



House of Commons  
CANADA

## **Standing Committee on International Trade**

---

CIIT • NUMBER 003 • 2nd SESSION • 39th PARLIAMENT

---

**EVIDENCE**

**Thursday, November 22, 2007**

—  
**Chair**

**Mr. Lee Richardson**

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

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

## Standing Committee on International Trade

Thursday, November 22, 2007

• (1540)

[English]

**The Chair (Mr. Lee Richardson (Calgary Centre, CPC)):** We will be happy to begin the third meeting of the Standing Committee on International Trade.

The committee business today is a notice of motion circulated to the committee by Mr. Julian. We will then proceed in camera, pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), for consideration of the draft report on the study of Canada's trade relations with key foreign markets.

As I recall, we had determined at the last meeting that we were going to try to get this resolved within 15 minutes, so let's see if we can do that. With the committee's concurrence, I'd like to start by asking Mr. Julian to move the motion.

**Mr. Peter Julian (Burnaby—New Westminster, NDP):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Cannan will be particularly happy to hear me be very succinct.

**Mr. Ron Cannan (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC):** That is always the case.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** This stems from Minister Emerson indicating that he is proceeding with negotiations around a Canada-Korea bilateral agreement. As you know, Mr. Chair, as a committee we are looking to examine further that agreement.

There have been concerns raised outside the House by organizations in the community about possible job loss, so essentially what this motion does is indicate that we'll be hearing testimony about those concerns as well as hearing from those who support the proposed agreement, looking at alternatives around the agreement, and letting the House of Commons know that we are undertaking these hearings.

It is fairly straightforward, and hopefully we can quickly move on to the committee report. I move that motion.

**The Chair:** Is there any debate on the matter?

Go ahead, Mr. Pallister.

**Mr. Brian Pallister (Portage—Lisgar, CPC):** I support the intention of the motion, although I question its necessity. Nonetheless, I'll propose an amendment in good faith, which is that we delete everything after the word "negotiated" at the start of the third line.

That would allow the expression that we previously agreed to here in committee, which was that we wanted to hear witnesses on the

issue of the Korean negotiations—as a committee we've already agreed to that, of course—and it would also allow Mr. Julian's motion to pass as amended. I will propose that as a conciliatory way to get this out of the way, so that we can get on with dealing with the agreement.

**The Chair:** Before we proceed any further, I'll indicate that we have an amendment, and that Mr. Julian's motion would now read:

That the Standing Committee on International Trade conduct extensive hearings on the implications of the Canada-Korea bilateral agreement currently being negotiated.

Is there any debate on the amendment?

Mr. Miller is first.

**Mr. Larry Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC):** I'm obviously going to support the amendment. The reason, as Mr. Pallister said, is that although I know where you're headed with the motion and its intent and I don't have a big problem with it—although I do question its necessity as well—to name everything in there is almost being presumptuous that there's a problem in there. We don't have to have those particular ones in the motion, whether others have been missed or whatever, and in no way does not having them in the motion keep us from studying those at committee here. We can still call witnesses, but to have it actually in the motion is unnecessary.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Go ahead, Mr. Julian.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Mr. Chair, what that amendment would do is take out the function of informing members from all four corners of the House that the committee is undertaking this study, and that's a very important component. Reporting to the House allows all members to know that this committee is undertaking that study. It's important, as you well know, Mr. Chair. The amendment takes out what is one of the most essential aspects of what the motion actually indicates.

We have members who—

**The Chair:** That would be "that the committee report this to the House".

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Yes. Essentially it has been normal practice through the trade committee as well to let members of the House know what work we're undertaking. We have had members of the Liberal Party, the Bloc, and the NDP raise concerns; this allows those members to know officially, through the chair of the committee, that we're undertaking this study.

Perhaps one of my colleagues could amend the amendment, but I don't think we need to take a lot of time here. We're getting to the point of quibbling over words while the motion, as it stands, is fairly clear. It is clear, and it allows for the manufacturing sectors that have already raised concerns outside the House about potential problems and potential job losses to come before committee and express those concerns, and it allows this committee to evaluate those concerns and evaluate the alternatives they are proposing.

**The Chair:** We have a speakers list.

Mr. Bains.

**Hon. Navdeep Bains (Mississauga—Brampton South, Lib.):** Thank you very much, Chair.

I first of all want to echo the comments made by Mr. Julian. I think this motion makes no presumption. I think manufacturing is in crisis. I think there are tremendous job losses. It's a well-written motion and I fully support it in its entirety.

**The Chair:** We're on the amendment right now.

**Hon. Navdeep Bains:** Yes, I'm just speaking to the reason why I feel the amendment is a bit short. I understand that there was a point raised by Mr. Pallister on the intention and necessity of this motion, but now that we are dealing with this motion and the intention seems to be well intended, I think it's very important that we have the continuation of the motion in its entirety, specifically talking about manufacturing and Canadian job losses, in the way it's worded.

**The Chair:** Mr. Maloney.

**Mr. John Maloney (Welland, Lib.):** Yes, I think the motion in its entirety should be dealt with. Certainly we've heard concerns expressed both inside and outside the House on this specific trade agreement, especially from the sectors that have been listed. I think it's important that there is the clause saying "that the committee investigate alternative ways to build and strengthen Canada's trade relationship with Korea". It reinforces the fact that we're not saying never any trade with Korea. I think we want to trade with Korea, but job losses have been directly targeted in the sectors mentioned. I think it's important that we give this a fair hearing.

Certainly in my constituency I've heard from many people. They would like to have some answers, and I don't think we've had those answers forthcoming.

• (1545)

**The Chair:** Monsieur Cardin.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Serge Cardin (Sherbrooke, BQ):** Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My comments are along the same lines as my colleagues who spoke before me. Overall, we are satisfied with the motion.

We must never lose sight of the fact that we represent the public and different groups, whether it be from the standpoint of the economy or of workers. Numerous jobs have been lost in the manufacturing sector. Indeed, conditions in the manufacturing sectors vary from region to region in Canada. While concerns are different as well, the manufacturing sector continues to be the focus.

As members, we have a duty to gather as much information as possible. To date, we have received some information, but MPs need

to know what the issues are. We need to find the tools to conduct in-depth studies and to investigate alternative ways of conducting trade with Korea that will not jeopardize the various manufacturing sectors in Canada and Quebec.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Mr. Cannan.

