



House of Commons  
CANADA

# **Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs**

---

NDDN • NUMBER 005 • 1st SESSION • 38th PARLIAMENT

---

**EVIDENCE**

**Wednesday, October 27, 2004**

—  
**Chair**

**Mr. Pat O'Brien**

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

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

## Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs

Wednesday, October 27, 2004

• (1535)

[English]

**The Chair (Mr. Pat O'Brien (London—Fanshawe, Lib.)):** I would like to welcome everyone and call to order the fifth meeting of the Standing Committee on National Defence and Veterans Affairs.

Today is, as agreed, a business meeting for the committee. You should have an agenda and some other documents there.

I'm in the hands of the committee on this, but it's certainly my preference, going back to my municipal days, to try to meet in public as much as possible. Whether it was at municipal council or here, I've chaired committees at both levels, as many of you have. Obviously there will be times when we're going to want to go in camera, and that's appropriate, but I think that should be a conscious decision of the committee.

I don't know what your experience is, but I know in my local community right now they're going through some pretty good and deserved scrutiny for being in camera way too much—in that case as a municipal council. I'm totally in the hands of the committee, but subject to your thoughts, I would propose as chair to start every meeting in open session, and then if we get to a point where we feel it's appropriate to go in camera, we would have a motion and decide collectively to go in camera. I've asked the clerk to alter the agenda to reflect that.

I'm in your hands, but let's be quite candid, it's my personal preference to start all meetings in public session and then go in camera only for those portions where it's necessary.

I think people understand that there's public business that sometimes has to be done in camera. It's just a strongly held personal view I have that it should be minimal and it should be justifiable.

With that—and I'll change the order of this a little bit, with your indulgence—I want to start with Mr. Blaikie, who some time ago gave us notice of motion.

I'm going to give Mr. Blaikie the floor now.

**Hon. Bill Blaikie (Elmwood—Transcona, NDP):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Pursuant to the notice I gave the chair on Thursday, October 18, I would like to move that the government whip be asked to remove the parliamentary secretary from this committee. And before you rule on the acceptability of my motion, Mr. Chairman, I just want to say that this motion is not motivated by or having to do with the presence of

the current parliamentary secretary for defence, although I did find that his behaviour at the first meeting tended to reinforce my argument.

Nevertheless, I want the committee to know that my position on the presence of parliamentary secretaries on committees predates the arrival of the parliamentary secretary in Parliament, never mind the arrival of the parliamentary secretary on this committee. And there is a—

**The Chair:** Was he even born?

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** I won't go there.

There are strong arguments that have been expressed and accepted in the past by previous parliaments. Following the recommendations of the special committee on the reform of the House of Commons in 1985, parliamentary secretaries were removed from committees. It was understood to be a move that would reinforce what was trying to be achieved at that time, and it was simultaneous with giving committees the powers to initiate investigations on their own without having to wait for instructions from the government. It wasn't always the case, Mr. Chairman, that committees could decide to look into submarines, for instance. When I first arrived here, we would have had to have had a motion passed in the House of Commons, approved by the government, referring the matter of the purchase of the submarines to the committee, and without the government having decided to do so, the committee would not have been able, on its own, to engage in such a study.

Simultaneous with those kinds of developments, it was also felt that if the committees were going to be more independent of the government, the removal of parliamentary secretaries would be part and parcel of that. At a certain point, the Mulroney government decided to put the parliamentary secretaries back on the committee, ultimately, I think, because committees were getting too independent—for the government's taste, anyway—and we've had parliamentary secretaries back ever since.

With the new government and the appointment of parliamentary secretaries to the Privy Council, it seems to me this argument about parliamentary secretaries is due for new life, given that parliamentary secretaries are now even more tied to the government's agenda than before.

I move this motion, knowing that there's controversy about its substance, also about its acceptability. I also understand this is now before the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs and there's been a motion brought forward by Mr. Hill on behalf of the Conservatives, which, if passed at the standing committee, either today or tomorrow, or whenever it gets dealt with, would actually empower committees to remove the parliamentary secretaries if they so chose. In other words, it wouldn't remove them *carte blanche*; it would be up to committees themselves whether or not they felt this was the kind of committee they wanted.

Having said that, Mr. Chair, I put my motion before the committee.

• (1540)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Blaikie.

I've had advice from the clerk—and she's sought other advice as well—and as it stands now, I have to rule under Marleau and Montpetit that the motion is out of order. I can't receive it, so it's not open for discussion. I see some hands getting ready, but I can't discuss what I haven't received. Mr. Blaikie gave us proper notice of motion, and he's had an opportunity to speak to it, and it's a very interesting historical snapshot on this question. Some of us remember, from the last time we were on this committee, in the last session of the previous Parliament, that it came up at that point in time. There was some pretty decent consensus at that time on this particular committee, but it's a bigger issue than any one committee.

I have to respectfully decline to accept the member's motion and call it out of order under Marleau and Montpetit now. And as you've indicated, Mr. Blaikie, the issue has gone to another venue, and it may be that if it becomes in order, we may revisit it. But right now, I can't receive the motion.

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** There are two things, Mr. Chairman. First, with respect, I don't think it's enough to just say Marleau and Montpetit. It's a book of about 500 pages, so if there's a particular section of Marleau and Montpetit that the chair is using in order to rule my motion out of order, I'd like to have it read into the record.

**The Chair:** Fair enough. We can certainly do that. We can read it into the record, and I will when the clerk comes to it. You can appreciate that on something like this we wanted to do some research—

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** I can't argue the point, Mr. Chairman, unless you put on the record what it is you're using.

**The Chair:** Thank you. I appreciate that.

Standing Order 108(3) speaks to the mandate and powers of standing committees. It specifically indicates that membership of committees is in the sole purview of the procedure and House affairs committee. I'm just citing the reference for you.

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I don't know if there is more—there is more to it because I've read it myself—but I'm not challenging the purview of the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs. I'm not challenging its right to determine the nature of committees. I'm not challenging the right of the government to determine its own membership on the committee, although the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs may well do that sometime soon. All I'm arguing is that this

committee should form an opinion about how it should be made up. I find it very odd that the committee cannot have an opinion about itself.

