



House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade

FAAE • NUMBER 037 • 1st SESSION • 38th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Thursday, May 5, 2005

—
Chair

Mr. Bernard Patry

All parliamentary publications are available on the
"Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire" at the following address:

<http://www.parl.gc.ca>

Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade

Thursday, May 5, 2005

• (0910)

[Translation]

The Chair (Mr. Bernard Patry (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.)): Today's agenda deals with the business of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade.

I have a few comments to make before resuming debate on Ms. McDonough's motion, but Mr. Paquette now has the floor.

Mr. Pierre Paquette (Joliette, BQ): Mr. Chairman, I would like to know when we will deal with the report of the subcommittee on chapter 19. Would it not be preferable for Mr. Menzies to start by proposing his amendments to the subcommittee, since that is where the discussions on the validity of the various recommendations take place? These amendments are by and large minor, but there are nevertheless one or two subtle differences that led the subcommittee to submit these recommendations rather than other ones.

I would like an opinion on that.

The Chair: Mr. Paquette, we had asked Mr. Menzies to propose his amendments to the committee this morning. If the committee wishes, it may simply ask Mr. Menzies to discuss them at the Subcommittee on International Trade, Trade Disputes and Investment and to then come back to the committee after having obtained the consensus of the subcommittee. We could adopt the report the same day or during the following meeting. Is that all right with you?

[English]

Is it all right with you, Mr. Menzies?

Mr. Ted Menzies (MacLeod, CPC): I think that's the only appropriate thing to do.

The Chair: Okay. That's fine.

Mr. Ted Menzies: We shouldn't be taking this committee's time on something that hasn't got consensus from the subcommittee.

The Chair: No, no. That's fine.

Now, before we go to the motions, I have a couple of things I would like to mention to you.

First of all, I'm going to tell you the schedule.

On May 10, next Tuesday, we have two ministers coming here. They are Ms. Carroll, from CIDA, and Mr. Peterson, from International Trade Canada. They're coming here concerning the main estimates.

On May 12, concerning the international policy review, I have Mr. Derek Burney, who was an adviser to Mr. Mulroney and a former Canadian ambassador to the U.S.

Monsieur Jocelyn Coulon will also be here on May 12. That is 9 a.m. to 11 a.m. At 11 a Kuwaiti delegation would like to meet with the foreign affairs committee for maybe half an hour.

These are just my notes. You're going to receive a calendar concerning this.

On May 16—that's a Monday—it will be an official opening, in a certain sense, for the international policy review. We'll have Minister Graham and Minister Pettigrew together on May 16.

Mr. Kevin Sorenson (Crowfoot, CPC): Mr. Chairman, are we going to receive this today, or is it going to come later?

The Chair: Today or tomorrow you are all going to receive the calendar concerning the next few weeks.

Ms. Beth Phinney (Hamilton Mountain, Lib.): Do you have a copy?

The Chair: I don't have a copy. These are my notes.

Ms. Beth Phinney: I just thought maybe we could have had it photocopied.

The Chair: That's just my notes.

Mr. Maurizio Bevilacqua (Vaughan, Lib.): We know we have a few dates.

The Chair: I have five days. I say May 10, next week, we have two ministers. We have witnesses on May 12. On May 16 we have Mr. Graham and Mr. Pettigrew for the opening concerning the international policy review. On May 17 I have Mr. Pettigrew on the main estimates. That's it for the moment.

Now, I just want to put a motion. My clerk tells me I need this motion.

Next Tuesday, because we have two ministers for one hour each, we would like to defer any motion to another day. We're not going to discuss motions, because if we discuss motions, we're decreasing the time for the ministers. It's just to ask you if you agree that next Tuesday there will not be motions.

I'll read it. It says:

That, notwithstanding the Order of Thursday, October 14, 2004, the Committee defer, on Tuesday, May 10, 2005, consideration of any motion requiring 24 hours' notice to the next meeting of the Committee.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

•(0915)

The Chair: My clerk also said that concerning the international policy review, he wants to get a motion to have Ms. Carroll and Mr. Peterson come before this committee. He needs a motion concerning this. No problem? That's fine?

That the Committee invite the ministers responsible for International Trade Canada and for the Canadian International Development Agency to appear, as soon as possible, to be heard on the subject of the International Policy Statement.

We've already discussed the amendment of Mr. Menzies. It's going to deal first with the subcommittee and come back to the main committee after that.

