



House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on National Defence

NDDN • NUMBER 003 • 3rd SESSION • 40th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Thursday, March 18, 2010

—
Chair

The Honourable Maxime Bernier

Standing Committee on National Defence

Thursday, March 18, 2010

• (1100)

[English]

The Chair (Hon. Maxime Bernier (Beauce, CPC)): Good morning, everyone.

[Translation]

Welcome to the third meeting of the Standing Committee on National Defence. Pursuant to Standing Order 81(5), we are going to study the supplementary estimates (C) 2009-2010: Votes 1c and 5 under “National Defence”, referred to the committee on Wednesday, March 3, 2010.

It is an honour to have with us the Minister of National Defence, the Hon. Peter MacKay.

[English]

Before starting our session, I will ask all the members to use their time in an efficient manner. I will manage your time very strictly. I want to be fair to each member to be sure that everyone has time to ask their questions. So if you are too long with your questions, members, I will interrupt you and ask you to be more precise.

[Translation]

The same thing goes for the minister.

It is a privilege for us to welcome you here. You have 12 minutes to make your presentation, which I am looking forward to very much. Thank you for being with us and welcome to our committee. The floor is yours.

Hon. Peter MacKay (Minister of National Defence): Thank you, Mr. Chair and my esteemed colleagues.

This is my seventh appearance before your committee. The first two were as Minister of Foreign Affairs and the subsequent appearances were as Minister of National Defence. It is a pleasure to be back.

This time, I am happy to be accompanied by Mr. Robert Fonberg, Deputy Minister at DND; Mr. William F. Pentney, Associate Deputy Minister at DND; Vice-Admiral Denis Rouleau, Vice-Chief of the Defence Staff; Mr. Kevin Lindsey, Assistant Deputy Minister, Finance and Corporate Services, at DND; and by Mr. David Jacobson, Acting Assistant Deputy Minister, Materiel, at DND.

I am pleased to be here to talk about the supplementary estimates because I know how important your work is in ensuring that Canadian taxpayers get good value for their money.

A great deal of thought and planning go into preparing our initial yearly funding requirements through the main estimates. However, the world in which the Canadian Forces operate is uncertain and unpredictable. We plan, but we must remain flexible in delivering on our mandate.

National Defence has been extremely busy since supplementary estimates (B) were discussed in December. We have gone about our important duties both at home and abroad. But in addition to those responsibilities, we have also undertaken some special tasks over the last few months. Their costs—and other unforeseen financial requirements—are the subject matter that I am here to discuss with you today.

Let me touch on the highlights.

• (1105)

[English]

As everyone here knows, last month Canada hosted a very successful Winter Olympic Games in Vancouver and Whistler, B.C. People from around the world came to watch competitors and they witnessed the amazing accomplishments of top athletes who performed spectacularly. It was a great source of pride for our country.

What a lot of people wouldn't know and didn't see was how the Canadian Forces worked to support the RCMP, the Vancouver municipal police, and other partners at the federal, provincial, and municipal levels to make sure that everything happened at the Olympics in a safe and secure manner. The cost of the National Defence contributions to security at the Olympics, and at the Paralympics, which are currently under way, requires supplementary estimates of \$17.4 million.

Canadians and our guests from many, many countries have also been able to safely enjoy the spectacular Winter Olympics and the Paralympic Games, and they've thanked us for them. In just one reference, NBC's Brian Williams—not the Canadian broadcaster, but an American broadcaster by the same name—said it best when he stated, “Thank you, Canada...For securing this massive event without choking security, and without publicly displaying a single automatic weapon”.

Our Canadian Forces, like our Olympians, train year-round. They spent a great deal of time extensively away from their families in preparation for these games. They wear a Canadian uniform and a flag on their shoulders. They're proud and they're patriotic. Indeed, we have a lot to be proud of when it comes to their extraordinary public service.

This summer as well, Canada will be in the spotlight again as we host two major international conferences, the G8 and G20 summits in Toronto and in Muskoka. As with the Olympics, the Canadian Forces will again be working alongside the RCMP and other government departments and agencies as part of an integrated security unit. The \$11.7 million we've requested for this fiscal year will help us prepare for those two summits that take place this summer.

I'd like to conclude my remarks, Mr. Chair and colleagues, by discussing another place near and dear to the hearts of Canadians, and that, of course, is Haiti. As we speak, the Canadian Forces are wrapping up our military contribution to the Government of Canada's whole-of-government response to the earthquake in Haiti. When the earthquake hit, the Government of Canada was ready to respond in record time, as were the Canadian Forces.

Our response was rapid and effective. The day after the quake, we had boots on the ground within 20 hours. Within two weeks, we had a full task force of 2,000 people up and running. It included seven helicopters, two Canadian battleships, a field hospital, firefighters, search and rescue technicians, and, of course, the Disaster Assistance Response Team.

Our forces have performed their mission and are now returning home after setting the stage for our partners in civilian and non-governmental organizations to now take up the task with the long-term reconstruction of Haiti. We are now seeking \$62.3 million in supplementary estimates (C) for this unforeseen and un-budgeted event.

In conclusion, the Canadian Forces have demonstrated time and time again their flexibility, versatility, and capability to respond to a whole array of events. In addition to security at the Olympics and Paralympics, and the Haiti mission that we mentioned, of course, we have another major mission in Afghanistan and the train-up for that ongoing responsibility of the important NATO-led, UN-mandated mission in Afghanistan.

What the Canadian Forces do and continue to do is keep Canadians safe and bring credit to our nation through their dedication and resolve and through their skill. The government recognizes them for their excellence, and we are working hard to give them the support and the equipment they need.

At the same time, we plan and we do our very best, our level best, to use taxpayers' dollars responsibly, by careful planning. And with careful planning, as important as it is, we cannot always account for every circumstance. As I mentioned, we need to be flexible enough to make the adjustments so that the Canadian Forces will have the tools and the means they need to do the important work that we ask of them.

With that, I'll conclude my remarks. *Merci*. I look forward to your questions.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

Now we begin the questions from the members of the committee. Before we start, I would like to remind you that the minister will be with us until 12:00 noon and that we are studying the votes in the

supplementary estimates (C) 2009-2010. In order for the discussion to be helpful, I invite members of the committee to confine their questions to matters of a budgetary nature. For the first round, each member of the committee will have 10 minutes. Mr. Dosanjh, from the Liberal Party, has the floor. I understand that you will be sharing your time with Mr. Wilfert.

[*English*]

Mr. Dosanjh.

• (1110)

Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh (Vancouver South, Lib.): Thank you.

Mr. Minister, you mentioned our mission in Afghanistan. I noticed that in the budget there has been a reduction of funding to the Military Police Complaints Commission. We noticed that no chair has been appointed. The interim chair has now appointed himself to proceed with the hearings.

Based on the history of that situation, the fact is that this particular institution has been impeded by various departments—at least that's my view. Why is there this reduction in funding? Why is there no new chair, and why is it not being done quickly?

Hon. Peter MacKay: I disagree with your assessment that they have been impeded. In fact, we've cooperated in providing them documents and witnesses.

The positions or the reductions that you're referring to were made in consultation with the previous chair, Mr. Tinsley, who I think you're familiar with. His position, of course, came to an expiration. He will be replaced by an existing member of the board, and the Military Police Complaints Commission will begin its deliberations again within days, I'm led to believe, if not weeks.

Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh: My understanding is that the new chair you're talking about has no legal training—not that it has always been a bar to these issues, but these are very complex issues. Then you have a battery of lawyers present from the Department of Justice, which has been, I would say, obstructing; your view is different.

In terms of the detainee concerns emerging from the Military Police Complaints Commission and then actually spreading all over in terms of our mission in Afghanistan, you said back in November 2009:

I'm not suggesting that we have not heard serious allegations from the moment we took office.

You were referring to serious allegations of torture.

General Natynczyk, after he was reminded that he may have misspoken about a particular incident, went back and checked to verify whether he had testified appropriately and correctly before this committee.

Have you ever had the thought of going back over documents for the last four or five years in your own departments, and your department currently, to look at the traffic in terms of this issue? And if you haven't, why not?

Hon. Peter MacKay: Mr. Dosanjh, to quote yourself with respect to the issue of transfer arrangements, going back to a debate in the House on April 10, 2006, you spoke regarding the 2005 transfer arrangement, which your government put in place. There are in fact 12 members of your government currently who were part of that government when the transfer arrangement in 2005 was first put in place. Your government, of course, was in office for four years when the Afghan mission began.

This is what you had to say about that 2005 transfer arrangement:

I have had an opportunity to look at the agreement. I agree that it is an important agreement and it is one that is quite good in many respects.

You went on to talk about the supervision of the Red Cross, and Red Crescent, society as an independent party, about the fact that it's very important because they can follow the prisoners and ensure that they're treated well and appropriately in accordance with the Geneva Conventions.

So I would invite you to do the same; I have in fact looked at many of the documents various times. I've looked at the transfer agreements, both the previous one and the one that our government put in place in May 2007 as a result of inadequacies that were discovered, concerns over monitoring in particular, which you spoke to in the House of Commons.

As well, I would remind you that senior diplomats have also testified, people such as David Mulrone, and members of the military who would have had first-hand knowledge of the conditions then and the ongoing evolution of conditions.

You're right to suggest that there were circumstances in Afghanistan that we were concerned about, both inside and outside prisons, and we've made substantial investments to try to improve the human rights conditions in both environments.

Obviously now we have a more robust agreement that allows for greater access, regular and unannounced visits to prisons. In fact, I think you'll find that there have been over 210 visits, one as recently as 10 days ago, that allowed for Canadian officials from the public safety department or the Department of Foreign Affairs to be inside Afghan detention facilities—an eyes-on, first-hand ability to monitor Canadian-transferred Taliban prisoners. In fact, it's primarily our focus.

Yes, we have received general concerns expressed in reports and through various channels about conditions, but our primary responsibility, I remind you, sir, is prisoners who were captured by Canadian Forces—many in the aftermath of a battle, or tested for explosive residue on their clothing or hands—and then turned over to Afghan officials.