**Mr. Ron Cannan:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Just hearing what Mr. Julian alluded to, I wonder if I could add either a friendly amendment or a subamendment to just say that the committee report this study to the House, then.

**The Chair:** Just so I'm clear, you would be suggesting, then, that you'd have an amendment to the amendment, to suggest that it would now read:

That the Standing Committee on International Trade conduct extensive hearings on the implication of the Canada-Korea bilateral agreement currently being negotiated, and that the committee report this to the House.

**Mr. Ron Cannan:** Report the study to the House, yes.

**The Chair:** Report the study to the House, yes.

**Mr. Ron Cannan:** Mr. Chair, we don't know what's going to happen—

**The Chair:** Thank you. I think we have to move now to the discussion of the subamendment then. It's a little different.

Is that wording acceptable to you, Mr. Pallister?

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** No, not really. No, I'd like to deal with the original motion. I'd like to deal with them one at a time, Mr. Chairman, that's the only reason I'm saying this. I think it's simpler. We can just deal with mine. It's going to get voted down, it looks like, and then we can deal with the other. It'd be easier, I think, wouldn't it? I don't know. It's up to you.

**The Chair:** Apparently not.

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** I just thought it'd be easier to deal with them one at a time. It's just a suggestion.

**The Chair:** All right, then, it will be have to be dealt with. Unfortunately, it's a little late to do that, because we have a subamendment moved, so we have to deal with it as a subamendment. We'll vote on the subamendment.

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** Okay.

**The Chair:** Then we'll go to your motion, if you want to do it that way. It seems a little backwards. If we make it a friendly amendment, then we can just amend your amendment to include the wording that Mr. Cannan suggested. That would be:

That the Standing Committee on International Trade conduct extensive hearings on the implications of the Canada-Korea bilateral agreement currently being negotiated, and that the committee report this study to the House.

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** Sure. It's whatever facilitates the discussion.

**The Chair:** We can always move another one.

We have a new one on the floor, and I don't have any names on the speakers list.

Is there any debate on the subamendment?

**Mr. Peter Julian:** I call the question, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** We have a vote on the amendment. The motion would now read:

That the Standing Committee on International Trade conduct extensive hearings on the implications of the Canada-Korea bilateral agreement currently being negotiated, and that the committee report this study to the House.

(Amendment negatived)

● (1550)

**The Chair:** We return to debate on the original motion, then.

Mr. Pallister.

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** Well, I'll try again to accommodate what I think were Peter's main points. He said he wants us to inform the House. I agreed with that and agreed to allow the amendment that says "report to the House" in.

What concerns me about the whole motion as it's worded, colleagues, is that it presupposes that we should as a committee focus on the concerns, but mentions nothing about the potential or the opportunities that might come from such an agreement, something I think we'd all be hopeful would also be there.

If we're going to presuppose, I think that's a bit dangerous, in the sense that the results of our inquiries.... If we're seen to prejudge that this is more a problem than a benefit at the outset, with this motion, then our hearings will also be seen to be conducted in the spirit of prejudging in that way.

For that reason, I'd rather see us as a committee not try to make conclusions in this motion, but rather remain somewhat neutral in what we're pursuing. After all, we're doing these hearings to try to pursue input from Canadian sectors that we're going to listen to. Some of them have concerns for sure: we've heard those concerns. Others also see that there are some opportunities, and I wouldn't want to see our motion just say "concerns" and nothing else.

So I'll propose an amendment that I hope addresses effectively the suggestions Peter made earlier, but at the same time does not prejudge: that we're starting these hearings for the next three weeks from the negative perspective; that we are beginning them assuming at the outset that this is a bad deal. We should be open to hearing what people have to say.

With that in mind, I would propose an amendment. It would delete the words after "testimony" in the third line. I'll just read it as I hope colleagues might agree to have it:

That the Standing Committee on International Trade conduct extensive hearings on the implications of the Canada-Korea bilateral agreement currently being negotiated, specifically hearing testimony

Then we'd delete that next piece and go down to the next line and say:

from a wide range of sectors and regions.

In essence, it would delete the words after "testimony"; it would delete "on concerns about Canadian job losses", which presupposes the input we'd be listening to, and instead would say "specifically hearing testimony from a wide range of sectors".

Then, rather than try to list specific sectors, which, again, we should not do.... Each of us has submitted lists of people we want to hear from, certainly, but I don't presume to try to limit the witnesses to these categories; you may have other suggestions.

So I would propose taking out everything after the word "sectors" and then going down to—it could say "diverse regions"; I'm fine with that—"diverse regions of Canada; and that the committee report this to the House".

Is that okay?

This would serve Peter's suggestion about informing the House. At the same time, it would address the concerns we want to see addressed, but it would not prejudice what the input would be that we would receive; nor would it narrow the nature of the sectors we should be listening to. We should be listening to as many sectors as we can possibly do in the six meetings we've allocated, I think.

There would be a suggestion.

**The Chair:** We have another amendment. I would ask the clerk to read the amendment, as you understand it.

**The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Chad Mariage):** If I understand Mr. Pallister correctly, the motion would read as follows:

That the Standing Committee on International Trade conduct extensive hearings on the implications of the Canada-Korea bilateral agreement currently being negotiated, specifically hearing testimony on a wide range of manufacturing sectors

● (1555)

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** No, "from a wide range of sectors".

**The Clerk:** Okay, "from a wide range of sectors".

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** Yes, "and regions of Canada".

**The Clerk:** You said you had kept "diverse regions".

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** Oh, "and diverse regions of Canada".

**The Clerk:** Yes, "and diverse regions of Canada, and that the committee investigate alternative"—

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** No, "report to the House".

**The Clerk:** Okay: "and that the committee report to the House".

You're moving that part as well?

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** That's correct.

**Mr. Larry Miller:** It's "report the study to the House".

**The Clerk:** That wasn't in the original motion.

**The Chair:** Did you want to put "study" in?

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** Just as I proposed it.

**The Chair:** Does everybody have the gist of it? Is there any debate?

Mr. Dhaliwal.

**Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal (Newton—North Delta, Lib.):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Because I'm one of the newest members on this committee, excuse me if I'm going out of the.... The way I look at it is Mr. Pallister brought in a pretty good suggestion, that we should also be talking about a positive tone as well.