I'll just mention that on May 12, after the meeting from 9 to 11, we'll get a delegation from the Kuwaiti parliament to discuss two things of interest to our two countries. It will be a bilateral. That is May 12.

Mr. Stockwell Day (Okanagan—Coquihalla, CPC): Which parliament?

The Chair: Kuwait's parliament.

Now, concerning the international policy review, we have received many requests from international organizations and Canadian organizations who want to appear in front of our committee. We don't have many weeks left to go. It depends on whether or not we are going into an election. I just want to know from you if there is anyone you would like to be heard in the beginning or if you will leave it to the chair, our clerk, and the staff.

Mr. Day.

Mr. Stockwell Day: We are anticipating bringing a couple of names forward. We don't have them right now. We appreciate the good help of the staff, but we will also bring a couple of names forward.

The Chair: Sure, that's fine. That's what I requested from you—bring some names.

Yes, Madam McDonough.

Ms. Alexa McDonough (Halifax, NDP): Similarly, I'm sorry, I haven't resubmitted names from way back, when we talked about it, so we'll do so.

I guess the one group that seems to me to be just common sense to hear from fairly early might be the umbrella group of the various NGOs. I'm thinking of the Canadian Council for International Cooperation. It represents a vast range of groups that pertain to the whole array of issues that the IPR is dealing with.

The Chair: That's why I would like you to give the names to the clerk or the researcher, just to be sure that the people who will come before this committee are your priority.

Now we will resume debate of the motion of Mrs. McDonough.

Madam McDonough, go ahead, please.

Ms. Alexa McDonough: Thanks very much.

I know there's been a lot of frustration because we've gone round and round on this. Regrettably, I think a good-faith effort to try to achieve complete consensus, one that all parties would be prepared to go forward with, hasn't resulted in a complete consensus, even

though we have heard from Lloyd Axworthy and have tried to break the stalemate. So I would, at this point, put forward the motion that is before us for discussion.

I would like to reiterate that I think the purpose of this exercise, as I think we have all seen it, is to take the information we have before us, the testimony from Lloyd Axworthy's presentation, the input we've heard from the Ethiopian and Eritrean diaspora, and achieve a motion that would help move us forward from this terrible stalemate that exists. There are dangerous tensions building, increasing violence and the threat of border hostilities that are very dangerous, not to mention the economic devastation resulting from the desperate situation on both sides.

I feel the motion we have arrived at is one that represents some give and take, but we should move forward with it. And I do understand. I want to say it was something of a frustration for Madame Lalonde that she was unavoidably absent during many of the discussions. We've not been able to reach a consensus that would mean we could go forward with all of us in agreement, but I do understand she has a couple of amendments to the motion I am moving before the committee that she might want to put forward at this point.

•(0920)

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. McDonough.

Ms. Lalonde, go ahead.

Ms. Francine Lalonde (La Pointe-de-l'Île, BQ): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This is not about frustration. I simply want to participate in this important debate. I was not here when Lloyd Axworthy came, but I carefully read through his presentation. I would have liked to see the text that I distributed to people two weeks ago—I know that the parties saw it—be put on the agenda. I have been told that it was not possible this morning, but I do not understand why. I am going to submit an amendment to a text that you do not have in front of you, unless you brought it today. I find that somewhat frustrating.

I am going to share my amendment with you. Of course, you will do with it what you want. For the reasons Alexa mentioned earlier—it seems to me that we must treat the two countries as Lloyd Axworthy wanted them to be treated. The two countries have been through a terrible war, and the border issue is extremely important. The two countries can resolve some things between them, if they sit down at the table together. For that to happen, Lloyd Axworthy proposed that Ethiopia recognize the border and that, while the demarcation work is done, the broader discussion that Ethiopia wants to have with Eritrea on a host of economic and social issues begin. Lloyd Axworthy stated that very clearly.

Moreover, he also said that he was surprised that Canada had committed \$100 million to Ethiopia without highlighting the fact that Ethiopia had agreed to accept the outcome of the Boundary Commission study, whereas Ethiopia was opposed to it.

Finally, he stressed that it would be desirable for the signatories of the Algiers Peace Agreement to act as a contact group.

I therefore prepared a text that could be inserted into the whereas clauses wherever you want.

The Chair: Ms. Lalonde, is the text that you were preparing to read a new paragraph that you want to insert? It does not amend the current wording, does it?