• (1115)

The Chair: Thank you, Minister.

You still have five minutes, and you want to share your time, Mr. Dosanjh—

Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh: I have a very brief question.

Minister, you may have seen the comments of General McChrystal. He has made the special forces directly accountable

to him. Can you shed any light on the command structure of the special forces? Who do they report to?

Hon. Peter MacKay: They report to the Chief of the Defence Staff.

Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh: Do those reports ever come to the minister?

Hon. Peter MacKay: What reports?

Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh: Any reports from special forces; do you ever see them?

Hon. Peter MacKay: I see some reports, but we generally don't discuss the reports of the Canadian special forces.

Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh: I'm not asking you to discuss them; I'm simply asking.

General McChrystal has actually restructured the reporting because he is worried about extra-judicial killings in the context of their operations.

Hon. Peter MacKay: That may be your interpretation.

Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh: That's in fact reported in the newspapers.

Hon. Peter MacKay: Well, therefore it has to be true.

Voices: Oh, oh!

Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh: Sometimes it is. When the governments don't give you the correct information, then you have to base your allegations or views on what you hear. If you want us to hear the truth, perhaps you should tell us whether or not there have been similar concerns on the part of the Canadians.

General McChrystal is alleged to have done this, based on his fear that they were out of control.

Hon. Peter MacKay: Again, that's your assessment of someone else's assessment, but as I indicated, we do not discuss special forces at public committees.

Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh: I'm simply asking if you have restructured the reporting.

Hon. Peter MacKay: No, I have not restructured the reporting.

Hon. Ujjal Dosanjh: Thank you.

The Chair: I will have to give the floor to Mr. Wilfert.

You have only two minutes and 30 seconds.

Hon. Bryon Wilfert (Richmond Hill, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Minister.

Mr. Chairman, I may then ask for these answers in writing, if I could.

Minister, I'll return to the subject I brought up before about the navy. It's been reported that DND is trying to save about \$423 million at the end of the month to free up money for equipment purchases. In the meantime it's been reported that the navy has cut training of its reserves and reduced infrastructure maintenance and repairs. The air force has issues as well.

The Canadian navy, it seems to me, is in dire need of support. Over a year ago I asked the vice-admiral about the status of the JSS. He stated at the time that he was redefining the requirements, and that by summer we'd have a new plan. In October I asked again about the status of JSS, and again it was reaffirmed by the admiral that he had consulted the industry and was submitting their returns.

It's now four years later and we still have no word on the status of these ships. This was a priority for the government in 2006. I'd like to know where we are on that.

I'd like to put something else on the table. What is the status of the Arctic offshore patrol ships? This is something you know we've been talking about with regard to Arctic sovereignty. It's my understanding that there's been a scaling back of the capabilities and the numbers, which would obviously be a concern to us.

My final question is whether the JSS are still a priority. This past July we had what we called a shipbuilding summit with industry and discussed the requirements. The JSS are moving in parallel with the results of that summit. In fact, industry has just returned to the four departments that were leading that summit, with returns in mid-September. So this is obviously very fresh. I'd really like to know where we are on this project, because we were supposed to get them in 2012, and now it could be five or six years down the road.

The answers will probably have to be in writing, Mr. Chairman, but I wanted to get those questions on the table.

The Chair: Yes.

I think they will have to be in writing, Minister. You have only 30 seconds.

Hon. Peter MacKay: Sure.

Mr. Wilfert, I can assure you that the navy and shipbuilding projects remain a huge priority for the Department of National Defence. JSS would be at the very top of that list. We saw the utility of having the type of vessel envisioned for our joint supply ship in the use in Haiti, for example, and deployment into the Americas.

We hope that contract will be able to be put out in the very near future. We had envisioned bringing forward an entire strategy, which, as you know, involves not just Canadian Forces ships but also ships that are under the purview of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, such as coastal ships and icebreakers. So a package of ships was what we had hoped to bring forward.

As you rightly pointed out, we had discussions this past August with industry, and all departments were there in an unprecedented way. Public Works, Industry Canada, Fisheries and Oceans, and our own department met directly with industry to lay out in a very systematic way the number of ships, which can be upwards of 50 ships. The budget within our department is identified. Our money is there.

We also understand—and this will be my last point, Mr. Chair—that there have been problems, as you know, with one of the shipbuilding facilities that would be a primary contractor, a primary bidder, on these projects. The Davie shipyard in Lévis has experienced difficulties. That has also been factored in as we move forward.

I don't know if the vice-chief wants to add anything further, but our intention is to proceed post-haste. Non-compliant bids have come back. That was, I would express to you, the reason for part of the delay. But this is a national shipbuilding program that will affect every shipbuilding facility in the country. There is enough work for shipbuilders, large and small, to bid on and successfully receive contracts in this regard.

• (1120)

Hon. Bryon Wilfert: That would tie in with the need for a national shipbuilding strategy.

Hon. Peter MacKay: Correct.

Hon. Bryon Wilfert: My last comment is that some of these ships are older than the sailors who are on them, so I'm obviously concerned about that.

Hon. Peter MacKay: Yes, you're absolutely right.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Wilfert.

I understand that the department and the minister will provide a written response to your question. I just want to be fair to all members.

We have ten minutes for Monsieur Paillé.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pascal-Pierre Paillé (Louis-Hébert, BQ): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would like to inform you that the final minutes of our speaking time will go to my colleague, Mr. Plamondon.

I thank the minister for being here. I would like to start with a rather specific question. In one section of your summary table, we see the Military Police Complaints Commission. As I understand it, the commission still has not had a chair nominated.

Could you tell me if you plan to have a new chair? In the estimates that have been approved so far, we see that no adjustments have been made. The chair's salary is still there. I would like some information about the chair of the Military Police Complaints Commission.

[*English*]

Hon. Peter MacKay: Yes, absolutely.

[*Translation*]

Yes, we plan to appoint a new chair. Someone is chairing the committees at the moment. This is a good thing, as it ensures continuity. I hope that we will be able to hear about the committee's deliberations in two or three weeks.

Mr. Pascal-Pierre Paillé: So you feel that there will be a new appointment in two or three weeks.

Hon. Peter MacKay: Yes.

Mr. William F. Pentney (Associate Deputy Minister, Department of National Defence): May I add that the chair's salary is established by the Privy Council Office independently of our department.

Mr. Pascal-Pierre Paillé: So the salary is not included in the amounts that are already preapproved?

Mr. William F. Pentney: Yes.

[English]

Hon. Peter MacKay: Just to be clear, when the Military Police Complaints Commission commences its work again, there will be an acting chair, somebody who is already part of the commission. We're not appointing a new one. We are not bringing in somebody from outside the existing body, just to be clear.

[Translation]

Mr. Pascal-Pierre Paillé: Do you foresee an official chair being in place within a reasonable period? You keep talking about an acting chair. At what point do you foresee the commission having an official chair?

[English]

Hon. Peter MacKay: The acting chair will be the official chair, but it will be for a year as opposed to the permanent appointment, which I believe is for a three-year duration.

So rather than bring somebody in from outside the existing body, we have chosen to elevate somebody to the chair's position who was already part of the commission.

•(1125)

[Translation]

Mr. Pascal-Pierre Paillé: Thank you.

On another matter, at the meeting last December 8, I asked a high-ranking army officer about the reservists that had been cut. This was the information I received. In the middle of the fiscal year, the Department of National Defence reassigned \$80 million from the army's budget to finance other priorities. At the end of his answer, he said that the army is still dealing with financial pressures at the moment.

In the supplementary estimates document, nothing shows me that the army's budget has been reworked. Nor does anything show me that, in the long term, there will be a correction so that we do not get into giving contracts to reservists, then thanking them for their services just in order to hire them back later.

So I would like a little more information about the reservists who were temporarily laid off.

[English]

Hon. Peter MacKay: Sure. Well, they were not suspended or eliminated.

I'm glad you asked this question, because reservists are an integral part of the Canadian Forces. They do spectacular work, and most, as you know, have other full-time positions and work in our communities in many different capacities. They're your neighbours, your hockey coaches, your teachers, and your firefighters. They are an integral part of Canadian Forces operations and plans. In some cases, on deployments such as Haiti and Afghanistan, 20% to 30% of the participants come from the reserves.

That being said, as you would expect, commensurate with the tempo of operations, we invest in and train up reservists to fit the need. So when the tempo is high, we need more reservists. When things start to slow down, that also impacts on the number of reservists and the training hours.

As well, adjustments are based on the number of regular forces that we have available. We're in a period of growth and expansion right now in the Canadian Forces. As part of the Canada First defence strategy, we have committed to bringing our entire force to 100,000—with 30,000 reservists and 70,000 regular forces.

I'm pleased to tell this committee—and I know you'd be interested in knowing—we've had a record year in terms of recruiting and retention. That is to say, because of the level of commitment and interest in the Canadian Forces right now—and there is a formula that's applied—attrition is down, retention is up, and record numbers are coming into the forces. This impacts very much on the number of reservists and the budgets committed for training. All of this is calculated by our senior officials within the Canadian Forces to meet the needs.

For your interest, colleagues, we've grown by 2,000 this year alone. That is, our force numbers have actually gone up by 2,000, which is a record year for us.

I want to be very clear that there is no impact on training when it comes to reserves that are deploying into Afghanistan. They receive the same training as regular forces because we expect the same of them when they're in the theatre of operations.

There is, from time to time, impact when financial implications arise, as they do in every budget year. Every effort has been made to ensure that our soldiers' preparation, training, and participation in operations are not affected in that regard. So I can assure you our reservists remain an integral part of all of this planning. Their service to country is remarkable and admirable, and we support them in every way.

[Translation]

Mr. Pascal-Pierre Paillé: Okay.

How much time do I have left? Three minutes?

The Chair: Yes.

Mr. Pascal-Pierre Paillé: I got part of the information. I have the translation and, though I understand English, given the circumstances, I use the translation even though there is some delay. But I do not want to dwell on the matter either.

According to my information, there actually was a reduction in the number of reservists hired full-time. I would appreciate it if you could perhaps send us more information on the number of reservists who will be hired back part-time compared to those hired full-time.