But working on other committees, it is my understanding that when we bring in the witnesses and when they come in and talk about the negativity of this free trade agreement, they will also be talking about the positives and the strengths that it's going to bring. So the report that we will be putting together as a committee will include that.

At the bottom it also says "the committee investigate alternative ways to build and strengthen Canada's trade relationship with Korea". It's covered there as well.

So I don't see much difference between what Mr. Julian brought in and what Mr. Pallister brought in as well. It's pretty well the same thing. It's just how you say it. That's the way I see it.

I don't know. Maybe Mr. Julian has a comment on that, but I am agreeing. In a way, both of you are saying the same thing, so I have nothing against yours and nothing against his. That's the way I feel personally.

**The Chair:** Mr. Maloney.

**Mr. John Maloney:** The biggest concern with the Canada-Korea proposed agreement is the non-tariff barriers that exist. I think we all admit that they in fact do exist. That's why I think it's important, if we were not to enter into an agreement, that we also investigate alternative ways to build and strengthen Canada's trade relationships with Korea. So I think it's important that this part of the clause be left in.

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** I'm sorry, gentlemen, which clause?

**Mr. John Maloney:** The section that says "that the committee investigate alternative ways to build and strengthen Canada's trade relations with Korea". I think that's a key.

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** I'd agree to that.

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

Just so I'm clear.... I just want to keep everybody on the same page here.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Serge Cardin:** I'm not sure if you understood the English version, but the interpreter is asking people to keep their BlackBerrys away from the microphones because he's having trouble hearing properly.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I don't know if everybody got that, but apparently there are some BlackBerrys near the microphone and it's interfering with the sound.

I'm going to ask the clerk to read the motion as amended by Mr. Maloney, and accepted as a friendly amendment, I take it, by Mr. Pallister.

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** Yes.

**The Chair:** Mr. Clerk, would you give us a synopsis?

**The Clerk:** We have:

That the Standing Committee on International Trade conduct extensive hearings on the implications of the Canada-Korea bilateral agreement currently being negotiated, specifically hearing testimony from a wide variety of sectors and diverse regions of Canada

And the rest is the same.

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** Yes, okay.

**The Chair:** And the rest:

and that the committee investigate alternative ways to build and strengthen Canada's trade relations with Korea, and that the committee report this to the House.

We have a speakers list.

Mr. Julian.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Mr. Chair, the amendments have been a little confusing. We're now on the third or fourth or fifth version from the Conservatives.

**The Chair:** We just read the amendment, Mr. Julian. If you're confused, I can read it again.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Well, the—

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** It would be less confusing if you didn't have this motion here.

• (1600)

**Mr. Peter Julian:** No, the motion is pretty straightforward.

**The Chair:** One of us interrupting him is enough.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Mr. Chair, there are specific sectors that raise concerns. We're flagging those sectors from which we want to hear concerns. We want to evaluate the concerns; we want to look at the alternatives that are being proposed, as Mr. Maloney said so eloquently a few minutes ago.

The fact that there are some sectors in there I think indicates to them that we want to hear their opinions and to hear the concerns they're expressing. It's nothing more than that.

**The Chair:** I think we get your points, but it didn't seem to me those were precluded by the amended motion.

Mr. Cannan.

**Mr. Ron Cannan:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I will be supporting the motion, the reason being I just want to help Mr. Dhaliwal. In fact, we do want to hear from all sectors or as wide a range as possible, not just those that, according to the motion, will be assuming they're going to be affected by this agreement. So if we could hear from as many of the industry sectors as possible, we'd have a more informed opinion as we move forward.

I would support the motion. I recommend that Mr. Dhaliwal does as well, just to help to clarify the reason the amendment is there.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Mr. Miller.

**Mr. Larry Miller:** Thank you.

I would also support Mr. Maloney's amendment.

Peter, I'm going to ask the clerk a question, and you may like to hear the answer, though I don't know what it's going to be.

In your opinion, Clerk, do you think this in any way keeps us from bringing before us any witnesses in relation to any sector in here? That seems to be Mr. Julian's concern.

**The Chair:** The clerk isn't a witness, Larry. He's not required to answer.

I don't have any more names on the list, and we have another amendment before us.

Monsieur Cardin, did you want to speak to the amendment?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Serge Cardin:** To my way of thinking, if the proposed amendment had in fact been the original motion, perhaps we would all have supported it. However, it does away with important components which represent the *raison d'être* of the motion, namely concerns.

This motion confirms that the government may not have been attuned to these concerns and has failed to listen. It makes a clear reference to Canadians' concerns about job losses in a wide range of economic sectors. It contains the word "including".

I realize full well that certain sectors of industry would be delighted to have free trade agreements for their own production. Moreover, I have no doubt that the Conservatives will be extending an invitation to these individuals, since the agreement with Korea will prove beneficial to them.

We are not excluding anyone, but we are emphasizing the very essence of the motion, namely the concerns that Canadians have about job losses in the different sectors that have been identified most often. In no way does this mean that other sectors are excluded.

For that reason, I am completely satisfied with the motion as originally worded.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I take it then that you're not going to support the amendment.

Is there any further debate on the amendment?

**Mr. Larry Miller:** On the subamendments?

**Mr. Ron Cannan:** Mr. Chair, on a point of order, in the last motion we only allocated 15 minutes to debate this, and we've been over half an hour at it. Do we have to change that motion, or do we just continue on? I just want to clarify this for my own information.

**The Chair:** Unless there is anybody who wants to move closure here.... We can discuss that, but I don't think we're going to do that at committee.

**Mr. Ron Cannan:** I just think we should wrap it up and get on with the report.

**The Chair:** Well, we are just about to vote.

Would the clerk again read the proposed amended motion?

**The Clerk:** The motion would read:

That the Standing Committee on International Trade conduct extensive hearings on the implications of the Canada-Korea bilateral agreement currently being negotiated, specifically hearing testimony from a wide variety of sectors and diverse regions of Canada, and that the committee investigate alternative ways to build and strengthen Canada's trade relationship with Korea, and that the committee report this to the House.