Ms. Francine Lalonde: It is a new paragraph that reads as follows:

Recognizes the efforts of Mr. Lloyd Axworthy, UN Secretary General Special Envoy to the Horn of Africa, and supports the conclusions shared with the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Trade and demands that the Government of Canada adopt them to the effect:

—That the partners of the Peace Agreement signed in Algiers can act as a contact group between Eritrea and Ethiopia,

—That Ethiopia has to be convinced to collaborate with the Eritrea-Ethiopia Boundary Commission clearly signifying its compliance with the borders but also that at the same time, on their part, and

These two words are important.

—That Eritrea has to be convinced of the necessity to engage a serious dialogue on a number of important issues that matter to each country, and

—That Canada should not give Ethiopia direct aid without assurance that the resolution of the conflict is part of the agreement.

I also have the text in English.

I reworked the rest of the motion, but I fully recognize Ms. McDonough's intentions. I move this amendment wishing not to take away from but to support her objectives.

• (0925)

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Lalonde.

[English]

You have these two copies.

I just want to pinpoint that, in my view, concerning what you just put forward, it should be added after paragraph 9. That's the paragraph that says in English, "recognize the efforts of Dr. Lloyd Axworthy, UN Secretary General Special Envoy to the Horn of Africa...", and after that the text you just added should be inserted, put there at paragraph 9.

Any comments concerning this?

Mr. Menzies.

Mr. Ted Menzies: How are we going to discuss this if we haven't even had a chance to read it?

The Chair: Madame Lalonde said it was circulated, but I didn't see it either.

We'll get a copy. I'll ask the clerk to make 10 copies for each one of us.

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Andrew Bartholomew Chaplin): It's in order because it's a modification of a motion already being debated, so no notice is required.

The Chair: With your permission, we're going to hold that motion, and we can go to the second motion in the meantime, that of Mr. Stockwell Day.

Do you have a new motion concerning the state of Israel?

Mr. Stockwell Day: No. I had indicated, with the positive intent expressed for support in general, that I would come back with something reformulated, and we have not yet done that, so I'm still deferring it.

The Chair: Okay, fine. Thank you. It's deferred.

There was a notice of motion from Mr. McTeague, which reads as follows:

That the Committee request officials from the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade to appear before the Committee at the earliest opportunity to provide detailed information pertaining to questions relating to Taiwan that arose out of the Committee's meeting of May 3, 2005, and, most notably, to provide information on the issuance of transit visas to Taiwanese officials and the state of Canada's relationship with Taiwan.

Mr. McTeague

Hon. Dan McTeague (Pickering—Scarborough East, Lib.): Chair, I didn't want it to be the case that it was my word the committee should take in the exchange in which all members participated.

[Translation]

I think that the vast majority of members here participated in the debate surrounding Mr. Andrew Cohen's evidence. His evidence appears to have raised major questions, most notably pertaining to the issuance of transit visas to Taiwanese officials.

As I proposed that day, it would perhaps be helpful for the committee to take note in due form of his decision in this regard. I am convinced that it has not been rejected. That would at least help us to know if there were cases where officials from Taiwan were rejected.

[English]

Therefore, I am simply, in the interests of providing clarity for all members of the committee and pursuant to the exchange we had here the other day on other issues dealing with the testimony of Mr. Andrew Cohen, providing an opportunity to have officials here and ask very pointed questions of them. It's more an issue of information, and I hope we can support the motion.

[Translation]

The Chair: Ms. Lalonde has the floor. We will then go to Mr. Day, and Ms. McDonough.

Ms. Lalonde.

Ms. Francine Lalonde: I simply want to clarify the meaning of the part of the motion that reads as follows:

[...] to provide detailed information pertaining to questions [...], and most notably, to provide information on the issuance of transit visas [...]

I am not convinced that covers the whole Taiwan issue.

Since we have raised the issue as to the way in which Canada acts politically and economically from all perspectives, it would be beneficial for the person who comes to be able to answer all of our questions on the situation in Taiwan.

• (0930)

[English]

The Chair: I'll go to Mr. Day, Madam McDonough, and then you can answer back.

Mr. Day.

Mr. Stockwell Day: I wouldn't want this to disintegrate into a he said, she said, with various officials saying one thing and Taiwan officials saying something else. But if it's going to get us to a clarification of which officials can visit from Taiwan and when—if that's a precursor to this—then it's a worthwhile discussion. My concern is over what it's going to do to the work schedule we've proposed today, because it's not going to be a short discussion.

