



House of Commons  
CANADA

## Standing Committee on National Defence

---

NDDN • NUMBER 060 • 1st SESSION • 39th PARLIAMENT

---

EVIDENCE

**Thursday, June 14, 2007**

—  
**Chair**

**Mr. Rick Casson**

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address:

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

## Standing Committee on National Defence

Thursday, June 14, 2007

• (0905)

[English]

**The Chair (Mr. Rick Casson (Lethbridge, CPC)):** We'll call the meeting to order.

This is meeting number 60.

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

**The Chair:** Time flies when you're having fun.

On today's agenda we have two motions to deal with, presented by Mr. Coderre. We'll split them up and deal with them—they were kind of worded as one—as two separate motions. One deals with procurement and one deals with travelling to Afghanistan.

I wish to start with the Afghanistan trip, and then I will give Mr. Coderre an opportunity to speak to this motion. To preface this a bit, I'm under the understanding—and I think others are as well—that the foreign affairs committee will be approaching the liaison committee today to travel to Afghanistan. Veterans Affairs was already approved at the last Liaison Committee meeting to travel to Afghanistan, and now, if this motions passes—and I'm not suggesting it will or will not—we'll be travelling. I think there might be some logistical issues to deal with, as far as DND is concerned, that we might have to delve into a little more.

I'll just preface with that.

Mr. Coderre, it's your motion, and I'll open the discussion with you.

[Translation]

**Hon. Denis Coderre (Bourassa, Lib.):** I shall be brief, Mr. Chair.

We must be coherent, and we have accomplished a great deal of work on our Afghanistan mission. For security reasons, the time when that will take place will not be specified, but just between us we know that this fall there will be a trip organized by National Defence. From August on, there will be troops from the Royal 22nd Regiment there. We also think it would be right and appropriate to join our friends from the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development and the Standing Committee on Veterans Affairs to go to Afghanistan. There is the whole issue of security, but if it is possible, let us do what we have to, to initiate the process for us to join them in Afghanistan.

Lots of things have occurred in the past ten months. In view of our achievements, notably with regard to the Afghanistan report, I think it is appropriate for us to take action so that we can also go there.

[English]

**The Chair:** Okay. I just want to mention that we are in open session, and if we get into specific dates—

**Hon. Denis Coderre:** That's why I didn't say any dates.

**The Chair:** Yes. And it doesn't mention anything here, and I think that's wise.

Cheryl.

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC):** I was just concerned about the issue of going at the same time as other committees.

When we travelled to Kandahar earlier this year, the constraints on the number of people to go were such that not all the committee was able to travel, and even when we did travel, our clerk was left behind at the staging grounds.

**Hon. Denis Coderre:** Yes, but we have a recommendation. We fixed that problem.

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant:** I wouldn't necessarily want us to confine ourselves to having to travel with another committee or group of committees.

Not only that, but, Denis, we know you like to have the stage, and you'd be sharing those sound bites with other critics, so I'm only thinking of you.

**Hon. Denis Coderre:** I'm a team player, so you'll give me your time!

**The Chair:** Is there anybody else? Well, it seems that discussion has come to a quick end, and we'll ask the question.

All those in favour of this motion would please signify in the usual manner.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** That, I will point out, is unanimous.

The next item on the agenda is a motion, another one, from Mr. Coderre, and it states the following:

That the Committee invite Colonel (Retired) Michel Drapeau and representatives of EADS, the Rideau Institute and the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives to appear before completing its report on procurement.

Mr. Coderre.

[Translation]

**Hon. Denis Coderre:** Mr. Chair,

[English]

I move the motion.

[Translation]

We have done some pretty exceptional work respecting the policy on the procurement of military equipment. Some events, meanwhile, have meant that we could fine-tune our report before submitting our recommendations. I think that we could do everything the same day. Of course, we do not know whether we will sit next week.

We have completed the report on Afghanistan, and now it is about the policy on the procurement of military equipment. First of all, I think that we must take into consideration the fact that the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives this week published a major report on the procurement process pertaining to the mission in Afghanistan. I think that it supported the recommendation in the Afghanistan report and we have always said it was essential and important, insofar as there were specific and immediate equipment procurement needs to be met for the mission, for our troops to have all the tools they need to defend themselves.

This being said, we had some reservations. The mission in Afghanistan was being used to procure other things. It would seem that since then comments have changed politically. Nevertheless we want a report that shows all sides of the picture. The report by the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, to my mind, is complete and interesting. For the sake of intellectual honesty, we have to look at this side of the picture.

