



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

Standing Committee on National Defence

NDDN



NUMBER 059



1st SESSION



41st PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Thursday, November 29, 2012



Chair

Mr. James Bezan

Standing Committee on National Defence

Thursday, November 29, 2012

• (1530)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake, CPC)):
Good afternoon, everyone.

We're pleased to be joined today by General Lawson, Chief of the Defence Staff, as we continue on with meeting number 59.

General Thomas Lawson graduated from the Royal Military College of Canada with an electrical engineering degree in 1979. He then completed his wings and fighter training and was posted to 421 Squadron of CFB Baden Soellingen, where he flew the CF-104 Starfighter.

In 1988 General Lawson was promoted to major and was posted to Montgomery, Alabama, to attend the United States Air Force Air Command and Staff College.

In 1996 he was posted to National Defence Headquarters as a career manager and was promoted to lieutenant-colonel.

In 1998 Thomas Lawson was appointed commanding officer of 412 Squadron, where he flew the CC-144 Challenger until 2000.

In 2003 he was promoted to colonel and held various staff positions with the air force before joining the CF transformation team in 2005, where he led the stand-up of the Strategic Joint Staff.

In 2006 General Lawson was posted to CFB Trenton and completed a year in command of that base before being promoted to brigadier-general in May 2007.

In September 2009 he was promoted to major-general and appointed assistant Chief of the Air Staff.

In July 2011 he was promoted to lieutenant-general, and on August 15 of that year he was appointed deputy commander of NORAD and posted to Colorado Springs, a place I hope we'll be travelling to soon.

On August 27, Prime Minister Harper announced the appointment of Lieutenant-General Lawson as incoming Chief of Defence Staff to replace outgoing General Walter Natynczyk.

General Lawson, welcome, and thank you for appearing. It's good to have you here. Although you have been to committee before, I understand you're going to speak for longer than our regular 10 minutes with your opening comments. We will accommodate you, and we look forward to everything you have to say.

You have the floor, sir.

General Thomas Lawson (Chief of the Defence Staff, Department of National Defence): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Members of the committee, good afternoon. Bonjour. It really is a privilege for me to be here today as the new Chief of the Defence Staff. As I sit here, I am struck that even though we are in slightly different uniforms, we are all serving the great people of this great nation.

Before I begin, I would like to express my sincere appreciation for the important work you do, both in Parliament and specifically in this committee. Thank you for the attention and oversight you give, time and again, to pressing Canadian defence issues.

Further, having met some of you already, I understand that some of you have had distinguished service, and I know that all of you have intense interest in the Canadian armed forces. It really is an honour for me to join you here today.

I have been in the Canadian armed forces for over 35 years, and I come from a family with some military tradition. I am the son of a Second World War Spitfire and Mustang pilot and the grandson of a transplanted Scotsman who fought in the trenches in France, and I am now the father of a couple of young servicemen. My family is quite typical of the very rich history and heritage of many families in the Canadian armed forces.

• (1535)

[Translation]

Thanks in great part to my predecessors, the Canadian Armed Forces have developed a solid foundation of skill, experience and expertise that will allow us to meet whatever challenges come our way. So it is with a profound appreciation for those who have served before me, but also with an eye firmly fixed on the future, that I will serve this country as the 18th Chief of the Defence Staff.

[English]

Members of the committee, today marks the end of my first month in this term as Chief of the Defence Staff, and in the past few weeks I've gained a deeper understanding of where we are as an organization and of the challenges and opportunities before us. This afternoon, I will share with you my priorities for the Canadian armed forces going forward.

The Canadian Forces are a dynamic institution operating in a dynamic environment, and we see that all the time. Like any vibrant organization, we're constantly learning lessons and adjusting course accordingly, so I would expect my priorities to evolve as time goes on. But as a starting point, I envision four key areas of focus presented to you as a whole, and not necessarily in order of importance, this afternoon. These are: leading the profession of arms; delivering excellence in operations; caring for our people and their families; and, finally, preparing for our forces of tomorrow.