The Chair: We don't know when. It's just a motion. The fact is we want it at the earliest convenience.

Mr. Stockwell Day: That's fine as long as we understand that it's subject to the committee approval in terms of the date.

The Chair: Yes, that's fine.

Mr. Stockwell Day: I don't want it just narrowly focused on the question of what's happened in the past, but if this can be used to lay out some kind of a format for the future, then it's a worthwhile exercise.

Hon. Dan McTeague: If I could, Chair, I'm quite willing to work with the proposals that have been made here. I really want to ensure that we don't have a similar situation like this again, where it's a question, as Mr. Day has pointed out, of he said, she said. I think it would be very constructive, because there are a number of motions that are coming, or perhaps even private member's bills, and we need to have a much wider discussion on this.

Again, I'm not here to stop the work of the committee as it's currently suggested, but we should see these witnesses when there is time and at the earliest opportunity. I am fairly flexible on that.

The Chair: Fine.

Mrs. McDonough.

Ms. Alexa McDonough: I support the motion that has been brought forward by the parliamentary secretary because I think it is in the interests of all concerned and of interest to this committee to clarify exactly what the current situation is with respect to the issuance of transit visas and to try to determine the facts around what I guess is now a dispute of facts in relation to a specific application that the Taiwanese indicated had been made and denied.

I'm a little concerned about the collision course we're on with time, and I wonder whether it would be in order, by way of not supporting the motion—because I have no problem with supporting the motion—to request that there be a brief report brought forward to the committee, which we would then consider as part of that session. There is the possibility that we won't get to hear from those officials and we won't have an opportunity to address it before this committee is no longer meeting, possibly until after a next election.

I'm wondering if we could request that they address the question that was raised by a letter or memo to the chairman of the committee, and then when and if we have the opportunity to meet with them, we can pursue it further.

Similarly, because there seems to be a dispute around the facts here, I wonder whether we might accord the same courtesy to the Taiwanese, who certainly raised this concern at the time, and several times since, to direct a letter to the committee to outline the concerns that brought my colleague to the point of raising it in the committee.

The Chair: First of all, I just want to pinpoint to Madam Lalonde, Mr. McTeague, and Mr. Day that the motion says, “to provide information on the issuance of transit visas to Taiwanese officials and the state of Canada's relationship with Taiwan”. That includes everything. This is what I think the committee wants, and I have no problem with it.

If we pass the motion, with your permission I will send a letter on your behalf to the department to provide us with some information before they appear in front of the committee, because it will be good for us to read some material before.

Is there agreement on this motion?

[Translation]

Yes, Ms. Lalonde.

Ms. Francine Lalonde: The French version should say “*afin de fournir de l'information détaillée sur les questions*”, and not “*afin de fournir de l'information détaillée aux questions*”. It is not about answering the questions, but providing information on the questions. That means that the committee's questions and responses remain the committee's questions and responses, and that we are given information; that is more consistent with the English meaning of “pertaining to”.

• (0935)

The Chair: I fully agree with you on that. Your translation is always effective and accurate.

[English]

Do you all agree on this motion and the fact that I'm going to send a letter to the department?

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: Now we're coming back to the motion of Mrs. McDonough.

You've all received the changes from Madame Lalonde—to recognize the efforts of Mr. Axworthy; that the partners of the peace agreement signed in Algiers can act as a contact group between Eritrea and Ethiopia; that Ethiopia has to be convinced to collaborate with the Eritrea-Ethiopia Boundary Commission, clearly signifying its compliance with the borders, but at the same time, on their part, Eritrea has to be convinced of the necessity to engage in a serious dialogue on a number of important issues that matter to each country; and that Canada should not give Ethiopia direct aid without assurance that the resolution of the conflict is part of the agreement.

Now, we're on the amendment of Madame Lalonde to have what I just read. Are there any comments?

Mr. McTeague.

Hon. Dan McTeague: I appreciate Madame Lalonde's comments and the four points she's made. I must say I am not in favour of the proposals. I understand she could not participate in the efforts made by Ms. McDonough and the other offices. She was not able to be here during Mr. Axworthy's testimony either.

I had the benefit of speaking to Mr. Axworthy on Saturday evening. He is comfortable with the proposals and the work the three parties have done on the resolution, which is exhaustive.