I also think that it is right to be able to add elements from the Rideau Institute and other think tanks. I saw that some retired colonels or generals have often played a role in connection with the Department of National Defence. Even if he and I were not of the same stripe, Colonel Michel Drapeau did a considerable job on many levels. He could come and explain certain elements to us.

There is also the recommendation to create an inspector general's position within the Department of National Defence. In England, in the U.S. and in many other countries, this inspector general's function exists. It could protect the politician from the system and the system from the politician. Having

● (0910)

[English]

Or it could be a man or a woman in uniform, or a civilian, but somebody with the same judicial power of inquiry and to lay charges, to look at the training, to look at every level. But you would have that function for the sake of the contracts. I believe Canadians are ready for that kind of discussion.

[Translation]

Colonel Drapeau has already suggested this idea. I think that it would be interesting and important to do so.

With regard to the Airbuses, we have always said that as long as the contracts have not been signed... I think that when we had this discussion with the Auditor General, she agreed to audit certain contracts.

The contract for the Lockheed Martin C-130J airlifter has not yet been signed. There are other sorts of contracts. We can talk about the

Chinooks. Some people have a hard time accepting the way that was done, saying it was on account of the Afghanistan mission, notably with respect to the contracts without bid. I think it would be appropriate to accept the request by the EADS group and let it make its proposals to us about what it would like to suggest as a convincing alternative to the Hercules aircraft.

We are not experts, that is true. I think that Canadians are entitled to know whether we would save money if there were calls for tenders. Are there other alternatives with regard to equipment? How can we find the best equipment for our troops while showing respect for taxpayers?

We do not want to hold 25 meetings. I think that one two-hour meeting would enable us to hear all these guests. Then we would be prepared to submit our recommendations and have a thorough discussion about how to proceed.

I think that all the committee members have done an excellent job on the procurement policy issue. Obviously when we are talking about billions of dollars, it is important to make sure that we have covered all the angles. The other element is that for most of the equipment, the service life is 15, 20 or 30 years. I think that before signing a contract it is important to see whether we have really done everything to comply with the criteria we have adopted as responsible politicians and to make sure that the troops can get the equipment they need.

Mr. Chair, I am proposing this motion so that we can properly complete our work pertaining to the report on the military equipment procurement policy.

Thank you very much.

● (0915)

[English]

**The Chair:** Thank you.

The motion is moved and open for discussion.

Mr. Del Mastro is first.

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro (Peterborough, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I respectfully submit that this process is going in circles as long as you're going to bring in contrasting views on this topic. I understand the panel that has been suggested is going to present contrasting views, which I think will only lead to panels that will bring in views that would counter the views of the panel that's been suggested.

I think a study has been done on procurement, and the report should be completed. We should move on as planned to the study of NORAD, something I know the committee has spoken about in the past and wants to complete a study on.

We can continue to banter around whether we are getting value for money or whether we're actually addressing the needs of the forces, but I think the forces are ultimately going to determine what their needs are, and that's going to drive the procurement. As a committee, we should stand behind their decisions. I think the report that has been worked on does address the fact that we need accountability in the procurement process. Again, we as a group have a feeling that there's nothing wrong with a second study on procurement, but we don't think now is the time.

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

**Hon. John McCallum (Markham—Unionville, Lib.):** In response to my colleague from the finance committee, I would say that he seems to speak as if a panel of contrasting views is something negative, as if one would prefer to hear a panel of one single view. It seems to me that procurement is a matter of great importance. These are experts. My colleague has said only a relatively short period. I can't see the downside, myself.

**The Chair:** Are there other comments?

Go ahead, Mr. Hawn.

**Mr. Laurie Hawn (Edmonton Centre, CPC):** I have a point in response to John's comment: these guys will not give contrasting views; these guys will give one view.

**Hon. John McCallum:** I thought you said they were contrasting views.

**Mr. Laurie Hawn:** No. I was suggesting that we would need contrasting views, because these guys have an agenda. I know them.

**Hon. John McCallum:** Then I withdraw that comment, but I still think it's a good idea to have them.

**Mr. Laurie Hawn:** There's nothing wrong with contrasting views, as long as—

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro:** My point is we'd need another panel in that would reflect a more rounded version.

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

**Mr. Laurie Hawn:** Just to finish that off, I support what Dean said. We can reopen everything continually and never get to actually doing a report. I think we've done it; I missed most of that because I was doing something else, but I followed what was going on here. There was a thorough job done, and I think it's time to get on with the program as laid out by the subcommittee and get on with continental defence and all the other things we need to look at.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mrs. Gallant.