I ask my colleagues to think about that because it seems rather odd that we can't collectively have an opinion. I don't mean have jurisdiction or be able to make a decision but that we cannot form an opinion and make that opinion known about how we would like our committee to be structured.

It's on those grounds, Mr. Chairman, that I would appeal to you, even though you may have your mind made up, to think twice about your ruling.

**The Chair:** I understand that, Mr. Blaikie.

The reason I'm quite clear on what the ruling is, given the advice I've sought... That is exactly the point I made. The intent of the motion is to have the committee express an opinion and make a request to the government that it withdraw the parliamentary secretary. We can spend the whole meeting on it if you like, but I can only tell you that it's very definitive and clear. The advice I was given through the clerk is that such a motion is unreceivable by me as the chair.

Now, can I have the clerk comment on it?

See, I can't accept comments on it by other than me and the mover because it's not in order. That's what I'm ruling.

Madam Clerk.

• (1545)

**The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Angela Crandall):** The mandate of the committee is set out in Standing Order 108, and it's discussed in Marleau and Montpetit in the chapter on committees, on pages 814 to about 826. Committees in general have a specific mandate to deal with departments and documents that are referred to them from departments they're responsible for, in our case National Defence and Veterans Affairs. Also under 108 they can initiate studies that fall under those responsibilities. They don't have a mandate to do anything outside of that.

In the Standing Orders the mandate to deal with membership is specifically given to the procedure and House affairs committee. A normal interpretation of the regulations or rules—whatever—is that it's not within the purview or the mandate of the committee to discuss membership.

**The Chair:** That's the problem I have, Mr. Blaikie, so I have to rule it out of order. I guess we could play verbal ping-pong—

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** Can I ask a further question?

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** Again, Mr. Chairman, just by the clerk's own statement, we're concerned with the department. The parliamentary secretary is part of the department. It's departmental policy, ministerial policy, to have the parliamentary secretary on the committee rather than having him on some other committee or not having him on a committee at all. I think I could make a counter-argument, but it's within your powers to rule it out of order and I respect that.

But I wonder, what is the constitution of the committee or what are the rules of the committee with respect to rulings by the chair?

**The Chair:** That's a fair question, on whether you can challenge the chair.

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** Yes. What are the rules with respect to the ability to challenge the chair, to ask the committee whether or not it wants to overturn—

**The Chair:** That's a fair question, Bill, and let's find that out. My experience at two levels of government is that you can always challenge a ruling of the chair. Can we reference that? Does anybody know? Happily for me that's never happened before.

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** I haven't had to do it myself.

**The Chair:** No, and I don't take any personal offence. I've certainly done it a couple of times as a member of a committee, challenge a chair, and if you can convince enough members—

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** I wonder if in order to facilitate the work of the committee it would be possible for me to reserve at this point the right to challenge the ruling that my motion is out of order; we could take it up at the next meeting.

**The Chair:** Fair enough; we'll hold it. It hasn't been received, so I can't take other speakers on it. Mr. Blaikie is inquiring about—

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** It hasn't been received but it's been moved and ruled on, and now we reserve the right—

**The Chair:** That's right. We're going to now put in abeyance or table that thought that there may be a challenge to the chair's ruling that this is out of order, and that may come at a future meeting, obviously.

**Mr. Claude Bachand (Saint-Jean, BQ):** Do you need a challenge now?

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** Perhaps it would be better, Mr. Chairman, if I could move that the ruling of the chair with respect to my motion be overturned by the committee, and then we could just table that motion.

**The Chair:** I agree. So the motion is—I keep seeing hands, but procedurally you can't take hands on a tabling motion, so with all due respect, hold the hands because I can't recognize anybody right now. I can accept your motion and table it.

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** Do I have a seconder, perhaps, on this?

**Mr. Claude Bachand:** What is that? I don't have any sound here, first of all. I just want a translation of what he said.

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** I'm just saying, I'm going to move to table. I've moved the motion to challenge the chair's ruling.

**Mr. Claude Bachand:** Can he do that even though it's his own motion?

**The Chair:** Yes. It's a point of order, and a point of order is always in—

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC):** This is directed towards the clerk who read the rulings. Both Marleau and Montpetit and the Standing Orders were written prior to the parliamentary secretaries being brought into—

**The Chair:** That's not a point of order, with all due respect; that's debate.

Mr. Blaikie has properly moved a motion. I have, in my view, properly ruled as chair—under Marleau and Montpetit, which we've referenced—that I can't receive it. Mr. Blaikie has indicated he wants to challenge the ruling of the chair. It's my understanding he has every right to do that. He subsequently indicated he wants for now to table his challenge to the chair's ruling, so we'll leave it for another meeting and we'll move on.

Is everybody clear on it now?

• (1550)

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** I'm only doing that to give you guys time to get your act together.

**The Chair:** I confess that I don't know the committee rules on challenging a chair. Does the clerk know offhand?

**The Clerk:** I'm not completely certain. I know the ruling can be challenged, but I think it would actually be appealed to the Speaker of the House in that case.

**The Chair:** As I say, it's one of the few new experiences for me, so we'll have to find out what it takes to challenge the chair, what the opportunity is.

Thank you for that, and we're going to get this done sooner or later.

Let's go on to the next point, which is the report of the subcommittee on agenda and procedure of the Standing Committee on National Defence. You all have it. We're going to get into the details of that, I would suspect, in camera, but this is just to get it officially on the record here. Are there any questions on the subcommittee report?

Mr. Casson, could I ask you to move it?

**Mr. Rick Casson (Lethbridge, CPC):** Certainly.

**The Chair:** It's been moved by Mr. Casson.

Claude, can you...?

**Mr. Claude Bachand:** Sure.

**The Chair:** Mr. Bachand has seconded it.

It's pretty straightforward there. We're going to get into the nitty-gritty of the study perhaps in camera in a few minutes, but that would be up to the committee.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Let's see what else we can deal with that's clearly in public. There's been a distribution of documents received by the committee. There's been a request to the clerk, I understand, from media people; they would like to be assured access to the various documents the committee asked for the other day. Mr. O'Connor, Mr. Bachand, and others brought it up.

The clerk has told me what the public accounts committee did as an example. Obviously, all committee members had copies of these documents, but then there were a couple or three other copies made available to the media; any media people were just told to go and reference them at that place.