I can understand that part-time reservists have other jobs, but some full-time reservists were temporarily laid off. That is the aspect that concerns me and I do not want to see it happen again in the future.

I will now give the floor to my colleague, Mr. Plamondon.

•(1130)

Hon. Peter MacKay: Of course, I will provide that information.

Mr. Louis Plamondon (Bas-Richelieu—Nicolet—Bécancour, BQ): Thank you for appearing before the committee, Mr. Minister.

I have a question about the tanks we bought from the Netherlands. We bought 100 tanks to use in Afghanistan. We borrowed 20 tanks from Germany for a time as we made modifications to the ones that we bought from the Netherlands.

At the moment, 20 of them are having the modifications done in Germany by a German firm that was given a non-tendered contract. They will be ready in 2012, but we have to give them back to Germany since the ones that Germany lent us are no longer operational.

The others are stored in 25 warehouses in Montreal, or are still in the Netherlands. They will have the modifications done later. Apparently, there will be a tender. Remember, Germany has a head start since they will already have modified the first 20 when they submit their bid.

Does it seem like a good idea to you that we bought those hundred tanks that were supposed to serve in Afghanistan, but that will not be ready until 2015?

[English]

Hon. Peter MacKay: I can tell you that the ones that have been used in Afghanistan have saved lives; they are the most combat-capable protective equipment in the theatre. So do I think it was a good purchase? Yes, I do.

The way in which we were able to effectively trade up with the Germans allowed us to get those tanks—

[Translation]

Mr. Louis Plamondon: The tanks we are using in Afghanistan are the ones you borrowed from Germany.

[English]

Hon. Peter MacKay: If you will let me finish, sir—

Mr. Louis Plamondon: But you don't understand my question. You speak about—

Hon. Peter MacKay: I think I do.

[Translation]

The Chair: Mr. Plamondon, the minister is going to answer your question.

[English]

Hon. Peter MacKay: We were able to work out an arrangement with the Germans that allowed us to receive tanks that were already upgraded, that had protective equipment, that made those tanks able to go into a theatre of operation. In exchange, we gave the Germans tanks that required further upgrades. We took tanks back to Canada—40 in total—that will be used for training and that will also require some investment to improve them because they have been sitting for some time.

This was done in a way that expedited our ability to get that equipment into theatre. It was obviously complex in that it involved three countries and it involved moving this equipment to Canada. Some of those tanks went directly into Afghanistan from Germany, and then we took some from Holland to replace the tanks the Germans had given us.

[Translation]

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Minister. I now give the floor to Mr. Davies for 10 minutes.

[English]

Mr. Don Davies (Vancouver Kingsway, NDP): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I may be splitting my time with Mr. Harris, if he returns from the House. I don't know that he will.

Minister, the analysts for this committee, and the estimates, indicate that the planned spending for the Department of National Defence has been cut by \$2.5 billion over the next three years, and defence spending, at about \$20 billion, will slow in two fiscal years.

I want to specifically direct your attention to Canada's search and rescue capabilities and ask for your confirmation that none of those budgetary slowdowns will affect Canada's search and rescue expenditures or our need to actually expand search and rescue capabilities.

Hon. Peter MacKay: We have no plans to cut search and rescue. We actually have plans, as you know, to replace an aging fleet of Buffalo aircraft on the west coast. We hopefully will be entering into a process in the near future to do just that. So that will involve further investment in search and rescue.

We have very capable SAR techs. I referred earlier to how the Canadian Forces are in some ways like our Olympian athletes. Well, the SAR techs are like gold medallists. They perform at a very high rate of efficiency and training. They perform heroic feats literally daily in their efforts to rescue people in extremely dire circumstances, whether that be in avalanches or ships at sea, in areas where we know there are volatile weather and environmental conditions.

To answer your question directly, there are no plans whatsoever to do anything more than invest in the area of search and rescue.

• (1135)

Mr. Don Davies: Thank you, Minister.

You may have anticipated where I'm going next, which is on the \$3-billion search aircraft project. As you know, there have been allegations, actually, that the air force.... And these are not my words; these are words that have been used. The air force was accused of rigging the specifications for the \$3-billion project to favour the Italian-built C-27J aircraft. As a result, your government brought in the National Research Council to examine the specifications and make recommendations. That study is now out, and it found that most of the requirements for the military's new search and rescue aircraft are unacceptable.

I would like your comments on that study.

Hon. Peter MacKay: I would disagree with your assessment that most of the requirements were deemed unacceptable. In fact in some cases, requirements like a rear door on an aircraft, for example, which the Department of National Defence, and the air force in particular, had deemed as desirable, the National Research Council reinforced as being not only desirable but also absolutely critical and necessary.

In fact in some instances this report reinforced the minimal standards that the air force would require to perform the type of search and rescue—landing on gravel runways as another example; the type of radar onboard certain aircrafts; the window, visibility within the cockpit of the aircraft. These were the minimal standards we had asked for collectively, and the Department of National Defence, Public Works, and Industry sought an independent view of what those minimal standards should be.

Yesterday I spoke with my colleagues Minister Ambrose and Minister Clement about the need now to take that report and move forward with recommendations and proceed with a procurement plan. This is what we sought as far as verifying the minimal standards you mentioned.

Mr. Don Davies: Minister, I take it you would agree with me that we're not talking only about minor requirements like the sizes of windows. I believe the study found that things like range were unacceptable. Now surely you wouldn't say that the range of an aircraft involved in search and rescue is a minor consideration, would you?

Hon. Peter MacKay: Absolutely not. In fact, we've maintained all along that we have to have at a minimum the equivalent of what the current Buffalo and Hercules aircraft and Cormorant fleet have. We have a combined fleet, just to be clear. Now we're operating three different types of aircraft. In an ideal world, we are hoping to craft a procurement strategy that will allow us to purchase aircraft and ensure they will meet those minimal standards.

Some of the recommendations, in an ideal world, would involve building more bases, but obviously there are financial commitments that have to be made with respect to the equipment. There's also the maintenance of the fleet. Obviously, there are also considerations about where they will be flying and if we will be able to refuel them. The refuelling capacity is another consideration.

When we talk about minimal standards, it's not to minimize the importance of them, it's to simply say they have to meet that threshold at a minimum, or exceed it, which would be the preferred option. If money were not an option, we could build bases in many parts of the country and use different equipment.

Mr. Don Davies: Thanks, Minister.

One of the findings of the NRC study was that the timetable of when the new aircraft should be delivered was unacceptable. I note that in December 2008 you announced that you planned to move quickly on the search and rescue acquisition, indicating you wanted to procure aircraft in early 2009. That never happened, and I'm just wondering, now that it is over a year later, if you can explain whether being in 2010 and still not having even an acceptable procurement practice at this point complies with your indication that you planned to move quickly.

Hon. Peter MacKay: You know, I heard similar statements made about the replacement of the Sea King program, which as you know is still awaiting the final delivery of aircraft. It has a lot to do with industry's ability to respond and manufacture these aircraft. You can't go out and get helicopters or ships at the local Canadian Tire store.

As you know, these contracts are very complex. The on-board equipment has actually changed in some instances between the time

the procurement process has begun and the time of the delivery. We have numerous examples of procurement strategies that have taken an exponential amount of time.

In an ideal world I'd love to be able to go out to buy these aircraft and get them quickly. I think we need them. I will express to you my personal frustration that the process has been sidelined at times.

We've also faced the reality that this involves more than just one department, as you can appreciate. DND does not go out and negotiate the contract for equipment. That is left to the Department of Public Works. Industry Canada, obviously, has the most direct interface with the industries that are involved in the building of fixed-wing search and rescue aircraft.

There's always the backdrop that we want to maximize the benefits to Canadian industry and the very complex but important element of industrial regional benefits. That is to say that when a large contract is awarded, if it is not to a Canadian company, we must consider how we spread the wealth, if you will, to benefit all regions of the country in the procurement, construction, building, and delivery of contracts.

● (1140)

Mr. Don Davies: Minister, having said before that you hoped to procure aircraft in early 2009, can you tell us, sitting here today, when Canadians might expect the procurement of new search and rescue aircraft?

Hon. Peter MacKay: I'd hope it would be in the near future, but we could very well be back here in a year or two, and you could be asking me that same question. I hope, now that we have received this recommendation with independent views on what those minimal standards are, that will accelerate the process. I hope that will bring greater clarity to the type of search and rescue aircraft we need.

Certainly all of the departments are now focused on the urgency. In the meantime, we've indicated quite clearly that this is a priority for everyone. I know that the air force has other projects it wants to see, including the joint strike fighter. In my view, this particular project has to proceed quickly.

Mr. Don Davies: Thank you.

Minister, I know you're aware that domestic and even some foreign aerospace firms have raised concerns that the air force wanted the C-27J, and of course we have Viking Air in Victoria, B. C., which has argued it could build the new Buffalo aircraft at assembly lines in British Columbia and Alberta. Company officials have questioned why your government would want to award search and rescue contracts to a foreign firm when we could have this aircraft built in Canada. Can you comment on that?

Hon. Peter MacKay: Well, you're assuming somehow that I have a bias in all of this. What I want to see is the best aircraft able to cover a country that has the largest coastline in the world and has extreme weather conditions, and an aircraft that has the capability to service the north, which is a massive part of our country. These aircraft, as you can appreciate, spend a great deal of time over water. They spend a great deal of time flying in conditions like valleys in the mountainous regions, in places that pose serious threats to pilots because of the complexity in the terrain.

I just want to see the best aircraft. I take advice from the Chief of the Air Staff, from technicians, from individuals with specific knowledge of the limits to which those aircraft can fly. We also have real concerns about and a consideration of the ability of SAR techs themselves—that is, the men and women who jump out of those aircraft, often with a great deal of equipment on their backs, with medical supplies, and with the ability to get into an emergency situation very quickly.

So all of those important considerations go into this complex factor and grid of how we get the best plane. Canadian aerospace will be the beneficiaries; to what extent and what company will build this plane, that will be determined through this process.

Mr. Don Davies: Well, we look forward to you cooperating with the committee as we study that.