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant:** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dean is correct. This committee has studied procurement twice in as many years. This committee is not a congressional oversight committee with the power to reverse government decisions. We agreed to discuss continental defence, and it's possible for this committee to have an influence on reversing the apparent trend for NORAD to be blended into NORTHCOM, an organization in which Canadians have no say when it comes to North American continental defence—that is, unless Denis wants to capitulate to the United States on North American defence.

This committee previously voted to follow an agreed set of topics, so this motion is out of order.

**The Chair:** I'm not sure it's out of order. We take motions in, but I will agree that the steering committee has come up with a plan that was agreed to as to what our forward studies would be: Afghanistan, procurement, and then continental defence or NORAD, and whatever that shapes into. This is asking for a change in what we've already agreed to.

Is there anybody who wants to comment?

Claude, for you and Dawn, we've already dealt with the motion on Afghanistan. We've agreed to apply to go, or whatever the process is. I have a list of what the processes involve and I'll get that out to you after we deal with this motion, because we need more detail from the committee on Afghanistan.

Is there anybody else on this?

• (0920)

**Mr. Russ Hiebert (South Surrey—White Rock—Cloverdale, CPC):** I'll offer some comments.

Throughout the Afghanistan report we continually had the debate about whether to bring in more witnesses as the situation evolved. We as a committee agreed on numerous occasions that it would simply not be appropriate because it would extend this report indefinitely, since the circumstances are always changing.

I think we're now experiencing the same thing on procurement. It's an ongoing issue for the government, and of course there's going to be ongoing comment from industry, associations, and groups like this. It would be, for all the reasons that have been mentioned, inappropriate for this committee to reopen this debate after we already agreed some time ago that the researchers should draft a report.

I'm wondering, Mr. Chair, if you could tell us what the status of that report is. I was expecting it to be drafted at any time.

**The Chair:** We've also been working on it. I had one look at a very preliminary report. It went back for some work, some more editing, and whatnot. So what we've done to date is pretty close to having something fit and suitable for the committee.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** Again, this would send the researchers back to incorporate new comments and witnesses.

As Mr. Del Mastro suggested, if we open it up to one group, we have to have other perspectives available as well. I see this simply dragging on in a way that we agreed with the Afghanistan report would not be appropriate, because we felt we had a deadline to get a report out.

Now we're very close to having that happen, after a very long period of time. I would not want to see that happen on this issue as well, especially since the steering committee has made it clear what our priorities are.

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Ms. Dawn Black (New Westminster—Coquitlam, NDP):** I have a comment.

The motion looks to me like it's only one meeting. I don't think it needs to be more than one meeting.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** But if we have this group present, there will be others wanting to present an alternative perspective.

**Ms. Dawn Black:** We could make a decision on that when the time comes.

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant:** He had his chance and missed it.

**Ms. Dawn Black:** I'll support the motion, because I believe it will only take one meeting.

**The Chair:** Thanks, Ms. Black.

Mr. Coderre.

**Hon. Denis Coderre:** I'm calling the question, and I mention the fact that we're talking about a procurement report. We're totally in order, so let's vote.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** Mr. Chair, before we vote, I'd like to move an amendment to this motion. I guess it would come at the end of the existing motion, and the spirit of it would be to invite other groups to provide an alternative perspective to those provided by said groups.

**The Chair:** In the past, when we've taken on a study, all parties were welcome to bring forward witness lists. However, this motion is very specific to these people, so your amendment indicates that the motion be amended to open it up even more.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** Okay. How about this? After "Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives", add "and other groups" or "and others", and then it continues.

**Hon. Denis Coderre:** This is a friendly amendment, and I don't mind.

Just for the record, we were very specific. To say that because we have them, we don't have the alternatives, if you look at all the lists of witnesses who came out, we had all points of view. We have to remember that a report is not just based on witnesses; they are not the sole source of reference.

I believe that for the sake of the recommendation we will deposit those points of view, and I think that would be good.

I said about Colonel Drapeau that it was about the inspector general, so we don't want to expand and rewrite the report.

We want to look to their point of view, so we can have those discussions eventually, afterwards, on the recommendations. I don't see any problems there at all, and if you want to put it as a friendly amendment, I don't have any problem. I'm open to have others; it's not the issue.