Cheryl.

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant:** We have asked for the details of contracts. Would it be putting the companies who bid on these contracts in any difficulty if all the details of the contracts were made public?

**The Chair:** I think it would just be understood that if it comes to us under confidential cover, it can't be given to the media. If it doesn't come to us under confidential cover, I don't see why the media couldn't have it.

Claude.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Claude Bachand:** I'd like us to agree that committee members should in principle have access to documents before members of the press.

I'm fed up with the fact that members of the press always seem to manage to get their hands on documents. Imagine how ridiculous it would be if at our next meeting, reporters had documents that had not yet been distributed to us and that we had not yet had time to review. Imagine if these reporters actually queried us about the documents in their possession. We would be forced to answer that hadn't even received copies of them yet. I insist that committee members receive the documents first, before they are distributed to members of the press.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I see a lot of nodding heads. We absolutely agree with that. After it's come to us, it could then be indicated to the media that there are two or three copies of those documents available to you, and here's where you can go and see them.

Keith.

**Hon. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Lib.):** Mr. Chairman, I think it would be only fair to say to the Department of Defence, in our request to them for documents, that these documents, if we so choose, are going to be made public to the press. We need to tell them that beforehand in order to deal with issues such as what Mrs. Gallant mentioned, about violating issues of privacy with respect to the companies involved.

What I'm asking for is that in the context of the request we're making to DND, which has already been made, we must tell them that these documents are going to be available to the press too.

**The Chair:** Fair enough, but if it's deemed by the people giving us the documents that they're under confidential cover, then the media can't have them. That's just the way it is. But in fairness, we will indicate that to the military officials.

Mr. O'Connor.

• (1555)

**Mr. Gordon O'Connor (Carleton—Mississippi Mills, CPC):** Mr. Chair, I understand the problem with the contracts, because there's commercial involvement there, but I think you'll find that all the documents I asked for are older documents. I don't think there'd be any problem with them.

**The Chair:** All right.

I have Mr. Blaikie and then Mrs. Gallant.

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** Mr. Chairman, I think we should have our own opinion about what's confidential and what isn't. To take your words at face value, if they put it under confidential cover, then it's confidential cover. If I were them, I'd just put everything under confidential cover and be done with it.

Surely we have some notion of what we think ought to be treated as confidential and what shouldn't be. From my understanding, in terms of what was requested by Mr. O'Connor, unless he feels that something in there should be confidential, these were all documents that could be in the public domain. I would think it would be unacceptable—on the basis of your comments, for instance—for DND to decide to say, guess what, they're all confidential; you can't share any of them with the media.

I don't think we should be quite so laissez faire, letting them determine what is regarded in that way and what isn't. If Mr. O'Connor, for instance, feels that what he requested is properly in the public domain, and somebody wants to argue to the contrary, then they need to make a good argument to the contrary. They can't just call it confidential.

**The Chair:** I agree, and that's not what I intended to say. I think I started my comments by saying that it would be my intention to call the documents public. Now, if they send us something and they say it's confidential, and we disagree, I agree with you that we can decide to release it and then take whatever fallout there is.

It's the same point that's behind my intention to start every one of these meetings as an open session. That's just the way I think government should operate. If we go in camera, let's get a formal motion, and be prepared to defend why it is you want to go in camera.

So I agree with the same point on the documents.

Keith.

**Hon. Keith Martin:** There are, with all due respect—

**The Chair:** Sorry, Mr. Martin, I had Mrs. Gallant next.

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant:** Mr. Chair, my comments were along the same lines as Mr. Blaikie's. I'm concerned that if Keith's proposal was followed through on, and the military was told that this may go into the hands of the media, they would use that as an excuse to withhold information from us. And we would not want the military to withhold information we've requested on the basis that we may show it to the media.

**The Chair:** That's fine, but I would suspect that the military would not want to withhold information requested from it by a standing committee. That would be a very serious problem for them.

**An hon. member:** How would we know?

**The Chair:** We would find out. I would certainly want to pursue it. I can't imagine them withholding documents that have been properly requested by a standing committee.

How we would know, that's another question. It would be pretty serious for them to do that. They could be hauled before Parliament. They would be in breach of some pretty serious rules around here.

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant:** No one's ever been hauled in for perjury, in a standing committee.

**The Chair:** Do you understand the full weight of the powers of the parliamentary committee? I invite you to review them. There are some pretty heavy powers we can invoke.

Mr. Martin.

**Hon. Keith Martin:** What we're doing here is actually having a third party going and making decisions on confidentiality. There's an issue of legal responsibility involved here. This committee is not legally responsible for issues of confidentiality. The Government of Canada's Department of National Defence is legally responsible.

The engagement of contracts occurred between two parties, and to put a third party in there that's going to influence or alter an issue of confidentiality between two parties is absurd. Quite frankly, it's absolutely illegal.

You may want to consider doing this—I understand where it's coming from, so that we get to the truth of the matter, which is what we all want—but there are legal grounds upon which you can't get a third party to force two individuals to disclose information that was deemed to be confidential.

**The Chair:** Before I go to Judi, it's pretty obvious that we're going to need some legal advice at this committee. At some point we're going to talk about other staff resources. Besides our trusty and very good researchers, we're probably going to need some other staff resources. I think this discussion highlights the fact that we're going to need some legal advice at this committee, either on an ongoing basis, for this study, or at least from time to time. I'll just put that out for your consideration now.

Mrs. Longfield.

**Hon. Judi Longfield (Whitby—Oshawa, Lib.):** My understanding was that nothing would be released to us of a confidential or a classified nature without it having gone through the appropriate channels. If the documentation is classified, if it's confidential, then they can't give it to us, and they would come back and tell us why they couldn't give it to us. If they gave it to us, obviously it's not classified, not confidential. It would be public domain.

• (1600)

**The Chair:** Anybody else on this one?

Gordon.

**Mr. Gordon O'Connor:** I know what I'm looking for, and I'd be very surprised if anything, in all the documents I've asked for, is a national secret. Confidential is a pretty low standard of security. Somebody could declare a thing confidential; it means embarrassing. So I'd be very surprised, but I'll wait and see.