Hon. Peter MacKay: By all means, and thank you for the question.

The Chair: Thank you.

You don't have enough time, Mr. Davies.

Mr. Payne, you have the floor for 10 minutes.

Mr. LaVar Payne (Medicine Hat, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Minister, Admiral Rouleau, and officials for coming here today. It's an important opportunity for this committee to get some further understanding in regard to the supplementary estimates.

First of all, I just want to touch a bit on Haiti, Minister. In particular, I want to tell everybody here how proud I was as a Canadian in terms of our response to the devastating earthquake in Haiti. I'd like to thank our Canadian Forces and you, Minister, for that.

In terms of that, there certainly is a fairly large expenditure of some \$62 million in response to the Haiti earthquake. I'm wondering if you can outline where those funds went. Certainly, if Admiral Rouleau wants to add anything, that would be quite fine.

• (1145)

Hon. Peter MacKay: Thank you very much, Mr. Payne.

Like you, I felt an extreme surge of pride when I saw the work that was being done. I had the extreme pleasure of visiting Haiti just two weeks ago, and saw first-hand the type of extraordinary work that the men and women in uniform are doing there. They're doing it, as you know, in conjunction with other departments—with CIDA, of course, and Foreign Affairs—but the enablers in this mission, let's be clear, were the Canadian Forces. They arrived there within 20 hours and there was a reconnaissance team on the ground.

I can't be any more stark than to say that they saved lives. The medical staff who were there set up a hospital. They treated in the past month over 20,000 people, some of them for grievous injuries. They delivered babies. They continue to treat injured people in the aftermath of that terribly devastating earthquake.

They also took part in other life-saving activities. They provided close to three million litres of water during the time they were there. That's more than an Olympic-sized swimming pool of water—clean, potable water.

Obviously in the early days they helped to pull people from the wreckage and to locate people who were under crushed buildings. What struck me when travelling around places such as Jacmel, Leogane, and the capital, Port-au-Prince, was that it was as if a giant had stepped on those communities. The buildings were crushed. They were pancaked because of the inadequacy of the cement and the structural durability of many of those buildings. Some grievous injuries resulted.

Canadian Forces were able to get there quickly, in large part because of the C-17 aircraft that our government purchased. The utility of that aircraft was on full display. We were able to move in equipment and personnel very quickly to have maximum effect.

With the able assistance of personnel aboard the HMCS *Halifax* and HMCS *Athabaskan*, we were able to be there quickly to provide life-saving equipment and life-saving personnel to that country at its most dire time.

We have a long-standing history and we'll be there for a long time into the future, but the Canadian Forces, in my view, performed brilliantly, in record time. While we're drawing down now, as I mentioned, we are handing off and transitioning to other agencies, including CIDA, but non-governmental agencies as well.

The other extraordinary part of this story is the interoperability that was demonstrated, our ability to work with the international community. We had a small number of personnel in Haiti prior to this disaster, through MINUSTAH, the UN mission to Haiti. We've doubled our complement there. That will remain as a permanent fixture. We'll have more Canadian Forces personnel in the aftermath of this disaster.

But your point is well made. They rolled out very quickly, and they had an immediate impact. As well, because of their language skills and their cultural understanding of Haiti, as many had been there before—many of the members of the Royal 22e Régiment from CFB Valcartier had previous experience—they interacted in a way that was compassionate, that was polite. They asked first how they could help. That went a long way.

We worked closely with the needs as identified by the Haitian government, and I think the Prime Minister and the President of Haiti...in my discussions with them and with other officials there, have nothing but admiration, respect, and gratitude for what Canada was able to contribute in this whole-of-government mission.

Perhaps I'll just ask the admiral to speak briefly to the role of the navy, because the navy really, in my view, was one of the biggest moving parts in our ability to respond to Haiti.

• (1150)

Vice-Admiral Denis Rouleau (Vice-Chief of the Defence Staff, Department of National Defence): In fact, a critical point of what took place down in Haiti is what you would call a completely tri-service effort. If you use the word “joint”, that expresses exactly what took place down there. We had two ships sail there to bring, first of all, a command and control capability until it was fully established ashore, so they provided that as they arrived on the scene. They provided work parties to go ashore, and at the same time, land force units were already on the ground or arriving on the ground due to the air force capability to bring them there quickly. We were all working together.

The air force basically took a landing strip in Jacmel and turned it into an operational airport under their own control, in order to give some relief to Port-au-Prince, which was completely packed and was not able to operate. The Canadian air force did that, of course working in conjunction with the ships at sea and the land forces ashore. This is a beautiful example of a joint operation that went very, very quickly. As the minister said, the day after the earthquake there was a Canadian aircraft on the ground in Port-au-Prince, and it just went from there.

Mr. LaVar Payne: Thank you for that, Admiral.

I would have to say that the Canadian Forces have done an admirable job. I'm just wondering about the number of Canadian Forces members who were sent there and how many are still there. When will the final ones be returning?

Hon. Peter MacKay: It was roughly 2,000 during the entire course of the mission. We're down to roughly 236, I believe. We've been gradually drawing down. That's as of today.

The two ships have now returned to port, and the remaining members of the team continue to hand off various responsibilities. One of the last things I would say is that the Canadian Forces were involved in the building of shelters and latrines because of the concerns about sanitation. That was one of the last things they were doing as they were leaving. They were handing that off to private, or I should say non-governmental, organizations. With the rainy season coming, shelter will be one of the bigger challenges the country will face.

There was an urgent need. They were building, in some cases, the framing for 15 houses a day, which was an impressive effort. It was a Herculean effort on the part of many.

From my perspective, they were doing this above and beyond the expectations, because they felt such a connection to the people there. They really wanted to see Haiti given the restart that we all know it deserves. Canadians responded brilliantly, as you know, as far as personal donations are concerned.

Some of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and women were reaching into their own pockets and contributing money. That was on top of having brought things like children's clothes, diapers, and things they were able to gather up before they left the port of Halifax. There are also some heartwarming stories of Canadian Forces personnel

who were returning to Haiti. They left there in childhood, having been adopted by Canadian families. Some of them—I've heard stories—are in the process of adopting Haitian children themselves.

Mr. LaVar Payne: Thank you.

The Chair: You have one minute.

Mr. LaVar Payne: I think I will just pass on the last minute here.

I want to thank you, Minister, again, for coming, and Admiral, for all the Canadian Forces people.

Thank you.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: I now give the floor to Mr. Martin who will be the last member of our committee to ask the minister questions. Remember that we have to break at noon in order to be able to hear the witnesses from the Department of National Defence.

[*English*]

Mr. Martin, you have five minutes.

Hon. Keith Martin (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca, Lib.): *Merci beaucoup.*

Mr. MacKay, Vice-Admiral Rouleau, gentlemen, thank you very much, all of you, for being here today. I would also thank CF members for their work in Haiti, and, being a B.C. MP, for your exceptional work in Vancouver during the Olympics.

I'm going to just make a couple of comments, Minister, and then I'll pose the questions. If you would be kind enough to respond in writing, that would be fantastic.

With respect to Haiti, I think it would be great if Canada took the advantage and actually advanced an international 911 response system so as to avoid the logistical disaster that always happens post-problem, whether it's a tsunami or Haiti, and so on. It would be a great initiative to have that integrated system to respond logistically to disasters.

My first question is with respect to the future of the JSS and the fixed-wing search and rescue. We know that this is core for the operational abilities of our Canadian Forces. When can we expect the request for proposals to be submitted, and when do you expect this to be completed?

Secondly, do you have a long-term procurement strategy for CF assets? If you do, could we see it? If you don't, when will such a procurement strategy be released so that we don't have this ebb and flow that takes place with respect to the procurement of assets? Then the members can have the surety that they are going to get them when they want to get them.

In the main estimates of 2010-11, there is a \$3-billion request for equipment for acquisitions. What equipment is this for?

The last two questions are with respect to the Afghan National Army and the Afghan National Police. How many members have currently been trained and are functional today? What are the end targets? Has anything been done to resolve the challenges within the Afghan National Army and the police, which largely has a non-Pashtun dominated leadership, which is causing structural problems within both of those institutions in Afghanistan?

Finally, how many of the new Leopard tanks that have been purchased are deployed, and how many are sitting in Canada?

Sorry for the lengthy list. I'd appreciate sometime in the future receiving answers to those.

Thanks very much.

• (1155)

Hon. Peter MacKay: I'll try to respond to a few of them quickly.

On the long-term procurement strategy, we have the broad-brush strokes of the Canada First defence strategy that talks about building all the pillars of the Canadian Forces. This includes investments in equipment, the infrastructure where we house the equipment and where members train, and, most importantly, personnel issues.

Within that strategy you will find dedicated finances for procurement. That includes the refurbishment of all of the major platforms such as shipbuilding, JSS, but also all surface combatants with respect to ice-breaking capability and offshore patrol. Those are not directly under our purview, but they obviously impact Canada's overall shipbuilding strategy.

On the air force, priority funding has been earmarked for replacement of CF-18s and our fixed-wing search and rescue aircraft. We have procured the C-130 replacement contracts now for our Hercules aircraft—so the next generation of that transport capability. We've already purchased and received the C-17s, the heavy transports. We bought used Chinook aircraft that are currently operating in Afghanistan. That was part of the independent recommendations of the panel. We are also purchasing new Chinooks, the F model, for post-Afghanistan operations.

On the family of land combat vehicles, that was a \$5-billion procurement. We're working through that, but that money has been set aside specifically for land combat capability. There have already been numerous announcements about patrol vehicles, tanks, and trucks, and there'll be more on the infrastructure on several of our bases across the country.

The frigate life extension program for the existing frigates is well under way. You'll find much of that within the Canada First defence strategy, but we can provide you greater details on the dollar amounts and timeframes.

On the training of Afghanistan soldiers, we have been major participants in that from the earliest days through what are called OMLTs and POMLTs—the operational mentoring teams. We've had dedicated efforts in that regard.