One of my main concerns with what Madame Lalonde has proposed is the sticky question of withholding direct aid unless we have assurance that resolution of the conflict is part of the agreement. We would be out of line with the entire international aid community if we were to do this. Using aid as a stick would not do anything to bring the players closer to a resolution. It would hurt the very people we are trying to help. We have to distinguish humanitarian aid from regime change or regime involvement, particularly as it relates to this conflict.

The proposal also seems to suggest that we have to convince Ethiopia and Eritrea to engage in number 2 and number 3 of her motions. The motion is calling for us to work with Lloyd Axworthy and to ensure that the parties to the Algiers agreement are there.

The resolution that Ms. McDonough has brought forward is comprehensive. I would not say it's overarching, but it covers much of what has been proposed by Madame Lalonde, without getting into the more controversial areas of aid withdrawal. I don't think this would serve Canada's interests. I've discussed this with others. It is not something we can support, regrettably.

The Chair: Any other comments, Mr. Day, on the amendment?

Mr. Stockwell Day: We've been urging that Canada step up its investment in the Ethiopian elections. We've already put money in there, but we're also pressing for observers. How would this addition to the amendment affect that?

It's part of our policy that aid to other countries should be dependent on their degree of governance and their support for human rights and full democracy. So broadly speaking, this is not a problem for us. But we don't know what the implications are, and we're saying, "Stop all aid to Ethiopia". We need time to assess what that's going to mean. What aid is being stopped?

We've made a partial case. We don't like some of the threats that are surrounding the election coming up on May 15. So we have some concern with that part of the amendment.

The Chair: Madame McDonough.

Ms. Alexa McDonough: I just want to say further that I respect where my colleague, Francine Lalonde, is coming from here. I personally have no difficulty with the first three points contained in this, but I have some concern about any possibility of denying humanitarian aid to Ethiopia, or any other country in such absolutely dire economic circumstances. We're talking about human lives that are being lost now due to starvation and ill health, so I think for us to do this is worrisome.

If that is the main sticking point, I wonder if Madame Lalonde would want to consider withdrawal of the final of those four points, because it sounds as though there is a lot of concern about that. I think it's a dangerous precedent to engage in. I also think it's almost open-ended as to what it means, if I try to interpret that Canada should not give Ethiopia direct aid without assurance that the resolution of the conflict is part of the agreement. I'm not sure exactly what that means—what the resolution of the conflict being part of the agreement would actually look like. I think what we're seeing here in the whole motion before the committee is an attempt to move the process forward to achieve a resolution, so it almost seems as though it confuses the situation.

But I have no difficulty with the first three parts of that amendment that has been put forward, given that the primary concern raised by all three of the other parties is around how drastic the implications of denying humanitarian aid to such desperate people would be.

I don't know whether Madame Lalonde wants to consider withdrawing that fourth part. That might find support. I don't want to speak for anyone else, but I would support it.

● (0940)

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Ms. Lalonde, please.

Ms. Francine Lalonde: First of all, Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize the distinction between humanitarian aid and direct aid. We are talking about direct aid, in other words development aid. Humanitarian aid is provided by UN organizations. When we talk about famine, we think about UN organizations.

I have already debated the issue at this very committee, in a previous Parliament. Several countries in the European Union were exerting pressure on Ethiopia, by threatening to not provide any direct aid. I had supported the motion, at the time, and my counterparts said that it was out of the question. I insisted then on distinguishing humanitarian aid, that the UN distributes based on need, from aid for rebuilding and development, that some countries provide.

There must be negotiations to speed up the resolution of the conflict, which hinges on an agreement on the borders. If it were not for that, the conflict would be over. Until there is an agreement on the borders, there will be economic and social problems, problems transporting goods, problems with trade, and the risk of famine.

As long as there is no resolution, negotiators can intervene. It says: "That Canada should not give [...] aid...". We cannot withdraw that. Aid is ongoing.

In negotiations—and other countries do the same thing—the parties must agree, and there are attempts to satisfy the main demand of both parties. Eritrea wants recognition for the borders; Ethiopia wants a corridor and also wants to discuss economic issues. They must do both at the same time, and pressure must be brought to bear on both countries. That is how you negotiate; there must be a *quid pro quo*.

I did not want to withdraw anything, but if Canada is giving \$100 million, it hopes that Ethiopia will respect international law, because it has committed to accepting the decision of the commission.

