subcommittee meeting. We don't know when our next committee meeting will be, so that will be announced and it will be sent to everyone.

Monsieur Perron.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Yves Perron: How will upcoming meetings work: will they be virtual, in person or hybrid?

[*English*]

The Clerk: Do you want me to take that, sir?

The Chair: Go ahead, Madame Belmore.

The Clerk: As per the order that was adopted in the House, the future committee meetings will be hybrid meetings. It will be your discretion as to whether you wish to appear in person in Ottawa in the committee room or whether you wish to appear virtually.

The Chair: Again, to the clerk's notice, all meetings will be based on the whips' various parties agreeing when our time will be. We don't really control that. However, as soon as they give us a time frame, we'll certainly have the meeting and proceed.

I don't know if there is any other order of business that you want to discuss at this time.

Go ahead, Monsieur Drouin.

Mr. Francis Drouin: I just wanted to welcome Dave Epp, who's wearing a different hat now. He was with the Canada Foodgrains Bank. I look forward to working with him.

I don't know Mr. Steinley personally, but I look forward to working with him as well.

I just wanted to give them a shout-out and a welcome.

Mr. Kody Blois: I'll second that, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

I'm certainly happy to have you and your experience in the grain industry, which is part of our discussion for sure.

Thank you, again, Mr. Epp and Mr. Steinley.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Perron, you have the floor.

Mr. Yves Perron: We got off to a great start, but I wanted to congratulate you on your re-election as chair.

Ms. Rood, congratulations on being elected vice-chair.

I am happy to see everyone back, and I welcome all new committee members. We will get to know each other better.

• (1620)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Perron.

[*English*]

Everyone, we'll see you next time. You will be notified.

Again, work on your motions.

I'm sorry, I missed Ms. Rood.

Go ahead, Ms. Rood.

Ms. Lianne Rood: I just want to echo those comments.

It's great to see everybody back again. I'm really looking forward to working with all of you to do the great work that we've been able to do before. I hope we can continue to do that with our new members as well.

I'm glad to see you all back.

The Chair: Thank you everyone.

Have a good Thanksgiving weekend.

The meeting is 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>