**The Chair:** Okay, there is the amendment. I call the question on the amendment.

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

● (1605)

**The Chair:** The question is on the main motion as amended.

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** I have one question for clarification, and if it needs an amendment, good; if it doesn't, good.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Come on.

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** No, this is just for clarification I am asking.

Wow! This is unbelievable.

The last line says "report this to the House". Report what to the House? Is it the report that we produce? Is that what we're reporting to the House, or what? I don't understand that part.

Peter, do you?

**Mr. Peter Julian:** It simply indicates that the chair will be reporting to the House that we are conducting these hearings.

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** So it doesn't mean the report itself. It just means the motion that we agree to.

Okay, thank you.

**An hon. member:** Is that your intent?

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** I thought it was the report.

**Mr. Larry Miller:** We should report the study.

**The Chair:** That's why we kept putting "study" in, and you kept saying no.

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** No, then we need a little amendment just to say it's the study, if we're in agreement. I thought that's what we were....

Navdeep, you make a motion. Peter will give me hell if I make another one.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** That's something that comes when the study is produced.

**The Chair:** Just so that we're clear, we're going to have two reports to the House. We're going to report that we're having our study....

As though nobody will know? It seems redundant.

**Mr. Lui Temelkovski (Oak Ridges—Markham, Lib.):** They care a lot.

**The Chair:** Yes, they care a lot.

Mr. Dhaliwal.

**Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal:** Mr. Chair, the first thing is, we are just making a statement that we are doing that study, and once that study is done, then we are presenting an official report from you. That's what I think.

**The Chair:** No, it's not quite. The motion says report this motion as a report to the House, and we'll take House time debating this motion. That's what's intended.

**An hon. member:** No.

**The Chair:** Well, then we don't need it. We don't need to report—

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** I will propose an amendment.

**The Chair:** Excuse me. Mr. Julian has the floor.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Mr. Chair, this is standard format. It allows you to inform members of the House of Commons that we are conducting these hearings. It's very simple; it's very straightforward: you bring it to the House and you inform members of the House of Commons that we're conducting these hearings.

**Mr. Larry Miller:** Peter, they're going to know when you talk to the media this weekend.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** I call for the question. Let's move on to the report that we have to look at today.

**The Chair:** I just want to consult with the clerk on this.

We have a speakers list.

Gentlemen, I just want to clarify here what the implication of this is, the difference between saying in the last line “and that the committee report this to the House”.... If we just say that, then what will happen is that I as chair will stand up in the House and report that we're going to do this study.

What that also allows is that any member of the House then can stand up and say, “We want three hours of debate in the House on this motion.”

Is that your intent? Is that what you want to do?

**Hon. Navdeep Bains:** Yes, and I'll explain why.

**The Chair:** Mr. Bains.

**Hon. Navdeep Bains:** The reason for that, Mr. Chair, is that there is a concern that this deal might possibly be signed while we're debating this issue here in committee. This allows us to go on record—and allows you to present it in the House—that the committee is examining this trade agreement and we are consulting the stakeholders and taking into consideration what they have to say, and that we don't want any deal signed until the final report is submitted.

This allows us a safety net in case a deal is signed. That is the intention behind it: to call to the House, if a deal is signed, saying: look, we put it on record that we are debating this issue in committee and that we want to present a report. So we put the government on notice and we let the minister know that any deal that is struck while we're trying to study it would be a compromise of the process—in committee at least. That's the intent.

•(1610)

**The Chair:** So the intent is simply to report it to the House, not to have three hours of debate in the House on this motion.

**Hon. Navdeep Bains:** That's not the intent, but that is always an option.

**The Chair:** It's no longer your option, then; it could be any member of the House. If you want that to happen, it's going to happen as soon as you do this. It's out of your hands at that point.

**Mr. Larry Miller:** Darn right it is.

**Hon. Navdeep Bains:** It is, but I think there are fair-minded, level-headed parliamentarians on this committee who understand it.

**The Chair:** Mr. Pallister.

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** I'll just propose adding “this study” in the bottom line, to read “this study to the House”, because we get to debate this thing here at committee. If we debate it in the House before or in the process of hearing witnesses, we're by necessity going to be speaking only about the process; otherwise, we'd be prejudging what the testimony is that we've invited people to come to give. We debate it anyway when it comes forward.

If we could get a negotiation done, which has rarely happened in the last decade and a half, then we could debate it here and we can debate it in the House as part of the normal process.

So rather than creating a circumstance where, I fully suspect, some of our colleagues would want to pre-empt our discussions—and that's how I would view it—and enter into a debate in the House before we are done our process as a committee of hearing witnesses.... I think that is duplicitous, at the very best, in terms of what it is we're trying to do as a committee, which is to honestly and openly hear the concerns and some of the positive and hopeful comments of Canadian people around this deal.

My understanding originally was that this is a study we were going to report to the House. That's why I would, for greater clarity, say the word “study” after “this” on the last line, so that we “report this study to the House.”

**The Chair:** Okay. Now we have a new amendment, so we'll have a new speakers list for the amendment.

**Mr. Ron Cannan:** No. If you have a friendly amendment, you just add it in there.

**The Chair:** Wait a minute. We voted on the amendment. So you're having a new amendment.

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** Yes, just adding the word “study” for greater clarity. Exactly.

**The Chair:** Okay, we have a new amendment that is exactly the same as the one we just had. It says “the committee report this study to the House.”

Is there a debate on that point?

Mr. Cannan, did you want to add something?

**Mr. Ron Cannan:** No. If that was a friendly amendment, we would just....

**The Chair:** No, because we've already voted on the amendment.

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** Yes.

**Mr. Ron Cannan:** Okay.

**The Chair:** Mr. Cardin.



[*Translation*]

**Mr. Serge Cardin:** I would like you to clarify something for me, Mr. Chairman. Will this motion be subject to a report to the House, so that it knows a study will be conducted? If someone requests that the matter be debated, any debate will focus on the relevance of carrying out study, which in essence will not change anything. I'm confident that after three hours of debate, the House will agree to the proposal. We will then proceed with our study, call witnesses and then draw up our report.

As I understand it, the motion as drafted call for the House to be informed initially that a study of the agreement is to be conducted, and that subsequently, the completed report will be tabled to the House. I simply want to know if my understanding of the sequence of events is correct. If it is, then I thank you. Otherwise, I'd like to know.