Specifically, the purpose was to say that it's going to be one meeting and that's it. We don't want to expand, but as you wish. If you want to have an amendment, we'll support it. But if you want a

friendly amendment, let's put it as a friendly amendment and then vote on the motion as is.

● (0925)

**The Chair:** We're getting a list, but I'll let Mr. Hiebert go first, because he proposed an amendment.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** I think Mr. Coderre made the suggestion that this be limited to one meeting. This would be an additional friendly amendment that I'd like to make. After "alternatives and others to appear", it would read "for one meeting before completing its report on procurement".

**Ms. Dawn Black:** Do the "and others" have to appear at the same meeting?

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** Yes.

**Ms. Dawn Black:** We don't know how many "and others" there are?

**An hon. member:** That's the issue.

**Ms. Dawn Black:** Then I can't vote for the amendment.

**Hon. Denis Coderre:** No, we can't vote for that.

The friendly amendment said that you want more, but if you want one meeting to add your six people, or ten, divided by two hours, come on, I'm generous, but not naive.

**The Chair:** The amendment is....

**Hon. Denis Coderre:** Make your amendment, and if you want three hours, I don't mind.

**The Chair:** Okay.

You're suggesting "and others for one meeting". Is that the amendment?

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** Yes.

**Ms. Dawn Black:** That is undefined and unlisted.

**The Chair:** That's the amendment that has been proposed that would come in after the words "alternatives and others to appear at one meeting before completing our report".

I have a list of people: Cheryl, Mr. Rota, and then Mr. Hawn.

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant:** I want to be next after the vote on this amendment.

**The Chair:** Okay, we have Mr. Rota and then Mr. Hawn.

**Mr. Anthony Rota (Nipissing—Timiskaming, Lib.):** I wasn't going to speak to the amendment, but I will.

It sounds as if we're trying to cram everything in here and dilute it to the point where it won't have any effect.

We've covered procurement in the past, and bringing someone forward now to give a little more information isn't such a bad thing, because it is an ongoing problem. It gives us a little more information, a little more insight, from a different view.

Saying we are going to cram everybody into one hour doesn't solve any problems. It says we are going to dilute it, as I said earlier. We want to leave it open so that if there are others we want to bring forward, we can bring them as needed and use some common sense.

That is something the committee can do. It seems a little more confrontational than it used to be when I was here, but still, it doesn't mean you can't come to an agreement.

**The Chair:** Okay. We'll take that as a comment.

Mr. Hawn.

**Mr. Laurie Hawn:** I want to point out that in Mr. Coderre's own words about three or four minutes ago, he said we heard from all sides on the original study. I agree we heard from all sides. If we're going to do another study, fine, propose another study and go to the subcommittee and it will come up, but you said yourself we heard from all sides in the first place, so, fine, let's do the report and let's move on to the agenda that was already agreed to by the subcommittee.

**Hon. Denis Coderre:** So you are voting against the amendment.

**Mr. Laurie Hawn:** [*Inaudible—Editor*]...but I'm just saying there is the amendment and the motion itself.

**The Chair:** Mr. Del Mastro.

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro:** I'd like to speak specifically to the amendment. It is important. I want to build a little bit on what Laurie just said, which is that the previous committee hearings focused on testimony from all sides. It is important, if we're not going to conduct some kind of kangaroo court hearing, that we do hear from all sides, and if we're only going to listen to one side of an issue and produce a report on one side of an issue, then the report isn't worth the paper it's written on. It is very critical.

I agree with Russ' motion. There is no reason why it can't be one meeting. Let's do a three-hour meeting with two panels. We can mix it up and have people from both sides, but if we only have people who are jilted from the process coming forward to testify just before the report is to be processed, you run the risk of having a slanted report, and I don't think that is what we want to see. We want something that is rounded, that speaks to the issue, and that may very well produce some very worthwhile recommendations.

Otherwise, what are we going through the process for? If we're going through the process to somehow make the entire process look exceptionally flawed, unfair, or unjust, then the motion itself is a very bad one.

Let's do the job right. Let's make sure we're listening to all sides. If we want to have another meeting, that's fine. Let's just make sure it's open to all those who want to attend. I don't think there's anything wrong with that.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Ms. Gallant wants to speak after the amendment.

Ms. Black.