The first priority, from my point of view, is that we on the committee get the documents. The press is secondary, from my point of view. We're the ones doing the investigation. I certainly want the press to have whatever they can have, but here in the committee, I want to have as much as I can have.

**The Chair:** I absolutely agree. I know that although sometimes we're not very enamoured of the press, particularly when they misrepresent what has been said, as you'll see from time to time, or when they do some incomplete or less-than-adequate reporting, from our judgment, we still live in a democratic state. I know we all on this committee want to be as transparent as possible, and let our work be as public as possible. That's just obvious, I think.

So the request is—and I think it's proper, from the media—that they have access to as much of the documentation as possible. It's a valid request, in my view. I'm sure the committee would want to accede to that through the proper, normal processes. I think Mrs. Longfield has spoken to the confidential nature of the information we might get.

Maybe we can move on.

Judi, I'll give you the last word.

**Hon. Judi Longfield:** There may be information that they don't want shared with the public that they could give to us in camera. That would give the members of this committee the opportunity to review those documents, but those documents would not then be available to the outside. That happens in a number of cases, where testimony is in camera or where other discussion is in camera. It is not then open to the general public, but it's certainly available for all members of the committee. And we may be in a situation such as that.

**The Chair:** Yes. That's a very good point too.

Monsieur Perron.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Gilles-A. Perron (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, BQ):** Mr. Chairman, is it the committee's job to supply the press with documents? In my opinion, they should make their own arrangements to obtain documents. It is not up to me to decide whether or not a document is confidential. Requests for documents should come from reporters themselves. It is not our responsibility to oblige them.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** No, you're quite right. I didn't mean to suggest that individual members would be giving the documents....

Maybe, I'll ask the clerk to comment, but the request came to the clerk for access to documentation. You'll see them moving around the media during a meeting and going over and taking stuff or information off files that are available.

Can you help with that at all?

**The Clerk:** Sure.

The committee receives the documents and they become the property of the committee, so the committee can decide how they want to deal with them. My question was, did the committee want to get into the business of distributing documents where some of them may be very voluminous and we might be making a lot of copies? A solution adopted in the public accounts committee last spring when they had a similar situation was that they provided three copies to the press gallery, and members of the press were told to consult the documents made available, any documents the committee received that it wanted to make public.

**The Chair:** Yes. That was a far more contentious topic going on at that committee—and it's not over—and that's how they resolved it. That's why I mentioned that at the start.

Mr. Casson.

**Mr. Rick Casson:** Mr. Chairman, maybe just for clarification from you, if you know this, if we ask for a document, whether it's classified or not, aren't they bound to give it to us? Can they...?

I see the researcher is shaking his head, so that's what I want to know; if we ask for something that is really higher than confidential, as Gordon said—

**The Chair:** Super-classified.

**Mr. Rick Casson:** Super-whatever.... Can they come back to us and say, "No, you cannot have that"?

**Mr. Wolf Koerner (Committee Researcher):** If it's a confidential document and if it comes under the Official Secrets Act, they don't have to give it to this committee, because the committee really operates in public and is a public body. Michel and I don't have security clearances and you know this has been a problem for them.

But generally, they have been pretty good with us over the years in terms of giving us the kinds of documents that Mr. O'Connor had asked for. I remember back when we did the quality of life study, they were quite forthcoming when we were asking for surveys they had done and for all sorts of documents that hadn't been public. They had absolutely no problem giving those to us, but we kept them under lock and key. These certainly wouldn't be things I would be prepared to give a reporter.

In a sense, the media have legislation that covers their access to it, and it's their job to find things out for themselves, really.

• (1605)

**Mr. Rick Casson:** Is the Official Secrets Act pretty clear what would be covered by that and what wouldn't be? Can something be moved from the public realm, or from the confidential realm, into an area where it cannot be accessed by anyone, or is it pretty clear as to what the parameters are?

**Mr. Wolf Koerner:** No, I think it's pretty clear. I'm not a lawyer, but—

**Mr. Rick Casson:** And it's laid out?

**Mr. Wolf Koerner:** It's pretty clear.

Departments usually give you what they want to give you, not what you necessarily want. Right?

The department has been, as I've said, pretty good.

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** Specifically, just have them give us what you want. He said, give us this, this, this, and this.

**Mr. Gordon O'Connor:** Well, if they don't come through, I'll make another list.

**Mr. Wolf Koerner:** On most of those, if I can recall, I think we'll get them.

**The Chair:** Are we done with that one?

Claude.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Claude Bachand:** Personally, I haven't seen Mr. O'Connor's list. However, I clearly recall asking Mr. Williams if we could see a copy of the contract between the two parties. I think he acquiesced. Time, however, is a factor. As I see it, the faster we're able to get our hands on documents, the better prepared the committee will be to set out the direction it intends to take. We can't have the Navy or the department telling us that our list of documents is incomplete. Therefore, I'd appreciate receiving these documents in a timely fashion.

I'd also like to know as soon as possible which of the documents on our list they consider to be confidential. As such, I strongly insist on seeing the contract. I do have some concerns, however, because no deadline was set for turning over the documents. I don't want to be here in a month's time listening to witnesses and still not have these documents.

Mr. Chairman, would you be willing to speak with departmental officials on the committee's behalf to put in a request to receive these documents as soon as possible?

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Absolutely, if the committee wants to, we can ask the clerk right now to communicate with the witnesses who were here the other day and say, "The committee wants this information absolutely as soon as possible".

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant:** Within 24 hours or 48—

**The Chair:** Do you want to give them a deadline? Do you want to say within 72 hours?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Claude Bachand:** I'm not sure how many documents in all Mr. O'Connor has requested. I've seen the lengthy list my colleague spoke of the other day, but are we talking about 1,000 pages or 2,000 pages? How we talking about 50 documents in all? I have no idea. A contract cannot be that unwieldy a document. I've asked to see a copy of the contract and I would appreciate getting it as soon as possible, so that we can start to review the particulars.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Right.

Let's enquire, and we'll make the point that we want this information as soon as possible. I'll ask them to give us an indication of how long they think that will be. If we don't like that answer, we'll come up with a deadline and say, "Meet it, or explain why you didn't". Okay? Thanks.