•(1615)

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Maybe I could ask the clerk to try to define it. There's a simple difference of one word here, and that is adding "study"; that is the current amendment. For clarity for everyone here, Monsieur Cardin has asked the question, and I'll ask the clerk to explain the difference.

**Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal:** Can I have a point of clarification from the other member?

**The Chair:** That's what we're doing.

**Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal:** We know what he's going to say, but we want a point of clarification from Mr. Julian.

**Mr. John Maloney:** Let's wait until we see what he's going to say.

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Perhaps the clerk can enlighten us.

**The Clerk:** Thank you Mr. Chairman.

As I understand it, the motion as worded would be tabled to the House, as you said.

Mr. Pallister's amendment—and you can correct me if I'm wrong—would mean that a report would be tabled to the House only upon completion of the study.

[*English*]

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** Do you want me to answer the question you asked?

**The Clerk:** No, I was just saying that if I'm wrong then you can clarify that.

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** You're not wrong, and yes it is my intention that we, as a committee, decide what's appropriate for us to study. We don't go back to the House and debate the appropriateness of what it is that we agree to study. I think that's an ill-advised course of action. We are to be the master of our own destiny, not going back to the House and asking whether it's appropriate that we have hearings on Korea. This is our committee. It would be dangerous practice for us to go back to the House of Commons and ask members to debate, for any length of time, what we should do here. We have a hard enough time determining our own priorities without asking 300 other people to do them for us.

**The Chair:** Mr. Julian.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Mr. Chair, this is problematic procedurally, for two reasons. One, I don't understand why the Conservatives are reluctant to let the House of Commons members of Parliament know that we're conducting this study. They haven't made that case very clearly.

**The Chair:** Mr. Julian, that's simply being provocative. I think that clouds rather than clears the matter.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Mr. Chair—

**The Chair:** The matter is not about whether we report to the House.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Will you allow me to complete?

**The Chair:** Well, if you want to be—

**Mr. Peter Julian:** We have a motion. There were very clear interventions. I do not understand the resistance to reporting to members of Parliament. It has not been explained by any Conservative member as to why they are resisting this.

Secondly, this is traditionally a motion that takes place once a study has been completed. For example, we have a study on Tuesday that we are supposed to be examining today. Once we've completed this report we will then have a motion to report this study to the House. That's what takes place after the study is complete, after members of Parliament have signed off.

I'm not even sure if Mr. Pallister's amendment is in order. It essentially says that the study will be reported to the House before this committee has adopted the study. In the years I've been in this House, I've certainly not ever seen a motion that sends a study to the House prior to the study being considered by members of Parliament. So I'm not even sure procedurally that it's in order. We'll certainly be consulting with our house leader and whip on this, but very clearly it's unprecedented as far as I can see.

We have a motion. We had an amendment that was proposed by the Conservatives and accepted by the majority of the committee. Let's just get this motion done, and let's go on to the study itself. Let's vote down this amendment because it's so problematic, procedurally unclear, and because it may well be counter to committee procedures. Let's just vote it down, get the motion, and move forward with the study itself.

**The Chair:** Let me ask you specifically what your intention is by including that line in your motion that the committee report this to the House. What is your intention with regard to this? What is it you're referring to: this motion to the House—

•(1620)

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Yes, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** So if we pass this motion, you want to report that to the House.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Mr. Chair, normally it would be you or one of the vice-chairs that would simply indicate to all members of Parliament that we are conducting a study. You would bring the motion forward; it takes about 30 seconds.

**The Chair:** Why would you do that? I've never done that with any committee. We already put it on the website after Tuesday's meeting. It's already been reported in that regard. The clerk put on the website that we are doing this study, because the study was approved at the last meeting.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Mr. Chair, that's—

**The Chair:** All this does, Mr. Julian, if you would allow me to finish, is allow you to bring this motion—not the study, but this motion—to the House for debate for three hours. That's what I think the government is trying to avoid. We want to deal with this in this committee, rather than in the House. That's the difference, and if anyone is being misled here, that's the point. So I'm asking you, if that's your intent, to be clear about it and be honest about it, and don't try to mislead the House by suggesting that you're not, or that the committee—

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Mr. Chair, not only is that inappropriate language—

**The Chair:** It's not inappropriate at all.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** To say that a member of this committee is “misleading” other members of the committee is very inappropriate language. I'm sorry.

**The Chair:** Was that not your intention?

**Mr. Peter Julian:** I think Mr. Bains explained the intention very succinctly, and so did I. We have both explained.

**The Chair:** I'm asking what your intention is. Is it your intention to have this motion discussed in the House?

**Mr. Peter Julian:** The motion would be brought forward to the House of Commons. All members of Parliament would be informed. As Mr. Bains also indicated—

**The Chair:** That's quite clear. Would you answer my question so we can carry on here?

**Mr. Peter Julian:** If you allow me to speak, Mr. Chair, I'm very sorry, I think we have—

**The Chair:** I don't think you're sorry at all. You're playing games here. I want to get to the point.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** I would hope, Mr. Chair, that as the new chair you would take members' concerns seriously, and I would hope you would avoid inappropriate language, because I find your choice of words very unfortunate indeed.

As Mr. Bains said, and as I have said, if the government's intention is to proceed forthwith with negotiating the agreement, as Mr. Emerson has indicated, then yes, it gives the opposition a chance to debate the motion in the House, if the government is pushing ahead. That's what we've said all along. But it fulfills the most important function, because as you know, concurrence motions also are subject to an order of precedence. It's not clear at all that any member will move the concurrence motion—

**Mr. Ron Cannan:** That's not what you said all along.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** So what we essentially have is the opportunity here to let all members of Parliament know that this committee is undertaking the study, and hopefully that would also indicate to the government that it shouldn't be fast-tracking negotiations if there are concerns in a number of manufacturing sectors about potential losses of jobs.

**The Chair:** Thank you for your clarity.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** I've been very clear from the very beginning, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Well, apparently not.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Yes, Mr. Chair, I've been very clear.

**The Chair:** Mr. Miller.

**Mr. Larry Miller:** Thank you very much.

The one point that I'm going to make right off the bat is that Mr. Pallister's amendment in no way says that we bring a report to the House before the report is prepared. I never heard—

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Yes, it does.