**Ms. Dawn Black:** I agree with what Mr. Del Mastro said; however, if you leave it open to “and others”—we just finished going through a situation with a joint committee of foreign affairs and defence that really was not worth the time that was put into it by

all the members on the committee. I don't want to see another meeting like that. By leaving it open to “and others”, you're inviting a zoo—

● (0930)

**The Chair:** Okay. Is there anybody else?

**Ms. Dawn Black:** —without being more specific or putting time commitments on it.

**The Chair:** Mr. Del Mastro or Mr. Hiebert.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** Mr. Chair, if the member's concern is that there are too many—

**Ms. Dawn Black:** No, it's wide open. You don't say anything but “and others”.

**The Chair:** Mr. Hiebert.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** Up to an equal number—that's a good suggestion, which I'd be willing to consider.

Let me start by saying that here this morning we've had agreement from all sides that we don't want this debate to go on indefinitely. I've heard it from at least two of the opposition parties. We've also agreed, again among opposition members, that we need to have alternative perspectives. There's been agreement on that, so the amendment I'm moving simply codifies what we've already agreed on. We don't want this to go on indefinitely, which is why I suggested we go for one more meeting. We don't want to have a slanted, one-sided report, which is why I amended it to add others. We have agreement on that. I don't understand—

**An hon. member:** No, we don't have agreement.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** I've heard agreement on that this morning.

**Hon. John McCallum:** No, and in fact you haven't specified how much time, you haven't specified—

**The Chair:** Just a minute.

Let's get on the speaking list here.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** Would you prefer that I specify that there be three hours? Would that accommodate the opposition? We would have two panels and indicate however many people can fit in one panel and however many people can fit in another panel?

**Hon. John McCallum:** That would be better.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** Okay, Chair, I make that amendment.

**The Chair:** What will that amendment say?

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** That amendment would say “and others to appear for one meeting of two separate panels of equal size for a maximum of three hours”.

**The Chair:** Is somebody writing this down? It's “of three hours”. You're—

**Hon. Denis Coderre:** Now you're changing your amendment.

**The Chair:** Yes, you're changing your—

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** I'm amending my amendment.

**The Chair:** We're going to have to deal with the subamendment. This is a subamendment to the amendment. We'll deal with the subamendment first and then we'll deal with the amendment.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** They're all friendly, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** I'm not sure they are.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** That's how they were described by my friend, Mr. Coderre.

**The Chair:** Hang on here.

Who's on the list?

Mr. Coderre, you have the floor.

**Hon. Denis Coderre:** So this is your new amendment.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chair, I think that we are underestimating the sincerity of the people who are going to come and testify. There is not any political wangling going on. Certain individuals and one think tank have issued some opinions. From the beginning, military lobbyists plugged into the government have been allowed to come and make their sales pitch and say exactly the same thing. These are people to whom you yourselves gave a briefing. Let us call a spade a spade.

It must not be assumed that people are insincere. I said that it would be interesting to hear the EADS group, since people have said that the Advance Contract Award Notice applied, that there was just one company that could deliver the goods and that it was the one wanted.

Having another point of view would show Canadians how it might have worked if there had been a sales pitch. Once again, I say that Colonel Drapeau appeared for you. Unless you present us with a Liberal from your list. It is assuming the worst if we say that we are going to increase the number of... You are the ones who wanted to stretch things out, not us. I do not think that any assumptions should be made about this meeting.

If you want to hold a three-hour meeting, that is fine with me. But do not make the assumption that these people are partial. These are professionals and free thinkers and they are not card-carrying members of any political party whatsoever. One of them perhaps used to have one, but it was not ours. That is your problem. If you no longer agree with him, you can have a coffee with him or something stronger. That is your problem.

I think that people testify in complete objectivity. There will be some recommendations. We are entirely in order. The next stage, after the Afghanistan report, on which we worked so hard, will be to finalize the procurement of military equipment.

Mr. Chair, if we are told we can invite other witnesses, I do not think that we should assume that. These four people are enough. If we want to invite others, we can present another motion. I do not know whether our colleague, Ms. Black, will suggest other persons. She said that we could have another meeting. Everyone has agreed to invite people who do not necessarily represent the point of view of the opposition, but who will help complete our work on the recommendations.

Mr. Chair, we are ready to vote on the amendment. If we realize that it is just to stretch things out longer and that people are thinking, on the government side, that it is absolutely necessary for them to have their friends too, we will vote against it. I think that we are ready to vote.

• (0935)

[*English*]

**The Chair:** We're discussing the subamendment, and we have one more person here who wants to comment.

Mr. Hawn.

**Mr. Laurie Hawn:** It's not a point of having your friends, Mr. Coderre. And you said it before: we already heard from all sides. This group of folks, I know and you know, will represent a particular viewpoint.