On decisions of leadership within the Afghan National Army, I'm not going to dispute what you've said about some of their challenges. However, I would indicate quite clearly, Mr. Martin, that this is a sovereign country. When it comes to the decisions of the leadership, who is in the chain of command, and what cultural or language background they have, we can give advice, NATO can give advice—and they often do—but these are really sovereign decisions, just as they would be in other government departments within Afghanistan.

The numbers are very ambitious. They're in excess of 300,000, I believe, when it comes to the combined security forces of army and police. That was outlined in General McChrystal's report last fall. We

set targets and have met and exceeded targets when it comes to the training of a *kandak* or battalion. But again, we are somewhat beholden to the ability of the Afghan army to provide us with soldiers to train. A big problem that I'm sure you're aware of is literacy levels. It's not enough to simply identify an individual as somebody you're taking into your security forces, but basic literacy skills are often an impediment to the accelerated training pace that we're trying to achieve.

Clearly the end goal here is to turn over security responsibility to Afghans. That has been a primary goal throughout our time on this mission. All countries, all NATO participants—the 60-plus when you include outside countries such as Australia and New Zealand—recognize that we want to enable those Afghan forces to do what our soldiers do and provide the security to propel the Taliban from entering the country, and provide security around the communities that we are currently tasked to protect.

• (1200)

[Translation]

The Chair: Thank you Mr. Minister. I also thank the members. Thank you for making yourself available and for your eloquence. You were able to answer the questions that the members of the committee asked.

We will continue our meeting with the officials from the Department of National Defence. We are adjourned for five minutes.

•

(Pause)

•

• (1210)

The Chair: We are going to resume this third meeting of the Standing Committee on National Defence. Our witnesses from the Department of National Defence today include the Deputy Minister, Mr. Robert Fonberg. We also have the Vice-Chief of the Defence Staff, Mr. Denis Rouleau, and the Assistant Deputy Minister, Finance and Corporate Services, Mr. Kevin Lindsey. We also have Acting Assistant Deputy Minister, Materiel, Mr. David Jacobson, and the Associate Deputy Minister, Mr. William F. Pentney.

Thank you for being here with us today. We are going to work until 1 p.m. I am going to give the floor to Mr. Boughen, from the Conservative Party, for five minutes.

[English]

Mr. Ray Boughen (Palliser, CPC): Thank you, Chair.

Gentlemen, let us share with you our thanks for taking time out of your busy day to sit with us and answer our questions. We appreciate it.

I have a couple of questions. The first one is addressed to Mr. Fonberg.

To what extent is the reduction in spending premised on the fact that there is to be a significant reduction in defence expenditures due to withdrawal of troops and machines from Afghanistan in 2011? Is there any comment on this that you're able to share with us?

Mr. Robert Fonberg (Deputy Minister, Department of National Defence): Yes, only to say, Mr. Chairman, that the incremental costs of the deployment in Afghanistan have been handled as a separate appropriation item since the mission began. So on the costs of the actual mission, while we will no longer be incurring the cost of the mission once we withdraw, no longer will we be getting the appropriation for that either. So the savings are really to the Government of Canada as opposed to the Canadian Forces and the Department of National Defence itself.

Mr. Ray Boughen: I have another question, Mr. Chair, if I may.

What particular capabilities that will be changed due to withdrawal of equipment may affect our Canadian Forces? I know that we're all concerned about the safety of the men and women in the CF. Will the depletion of equipment affect our forces in a negative manner? We're concerned. Although we reduce equipment, will we still be able to protect our men and women as best we can and as they need to be protected?

• (1215)

Vadm Denis Rouleau: In terms of the withdrawal plan and how we are actually going to terminate the mission in Afghanistan, it will be done in a way that will never diminish the requirement for equipment and the protection our soldiers have or need in Afghanistan, up until the moment they cease combat operations. They will not lose any equipment. They will not lose for the sake of saying that we are starting to draw down. The drawdown of necessary equipment will start only when the combat operations cease, and the troops stay, as the term is used, "inside the wire".

Mr. Ray Boughen: Thank you, Chair.

Mr. William F. Pentney: If I may, Mr. Chairman, perhaps I'll just add briefly to that. In fact, over time, we'll see a net increase in terms of the availability of equipment. We talked earlier about the availability of tanks. We will have relatively new Leopard tanks refurbished and upgraded for use in subsequent missions as and when the government deploys the Canadian Forces. We will have new Chinook helicopters that we did not have before. We'll have an upgraded UAV capability that we didn't have before, both tactical and other UAV capabilities. Those projects will roll on.

As we roll out of Afghanistan, we will upgrade and refurbish the light armoured vehicles that have served the troops so well, so that for the future in terms of army vehicles, you'll have an upgraded LAV after the rotation as well.

So as the vice-admiral has said, up until the end of the mission the troops will get the equipment they need and the protection they need, but looking forward to the next five to ten years, it could be argued that there's in fact a net enhancement of the availability of equipment for the troops associated with the investments, and I guess as well—it's not for me to say—in building on the lessons from the mission in Afghanistan. Prior to Afghanistan, many militaries were going very light and very fast, because the assumption was that's what you needed to do. I think there's probably been an adjustment in military

doctrine through Iraq, Afghanistan, and other missions where the IED has become the unfortunate weapon of choice.

Mr. Ray Boughen: Thanks, Chair.

The Chair: Thank you.

Now we'll give the floor to Monsieur Paillé, *pour cinq minutes*.

[Translation]

Mr. Pascal-Pierre Paillé: Mr. Chair, I am going to share my time with Mr. Bachand. My question deals specifically with the Manège militaire de Québec.

I have carefully read the supplementary estimates that you have sent us as well as the main estimates for National Defence. Last December 8, I asked a question about the Manège militaire. I was told that the government had set aside the sum of \$2 million in the 2009 budget in order to develop a plan for the future of the Manège militaire. In the 2010 budget, the Manège militaire is referred to on p. 259. We are told that the Economic Action Plan is also providing \$2 million.

Is that the same \$2 million that appears in two different budgets or is it new money? It seems to me like a repeat announcement.

Anyway, as I see it, \$2 million to rebuild an armoury is clearly not enough. The rumour in Quebec City is that \$100 million will be needed. I have looked through all the information that I have access to and I cannot find the amount allocated for the reconstruction of the Manège militaire. So that is my second question: have you established an amount, in the budget as well as in the estimates, to rebuild the Manège militaire de Québec?

Mr. William F. Pentney: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The government set aside \$2 million for public consultations, which took place last year, I believe. The government is now following up on those deliberations and is developing reconstruction options. It is true that you cannot rebuild an armoury with \$2 million. We have been through an economic crisis, but that did not bring costs down that much. The government has to come up with a plan, but our department is not the only one involved in the planning. There is also Public Works and Government Services, and Heritage Canada. The site is a rather important one, both for Canada and for the federal government.

• (1220)

Mr. Pascal-Pierre Paillé: Thank you very much. That answers my question.

The Chair: Mr. Bachand.

Mr. Claude Bachand: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I have a question about these infamous fixed envelopes. I have been told that the contract for the Fixed Wing Search and Rescue project has not been awarded yet. But \$3 billion has apparently been set aside in an envelope waiting for the project to get underway. Could you confirm that for me? If so, what are we waiting for to send out the invitations to tender?

Then, Mr. Pentney, you mentioned the refurbishing of the Leopards when they come back from Afghanistan. But there are already 40 of them in Montreal being used mostly for driver training. Can you tell me when it will be done? I have a lot of questions about them. I even went to see these Leopards in Montreal. You also said that they will need to be refurbished at the end of the mission in Afghanistan, but is it not standard practice for badly damaged vehicles, or the whole fleet, to simply be left for the Afghan armed forces? I was wondering if, in the course of your planning, you have already determined which types of vehicles will be left for the Afghan armed forces?

[English]

Mr. Robert Fonberg: Thank you for the questions.

Mr. Chairman, let me start with the issue of fixed-wing search and rescue at \$3 billion.

We don't do these things by way of fixed envelopes per se, Mr. Chairman. In our costing we have assumed, in the context of our annual \$21-billion budget, that over time we would end up purchasing a new fleet of fixed-wing search and rescue aircraft for approximately \$1.5 billion. The in-service support for those aircraft would be the other \$1.5 billion. That money is within our budget and is fungible from year to year. If we don't use it this year to enter into the contract, it is there and available for us in the following year. It is planned into our investment plan as a forward item.

Jake, would you like to say something about where the RFP is on the Leopard 2s for the R and O here in Canada?

Mr. David Jacobson (Acting Assistant Deputy Minister, Materiel, Department of National Defence): Mr. Chair, the contract for the Leopard 2s has not yet been awarded. It is currently in the bidding process. The responses to that request for proposals are expected by April 15.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Now we'll give the floor to Mr. Braid.

Mr. Peter Braid (Kitchener—Waterloo, CPC): Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, gentlemen, for being here this afternoon.

I wanted to pursue two topics. First of all, I wanted to come back to Haiti quickly, and then move to the upcoming G8 and G20.

With respect to our very successful and effective response to the tragic earthquake situation in Haiti, I wonder if you could perhaps elaborate and explain how earlier decisions to make specific investments in equipment and in our Canadian Forces have contributed to the very effective response that we saw from this government, from our Canadian Forces, both with respect to its rapidity and its coordinated fashion.

Vadm Denis Rouleau: First of all, as I mentioned earlier, immediately the next day, we actually had an aircraft on the tarmac in Port-au-Prince. The only way we could actually maintain the air bridge, which we have been maintaining with Haiti for the entire duration, was with the capability of the C-17 Globemasters that we have right now. They have been operating continuously from Trenton to Port-au-Prince. That is how we got the large majority of our equipment down there. Then, we actually used our container

ship, which took some of the heavier material. At the end of the day, we were even able to bring helicopters on board the C-17 and fly them down to Haiti. As well, some of them flew there themselves in pairs to go join the effort down there.

The equipment that our army actually used in Afghanistan, the new trucks that we had, which were part of SQFT, and all of this were part of the new equipment that was in their hands and able to be deployed. The enhanced DART equipment that was there as well is part of this continuous improvement in our equipment. That was there and available, despite our commitment in Afghanistan, despite our commitment for Podium, and despite the fact that we have an entire brigade, which will be the next rotation in Afghanistan, training down in the States.