**Mr. Larry Miller:** It does not, and you know it, Peter. I have the mike. Anyway, it doesn't do that. It basically means report the subsequent report, once it's finished, to the House.

It has become very clear what is going on here now. Mr. Julian does have a hidden agenda, and he's bound to bring that forth.

Mr. Chairman, right off the bat, the first ones to speak up about the report were Mr. Maloney—and he knows that this is not standard practice in any other committee, and never has been—and Mr. Dhaliwal was the same way, and maybe Mr. Bains would have said the same thing, until Mr. Julian rushed down to tell him how to vote. So, Mr. Chairman, there's no doubt about how—

**Mr. Peter Julian:** You guys are getting really nasty. People are getting up and walking out. You have people in the back speaking.

**Mr. Larry Miller:** So there's no doubt.

Navdeep, we're here as a committee, and you know as well as I do now—he all but admitted it—that the goal here is to shirk your duties as a committee in discussing this.

**Hon. Navdeep Bains:** I made my intention very clear, Mr. Chair, in my remarks. If you want to, I can repeat them, but I don't want to repeat myself.

**Mr. Larry Miller:** Can I have the floor and finish, Mr. Chair? I'll try to wrap up quickly.

There's no doubt about it that the goal here is to really not study this at all at committee; it's to get it before the House. As Mr. Pallister said, why would we want 300 other people to do our jobs for us?

John, you know that isn't right. You know this isn't right. It's never been done in any other committee, except when Mr. Julian has tried to do it in this committee, possibly in the past. It's not standard procedure. You prepare a report. You design what you want to talk about in it, which we do here as 12. No doubt that the opposition is going to get the topic study that they want, because they outnumber the government. So in no way does it curtail what the opposition parties want to do.

This is about one thing only, and it's not about studying it here in this committee. That's why I support this motion. It spells it out very clearly. And I can get a copy for Mr. Julian, who said he's never seen anything like it. There have been probably at least two motions from the agriculture committee in the last couple of years that we've dealt with. So it is not a precedent. In fact, I would argue very strenuously and be able to show that it's standard procedure to do it like this.

• (1625)

**The Chair:** Mr. Temelkovski.

**Mr. Lui Temelkovski:** Mr. Chair, in viewing the amendment that Mr. Pallister has put on the table, in my view inserting the word "study" doesn't change the intent or the final outcome of this, because I think it can be interpreted that the clerk would still have to report this study, this motion, to the House and then we will still have to vote on a motion to move the report later on after the study.

Whether we have "study" in there or not, I believe it's the same thing.

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** That's not my intention.

**Mr. Lui Temelkovski:** If the intent is to have it struck out or not reported to the House, then maybe having a final report of the study, as opposed to just the study....

Personally, I need some more clarification from the procedural part of this, because I'm not sure whether this would have to be reported as is or not.

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** I think that's a legitimate concern. I could maybe help by just suggesting—

**The Chair:** If you had the floor, you might.

The clerk has anticipated the question and has written a note to me suggesting that to accomplish what I think it is that Mr. Pallister wants to achieve, it's to report this study, once completed, to the House.

Would that clarify what your agenda is, Mr. Temelkovski?

**Mr. Lui Temelkovski:** That would clarify his intent, because by inserting "study" in there, to me it doesn't clarify that it's that way.

**The Chair:** Would you still have to report this and allow...? So it's "the study, once completed," reported to the House?

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** Yes, I like that.

**The Chair:** Just for clarification, it has been proposed and accepted by the mover that it would now say at the end that "the committee report the study, once completed, to the House".

It's making it clear that it's not this that's going to be reported to the House, but it is the study that's going to be reported to the House. That would be the nuance, that we would report to the House at the completion of the study. That is the intent of the current amendment that is now being debated.

We have Mr. Maloney on the speakers list.

**Mr. John Maloney:** I would like to look for some direction from the clerk. Concerns have been expressed that perhaps an agreement could be struck while we are continuing this study, and that's why the desire is, apparently, to inform the House that we're conducting the study. I don't think anybody.... Maybe I shouldn't presume that.

I certainly would not want three hours of debate on what we intend to do. I agree with Mr. Pallister there.

Is there any way we can satisfy both—just inform the House what we're doing, but not needing their direction on how to do it?

Just as a final clarification, I take exception to any member suggesting there's any intention on my part with any amendments I have proposed this afternoon as working to try to get a compromise. I think there has been some strong language all around, and I think we should just cool our jets. Let's try to compromise and work this thing out.

**An hon. member:** Hear, hear.

**An hon. member:** Take a deep breath, hold hands, and sing *Kumbaya*.

**Mr. John Maloney:** That's a good start.

• (1630)

**The Clerk:** Mr. Chair, thank you for the question.

I wouldn't presume to know the members' intentions. My reading of the rules is that once any report is reported back to the House, if any member wants to give notice of concurrence in that report they can do so. And once the notice for a motion of concurrence is given, it's added to the list.

Someone mentioned the list in order of precedence, and there is quite a substantial list of motions in concurrence. The way the Speaker selects which motion is going to be debated is if there is more than one motion proposed during the motions rubric in routine proceedings, then the Speaker selects which one is higher on the order of the ones that have been moved.

So if two people have expressed an interest to move a motion, the Speaker will select the one that's higher up, that was given notice earlier. So that's the way that would work.

**Mr. Lui Temelkovski:** And then?

**The Clerk:** And then once that motion is moved, then there's a three-hour debate on that.

**Mr. Lui Temelkovski:** And would that stop the signing of the agreement?

**The Clerk:** I wouldn't presume to know that. That's....

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** No, you can't stop the signing of the agreement. You can't stop anything with a debate. We get to debate it when it's signed. It's the way it's always worked, under your government too.

**The Chair:** So why report it?

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** It makes no sense.

**The Chair:** Is that clear?

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** If I could, I can address—

**Mr. John Maloney:** Can you answer my question?

**The Chair:** Let's be clear. That's the whole point here, John. Your question was...?

**Mr. John Maloney:** We want to study this issue, we want to prepare a report, and we want to send that report back to the House of Commons. What we don't want to have happen is that the government sign an agreement while we're doing this—or if they do, they do it perhaps at their peril.