If we're going to have all sides and continue to have all sides, then we do need more than these folks. If that means two meetings, or one long meeting with two panels of equal size, we can leave the chair and the clerk the discretion to say there are three, four, two, whatever, but if we are going to hear all sides, then let's hear all sides.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Mr. Hiebert.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** Mr. Chair, I want to appeal to the sense of fairness that has been operating at this committee for a great deal of time now. I think we've worked really well over the last number of months on the Afghanistan report in trying to have a balanced perspective.

I'm a little bit surprised this morning to see this evolving as it has. It does concern me, because I think we have worked well together, trying to have a fair representation of all views before this committee. What I see happening this morning seems to be deviating from that.

I appeal to the sense of fairness of my colleagues to thoroughly consider the amendments as they've been put.

**The Chair:** Very good.

**Hon. Denis Coderre:** Is it the amendment or the subamendment?

**The Chair:** There's the subamendment first.

Mr. McCallum.

**Hon. John McCallum:** I said earlier that balance is good. I think all Liberals think balance is good.

My colleague tells me the other side has already been heard. I haven't participated in the committee meetings, but if the other side has been heard in large numbers, it doesn't strike me as unbalanced to have time for another group.

**The Chair:** Okay.

The subamendment, as I understand it, would insert "in two separate panels" after "and others" and "of three hours" after "one meeting". So we're going to insert "in two separate panels"—

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** Of equal size.

**The Chair:** Two separate panels of equal size. That's right. You did mention that. I apologize.

So we're suggesting "two separate panels of equal size in a three-hour meeting".



**Hon. Denis Coderre:** Can I have a point of clarification, Mr. Chair?

**The Chair:** Yes, you can.

**Ms. Dawn Black:** I have a question. If you can't find an equal size to come on the same day, what happens?

**Hon. Denis Coderre:** That's a question I would like to ask. And second, who do you have in mind? Give me names. Do you want Lockheed Martin again?

Oh, okay. Of course. You're the new spokesperson.

**The Chair:** Well, I think—

**Mr. Laurie Hawn:** I don't know if he's the right spokesperson, but he's at least an expert. I would suggest that he's much more expert than Michel Drapeau.

**The Chair:** If this motion does pass, then we will have to have input from all parties as to who the witnesses should be. The steering committee will have to meet again to decide when this will happen and in what order.

**Ms. Dawn Black:** You're very specific in this motion. What if you can't get exactly the same numbers to come on exactly the same date? Does that mean we don't meet?

**An hon. member:** Yes.

**Ms. Dawn Black:** Yes, I think that's what it means.

**The Chair:** Mr. Hiebert.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** Mr. Chair, we've certainly had the situation in the past where there have been numerous panels addressing this committee at the same time. It hasn't been a difficulty. I don't see why it would be a difficulty in the future.

• (0940)

**Ms. Dawn Black:** That's not an answer to my question. If you can't get exactly the same numbers, what do you do?

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** I think that's a hypothetical situation that we can address if it arises.

**The Chair:** I agree that it does say “of equal size”, and we will endeavour to make that happen.

**Mr. Anthony Rota:** Excuse me, Mr. Chair, could we get to the vote? It sounds like we're going in circles here.

**The Chair:** Yes. We're going to the vote right now.

Okay. So the subamendment is “in two separate panels of equal size”, and then “of three hours in one meeting”. That's the gist of the subamendment.

I'm going to call the question.

(Subamendment negated)

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** Is this a recorded vote, Mr. Chair?

**The Chair:** Not after the vote. You have to ask for it beforehand.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** Let the record show, Mr. Chair, that all the opposition members voted against the government.

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

Okay. That was the subamendment, and it has been defeated.

The amendment indicates that “and others” appear after the word “Alternatives” and that “in one meeting” appear after “to appear”. So it would state “the Centre for Policy Alternatives and others to appear in one meeting”.

This is a vote on the amendment.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** I'd like a recorded vote.

**The Chair:** You've asked for a recorded vote, so we'll do that.

**Ms. Dawn Black:** And the question is on the original subamendment?

**An hon. member:** [*Inaudible—Editor*]

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

**The Chair:** No, no, no, that's not the question.

Ms. Black, if this amendment is agreed to, the motion would be changed to read, after “the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives”, “and others to appear in one meeting” before completing our procurement report. So the clerk will call the roll on that amendment.