• (1225)

Mr. Peter Braid: Very good.

I would very quickly, with the indulgence of the committee, like to share an anecdote.

Some constituents in my riding of Kitchener—Waterloo, a group of 10 people from a church, were in Haiti. They arrived about a week before the earthquake. Obviously, when they went to the country, they had no idea what was in store for them as the earthquake unfolded. With the assistance of Foreign Affairs officials and Canadian Forces personnel, they were successfully evacuated out of Haiti. I know that they are eternally grateful, so, on their behalf, I thank you.

Moving on to the upcoming G-8 and G-20, I note in the supplementary estimates (C) that there's \$11.7 million devoted to security operations and policing for the upcoming G8 and the G20. Could you please—through you, Mr. Chair—elaborate on what the role of the Canadian Forces will be in terms of providing security at those two important international meetings, and perhaps explain what some of those expenses are, and what the money will be used for.

Mr. William F. Pentney: Thank you for the question.

Mr. Chair, the role of the Canadian Forces in G8 and G20 will derive from the model that was used for the Olympics. The RCMP will have the lead as the lead federal police force. As chair of the G8 and the G20, Canada has an obligation to provide those international leaders with adequate security protection. That's something we take very seriously.

The Canadian Forces will be in support for G8 as they were for the Olympics. I would say the Mounties and the other police forces get the glory role and more visibility. The Canadian Forces will be in the bush around the site, providing perimeter security.

There will be about 2,500, give or take, Canadian Forces personnel deployed. Their role is largely perimeter security, providing the kinds of capabilities that the army, through the reservists and the regular force members, can provide.

Second will be air security. We're part of the North American Aerospace Defense Command, so through NORAD, which is a joint command, we will provide air security to create a bubble over that event, and we will provide certain specialized capabilities. In particular I'd note chemical, biological, and radiological. If there were ever to be such an event, the Canadian Forces have unique and specialized capabilities, which is part of a whole-of-government plan. We would deploy first into that zone.

So we'll be, again, in a supporting role. It will be largely hidden. They promise me that where the mosquitoes are, that's where the army will go. It will be to provide both personnel to provide that perimeter security and some specialized capabilities, in the air and on the land, to provide whatever security is necessary.

Mr. Peter Braid: Do I have any time left?

The Chair: No.

Mr. Peter Braid: Okay. Thank you.

The Chair: We'll have time for Mr. Wilfert, for five minutes.

Hon. Bryon Wilfert: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I return to a subject I raised before, and that is the issue of military procurement and how we go about it. I'm not asking a political question; this question is really for the government, but I'm interested in your response, particularly the Deputy Minister, with regard to the CADSI report that came out and that identified a number of concerns in terms of how we go about procuring military equipment and the cost of doing it the way we are presently, particularly in terms of the effect on the domestic economy. There were concerns, and I've raised this before, Deputy Minister, in terms of the shortage of project managers. I'd like to know where we are on that.

There have been concerns there may be turf wars between the Prime Minister's Office, Privy Council, Foreign Affairs, Finance, etc., in terms of going about it. One of the major recommendations I was struck by was the creation of a defence industrial strategy to improve the overall governance of the procurement process, so that in fact many of the issues that colleagues have raised could be addressed maybe more efficiently.

I'd be interested in your comments, through the chair.

• (1230)

Mr. Robert Fonberg: Thank you for the question.

I might actually just turn to Mr. Jacobson on the question of project managers in particular.

The CADSI report, as I read it, has really three critical recommendations in it. One is around this notion I think you've just raised of a defence industrial policy. The second one is really around streamlining the existing process, given the variety and number of players in the process. The third one, which I think is certainly beyond my pay grade, is the question of machinery and the issue of a single cabinet-level person. I'm sure you're very familiar with the report.

On the question of the industrial policy, I think that CADSI, and we've worked with them very closely, has identified a huge opportunity. The Canada First defence strategy lays out probably about \$240 billion worth of procurement over the next 20 years.

Somebody earlier asked the question about the clarity of the forward investment trajectory. Our ability to lay out with greater certainty and clarity what procurements are coming at what time; our ability to work with early-stage Canadian companies in the R and D and the S and T areas that will allow them to get ready for larger procurements as they come up for bidding three, four, and five years out; our ability to partner with others in supply chain opportunities—we've looked at all of that quite closely. I think we're ready to start having a very serious, deliberate discussion about a kind of defence industrial policy.

It doesn't always have the greatest ring to it, a defence industrial policy, but it's fundamentally about an opportunity to strengthen the Canadian supply base. We're fully on board with CADSI around that issue. To be honest, I think we can take their issue a little bit further.

On the question of streamlining—and then I'll turn to Jake Jacobson quickly on the issue of project managers, because it's an important question—it's a complex process. I accept that. I think we all accept it's a complex process. The accountabilities are the accountabilities. In my two and a half years on the job, I haven't seen anything that I would kind of call turf in any way. We have exceptionally strong relationships with our Public Works colleagues, with our Treasury Board colleagues.

You know, sometimes it's a little bit hard; the Privy Council Office has a lot of stuff flowing through it into the decision-making process. Sometimes it's a little bit hard to get their attention, but we get their attention when we need it. But I wouldn't say that we have had anything held up around something called turf.

There are a lot of questions out there. These are big projects for Canada. These are often projects where you're procuring stuff that has a life of 20 years, or 30 or 40 years. I think if we miss by a year in order to get it right, that's probably a year's worth of thinking and designing that's worth that particular time.

On machinery, there are different models. In fact, Jake's predecessor as the ADM Materiel has written a book on machinery options, always the purview of the Prime Minister. I think every model out there has its benefits and its costs. We work with what we have, and I would say we probably do an exceptionally good job.

Jake, I don't know if you want to say something about project managers.

Mr. David Jacobson: Yes, please. Thank you, Deputy.

Mr. Chair, you've heard the expression that it takes 20 years to develop a 20-year sergeant, and the same is true for project managers. We've made some great strides. That said, we've made some great strides in the last three years in particular in improving the capacity of not just our project managers but also of our engineering and procurement officers. In fact, in the last couple of years we've increased the number of engineers by about 57% and the number of procurement officials by over 50%.

On the issue of project managers themselves, we've been working to identify the competencies they need. What knowledge set do they need? What kind of experience should they develop through the course of their careers? What kind of management and leadership abilities should we develop?

We establish those competencies and apply the learning and training strategies. Also, because not everybody makes a great project manager, succession management is quite active within the group; we identify those people with the right kinds of aptitudes and background, and we develop those people fully. We can develop people from the \$10 million projects through to the \$50 million projects to the \$100 million projects and the \$1 billion projects. It's a very good question.

Hon. Bryon Wilfert: Thank you for those answers.

My final comment, Mr. Chairman, is that I'm obviously concerned; I don't want to see our defence industrial base decline to the point that we're dependent on foreign acquisitions. I take some comfort from some of your comments. Obviously this is going to be a political decision, but I commend at least the three ministers for initiating it. Obviously, we'll be following up on it.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you.

I will give the floor to Ms. Gallant for five minutes.

• (1235)

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We've been discussing the wonderful job our forces have done in Haiti and at the Olympics. Even though we didn't see them, we know they did their job and did it well. We've been discussing the progress they're making in Afghanistan and the plans for security at the G8 and G20. We talked about equipment procurement as well as the equipment coming home from Afghanistan.

What I'm interested in is the people aspect, in terms of the people coming home from Afghanistan and the people who've been home from Afghanistan. Perhaps this question is best directed towards General Semianiw.

In particular I would like to know what sorts of resources the estimates are providing for the joint personnel support units. Could you walk us through the process from the point when they first come into the life of a soldier who is returning injured from a deployment or who may have been injured on previous deployments? How do the JPSUs help them get back into their roles as soldiers?

[*Translation*]

Major-General W. Semianiw (Chief of Military Personnel, Department of National Defence): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I am sorry, but we will need about 25 minutes to answer the questions.

[*English*]

I think there are two aspects to the question: first is the coming home, and second is once you are home.

Mr. Chair, just let me again ensure that committee members know that we have many programs, many policies, many structures in place to ensure that prior to being deployed, men and women in uniform actually are screened—I use the word in a positive way—to ensure they are fit to be deployed.

That's done in a number of different ways, both from a military training sense and from a people sense to ensure they're healthy and they're fit, as well as to sit down with their families to ensure their families are prepared for that time, because it is tough on families. We know that much. You and I have talked about that. So that does happen.

They actually also have some degree of psychological screening before they go in. Once they are in theatre, what has been added is mental health teams that are now in theatre to support them. And again, they do their work, they come home on their leave for a couple of weeks, they head back into theatre, and then the time comes for them to come back. I think that's where the question actually really begins.

Prior to coming back, the screening actually begins once again in a very intensive sense. The chain of command and the medical teams actually ensure that those who have had challenges in whatever way, be it physically or mentally throughout that deployment, are actually screened, and that it is noted. The key is to ensure there is a link between when that soldier, sailor, airman, or airwoman leaves that operation and is actually back home. You are moving back to someone who owns you differently from when you are in theatre. So there is a possibility that someone perhaps could fall through the cracks. We've talked about that in the past.

To ensure that doesn't happen, medical records are updated in theatre and they actually come back to Canada, back to that soldier's location. Let's say perchance it is in Petawawa. They would actually come back to Petawawa, and what happens from a mental health point of view is that mental health screening does occur once they are back home.

Secondly, we have added this. Prior to getting back on the ground in Canada, soldiers, sailors, airmen, and airwomen, as part of the Afghanistan mission on the ground, actually go back and do a third location decompression in Cyprus, where they go through a number of briefings, with presentations on family reunions. It is a challenge coming back. You still think you're in control when you're overseas, but you're really not. It's your spouse at home who is really in charge.

So what does it really mean coming back? We never did this in the past, but we knew we had to do that, so that's in place now.

When you're back on ground, we have psychological screening. The chain of command actually works with you.