I take Mr. Blaikie's point on this PS thing quite seriously, but I'd like to dispose of it once and for all for this committee, so that it's not hanging over our head for the next six months. I'm not making light of it, but it's just that I suspect it's going to be dealt with at another venue. So I asked the clerk. I was quite sure there was a process at any committee I've ever heard of to challenge the ruling of a chair, if you want. And there is. She now has the way it works.

I've ruled I can't accept Mr. Blaikie's motion under Marleau and Montpetit. What he would then do if he doesn't want to accept that ruling is to make a motion—and I'll invite him to do that if he wants—or someone would make a motion that the chair's ruling be sustained, or in other words, be upheld. Then he would obviously vote against sustaining my motion because he doesn't like my ruling. All who agree with him and don't like my ruling would vote that way, and if the majority of the committee votes that my ruling not be upheld, then under the rules I'm overruled, and then his motion is on the floor.

•(1610)

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** Is such a motion debatable?

**The Chair:** I don't believe it's debatable under any rules I've ever heard of.

I'm going to invite Mr. Blaikie, in our collegial approach here, if he wants to make that motion. Go ahead.

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** Well, Mr. Chairman, there may be others who feel likewise and would want to make this motion, but I would make the following motion that the ruling of the chair be sustained.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Is there a seconder?

**Mr. Rick Casson:** Are you saying there can't be any debate on this motion?

**The Chair:** No, there's no debate; it's not a debatable motion.

**Mr. Gordon O'Connor:** What were his words again?

**The Chair:** That the ruling of the chair be sustained. Then it's upheld.

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** It's required that the motion be put in the positive.

**Mr. Gordon O'Connor:** Yes, okay. I was a—

**The Chair:** Yes, I know, it's a bit backwards, which is why I took.... So he's actually hoping you will vote no, as he will. All right?

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** It's one of the absurdities of pride that in order not to sustain the ruling, I must move that it be sustained.

**The Chair:** That's right.

Is there a seconder to the motion to sustain the ruling of the chair?

**Hon. Keith Martin:** I so move.

**The Chair:** Mr. Martin moves.

All in favour of sustaining the ruling of the chair not to receive Mr. Blaikie's motion, that is, that my ruling not to receive his motion be sustained, please raise your hands.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Mr. Blaikie or other parliamentarians will have an opportunity to pursue it at another venue.

Thank you.

Yes, Rick.

**Mr. Rick Casson:** Is it fair, Mr. Chairman, to discuss the motion that's been brought to the procedure and House affairs committee at this time, or is that part of this basic discussion?

**The Chair:** You can add it to the agenda if you want to. I didn't receive this motion so there's no discussion on it, but on the issue of PS's on committees, if you would like to talk about it here, let's add it to our list. If the committee wants, we can get into that discussion right now.

Mr. Blaikie.

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** If you ruled that the committee can't talk about this—

**The Chair:** We can't talk about your motion.

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** No, but you ruled against my motion on the basis that the committee can't talk about its own membership. So if we can't talk about it, we can't talk about it.

**The Chair:** Well, no, that's not quite right, with all due respect. I didn't say you can't. I think we can sit here as colleagues and talk about anything we want. I couldn't receive a motion; it's quite a different story between receiving a motion and having a philosophical discussion.

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** It was based on the paragraph in Marleau and Montpetit. It didn't say committees can talk about membership, but they can't move motions. It said that membership of committees is not the purview of any other committee other than the Standing Committee on Procedure and House Affairs. So as much as I'd love to discuss it, it seems to me that in order to be consistent with your ruling, which I objected to, we're not in a position to discuss it at all.

**The Chair:** That's fine. I'm in the hands of the committee. I wouldn't philosophically agree with that for this reason: I think Marleau and Montpetit speaks about actions of the committee and that's what you were seeking, the committee to take action.

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** That's not what it says.

**The Chair:** I think we're stretching the language a lot to say that we can't sit around as MPs at a committee and have a discussion, but if it gets to an action stage then the rules kick in. Anyway, let's not belabour it.

Rick, some don't want to talk about it.

**Mr. Rick Casson:** I think, Mr. Chairman, that there are far more important things for us to discuss at this time. We spent 40 minutes on this.

**The Chair:** Yes, let's go on. I understand the issue; we all do. I think it will be fought in another venue, so I appreciate that.

Let's go on. Where are we here?

**The Clerk:** We might want to go in camera now. We've discussed the motion and we've adopted the report.

**The Chair:** I think we're done with the media situation. We may want to get some legal advice on that whole issue.

Maybe we can just look at the briefing in Halifax. We can do that here now. We're proposing to go early afternoon, late morning to fly down. It's caucus day Wednesday, as we know.

Do you have times, Angela?

• (1615)

**The Clerk:** The last direct flight we can get is at 5:20 p.m.

**The Chair:** So we could fly direct from Ottawa to Halifax. Are there a couple of options of times?

**The Clerk:** In the afternoon, I believe, at 12:20 p.m. I can check for more times.

**The Chair:** So 12:20 p.m. There will be two or three flights likely that afternoon. We could skip out of caucus early if you want and get the 12:20 p.m. direct, go to Halifax, get into the work overnight, get the detailed briefings and see the sub and then you make your arrangements as to whether you're going to go back to Ottawa, or to your riding, or wherever you're going to go.

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** What are the options on Wednesday afternoon?

**The Chair:** We don't know for sure. There's 12:20 p.m. and 5:20 p.m. and there's probably something in between.

**Mr. Wolf Koerner:** If we do go, Mr. Bachand and Mr. Blaikie are coming to Venice, right, with NATO?

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** Pardon me?

**Mr. Wolf Koerner:** You're going to Venice with the NATO Parliamentary Assembly?

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** No.

**Mr. Wolf Koerner:** You're not. All right, because we're coming back on the 17th, so we'd have to fly into Halifax from there.

**The Chair:** Are you going to Venice, Claude?

[Translation]

**Mr. Claude Bachand:** Yes.

[English]

**The Chair:** How does that affect us?

**Mr. Wolf Koerner:** It's fine, because we'll just fly back to Halifax.

**The Chair:** Does the 17th and 18th work for everybody for this trip to Halifax?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** You might change your mind, but how many are intending to go right now? May I have a show of hands for the clerk. Eleven. So the full committee. The clerk, I suppose, would go. Both researchers?