Let me begin with leading the profession of arms.

[*Translation*]

It is an honour and a privilege to wear this uniform, but it also comes with a profound responsibility. As military members, we must meet the highest standards of professionalism.

[*English*]

We must uphold the four core military values: duty, loyalty, integrity, courage. Ultimately we must be willing to sacrifice everything in the service of the country.

The high calibre of our men and women in uniform is widely recognized across Canada and around the world. Indeed, I believe that because of our track record of service and sacrifice we have developed a strong relationship of respect and trust with Canadians from coast to coast to northern coastline. As CDS, it's my responsibility to ensure that we continue to exercise good, sound judgment in everything we do, and that we continue to uphold the highest ethical standards to maintain the trust of Canadians. It's also my intention that our forces continue to receive the necessary education and training to ensure that this level of professionalism endures.

[*Translation*]

As you probably know, I spent some time commanding the Royal Military College in Kingston, so the importance of professional development for our officers and NCMs is firmly ingrained in me.

[*English*]

It's the planning, the preparation, and the integration of all skill sets, expertise, and experience across the defence team that enable operations. Quite simply, professional development and a culture of continuous learning are essential to success and operations, which brings me to the priority of delivering excellence in operations.

Members of the committee, I command the Canadian armed forces as they work to protect and serve Canadians and operations here at home, to work alongside our American counterparts in the common defence of North America, and to project Canadian leadership and contribute to international peace and security abroad in places like Afghanistan, Libya, and the Mediterranean Sea.

[*Translation*]

The last few years have been particularly busy ones for our forces. Although the pace is not as hectic as it was, there's still a lot of operational work that continues.

[*English*]

Today, we still have over 1,600 military personnel serving Canada around the world: in maritime security and counterterrorism operations in the Arabian Sea; in UN missions in places like Cyprus, Haiti, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and the Middle East; and of course with some 950 Canadians with the NATO training mission in Afghanistan, where Canada remains the second largest contributor to that vital mission of training and transition.

That list, of course, is not exhaustive. We have troops deployed on 15 operations around the world. In fact, I will visit some of our deployed troops next week to see first-hand the tremendous work they are doing.

We also have forces stationed from coast to coast to coast, standing ready to help Canadians in case of emergency or disaster, undertaking search and rescue missions at sea and in the air, monitoring and defending our maritime and air approaches, and contributing to Canada's sovereignty in the Arctic.

[*Translation*]

So while the current operational tempo has changed, I would not say that things are slow.

[*English*]

As every mission we undertake is a no-fail mission, delivering excellence in operations remains paramount on my agenda.

Carrying out our operations in a wide variety of environments and circumstances—both here in Canada and around the world—requires a concerted effort by everyone on the defence team.

I want to underline that the key to our operational success has been, and always will be, our men and women in uniform. They are the ones who deliver—on the ground, in the air, on the sea—whatever the mission. These men and women deserve the best support to position them for the excellence they unfailingly achieve.

This leads me to the next priority, caring for our people. I mean this in the broadest sense. Our military family is large and comprises not only our men and women serving in uniform and the great civilian team in the department, but also their families, our veterans, and of course our wounded warriors. We must provide the necessary care and support to our military members, regular and reserve force, throughout their service career.

We are acutely aware of the toll that military service can take on our men and women physically, mentally, and emotionally, and of course the toll it can take on their families.

Much has been done in recent years to improve the care and support available to our whole military family, like the physical and mental health services for our ill and injured personnel, the career counselling and financial support for education for those transitioning into the civilian workplace, and the compassionate services for the families of the fallen. But when you meet a soldier who is silently suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder, or you try to comfort the family of those who have lost a loved one, you know that we can always do better. Indeed, as Rear-Admiral Smith explained to you just last week, continuous improvement is a key pillar of our approach to caring for our ill and injured, and I'm firmly committed to that.