I think it's unfair that they should sign an agreement—

**The Chair:** But frankly, I think it's beyond the realm of this committee if they do that.

**Mr. John Maloney:** But how do we give them notice that we're settling this without opening up the whole can of worms of a three-hour debate?

**The Chair:** Frankly, I don't think it matters. You can have a three-hour debate or not have a three-hour debate, and it isn't going to make any difference whether or not the agreement is signed or not signed. There will be a debate on the agreement in any event, I would presume, but I don't think this committee can change the course of it—other than to make recommendations, as we intend to do.

We've got three weeks until Christmas. You're presuming that the government is going to conclude an agreement with Korea before Christmas, before we report.

**Mr. John Maloney:** They've been negotiating for some time.

**Hon. Navdeep Bains:** The possibility is there.

**The Chair:** Frankly, I just can't imagine that whether or not we report this motion to the House will make the difference. If we get at it and do the report and send the report to the House, the sooner we send the report to the House, then the debate can commence. If you want, we can have a concurrence motion on our report, rather than on our intent to have a report.

**Mr. John Maloney:** Mr. Pallister thinks he has a compromise position.

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** Well, I hope so, if I may.

**The Chair:** Yes. There are four ahead of you on the list. It's Mr. Cannan, Mr. Dhaliwal, Mr. Pallister, Mr. Laforest, and then Mr. Julian. But I think there was a specific question asked of the mover of the amendment. Do you want to respond to Mr. Maloney?

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** I think this addresses the concerns that John and Navdeep expressed. I'm not sure if it will address Peter's entirely or not.

I'd suggest that the committee agree that we as a committee—because you know my feeling about delegating our job to the House, I think it subverts the work we're here to do....

My compromise is why don't we do a press release as a committee, send that out, say this is the work we're undertaking as a committee, and in that way it addresses your concerns about making sure it's on the record that this is being studied by this committee now.

We don't get a debate out of it. I know that's apparently what one of our members wants, but we do as a committee keep control of our own agenda and at the same time we communicate openly and clearly that we're studying this issue. Ultimately, if the negotiators arrive at an agreement—which we don't know here and shouldn't pretend to know—while our study is going on, you would all have

the right as committee members to say we want an emergency debate or we want to adopt a motion censuring the government. You can do any number of things as a committee to express your concerns at that point.

But I don't think we can cover off all the possibilities here. So if we do a press release as a committee, we are doing our job, and we're keeping control of our own agenda, gentlemen, which I think is very important here.

• (1635)

**Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal:** And also informing the minister—a press release to the letter to the minister. Right?

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** I think so.

**The Chair:** We have some clarity there. That would require a separate motion or suggestion after we vote on the amendment. To try to move it along—because I think we have some kind of consensus here—the motion would now read....

Clerk, do you want to read it again, as it was?

We could just follow carefully, just to see what would happen. The essence of this would be, then, that we're going to have a study of the Canada-Korea bilateral agreement currently being negotiated, and when that study is completed we would report that to the House. That is the intent of Mr. Pallister's motion.

To identify and address the other concerns that were raised, we would subsequently have a motion or a notion of the committee that we're going to put out a press release and announce it. I should say that it is already on the website of the committee, because we passed this on Tuesday. It might be redundant, but for clarity I'm happy to put a press release out.

Again, for clarity, would you like to read the motion, and then I think we can move on.

**The Clerk:** I just cleaned up some of the wording at the end a little bit. It would read:

That the Standing Committee on International Trade conduct extensive hearings on the implications of the Canada-Korea bilateral agreement currently being negotiated, specifically hearing testimony from a wide variety of sectors and diverse regions of Canada, and that the committee investigate alternative ways to build and strengthen Canada's trade relationship with Korea, and that once completed the committee report this to the House.

**The Chair:** Mr. Dhaliwal.

**Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal:** Mr. Chair, there's a subamendment too, that the committee will issue a press release and also write to the minister responsible that we are doing this study.

**The Chair:** I think there's an understanding that that's fine and acceptable. I wonder if we could do that in a separate motion.

**Mr. Lui Temelkovski:** Yes.

**The Chair:** I'm going to call the question.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Mr. Chair, you have a speakers list on whatever amendment Mr. Pallister has put forward.

**The Chair:** All right, go ahead. Do you want to speak again, is that what it is?

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Yes, very much so.

**The Chair:** Carry on.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Mr. Chair, it's very simple. We can see what's going on here. What the Conservatives are trying to do is stop reports that normally come from international trade through to the House. Last year we had a report, a motion was brought forward—supported by members of the Bloc, members of the Liberal Party, Mr. Bains, Mr. Maloney, Mr. Temelkovski—to the House of Commons to inform members of the House of Commons that we had concerns about the non-imposition of special measures against the cheap imports that were causing massive job losses in the textile and clothing industry.

Now, that is a tool the committee uses from time to time to ensure that members of the House are aware of what this committee is doing. And yes, members of the House take a keen interest in our issues, particularly the Canada-Korea trade agreement, because of the potential for lost jobs.

By moving away from that precedent that is used by almost all committees—and Mr. Pallister well knows that committees report—

• (1640)

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** Point of order.

**The Chair:** It's not a point of order. Let him finish, and let's get on with it.

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** Well, it's not used by most committees. That's a false statement, and he knows it. He should know it, if he doesn't.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** It is used by most committees. It is a motion. When motions are adopted by a committee, they can be brought forward to the House of Commons.

Now, our study, if we start it now, won't be complete until February. We're looking at having sessions through the month of December, then we have a January break, then we come back in February.

The minister has indicated that he wants to complete negotiations this year, 2007. He indicated that earlier in the year. So we have a situation where the government is pushing ahead and essentially saying that opposition members can't notify members of the House of Commons that we're conducting a study. And yes, it does have an impact on—

**The Chair:** Mr. Julian, with respect, we already have notified the House. It's on the website. We passed this motion on Tuesday.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Notifying members of the House of Commons is done in the House of Commons, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** You're now being redundant.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** As you're well aware, it's not done through press releases or through economic statements that take place outside of the House of Commons. It's done in the House of Commons. That's a tradition that took place under the Liberal government, and I hope that would continue under the Conservative government.

If we have systematic objection every single time by the Conservatives, every time a motion is brought forward that they're reporting it to the House, that is a major change in procedure for the international trade committee. It has implications.