**Mr. Wolf Koerner:** Yes, we'll meet you there.

**The Chair:** All right.

We'll get the options on the times and so on. What's wrong with 12:20 p.m.? We'd have to leave caucus early.

**The Clerk:** I'll see if there's anything.

**Hon. Keith Martin:** Between 12:20 p.m. and 5:20 p.m., you can't beat that.

**The Chair:** Yes, the latest would be five-something p.m. Hopefully there's a flight in between. We'll check the times.

Do you need an indication from the members on their travel arrangements back?

**The Clerk:** What I'll do is I'll send around a memo to everybody and they can indicate if they're coming back to Ottawa or they want to go back to their constituencies, and we'll make the travel arrangements according to that.

**The Chair:** Is that all right? Good.

**The Clerk:** I'll send that out tomorrow.

**The Chair:** Thank you. We'll do the budget for that trip in camera.

That's the briefing, Mr. Blaikie. We've talked about the documents.

Televised meetings. I thought I heard a consensus of the committee earlier, in talking with all of you informally, that with a lot of media interest around this topic we would try to be as accessible to them as possible in terms of our meetings and having them televised. Did I understand that consensus? Is it agreed that we'll try to do that then? There are limited television facilities around here. It's a little hard to believe it's still that hard to get it televised, but I will ask the clerk as per your consensus that we will endeavour to have our meetings televised on the subject of the submarine purchase if at all possible. If it's not, it's not, but we will try to make sure that it's possible.

We want to talk about the witness list. I don't know why that would have to be in camera. I'm in your hands from here on. If you think we should go in camera, somebody make a motion. We want to discuss possible witnesses, the parameters of this study in detail, the budget for the study, and the budget for the trip to Halifax in some detail.

The other thing I know we can do in public first, with your indulgence.... We didn't really adopt any rules for a third round of questioning of witnesses. Sometimes you get to a third round. What this committee has done in the past, and I'm in your hands—at least when I've been on it, whether I was chairing it or not—is after two full rounds, as per the rules, the chair has just said, the witnesses still have time, do any other colleagues have questions. You would take a question from Rick, maybe the next question from Dave, and the next one from Cheryl, and then we might want five minutes more for Rick. But if we want to have formal third-round rules then we'd better adopt them; otherwise we'll go with the chairman's call to give the chance to anybody in the third round who has a question to ask one or two, and then somebody, etc. Eventually you exhaust the questions. Do you have any thoughts on that?

Rick.

**Mr. Rick Casson:** Mr. Chairman, would it be appropriate to just repeat the second round?

**The Chair:** That's an option.

**Mr. Rick Casson:** I don't know if it has to be rigid, but use that as a guideline and go through that process. And if there's somebody in that party who still wants to ask a question, they have an opportunity to. If not, you just keep going down the....

•(1620)

**The Chair:** Are there any thoughts on using the second-round rules for the third?

Bill, and then Keith.

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** The only problem with that is I don't think I'm in the second round.

**The Chair:** Good observation. Does that mean you're speaking against it?

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** We shouldn't be under any illusions that this includes everybody. It sounds nice and innocent. I thought at the initial meeting that in some ways we went beyond the second round in what we decided. I'm hoping there would be some discretion of the chair to try to include myself in a third round at some point. But I understand the rules of proportionality make that difficult.

**The Chair:** Frankly, that's why it's on here, at my suggestion, because I like to be as collegial and non-partisan around here as we can. But when you're in the chair, you're in the chair and you're a bit of a referee. If a member on the political team I'm on is over, he or she is going to be told your time is up, the same as what I'd tell the opposition. I just don't want to be in a spot where all of a sudden it's an issue at some point, where I thought I was ruling on discretion and then find out, as chair, that I don't have discretion. I want to have it clear, either you want to have formal rules for a third round and decide what those rules are, or you're going to leave it to the chair to recognize whatever hands he sees after two full rounds in no particular order, other than that he sees those hands and he's trying to fairly spread around the questions. I'm in your hands on how you want to do it.

We have Mr. Martin and Ms. Longfield.

**Hon. Keith Martin:** I propose that Mr. Casson's suggestion be adopted, except with the modification that the NDP be included in that round.

**The Chair:** The third round?

**Hon. Keith Martin:** I think that is probably the fairest, most equitable way for everybody to have a chance. It's just a modification of the second round, but including the NDP.

**The Chair:** So that would mean that in the second round the NDP is not part of the questioning. In the third round—

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** I could be last in the third round.

**The Chair:** In the third round they'd be added back in. That's the suggestion.

Is it a motion or a suggestion?

**Hon. Keith Martin:** It's a motion.

**The Chair:** It is moved by Mr. Martin that a third round of questioning would operate as per the second-round rules, with the addition of Mr. Blaikie at the end of the third round. Mr. Blaikie seconds the motion.

Mr. Casson will speak to the motion.

**Hon. Judi Longfield:** I want to speak to it.

**The Chair:** Oh, you want to speak to it? Go ahead. We'll give you the floor.

**Hon. Judi Longfield:** I can speak in opposition to it.

I am wondering why. It hasn't shown that the back and forth hasn't worked. Maybe we're creating more rules than we need.

My suggestion would be that we allow the chair to exercise his judgment for the foreseeable future. If we find that there is a problem or if one party thinks it's not working well, we could bring forth a motion at that time. I just don't know why we wouldn't continue on.

**The Chair:** I'm happy to continue on. I just want to know what your expectations of the chair are and I'll follow them.

Rick.

**Mr. Rick Casson:** I have two points, Mr. Chairman. The first is to clarify exactly what the first and second rotations are right now. There seems to be a little bit of confusion.

The only way we can consider the motion by the parliamentary secretary is, because we have four full members on this committee, we would not want somebody else getting a second, unjustified shot when all our people have—

**The Chair:** No, that's right. That happened by my mistake, and I hope you'll believe it was an honest one. I was going back to my two previous experiences as chair of this committee, where we went through the parties on the first round, and then on the second round, we went opposition, government, and then opposition, government, all the way down the table.