I'm also studying the ombudsman's latest report on the treatment of injured reservists and would like to highlight that we are not tackling these issues in isolation.

• (1540)

[Translation]

Reservists are an integral part of our military family, and I am committed to ensuring that they are given fair and equitable treatment.

[English]

Supporting our military also means effectively preparing them for their work tomorrow. This is the final priority I'll present today. We've learned a lot in recent operations—particularly in Afghanistan—and we must use this knowledge as we plan for the future. But we must also ensure that the soldiers, sailors, airmen, and airwomen who we send into harm's way have the right tools and equipment to keep them safe.

The Canada First defence strategy has served as an excellent blueprint for the government's systematic modernization of the Canadian armed forces to ensure that we are agile and combat ready.

We've been re-equipping the army with land combat vehicles, providing the air force with new tactical and strategic airlift, and modernizing the navy's frigates, while planning for the replacement of the entire surface fleet through the national shipbuilding procurement strategy.

[Translation]

These equipment renewals are key to our military's readiness and, ultimately, to our operational success.

The Canada First Defence Strategy remains our framework going forward.

[English]

We will continue to deliver the commitments made in the Canada First defence strategy, even as we do our part to help government to return to a balanced budget. That is why we are increasingly thinking of how a mix of complementary systems and technologies, a sort of system of systems, could get the job done more efficiently. Acquisitions we have made through the Canada First defence strategy have enabled the success of our ready forces and will continue for the days ahead.

The creation of the Chief of the Defence Staff position almost 50 years ago was about improving coordination and establishing true

unity of purpose within the Canadian armed forces, but it was also about streamlining decision-making structures to be more cost-effective. So the times we find ourselves in at present are not so unique. The Canadian armed forces are not new to the challenge of building flexible, agile, and resilient forces while adjusting to fiscal constraints. In order to deliver on the four priorities I've just spoken to you about, it's clear we must address today's budgetary challenge.

[Translation]

In fact, it necessitates a determined and focused effort by the defence team to ensure our resources are being put to best use.

• (1545)

[English]

That is why the defence department has created a defence renewal team to help us identify and eliminate ineffective practices and ensure that taxpayer dollars are being put to best use. As the Prime Minister expects of us, we are working to free up resources that can be reallocated to our front lines. As you've heard, more tooth, less tail.

Some changes have been made already through the CF transformation with the stand-up of the Canadian Joint Operations Command this fall, with a plan to reduce administrative overhead by 25% and to redirect those resources to the ready force. I will make it my priority to ensure that this critical work will move forward in the months to come.

In conclusion, members of the committee, thank you again for your ongoing interest in what we do. As you know so well, the defence team has been very busy in recent years, and you can now see that our agenda will continue to be filled, but we have a great team.

[Translation]

I am immensely proud to lead such a skilled and professional institution. And I know we are capable of tackling whatever challenges lay ahead.

[English]

As CDS, I look forward to working under the leadership of Minister MacKay and alongside Deputy Minister Fonberg and the civilian defence team. Together, through sound governance, the Department of National Defence and the Canadian armed forces will continue to embody the highest ideals of public service in defending the sovereignty and interests of our great nation.

Thank you. Merci beaucoup.

The Chair: Thank you, General Lawson. You're well under time. Well done.

Mr. Harris, you have the first of the seven-minute rounds.

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

First, I want to thank you for joining us today. You have had a very distinguished military career as a fighter pilot, as a military academic—I guess you could call it that—and as a leader in various functions: commandant of RMC, command positions in the forces themselves, and also, of course, most recently as a co-leader of our partnership in NORAD.

Congratulations on your appointment as Chief of the Defence Staff. It's a significant position and important to our nation. So thank you for your service to the military and for taking on this challenging role.

Let me start by talking about what the Prime Minister talked about on your installation. I was among the many who were there to hear what he had to say, but he only repeated what we'd already seen in the transformation report prepared by General Andrew Leslie about a year or so before. You're no stranger to transformation issues, having participated in 2005 and 2006.