I will stop there, but I want to reiterate my point. It must be clear: humanitarian aid and direct aid are two entirely different things. I am not proposing and will never propose cutting humanitarian aid to any country.

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Lalonde.

[*English*]

Are there any other comments concerning the amendment of Madame Lalonde?

Mr. McTeague.

• (0945)

Hon. Dan McTeague: This is for clarification for members. I'm going purely on memory here, and I take into account what Madame Lalonde has just said. I want the committee to understand that Ethiopia, from a human rights perspective—I understand her talk about bilateral direct aid—is meeting its targets. The concern that has been expressed time and time again has been that Eritrea is not. If we go down this road of saying one versus the other, we wind up in that sort of grey area, and it's very difficult to make direct policy.

I thought Ms. McDonough's motion carried some of what Madame Lalonde suggested. The 11th paragraph calls on the Government of Canada to increase the pressure on the Government of Ethiopia to accept in full the recommendations, and there it talks about the decision with Badme and about involving the members of the Algiers agreement. I think it's very comprehensive, and while there are specifics that have been suggested here by Madame Lalonde, I just want to make it abundantly clear that everything to try to bring this issue to a head has been tried by this committee in consultation with members. I think the motion by Ms. McDonough as it stands is sufficient in and of itself, and I just want to make that clear.

The Chair: Mrs. McDonough.

Ms. Alexa McDonough: This is in response to Madame Lalonde's distinction. It's an accurate distinction, between humanitarian assistance and development assistance, but I think the two are so inextricably intertwined that it's a difficult one to make. For example, given that development assistance deals with the infrastructure of water transportation and so on, it makes humanitarian assistance either as effective as possible or the opposite. I would still have to express my concern about that fourth clause in the amendment that has been proposed.

The Chair: I just want to pinpoint that there's not much difference between what Madame Lalonde just said and paragraph 12 from Mrs. McDonough. Mrs. McDonough's paragraph proposed “that the Government of Canada suggest to the Government of Ethiopia that Canada's future cooperation would be given impetus with Ethiopian agreement to the recommendations of the Eritrea-Ethiopia Boundary Commission”. It's quite close, but we are on the amendment of Madame Lalonde.

[*Translation*]

Yes, Ms. Lalonde?

Ms. Francine Lalonde: Could we vote separately on the first three points?

The Chair: As you wish, it is your choice. We can vote on each point.

[*English*]

We're going to vote on the amendment of Madame Lalonde, and I am going to read it item by item. We're going to vote, first, that the partners of the peace agreement signed in Algiers can act as a contact group between Eritrea and Ethiopia.

(Amendment agreed to)

The Chair: The second bullet—I'll call them “bullets”—is that Ethiopia has to be convinced to collaborate with the Eritrea-Ethiopia Boundary Commission, clearly signifying its compliance with the borders but also at the same time on their part....

I call the vote on the second bullet.

Mr. Stockwell Day: Just on a point of order, Mr. Chair, for ease of movement, I really think 2 and 3 need to be together.

The Chair: Yes, we're going to go on 2 and 3, Mr. Day.

(Amendment agreed to)

• (0950)

The Chair: The next is that Canada should not give Ethiopia direct aid without assurance that the resolution of the conflict is part of the agreement.

(Amendment negated)

The Chair: There are three bullets we agree on; we disagree on the fourth bullet.

Now I go to the main motion as amended.

Mr. Kevin Sorenson: Wait a minute. Are we voting on the whole thing?

The Chair: Yes, we're voting for the whole thing as amended, including the three bullets but not the fourth.

(Motion as amended agreed to)

The Chair: It's unanimous.

The meeting is adjourned.

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

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

**Also available on the Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire at the following address:
Aussi disponible sur le réseau électronique « Parliamentary Internet Parlementaire » à l'adresse suivante :
<http://www.parl.gc.ca>**

The Speaker of the House hereby grants permission to reproduce this document, in whole or in part, for use in schools and for other purposes such as private study, research, criticism, review or newspaper summary. Any commercial or other use or reproduction of this publication requires the express prior written authorization of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Le Président de la Chambre des communes accorde, par la présente, l'autorisation de reproduire la totalité ou une partie de ce document à des fins éducatives et à des fins d'étude privée, de recherche, de critique, de compte rendu ou en vue d'en préparer un résumé de journal. Toute reproduction de ce document à des fins commerciales ou autres nécessite l'obtention au préalable d'une autorisation écrite du Président.