The other thing we have added is this. To all of our general practitioners across the Canadian Forces, we've demanded of them and hold them responsible and accountable now to actually do psychological questioning whenever anybody comes in. So per chance if I were in Petawawa and I'm not feeling good when I wake up one Sunday, it actually would go to my medical clinic in Petawawa. My doctor would then determine what it is, whether it is a physical or mental health issue, and focus on the mental health issue because I think that's where the question really comes from. I could then be referred to either the OSI clinic that we just put in recently across the country—we've added a number of operational stress injury clinics for PTSD—or be given any other type of support.

Once it is determined that you need a certain level of support, you are then moved on to the JPSUs or IPSCs. The JPSUs and IPSCs, I'm proud to say, are the only units in the Canadian Forces whose sole task is to look after injured and ill men and women in uniform. That's all they do. They work. We have members from the Department of Veterans Affairs in the JPSUs and IPSCs and we also have return-to-work coordinators. We have teams that will actually help soldiers if they want to improve during that rehabilitation time, recovery time. For their education, be it college or university, we're about to put in a small university component into that program. They actually stay in the JPSU until they get to that point medically where they can head back to the unit or we have to determine what else happens with them.

Clearly I would expect all Canadians would expect men and women in uniform—Haiti is a great example—to be prepared to deploy when they are asked to deploy. That becomes a fundamental issue. But at the same time we must ensure that we as a leadership, we as Canadians, this nation, provide a support to the men and women who have given so much for the nation. So the JPSUs were put in place for that. You've seen it. You've been to it. I went there with you to take a look at it not too long ago. It looks after them and it provides a whole suite. For example, it touched on the educational support that they need, be it college or university.

• (1240)

Secondly, we actually are partnering with industry. For example, TD Bank has come to us and offered us many positions for injured soldiers. They have gone off and worked with them.

I'll end at that. I think that answers your question.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Mr. Hawn, you have four or five minutes.

The floor is yours.

[*English*]

Mr. Laurie Hawn (Edmonton Centre, CPC): Thank you, Chair, and witnesses.

The department has begun a comprehensive strategic review to ensure its resources are aligned with the CFDS, and so on. I wonder if either the deputy minister or the admiral, or both, could provide us

with some details about what the strategic review will entail and what kind of timeframe we're looking at for that review to take place.

Mr. Robert Fonberg: The strategic review is part of the Treasury Board's expenditure management system. Every fourth year, every department of government and agency is going to have to go through a strategic review. We are coming up to 2010-11, which will be the fourth round. At the end of this round, all departments will have gone through a strategic review.

We have not been formally officially notified by Treasury Board via the Prime Minister and cabinet that we're going to be in this round, although we've anticipated that. We're such a large, complex department that we actually started getting ready for this probably eight or nine months ago. So we built a team inside the organization.

The purpose of the review is to basically go through 100% of our spending programatically and ensure that we can answer a number of key questions, including that every dollar we're spending is aligned to the government's highest priorities and that every dollar is actually achieving value for money, is being spent effectively and efficiently.

The government in the context of strategic reviews has asked every department to identify the lowest 5% of their program spending. Every department that has gone through the process up to now has done that. We are just completing the 100% review of our programs, and we will start an exercise, probably over the next couple of weeks, to look at what is the bottom 5%.

The way the process runs, we will have a preliminary report to the Treasury Board, probably in mid-June if the process stays true to what it has been in the past, and a final report to Treasury Board in agreement on what that 5% is next fall. That's the timeline. That's comprehensive. We have a significant team looking at this stuff, and when it comes right down to it, having been in the Department of Finance and Treasury Board and PCO, it's fair for departments to have to look through and identify. Everybody has a bottom 5% of what they are doing. Everybody has an interest in that 5%, but everybody has a bottom 5%. Collectively with our political masters, obviously we have to come to that conclusion.

Mr. Laurie Hawn: Thank you.

Again, through you, Mr. Chair, probably to General Semianiw, I was recently at Shilo cutting a ribbon at a new recreation centre there that had a very large component of rehab incorporated into it. It was really quite impressive and was obviously aimed at helping soldiers, sailors, airmen, airwomen, or whoever, who have come back from Afghanistan or wherever with physical challenges. Is that going to be a model for recreation centres throughout the CF?

MGen W. Semianiw: About two years ago we established a director of rehabilitation at Canadian Forces, realizing the challenge, tying into what the associate had said, that the IED is the weapon of choice and the result of that is many men and women in uniform who actually end up losing a limb. That happens throughout the world. It is not just focused on Afghanistan.

We realized that and we established a director of rehabilitation. We then went out and partnered with seven different civilian rehabilitation centres across the country. Those centres are civilian, so we didn't have to build them; they're already there. We actually put our rehabilitation military specialists into them when soldiers come back and need them. Secondly, we provide funds, if they need it, to be able to provide that additional support when they are in there.

On the Shilo case, again, the next step was what happens when they're actually in that recovery phase. We want to use sports to enable their recovery. That's the simple logic, to go across the country now in some simple area, such as ensuring that even the lockers are big enough so that our men and women in uniform who need a little bit more space can actually go in there to do the training they need, and other areas. So yes, it is the model we are looking at to go across the country as part of our health and fitness strategy that was announced about a year and a half ago. It's all dovetailed in.

As you saw, the minister was at Soldier On, at the Paralympics, where we had a military contingent, which again speaks to our support for men and women in uniform when they go through those tough times.

• (1245)

Mr. Laurie Hawn: Thanks, Mr. Chair.

Through you to Major-General Semianiw, there are some exciting things going on in rehab and other areas. There's a project in Edmonton at the Glenrose Rehabilitation Hospital that is paired with an organization here. I wonder if you could talk a little bit about that in terms of research and development and clinical capability.

MGen W. Semianiw: Glenrose is one of the seven sites we have partnered with, because at the end of it all, Glenrose has a very high standard of policy, process, and structure in place to support them. Personally, I've been there. I've actually been there when they've made prostheses for soldiers. They showed me that. It is world class.

We are looking at some other supports. We saw it here in Ottawa. Perhaps in the near future we might be able to expand what we're doing here in Ottawa as part of a certain CAREN system. That's a 3-D system that supports men and women in uniform to better wear their prostheses. We are looking at the issue in Edmonton, and hopefully, in the future, we can see if perhaps we could broaden it to western Canada.

[Translation]

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Mr. Wilfert, as I understand it, you are going to share your time with Mr. Martin.

[English]

The floor is yours.

Hon. Bryon Wilfert: Mr. Chairman, I have two very quick questions.

First, what cost estimates have been made with regard to savings when the Afghan mission comes to an end in 2011?

Mr. Robert Fonberg: Mr. Chairman, I think the total identified incremental costs of Afghanistan to date are around the \$9-billion

mark, I think, for the Canadian Forces and National Defence. I don't know exactly the number we're running at in 2009-10 and 2010-11. Whatever that number is, that number will no longer be available to the department and the Canadian Forces. It will no longer be appropriated for us. That number is in the order of \$1 billion per year.

Hon. Bryon Wilfert: I'd like just a quick clarification. On page 18-7 of the main estimates, under "Program by Activities".... I think I know the answer, but I just thought I'd ask a quick question. For 2009-10, there was a budget of \$1 billion, and then for 2010-11, it's zero.

What was that for?

Mr. Robert Fonberg: What is the line item?

Hon. Bryon Wilfert: The line item is under "Program by Activities" on page 18-7 in the main estimates. It was \$1 billion for 2009-10, and then for 2010-11 it is zero. What is it for?

Mr. Robert Fonberg: I don't know.

Do you know what it is, Kevin?

Mr. Kevin Lindsey (Assistant Deputy Minister, Finance and Corporate Services, Department of National Defence): I think, Mr. Chair, that the member is referring to the line item called "Contribute to Canadian government, society and international community in accordance with Canadian interests and values".

Hon. Bryon Wilfert: Yes.

Mr. Kevin Lindsey: I think, sir, what this reflects is simply a readjustment of the program activity architecture against which the main estimates are prepared. That money will have been redistributed across the other line items in the main estimates.

The vice-admiral might be able to elaborate on that.

Hon. Bryon Wilfert: It goes from \$1 billion to zero.

Mr. Robert Fonberg: If I understand Kevin's point, as we redid our program activity architecture, it actually went from a billion in that line to a billion in other program activities.

• (1250)

VAdm Denis Rouleau: It would have been broken down into the multiple subactivities within that line.

Mr. Robert Fonberg: We can certainly get back to you on that.

Hon. Bryon Wilfert: I would appreciate that.

The Chair: Mr. Martin.

Hon. Keith Martin: Major-General Semianiw, I have a quick question. Pre-deployment exposure to trauma, in my personal view, would be beneficial to our folks in reducing operational stress injuries. Beyond what you have done at Wainwright, which is excellent, are there any efforts to try to expose our CF members to the trauma one would be exposed to but in controlled settings, such as OR or emergency rooms in Canada?

Second, we have a proposal to create a centre of excellence at Royal Roads University. That centre would deal with the acquisition of best practices and research in the care of our CF members and their families. It would not be a treatment centre.

Finally, I would urge having the Bagotville model—having a primary care unit with a day care unit—duplicated in other bases across Canada. That would, in my personal view, really deal with the issue of primary care for our CF members and primary care for their families, which, as you all know better than I, weighs heavily on their minds, particularly when they're deployed abroad. It would enable them to deal with this in terms of the day care they desperately need for their kids when one member is away.

[Translation]

MGen W. Semianiw: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[English]

To address the first question, I'll use my experience.

When I deployed to Afghanistan in 2005 as the commander of the Canadian contingent, from February until August, all the doctors on my mission we actually put into emergency, into ERs, just before our deployment to ensure that their skills were, at that point in time, adequate for addressing issues from a medical point of view.

That has continued all the way up to today and will continue in the future. We also do training in Wainwright.

For the individual, which I think is what you are getting at, it's resilience training.

Hon. Keith Martin: They have less exposure to the kind of... [Inaudible—Editor]...not medical personnel?

MGen W. Semianiw: Agreed, and the issue comes back to...