The clerk indicated that the process for concurrence motions is fairly complicated and fairly long. It doesn't automatically move for a three-hour debate. What it does is provide some possibility for debate, given order of precedence, at some future time. All it does is to instantly inform all members of Parliament that we are conducting a study, and if the government does try to push something through, it allows us, as committee members, to put our motion in an order of precedence that may or may not result in a debate further on.

I would caution about adopting this amendment. It changes the whole focus of the committee, and I don't think that's in the interests of any member of the opposition.

**The Chair:** Is there any further debate?

**Mr. Larry Miller:** I'm on the list—just a short comment.

**The Chair:** Can we not just get to this?

**Mr. Larry Miller:** Yes, we can.

**The Chair:** I think we know the points on both sides.

**Mr. Larry Miller:** I just want to say—

**Mr. Ron Cannan:** I love you.

**The Chair:** Mr. Miller.

**Mr. Larry Miller:** Mr. Chairman, it's very important. This is not a normal practice by any committee. It's not normal. Only in Mr. Julian's...

As John said earlier, this is about negotiating. I think we've come very close. When this motion or this amendment is passed, as a voice of good faith, I would support Mr. Dhaliwal's motion to issue a press release.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Monsieur Laforest, do you want to comment?

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Jean-Yves Laforest (Saint-Maurice—Champlain, BQ):** I'm fine, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I think we're pretty clear on the issue. We have an amendment, as read by the clerk, on the floor.

(Amendment agreed to)

**The Chair:** We are now moving back to the original motion. I don't know if there's any need for further debate on the motion as originally moved, so I'll simply call the question.

**Mr. Lui Temelkovski:** Can you read it, please?

**The Chair:** It's essentially exactly the same as the amendment we just passed, but go ahead.

• (1645)

**The Clerk:** The motion as amended would read:

That the Standing Committee on International Trade conduct extensive hearings on the implications of the Canada-Korea bilateral agreement currently being negotiated, specifically hearing testimony from a wide variety of sectors and diverse regions of Canada, and that the committee investigate alternative ways to build and strengthen Canada's trade relationship with Korea, and that once completed, the committee report this study to the House.

**The Chair:** I'll call the question on the motion.

(Motion as amended agreed to)

**The Chair:** Yes, Mr. Julian.

**Mr. Peter Julian:** On a point of order, at Tuesday's meeting I will be bringing forward my notice of motion on the Canada-Colombia trade agreement.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Having dealt expeditiously with that, we have another item on the agenda, and that is the study of Canada's trade relations with key foreign markets.

Just before we do that, there was one other point with regard to our future meetings, and that was whether you wanted to hear from the minister. I asked through the parliamentary secretary to get an indication, and he said he would be pleased to do that on estimates. In terms of the schedule, it appeared there is maybe one day available.

**Hon. Navdeep Bains:** My understanding was, from the last discussion, we just wanted clarification on the deadline as to the latest possible date we can invite—

**The Chair:** I think the clerk has looked into that as well.

**The Clerk:** The supply period ends December 10, but the rules say the committee has to report, or only has until three days prior to the designation of the final allotted day to consider the estimates, so whenever the government designates the final supply day, the committee has to backtrack three days and you have—

**Hon. Navdeep Bains:** Has it happened yet?

**The Clerk:** It hasn't been designated as of now.

**The Chair:** Just to save further discussion, can I just say to you that from the minister's schedule, from what the clerk has said, as for where the government is, it appears if we want to hear it, it would be Tuesday, December 4. So if it's the view of the committee that they would like to have the minister for estimates, it sounds as if that's about the only day we're going to get.

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** That's not an accurate representation. The minister will accommodate the committee as best he possibly can, and if that date is deemed not appropriate, we'll try for another date. Whatever the committee wants.

**The Chair:** I appreciate that, but it just seemed to me that things were locked in that were just not changeable, and if we were going to get it in under the deadline, that would be the most favourable date. I didn't mean to put it in a negative light. He's trying to accommodate the committee and that seemed to be the best way we could meet that compromise.

Mr. Maloney.

**Mr. John Maloney:** I would assume we want to hear from the minister on this report on the Canada-Korea free trade agreement. Is there any possible way to allot sufficient time by the minister to combine the estimates with the kickoff of this committee report? We don't want him to rush in here and say he's got to be out of here in an hour.

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** He's a pretty accommodating minister, I think you'd agree, so we'll—

**The Chair:** I'll certainly raise that, and we'll do our best to make sure there's adequate time.

**Mr. Larry Miller:** Do we need a motion to get him here?

**Mr. Brian Pallister:** No.

**The Chair:** Okay, I just wanted to get some direction from the committee. I don't think we can chip it in stone until we deal, through the parliamentary secretary, with what the minister's schedule is. I just wanted to get the intent, so if we can do this, this is what we would like to proceed with before December 10, or three days in advance of that. So we would like to have the minister.... And frankly John, once you get the minister here, you can ask him whatever you want.

**Mr. John Maloney:** That's what we want.

**The Chair:** Mr. Dhaliwal.

**Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal:** Mr. Chair, I just want it clear that up, is that part of the motion, that press release and informing the minister, or do we have to bring another motion?

**The Chair:** I don't think we need to; I think we're all in agreement that's going to happen. Could I ask the clerk to do that?

Would you move a motion? Mr. Dhaliwal, would you like to move a motion?

**Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal:** I move that motion, to have a press release on this particular motion that we've passed, and also inform the minister responsible.

**The Chair:** Okay, the motion is that the clerk be instructed to issue a press release indicating we are studying this matter, and that this also be communicated to the Minister of International Trade.

(Motion agreed to)

**The Chair:** Okay, we're back to the other one now. We're going to have to go in camera for the discussion of this, so I'm going to give you a minute to stretch your legs and ask those who aren't otherwise involved with the members, or the whips' offices or the House leaders' offices....

● (1650)

**Mr. Peter Julian:** Point of order, Mr. Chair. It's traditional practice, when we have a motion, to say "those in favour, those opposed", and then of course—

**The Chair:** I'm sorry, was there...?

**Mr. Peter Julian:** At least three people didn't vote around the committee table.

**The Chair:** Those opposed? We don't count those abstained. That happens by default. Okay, we had one opposed to the motion, for the record.

[*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 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.**