I erred in that in the first meeting. It was an honest mistake that I won't repeat, hopefully. Would you help me out there?

I will confess that I was a bit surprised. I was partly surprised at the second round, and that's why I made that error, but here it is.

On the first round of questioning, it's seven minutes to a representative of each party in the following order: Conservatives, Bloc, NDP, and Liberals. On the following rounds of questioning, it says five minutes per party, beginning with the Conservatives, the Liberals, the Bloc, the Liberals, the Conservatives, and the Liberals; and that when a minister is in attendance, in the first round of questioning, 10 minutes be allotted to each of the opposition parties and 10 minutes to the Liberal Party, and in a second round, five minutes to each party—so the NDP is back in—alternating between the government and the opposition parties.

That's how I read it, that it's different for a minister. That's clearly what it says here.

Rick.

**Mr. Rick Casson:** Certainly in the first round that's what we had agreed to, but then we went Conservative, Liberal, Bloc, Liberal, Conservative, Liberal, Conservative. What that did was give us four spots for one of each of our members in the first two rounds.

**The Chair:** That was Conservative, Liberal, Bloc, Liberal, Conservative, Liberal, Conservative.

•(1625)

**Hon. Keith Martin:** Can you read that again, please?

**The Chair:** Yes.

In the second round, it's five minutes per party, beginning with Conservatives, Liberals, Bloc, Liberals, Conservatives, Liberals, Conservatives—end of second round. But it's different for a minister.

**The Clerk:** We didn't modify the motion from the last session. That was for the minister.

**The Chair:** Sorry, what was that?

**The Clerk:** When we proposed the routine motions at the second meeting, Mr. Casson proposed this motion. I understood him to say the motion is okay with the following change, but we didn't discuss any changes to the minister's....

**Mr. Rick Casson:** I don't recall that.

**The Chair:** We have the Minister of National Defence on Wednesday. Here's what I'm looking at. Tell me if this is the agreement.

If the minister is in attendance, the first round of questioning is 10 minutes to each of the opposition parties: Conservative, Bloc, NDP, and then Liberals; in the second round, Conservatives, Liberals, Bloc, Liberals, NDP, Liberals.

That's the way it reads; that's the way it's written. That's for ministers only or the Auditor General, people of that stature.

All right? That's what's in writing. It's a good thing we are clarifying this.

**Mr. Rick Casson:** Yes, because, as you can see, that's kind of weighted wrong. There's only one Conservative in the second round.

**Hon. Keith Martin:** Perhaps I can suggest this and see whether or not this is fair. On the second round, Conservative, Liberal, Bloc, Liberal, Conservative, Liberal, NDP—so you're not replacing a Conservative at the second to last one.

**Hon. Judi Longfield:** As I said, just add you at the end.

**Hon. Keith Martin:** Yes, or after this last Conservative put—

**Mr. Rick Casson:** After the last Conservative, add the NDP on the third round.

**Hon. Judi Longfield:** That's right.

**The Chair:** No, no. We're talking about a second round for a minister right now. On a second round for a minister, by what this committee agreed to, what I would do on Wednesday is Conservative, Liberal, Bloc, Liberal, NDP, Liberal, end of second round. That's what it says in writing.

**Hon. Judi Longfield:** But that's not what they're suggesting here.

**The Chair:** Okay. Well, then let's get it clarified.

**Hon. Judi Longfield:** That you just do exactly what you were doing without a minister. The only thing you are doing is adding NDP at the end. So it would be Conservative, Liberal, Bloc, Liberal, Conservative, Liberal, Conservative, NDP, end of second round. That's what I took out of it.

**The Chair:** If that's what you want, fine. That's not what it says here.

**Hon. Judi Longfield:** That could actually be the third round in a regular thing, which is what Bill had asked for.

**The Chair:** I have Mr. Blaikie and then Mr. Martin.

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** Mr. Chairman, if I remember correctly from the first meeting, we had two different sets of rules—one for when a minister or someone in that category appeared before the committee, and then for ordinary witnesses, if you would permit that sort of language. Is that right?

**The Chair:** Yes.

• (1630)

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** What we were discussing when we got into all of this was not the ministerial thing but how we deal with witnesses. All I was saying is that there should be some provision, I would hope, for me to get on somewhere for my own second round, even if it's in the third round. That's all I was pointing out. If we said that the third round was the same as the second round of the non-ministerial rules, and I'm not in the second round, then I have no reason to stay. That's fine. I'll just participate in the first round and the rest of you can spend your afternoon together.

One of the other ways of dealing with it, as I suggested, was to put me in the third round in a way that didn't jeopardize anybody else's position. I'm not even asking to be in the second round. I'm just saying make it worth my while to stick around. It might not be worth my while because it might not even get to me.

In the ordinary rules of the committee, if everybody takes up their time in a two-hour meeting, you're not going to get to me anyway if I'm tacked on at the end of the third round. I'd rather be somewhere in the third round than at the end. But if I'm not going to be in it at all, well, then I'll have to operate accordingly.

As far as the ministerial rules are concerned, the rules pertaining to when a minister appears, it seemed to me that we had a different understanding, that I would be in the second round at some point, and I hope it stays that way.

**The Chair:** Okay. I have some more speakers. As I said, you can see my problem and why I want this clarified. We have some serious work to do here and we don't need to get tied up on procedural stuff.

It happens that you get to a third round. It happened the other day. As a matter of fact, I'm glad we took those witnesses to the full time, because there were important witnesses and we had important questions.

It's a different Parliament. I've never been in a minority Parliament. This is my third time chairing this committee. I knew exactly what the rules were before, and I think I tried to enforce them impartially and fairly. I want to do the same this time, so I don't want any misunderstanding.

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** Nobody is questioning—

**The Chair:** No, but I just don't want any misunderstanding. Bill, there are two points. You're missing one of the points.

I want to know what we want to do on a third round. But I'm now hearing possibly a misunderstanding when a minister is here and I want to resolve it before he or she shows up. That's all.

Let me go to Cheryl first and then Keith.

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant:** Mr. Blaikie said himself that all members are equal, and often when there's a minister present only two of the four Conservatives would even get to ask a round of questions.

When the minister comes, he often comes just for an hour as opposed to a full two hours, and sometimes it's just one round that we get through, so if you would consider that when we're deciding on the speaking order....