I would throw this out: the jury is still out on what type of resilience training one should do to ensure one would be prepared. This much we do know. Do we need some form of resilience training? Yes. We're actually looking at it right now. We are doing some form of it already. Over the last year, we've implemented some form of it.

But from an institutionalizing point of view, we're still looking at it, because it's not as simple from a practitioner's point of view that doing this would actually end up dropping the amount of trauma you're going to see. We do that as part of training to ensure that our training is as realistic as possible, which it is if you go to Wainwright. I think that's one aspect of it.

But the tougher side of combat is someone getting injured or killed.

Hon. Keith Martin: That's right.

MGen W. Semianiw: That's what you're speaking to. We have done some form of resiliency training, but we're looking at it from an institutional point of view for what we do CF-wide.

On the second one—

The Chair: Briefly, please.

MGen W. Semianiw: Okay.

On the second one, I'm more than happy to sit down to talk to them. At least seven or eight different universities have come to us wanting to partner with us on research, to pass on information.

Finally, I'd only throw out to you that there's a danger in using the Bagotville model across the country. Remember: standardization is the death of innovation. The secret of our success in the last couple of years has been allowing local commanders to innovate to meet their needs.

I hear you, and I think there's some sense to it, but the only danger is to say that the Bagotville model will work in Trenton. I think there's a danger in going that way, but we have been practising this, and moving best practices across the country, particularly on the family side, which we did at the summit and we continue to do.

[Translation]

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Mr. Paillé.

Mr. Pascal-Pierre Paillé: Thank you. I wanted to share my time with Mr. Bachand, but since he has slipped away, I will keep going.

It may be a little persistent on my part, but I would like to come back to the Manège militaire business. There is still something I do not understand.

In the text, we can see that \$2 million over two years are set aside. But according to the information that I have been able to see, the Manège militaire study has already been done, the report has already been submitted and the public consultation has already taken place. In the budget, which is for two years, there is a figure of a million dollars. So there is a million dollars left, and everything seems to have been done. Only the internal analysis is left.

I would first like to know what is going to be done with the million dollars left over, why the million dollars is not still being used and whether anything else is intended. Second, is this the same \$2 million in two different budgets? From what I understand, it is \$2 million over two years. I assume that the two amounts are the same: \$2 million. Whatever the case may be, a million dollars has still not been used.

• (1255)

Mr. William F. Pentney: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We cannot answer your question because those \$2 million were not allocated to the Department of National Defence. As I understand it, the government allocated the amount to Public Works and Government Services Canada to carry out the study, to hold the consultations, and to do the follow-up.

[English]

I don't want to avoid the question, *mais*...

[Translation]

but it is not one we can answer. The question should go to Public Works and Government Services Canada.

Mr. Pascal-Pierre Pail : Thank you. That is what I will do.

I would like to go back to the Olympic and Paralympic Games. I am going to quote a part of the minister's speech. I know that I should have asked him the question, but perhaps you can help me. He said this: "We succeeded in keeping costs within what we had previously forecast." According to an article in *Le Devoir* dated November 24, 2008, security costs for the Olympics and Paralympics went from \$175 million to \$500 million. A little less than a month later, *La Presse* told us that the costs would rise from \$700 million to more than \$1 billion, especially if the threat level in Canada were to rise.

The Paralympic Games are not over, and you are asking for an increase of a little over \$17 million for security in the supplementary estimates. I am not claiming that this is a threat, but there are rumours, and some media are saying that Canada could become a target of terrorism. With this information, and in light of the fact that the Paralympic Games are not yet over, I would like to know if you feel that an amount of \$17 million should be enough to cover all the security. I know that you are not the only ones involved, that the RCMP and the local police in British Columbia are also involved. But I would like to know if you feel that other requests will be made so that we can continue to maintain security. We have gone from \$175 million to more than \$1 billion. There is a discrepancy between the numbers and the minister's statements.

[English]

Mr. Robert Fonberg: Thank you for the question.

To clarify, Mr. Chair, the expected costs for the Department of National Defence and the Canadian Forces for security at the Olympics, estimated almost a full year ago and appropriated, I think, in the supplementary estimates (A), were \$212 million. Through the course of last summer, as we completed our planning and realized we would need certain things, such as marine barrier protections for \$3 million, our estimate went from \$212 million to a total of \$229 million. It was not an overrun. It was simply a sharpening of the pencils and finalized planning, and it was complete last fall.

With reference to the \$17 million that's here for the department and the Canadian Forces, I understand we probably will not spend all of it. We will probably underspend that, but we will know shortly after the Paralympics. We're very good at forecasting, very good at planning these sorts of things and then actually forecasting the spend.

As for the move from \$175 million to \$500 million, I think you'd probably want to talk to the overall security coordinator, Ward Elcock, at the Privy Council Office.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Translation]

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Our last participant is Mr. Harris.

[English]

Mr. Jack Harris (St. John's East, NDP): Thank you, Chair.

I'd like to thank you all for coming.

I'm sorry I missed an opportunity to speak to the minister. I was hoping to pass on to him my compliments to your department and to the CF on the work in Haiti in particular. I know that Canadians hold Haiti and Haitians in special affection and have a lot of compassion for what happened there. Obviously there are lots of reasons for that, not the least of which is the respect and esteem that the Governor General of our country has, and the large Haitian community that we have in Canada. We're very delighted that our country and our forces were able to respond so quickly and so effectively.

I would like, Vice-Admiral Rouleau...and you're just the man to do it, being the naval vice-admiral. There was some confusion. I call it that because I don't know the rights of it; I hope you can set us straight, from your point of view, on the role of our ships going to Haiti. There is some question as to whether they were in fact to deliver humanitarian aid or not, and whether they were capable of doing that.

In that context, I'd like to ask you about the joint supply ship, which is the project under way. I would consider it to be, I suppose, from the naval point of view the equivalent of the C-17 in terms of being able to deliver supplies, handle troops, or do other activities.

Would you like to comment as to whether the joint supply ship, if you had one, would have been of use in the Haitian operation, and tell us what this confusion was? There was some media attention, particularly in the Halifax area, about the use of Canadian ships in that mission.

•(1300)

VAdm Denis Rouleau: First of all, on the issue of...you can call it possible confusion or not, but ships like the *Halifax* and the *Athabaskan*, which sailed for this operation, loaded themselves up to maximum capacity to sustain themselves and sustain efforts ashore. That included equipment for the troops ashore as well as equipment, humanitarian aid, and support that you can bring on board a warship.

If there was any confusion, in fact this has been a practice for this type of naval warship, despite the fact that they're not designed to do this. They actually find places on board those ships where they can store a lot of equipment. They maximized the use of their space to sail down there and operate the way they did there. Not only did they bring the equipment down, but they also brought the crew. The work parties they were bringing ashore were really the big factors.

With regard to the second part of the question, when the minister was here earlier, he brought up that very point. A JSS vessel that can support operations ashore is exactly what would have been thrown into the mix if one had been available. It was what the Americans did when they sent their own troops. That is why, from our perspective, JSS is still a very active project. It is right at the top of our list, and we want to move it forward.

Mr. Jack Harris: Thank you. I'm very glad to hear that.

I have one other question, and perhaps Mr. Fonberg could answer. I'm not going to get into the issue, but our committee is going to be undertaking a study of search and rescue response times.

One of the difficulties I've had over the last six or eight months of trying to research this issue is actually getting information from your department as to such matters as search and rescue operations reports. In fact, when we went to the Library of Parliament to seek some information, we were told that the only way to get this stuff—even to know whether or not there was a list of SAR ops reports, or whether there had even been any done—was to go through ATIP. I think that's rather unnecessary.

We're going to be undertaking this study, and I'm going to ask you for some commitment. We have two analysts here who are going to be doing research for this committee on this issue of search and rescue response times. Can you give us your full commitment and your department's commitment to cooperate fully, without our having to go through questions on the order paper or ATIP requests to get information to allow us to do our study?

Mr. Robert Fonberg: Absolutely, Mr. Chairman, but the only thing I would ask is that I'm not sure exactly what reports we're referring to. We'll certainly go back and look. You'll have our full cooperation.

[*Translation*]

The Chair: I would like to thank all the witnesses for their participation.

Your testimony has been very useful for our committee.

Before we finish, we have to vote on the votes.

[*English*]

I would ask the members to support these motions; that is your privilege.

We will now take a vote on supplementary estimates (C), National Defence, votes 1c and 5c.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Department

Vote 1c—Operating expenditures and authority for total commitments, subject to allotment by the Treasury Board.....\$114,887,239

Vote 5c—Capital expenditures—To authorize the transfer of \$393,200 from Health Vote 45, Appropriation Act No. 2, 2009-10 for the purposes of this Vote.....\$110,580,061

(Votes 1c and 5c agreed to)

The Chair: Shall I report votes 1c and 5c under National Defence to the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: *Merci bien.*

[*Translation*]

This concludes the third meeting of the Standing Committee on National Defence. Thanks to everyone and good afternoon.

Meeting adjourned.

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

If undelivered, return COVER ONLY to:
Publishing and Depository Services
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5

*En cas de non-livraison,
retourner cette COUVERTURE SEULEMENT à :*
Les Éditions et Services de dépôt
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5

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

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its Committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the *Copyright Act*. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a Committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the *Copyright Act*.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its Committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Additional copies may be obtained from: Publishing and
Depository Services
Public Works and Government Services Canada
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5
Telephone: 613-941-5995 or 1-800-635-7943
Fax: 613-954-5779 or 1-800-565-7757
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca
http://publications.gc.ca

Also available on the Parliament of Canada Web Site at the
following address: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>

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

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la *Loi sur le droit d'auteur*.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

On peut obtenir des copies supplémentaires en écrivant à : Les
Éditions et Services de dépôt
Travaux publics et Services gouvernementaux Canada
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0S5
Téléphone : 613-941-5995 ou 1-800-635-7943
Télécopieur : 613-954-5779 ou 1-800-565-7757
publications@tpsgc-pwgsc.gc.ca
http://publications.gc.ca

Aussi disponible sur le site Web du Parlement du Canada à
l'adresse suivante : <http://www.parl.gc.ca>