Tooth to tail is the shorthand for it, but clearly what General Leslie suggested...and I know some things have been done—the change in command structure, for example, the one that you stood up back in 2006. If I can just paraphrase what he talked about in terms of reducing significant costs, particularly at the command level, and that NDHQ had grown 46% over this decade while the so-called teeth had only grown by 10%... He talked about reducing numbers and headquarters staff by grouping functions or eliminating certain organizations; reallocating approximately 3,500 regular force personnel; demobilizing full-time reservists back to the baseline; converting the part-time service workers in units at armouries, etc.; and—this is an important one—reducing by 30% over several years the \$2.7 billion spent on contractors, consultants, and private service providers, and investing these funds in other programs, for example, in the CFDS. And that's mostly headquarters money. Then reinvesting approximately 3,500 civil servants in the higher-priority activities.

These are significant goals, probably not short term. I know some things have been started. I realize you've only been on the job for a month, although you've known about it for some time. Can you tell us your specific plans or how you envisage the Canadian Forces under your direction in terms of looking at these objectives? Is that something you see that needs to be done to be able to withstand the budgetary challenges and yet have the capable military force we need?

• (1550)

Gen Thomas Lawson: The transformation report that General Leslie produced has been an excellent blueprint in many ways for the transformative activities that have been under way over the past year and a half and that are continuing.

You've spoken already about the command structure, the regrouping of Canada Command, the Expeditionary Force Command, and Support Command under one roof, which leads to about a 25% administrative cost reduction that can be turned back into "tooth".

You've also spoken about the process of rebalancing our reserves. It's really very heartening that as the Prime Minister and the government give me my marching orders to focus on more tooth and

less tail, they also commit to my maintaining the capabilities and numbers in uniform.

In our reservists, as you mentioned, we won't see cuts. They'll maintain a balance of about 27,000. However, that balance will be much more towards part-time, so we'll go from about 11,000 class B reservists, which we really depended on during our combat time in Afghanistan, to a more traditional number of around 4,000 in full-time service, with the remainder back in part-time service.

You will have seen announcements about a decrease in the size of the public service supporting the Canadian armed forces. There will be a trimming of contracting, which we have to be very careful about. Of course, that contracting has come about over the recent 10 or 15 years, as we have transformed over the past couple of decades. Many of the capabilities that were carried out before by those in uniform but that weren't truly combat-type capabilities were handed off to contractors. So we have to be careful which of those we give away.

Quite a number of those things that were in the transformation report that you refer to have been undertaken already. Another third are under way and have been provided to the government for consideration. We will stand by for government decisions and direction on that.

For the future, for this difficult task of reforming our business process, the business of defence, to find these efficiencies is far more difficult. For that, we've stood up the defence renewal team that I spoke about. What's exciting about this is that it's a team made up of half public servants and half members of the armed forces.

Kevin Lindsey, the chief finance officer for the Department of National Defence, is the DND representative and co-leader of that. Major-General Al Howard, former assistant Chief of the Land Staff, is the military side of it. They're supported by an excellent and talented staff of military members and public servants.

Mr. Jack Harris: Perhaps I could get in one more question before the first round ends. It may come back to me again. This one is more directed toward your leadership, I suppose, and a question of confidence that the Canadian public and Parliament need to have in you, and it has to do with the F-35s.

We know that one of your roles in 2010 was to promote across the country the choice of the F-35. I don't know what you recall, but you were making the rounds of the country touting the virtues of the F-35.

As you know, of course, this is now under review. We hope, certainly on this side—because as a committee, we started a study of the F-35. We heard from some of the manufacturers and we heard all the arguments. We didn't write a report.

What I want to know is this. I don't think it's going to be left up to Mr. Fonberg as deputy minister, although he's on this committee. Clearly the Canadian Forces are going to have a significant say in this. We're being told that there's going to be a review, or a so-called "options analysis". We assume this means a re-evaluation of what the choices are in terms of aircraft or in terms of whether we should have a mixed fleet of fighters, for example, to perform our various tasks, including patrolling the longest coastline in the world, etc., and the capabilities that are required for one function over another.