(Amendment negated: nays 7; yeas 4)

**The Chair:** Okay. The amendment is defeated. Now, to deal with the main motion:

That the Committee invite Colonel (Retired) Michel Drapeau, and representatives of EADS, the Rideau Institute and the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives to appear before completing its report on procurement.

**Mr. Laurie Hawn:** A recorded vote, please.

**The Chair:** A recorded vote has been asked for.

Ms. Gallant.

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant:** I want to voice my concern over this being a precedent for our future business. Once we complete a study, as we have in this case, and then we reopen it because somebody has surfaced from the woodwork and wants to add their opinion, we'll never have our studies completed.

I look back to Afghanistan, and we were in the same situation. Groups decided they had something to say after we had completed seeing witnesses. What they did in that situation was to give written submissions.

So in the interest of time and expense, why don't we agree to accept submissions from these groups that Mr. Coderre has mentioned, and if there are an equal number of groups that Mr. Hiebert would want to accept submissions from, we'd take that tack.

Let's discuss that first, and then I'll comment later if that does not meet people's requirements.

**The Chair:** Cheryl's comment is that we don't really need a meeting, that the submissions be written.

I have Mr. Coderre on the list here.

**Hon. Denis Coderre:** I'm calling for the question.

**The Chair:** He wants to call the question. Is there any—

● (0945)

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant:** One more thing, then, Mr. Chairman. If there's no discussion on the proposal to accept a written submission, I would ask for an amendment to limit the extension of our procurement study to one more meeting.

**The Chair:** We've kind of dealt with that. "One meeting" was part of one of the subamendments and it was defeated, so I don't think we can revisit that.

Any other comment?

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant:** So is this going forth? I'm simply trying to clarify.

**The Chair:** The motion we're dealing with is as it appears, as it was presented. The subamendment and the amendment have been defeated and recorded, and now we're dealing with the main motion.

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant:** Then I would like to propose an amendment that we do accept other written submissions—

**The Chair:** Okay.

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant:** —from other groups.

**The Chair:** Would that come right after "procurement", to say "and written submissions from other groups"?

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** Or "that this committee accept".

**The Chair:** Well, I think that's a standard thing we do. But if you want to clarify it, that's your right.

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro:** We can also say, "will also accept written reports from other groups", or "written submissions".

**The Chair:** Well, that's what she said. Okay. The amendment would say, after "its report on procurement"...or where would it fit in here?

**Mr. Dean Del Mastro:** Yes, sure, after "procurement", "will also accept written submissions from other parties" or "groups".

**Ms. Dawn Black:** Didn't we pass the motion already?

**A voice:** No, we haven't. There's an amendment on the floor.

**Ms. Dawn Black:** We just defeated an amendment; we didn't pass the motion.

**The Chair:** We were dealing with the main motion and another amendment appeared.

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant:** Let's have a cut-off date; up until June 21.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** We may not hear from these other groups before then.

**Hon. Denis Coderre:** If you want this to pass, don't put any date.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** Don't put a date on it.

**Hon. Denis Coderre:** Don't put a date and it will pass.

**The Chair:** Where is this going to appear in the motion here? Right at the end? It can't.

So "the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives to appear before the committee's report on procurement and that written submissions be accepted from other groups"?

[Translation]

**Hon. Denis Coderre:** For semantic reasons, Mr. Chair, and given that the committee is inviting people to come, we could end by saying: "The committee also invites any other group to make written submissions for the purposes of the report." I suppose that that is what you mean.

[English]

**The Chair:** Is that the gist of your amendment?

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant:** That's the gist of it.

**The Chair:** Any further discussion?

On the amendment, all those in favour?

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

**The Chair:** Any further discussion on the amended motion?

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** Can you read it as it stands?

**The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Andrew Chaplin):** Can I get another copy of the motion?

**The Chair:** We've got it pretty much mucked up here. We'll just get that clarified.

The amended motion that we're voting on is:

The committee invite Colonel (Retired) Drapeau, and representatives of EADS, the Rideau Institute, and the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives to appear and that the committee invite written submissions from other groups before completing its report on procurement.

All those in favour?

**Hon. Denis Coderre:** Do we want a recorded vote?

**The Chair:** It looks like it's unanimous.

(Motion as amended agreed to)

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant:** Mr. Chair, before we possibly adjourn here, it's my understanding that we're going to have another meeting on this subject, potentially in September. We are near the end of this study. I'm asking whether or not we could direct our researchers and clerk to map out a plan of study for the next topic on our agenda, which is North American continental defence. The reason I'm suggesting this is that many people here have not been to see Cheyenne Mountain and it is due to close very shortly. That may be a visit that we want to take, if it's still possible, and the planning phases would need to be done now.