**The Chair:** That's a valid point. Sometimes you don't get....

Mr. Martin, and then I'm going to ask for some kind of motion on this.

**Hon. Keith Martin:** I'm going to withdraw my motion that was on the floor and propose this, because Judi has a better idea. Of course, I know Bill would like to stay around for all the testimony because he wants to hear all the testimony so he can contribute to the end product with all the things he's listened to.

I propose the following solution, regardless of whether it's a minister or not, which will make sure all members will have a chance to ask questions. Mr. Blaikie will have a chance to ask a question, the Bloc will all have a chance to ask questions, and so will we. The round I propose goes like this: Conservative, Liberal, Bloc, Liberal, Conservative, Liberal, Conservative, NDP, Liberal, and then it starts from the top again.

So regardless of whether it's a minister or not a minister, this will enable four Conservatives to ask questions, Mr. Blaikie will have his two opportunities, and the Bloc will have a chance to ask twice.

**The Chair:** So you're proposing this for—

**Hon. Keith Martin:** I'm proposing that this be the routine.

**The Chair:** For what, round two?

**Hon. Keith Martin:** For round two, and then round three will simply be going to the top and starting again. I can repeat it again if you like.

**The Chair:** Yes, please, one more time.

**Hon. Keith Martin:** So round two, and then round three will be the same as round two. It's just that I'm extending it.

Round two will be the following, the same as round three: Conservative, Liberal, Bloc, Liberal, Conservative, Liberal, Conservative, NDP, Liberal, and it goes to the top again.

**The Chair:** That's only three Conservatives and you said four.

**Hon. Keith Martin:** No, not if you include the top, the first round.

**The Chair:** Okay, sorry, all right.

Are you making that a motion?

**Hon. Keith Martin:** I'll make that as a motion.

**The Chair:** Mr. Martin is moving this motion that this be the rotation of speakers for the second round, any subsequent rounds,

and including any visit by ministers or persons like ministers. Correct?

**Hon. Keith Martin:** It would be the same regardless of whether it's a minister or not. The only difference is the time issue, but in terms of the order—

**The Chair:** A seconder for that motion? Mrs. Longfield.

Speaking to that motion, Mr. Casson.

**Mr. Rick Casson:** Mr. Chairman, the way we have the second round in a normal witness rotation without the NDP would have been: Conservative, Liberal, Bloc, Liberal, Conservative, Liberal, Conservative, stop.

That was agreed to and that's the second round with a normal witness. I'd like to stay with that.

I don't think we have an objection with regard to the third round, when the minister is here, of putting the NDP back in at the bottom. So I would like to see what the parliamentary secretary suggested applied to the third round when a minister is here.

●(1635)

**Hon. Keith Martin:** If you want to keep that as a second round, I don't have any objections to that. If you want to keep the third round to what I suggested: Conservative, Liberal, Bloc, Liberal, Conservative, Liberal, Conservative, NDP, Liberal.

**Mr. Rick Casson:** We would agree to that.

**The Chair:** So you are proposing a friendly amendment to have your suggestion apply to a third round and a visit by a minister. Is that the understanding?

**Hon. Keith Martin:** To anybody. This is the way it's going to be regardless of whether there's a minister—

**The Chair:** Third round, okay.

Speaking to Mr. Martin's motion, with the friendly amendment from Mr. Casson, Mr. Blaikie and then Mr. Bachand.

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** Mr. Chairman, I'm generally pretty good at following things, but....

I understand Mr. Martin's motion is dealing with the third round.

**The Chair:** It is now.

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** It's not dealing with the first round or the second round—

**The Chair:** It is now, yes.

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** —it's dealing with the third round.

**The Chair:** Yes, and visits by ministers.

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** It's dealing with the third round when ministers come, or it's dealing with the third round—

**An hon. member:** Third round regardless.

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** Every third round. So the distinction stays. We keep two different sets of rules for the first and second rounds, but on the third round it would be the same for both categories. Is that the idea? And the third round would be what Mr. Martin has suggested.

**Hon. Keith Martin:** For the second round, Mr. Casson made a friendly amendment, and the second round stays as it is.

The third round is as I mentioned, and that will give you a chance to ask two questions.

The Bloc will have three chances, the Conservatives will have four, and everyone will have a chance.

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** That was my concern, because first of all, I thought you were talking about a second round, not a third round, and that would have been unfair to—

**Hon. Keith Martin:** I was, but Mr. Casson came up with a better idea.

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** Okay. This way, you guys get to participate in the second round. I don't get into the second round; I only get into the third round. When you first said it, I thought you were talking about a second round. That's why I said—

**Hon. Keith Martin:** I was.

**Hon. Bill Blaikie:** I think maybe we got that sorted out.

**The Chair:** Maybe we have.

Mr. Bachand.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Claude Bachand:** If we were entitled to only one question during the second round, then I would object. However, if we stick to the same format for the two first rounds, as was explained earlier, and we continue to operate as we have done since the outset, I'll be happy with a third round.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** All right.

Then let's call—

**Hon. Judi Longfield:** Might I suggest that be written out and everyone have it? Then there's no problem; we have it, and it sits there. You can stick it in your binder, and—

**The Chair:** I'm going to ask the clerk to do exactly that: to give every member, so it's very clearly laid out, the first round of questioning, the second round of questioning, the third round of questioning, and questioning when there is a minister or not a minister.

**Mr. Rick Casson:** Okay.

**The Clerk:** Is it that we are amending the minister part to specify the same as the second round in the non-minister situation?

**Mr. Rick Casson:** From my understanding, that's what we're doing.

**Hon. Keith Martin:** Whether it's with the minister or a non-minister, we will have the same structure.

**The Clerk:** Just the time will be different.

**Hon. Keith Martin:** It's all the same, yes.

**The Chair:** Okay.

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

**The Chair:** We now have some budgetary items and specifics of our study. Does the committee want to proceed in public, or do you think we should go in camera?

**Hon. Judi Longfield:** We should go in camera.

**The Chair:** Mrs. Longfield has moved we go in camera, seconded by Mr. Rota.

(Motion agreed to)

[*Proceedings continue in camera*]









**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.**