Can you tell us how you can give us confidence that despite your role in the past, you will be able to participate in this in a fair and objective way so that Canadians can be convinced that this is not just a public relations exercise?

• (1555)

The Chair: Just before you start, General, if you can be brief in your response, I'd appreciate it—so I can be fair to all members of the committee and give them equal time, because we're well over a minute over the time

Gen Thomas Lawson: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I would confine my comments to say that I'm very pleased with the process that's now in place, in that it's a whole-of-government approach. The Canadian armed forces have one of those seven-point steps that's been outlined for the Public Works secretariat, and that is to provide advice on the options that come forward.

I think, by and large, when such a significant decision is being made regarding purchase of a fleet that will be with us for at least a generation and a half, perhaps more, all Canadians will have a chance to be comfortable that Canadian taxpayers' dollars are going to be used in the right way.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Alexander, it's your turn.

Mr. Chris Alexander (Ajax—Pickering, CPC): Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Congratulations, General Lawson, formally on your appointment. We're all delighted to have you here today. You have the support of this committee and the Canadian Forces have the support of this committee. That is the reason we're all here.

Of course, your opening remarks are stimulating for us, but also inspiring for us in that they remind us how broad the effort now under way is to bring about the systematic modernization, the continuous improvement of which you spoke. You know from your personal history—and you mentioned ancestors and children—how important it is to put that process of adaptation and transformation at the centre of what the Canadian Forces do. That has been the key to their excellence at every stage of their history. Part of that relates to new acquisitions, and you mentioned many of them in your opening remarks. Obviously, seven new aircraft in one decade is unprecedented and complicated.

I've personally been impressed, since coming back from Afghanistan, by the effort under way to learn lessons in terms of doctrine, in terms of tactics, in terms of strategy preparation for the very different kinds of operations the Canadian Forces are asked to perform. The army has learned exhaustive lessons, and still is learning them, from Afghanistan, the navy from recent missions and training in the Indian and Pacific Oceans, and the air force, obviously, from Libya and other missions.

I'd like to ask you to tell us a bit more about the “tooth” side of the future, which we hope will continue to benefit from an effective and streamlined “tail”. Part of it is obviously in leadership. Some of it's in the net workforce of the future, on which a lot of work has been done, but some of it relates to the basics: firepower; mobility; intelligence, which is more complex than ever; and the partnerships

we have, not just with a huge number of allies now, but with non-NATO countries with which we operate.

Tell us a bit about—after your first month—what that front-line capacity of an improved fighting force looks like for the Canadian Forces in the years to come.

Gen Thomas Lawson: Mr. Chair, it's a great observation that having been in combat, arguably for over a decade, there is now an entire generation of junior and senior officers, and young and more senior non-commissioned officers, who have learned all kinds of things that would have taken us double the time to learn in training back in Canada. What I speak about is the interoperational capability with our key allies and more. When I speak about that, I speak about not only our procedures and processes in the field, but also about equipment working together as we go on joint operations together. We've also learned how to operate jointly. The air war going on over top of the ground war in Afghanistan, the air war going on over top of the naval efforts in the Mediterranean during the Libyan conflict—all of these things provide us with an opportunity to experiment with the leading edge of the fabric that holds us together, those things that bring us together that we can then bring into our doctrine.

It's very important, as we come out of these lessons—and as we all learn at staff college, not to fight the last war—to take the lessons out of the war you've just had that can be generalized to other combat and be prepared for what you may find in the future. I think we have an opportunity now, for however long we're out of combat, to really bring back our army, navy, and air force and have joint exercises. We have a wonderful joint exercise coming up in May called JOINTEX—which I'd love to take the credit for, but it was well under way before I came in as CDS—which will bring the army, navy, and the air force together with their three major exercises and the Canadian division over top with some of this connective tissue. When I say “connective tissue”, I refer to some of the things you've spoken about: unmanned aerial vehicles, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities that we were just starting on 10 years ago and now are fundamental to our success and going ahead.