As well, there is a base in Tampa, Florida, I believe, which I don't think any of us have seen, that encompasses continental defence... and investigate other points of interest during the summer that may be of use for this committee to visit.

● (0950)

**The Chair:** I appreciate that. Just a comment: any travel by the committee has to go through this rigorous process of getting the budget, getting the Liaison Committee on side, and all the structure that goes with that.

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant:** Travel was just an aside. The main point is to have our researchers map out a course of study so we're not starting from ground zero in September.

**The Chair:** Unless I'm mistaken, I don't believe the motion that was brought forward to do continental defence or look at NORAD was accepted.

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant:** It was.

**The Chair:** Was it passed?

**Hon. Denis Coderre:** We said we would have a steering committee.

**The Clerk:** The committee agreed to it as a priority, but the specific motion was not dealt with; it was sent back to....

**The Chair:** So the specific motion of what the study would entail was not.... Continental defence and NORAD are the next subjects that we all agreed to study, but the parameters of it were not fleshed out. We're going to have to do that. In order to do this, we're going to have to have a steering committee meeting to get all this sorted out. The chair will be calling one of those.

Ms. Black.

**Ms. Dawn Black:** Just to support what Cheryl is saying, I don't think anything prevents having a tentative, loose kind of work plan established. I think what you were going to say next is that you have to come back to the steering committee. Well, that would give the steering committee something to look at. I think that's a good idea.

**The Chair:** But travel over the summer—

**Ms. Dawn Black:** No, I understand that. It could be a suggestion in there, understanding that we need to go through this other process before we're allowed to—

**The Chair:** I appreciate that.

Thank you.

Mr. Coderre.

[*Translation*]

**Hon. Denis Coderre:** That is what I meant.

[*English*]

We should have a steering committee. I just remind you that after discussing procurement, we said also that we wanted to have the minister, whoever it will be. We don't know what will happen this summer—but we should have a meeting again on the Afghan detainees. We said that the future/former minister or the actual/actual Minister of Defence should be here with the CDS.

**An hon. member:** It's still outstanding.

**The Chair:** Okay. I appreciate that.

Are there any comments?

Ms. Gallant, and then Mr. Hiebert.

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant:** Mr. Chairman, the suggestion to have our researchers get to work on this during the summer does not preclude having the Minister of Defence for the agreed upon meeting.

**The Chair:** Very good. Thank you for that.

Mr. Hiebert.

**Mr. Russ Hiebert:** What is the plan for next week?

**The Chair:** I wasn't going to plan anything for next week, because my personal opinion is that we're not going to be here. That's personal—believe me, I do not know anything. I think the opposition probably knows more about the timing of all this than we do, because they have some control over that.

Just to wrap up, committee—

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant:** We didn't say whether or not we were going to direct our researchers to map out a plan.

**The Chair:** Yes, I think we did.

**Mrs. Cheryl Gallant:** Okay. All right.

**The Chair:** I think there was agreement, consensus, on that.

The motion to travel to Afghanistan kicks in a whole lot of work that needs to be done. The clerk and I will start working on that as best we can. Of course, Foreign Affairs and DND become involved when a committee travels overseas. All of that has to happen, but it has been agreed by this committee that we do travel. We'll look forward to getting that approved and getting that going.

**Ms. Dawn Black:** Can we keep in mind my suggestion that we not only go to KAF, but have an opportunity to go to Kabul as well?

**The Chair:** The motion was to travel to Afghanistan.

**Ms. Dawn Black:** Yes, but when we went last time we were confined to KAF. I think it would be interesting to—

**The Chair:** I remember getting outside the wire a couple or three times.

• (0955)

**Ms. Dawn Black:** But we didn't get to Kabul.

**The Chair:** Four times. Once it was about this far.

Committee, if this is indeed the last meeting, I wish you all a great summer.

As I say, I'm hesitant to do anything next week, but if we are back next week, we can quickly have a steering committee meeting on Tuesday, and if not, *bon voyage!*

**Hon. Joe McGuire:** Mr. Chairman, I hear at your caucus meeting in P.E.I. that you're banned from all our golf courses.

**The Chair:** Are we? You bugger! Oh, excuse my language.

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

**The Chair:** 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 Parliament of Canada Web Site at the following address:  
Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada 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.**