I think that really is a very heartening thing. We have this new generation who have been energized by having practised their craft under the toughest of conditions. We come back, and for a period, at least, we'll be able to really transform that into the doctrine that drives not only our three environments, but also the joint interoperational abilities of those three environments together.

• (1600)

Mr. Chris Alexander: Thanks, General. Thank you for that insightful answer. It really digs into the fourth point you covered in your opening remarks, the preparation we need to continue with our forces for the missions of the future. Our committee will be reporting soon on the whole concept of readiness, an elusive concept but an absolutely important and fundamental one.

Tell us a bit about numbers. Our government has gone to great lengths to protect the size of our force in spite of the budgetary pressures we're under and our intention to balance the budget. Does the number of our forces reflect our needs in the current global climate? Does the breakdown of personnel in each of the elements adequately reflect the uses to which our navy, army, and air force are being put and are likely to be put?

Gen Thomas Lawson: Mr. Chair, in my 30-some years in uniform, I've seen the numbers as high as 80,000 people and as low as the low 50,000s. We are now at 68,000 in the regular force; 27,000 balanced across full-time and part-time reserves; and about 25,000 in the public service as a defence team. You're asking me, someone who's been in for 35 years and seeing what has been provided to us as core missions, this question, and I think what we have coming out of Afghanistan, coming out of Libya, is a very nice balance.

The tasking in the Canada First defence strategy is to have a balanced, multi-role, combat-ready force. With 68,000 and 27,000 in reserves, I believe we can do that. It's nicely balanced against the three forces. The army remains the largest, the air force is next, and the navy is next. There will be some balance in that, but I think largely we have not only the personnel, but the equipment for the personnel and the infrastructure for the personnel we need.

You speak to readiness. It's always a balance between those four things. Once you have the personnel, the equipment, and the infrastructure, what you do with it provides the readiness. I know the honourable members around this table have been looking at that very carefully. That's probably the most complicated of those four columns. In terms of personnel, I'm quite pleased with the numbers we're at right now.

If I could add just one little more piece to that, one of the most heartening things about being at 68,000 now.... As we came up from the mid-50,000s to 68,000, that was a tremendous bite to swallow. We were taking in upwards of 7,000 to 8,000 a year, which had our schools full and our training lists full. Now, last year, we brought in about 4,000. That's all we needed to maintain because our retention rate is so high in the Canadian armed forces. That's allowed our schools to empty out and our training lists to come down. Our trained effective strength is quite impressive.

The Chair: Mr. McKay, you have the last of the seven minutes.

Hon. John McKay (Scarborough—Guildwood, Lib.): Thank you, Chair.

Thank you, General Lawson, and may I add my congratulations to your appointment. It was a very impressive ceremony at your installation and it was a privilege to be there.

Rightly or wrongly, you're associated with the F-35 acquisition. As you can probably appreciate more than most, that's been a controversial procurement.

It appears, from what the Minister of Public Works is now saying, that all options are on the table. I'm assuming your contribution, the military's contribution, to "all options on the table" will be a restatement, if you will, of the statement of requirements.

• (1605)

Gen Thomas Lawson: The process that's under way does not require a restatement of the statement of requirements. The statement of requirements is done independently, based on a close study by the air force of future battlefields they may have to work over and the issue of sovereignty back here in Canada—defence of the continent. That's what the statement of requirements is based on.

Hon. John McKay: Will the minister be working with the same statement of requirements?

Gen Thomas Lawson: The secretariat requires from the armed forces a clear statement of requirements and advice on any options they bring forward. That's our entire role.

Hon. John McKay: Will that statement of requirements be the one that's already in existence?

Gen Thomas Lawson: That statement of requirements has not been asked to be reformatted.

Hon. John McKay: So there's been no change in the statement of requirements, at this stage, that you've been asked for.

Gen Thomas Lawson: That's right.

Hon. John McKay: If there's no change in the statement of requirements, how are all options still on the table?

Gen Thomas Lawson: The statement of requirements, as you know, Mr. McKay, is based on looking at the equipment we have, looking forward to how it may be used in the future, and looking at what threats that equipment will face. That statement of requirements is written in such a way that it's blind of whatever is out there, except in terms of technology that may be available.

Hon. John McKay: Will stealth still be a priority in the statement of requirements?

Gen Thomas Lawson: That statement of requirements does raise stealth as a priority.

Hon. John McKay: So stealth is still a requirement; it's not an option.

Gen Thomas Lawson: The statement of requirements has different weighting given to different portions. When things are listed in there as requirements, they are graded. In other words, when a statement of requirement goes forward to meet what's available to fill that requirement, there are only very few that require absolute, to the letter, meeting of that requirement. Stealth is one of those that's preferable.

Hon. John McKay: You know there are some who say that the statement of requirements is wired to one option and one option only.

Am I to assume, from what you've just said, that the statement of requirements is to continue as the statement of requirements and there are no changes to the statement of requirements?

Gen Thomas Lawson: As a bit of an answer to Mr. Harris's question, I am removed from the air force in this respect, so I will have to confirm that there has been no change to requirements. I know of no ask for that change of requirements, but I can assure that as any statement of requirements is written for any fleet of equipment to replace what we have, it's never written, I think you used the phrase, wired to a given solution, nor was this statement of requirements written to—

Hon. John McKay: I'm using the language of others who have read the statement of requirements.

I find it difficult to reconcile what you're saying with what the minister has been saying in the House. Ordinary people, myself included, would have thought that when all options are on the table, all options are on the table. In order for all options to be on the table, stealth would have to be one of the options on the table.

Am I incorrect in that assumption?

Gen Thomas Lawson: I think what we may not recognize is that all fighter aircraft come with some radar cross-section. All of them of later technology reduce that cross-section, as does our CF-18 right now.

•(1610)

Hon. John McKay: The big sales point with the F-35 is its stealth. It is superior to all other aircraft in its stealth, and it has been sold as such.

Does that mean, therefore, in your mind, that the Super Hornet is on the table as one of the options? Does that mean that the Eurofighter is on the table as one of the options?

Gen Thomas Lawson: I'm not part of the negotiations or the process that Public Works is going through, so I'm not sure which options come forward, but I can say that each of those aircraft that you're listing has an element of stealth capability. I would agree with you as well, with my background as a pilot and as an admiring engineer of any type of advanced technology, that the F-35, like the F-22, which of course isn't for sale, provides a level of stealth that those other aircraft you've talked about have not provided. However, there are countries around the world flying the aircraft you've mentioned to great success these days.

Hon. John McKay: I appreciate that as an engineer and a pilot you do appreciate it. I am having, however, some difficulties reconciling the minister's statements in the House, which I took to mean—and I thought pretty well everyone else took to mean—that when all options are on the table, all options are on the table, and that meant that even options that have less stealth capability than the F-35 would be on the table.

Can you confirm with me that at this point you've never been asked—in your capacity as CDS, but also in your capacity as a person intimately involved with the F-35 statement of requirements in the first instance—to change that statement of requirements?

Gen Thomas Lawson: I can confirm for you, Mr. McKay, that I am of the same opinion you are, that all options are on the table.

The Chair: Your time has expired.

We're going to go to a five-minute round, General, and we're going to lead off with Ms. Gallant.

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

As NATO membership is growing and evolving in terms of states with varying military capabilities and backgrounds, how do you expect Canada's relationship with our NATO allies and other non-NATO partners to evolve?

Gen Thomas Lawson: I believe our relationship with NATO remains extremely strong. We're the sixth largest contributor to NATO. The deputy commander of Joint Task Force Naples is Lieutenant-General Marquis Hainse, who replaced Lieutenant-General Charlie Bouchard, who, of course, led the combat mission over Libya. We have Vice-Admiral Bob Davidson at headquarters in Brussels, and quite a selection of talented officers and non-commissioned officers over in Brussels helping with that as well.

That will continue to be the way ahead for us with like-minded nations over there. As we have spoken a little bit earlier, we've worked to be interoperable with all of the equipment they use as well.

There are all kinds of tremendous projects under way with NATO to transform—in much the same way we're working on it—their operations toward smart defence. There's a reliance and an interdependence between members, which will allow certain members to decrease capabilities in a certain area. It's called smart defence. They're also working very hard on decreasing the overhead, much as the Canadian armed forces are doing.

NATO provides us an opportunity, as the third mission given to us in the Canada First defence strategy, to project Canadian leadership as we've been so successful in doing through NATO in Afghanistan, with many deputy commanders and commanders in combat over there.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: As a former deputy commander of NORAD, how would you like the relationship between Canada and the U.S., under the umbrella of NORAD, to progress?

Gen Thomas Lawson: It's a unique relationship in that it's a binational relationship, and as far as I know, it's the only binational military relationship in the world. It encourages the decrease of considerations toward sovereignty to allow for greater interoperations for the defence of the continent.

It has grown stronger over the years, and will continue to do so, because of our excellent operations and relationship with the United States, but also because of the fact that we've been battle buddies in Afghanistan for many years. All of that comes back to great fellow feelings and a great future for NORAD.

We should recognize that together with NORAD, USNORTHCOM—the same commander for NORAD is the commander for USNORTHCOM—is working very closely with Canadian Joint Operations Command on cooperation in the Arctic and cooperation in defence of the continent. So I think these things are well positioned to become stronger.

•(1615)

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Since 2006, NORAD has expanded its region to include maritime surveillance. Could you explain to the committee what exactly this expansion entails in terms of Canadian security?

Gen Thomas Lawson: Yes. It's not so much maritime surveillance. That remains extant with the navies and the coast guards of both nations, right down to constabulary elements at various ports up and down the coasts.

The part that's been federally mandated for NORAD is the role of maritime warning. That has been one that NORAD has had for about six years, and it's had to grow into this new set of shoes because it's one that was carried out by others before.

What is now quite successfully being done at NORAD...they have a common operating picture that's fed by some of these agencies I spoke to, which gives NORAD the ability to assess the entire picture, with intelligence coming from the FBI, the CIA, the RCMP, CSIS, and others, and then bring that warning to the decision-makers of both nations. There has been a very successful acceptance of a role. NORAD was ready to accept it immediately, but I think it was based on the acceptance by others to provide NORAD the tools to carry out that role.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: How do you plan to put your personal stamp on the Canadian Forces while you're Chief of the Defence Staff?

Gen Thomas Lawson: Now that we've come out of Afghanistan, for as long as we are not being used in a combat role—and we will be ready if the government needs us in any way to defend Canadian interests—we have an opportunity to focus on some of the other things that are deeply entrenched in the Canada First defence strategy: to look more closely at the Arctic; to open up a port at Nanisivik; to open up our Arctic training centre in Resolute Bay; to work on unmanned aerial vehicles; to work on intelligence surveillance and reconnaissance; and, as we spoke of before, to bring that into the regular operations of the army, navy, and air force to focus on joint capabilities.

[Translation]

The Chair: Ms. Moore, you have the floor.

Ms. Christine Moore (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, NDP): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Recruiting centres were recently closed in certain parts of northern Quebec and Ontario, including Rouyn-Noranda, Thunder Bay, North Bay and Sault Ste. Marie. There were closures in other areas up north, as well, Yellowknife being one. That leaves a void as far as recruiting goes. The presence of the Canadian Forces, especially reservists, in these areas is becoming more and more flimsy. For instance, the Combat Engineer Regiment in Rouyn-Noranda was merged with Montreal's. And as a detachment, the regiment is losing autonomy.

These areas often act as intermediaries in terms of access to Canada's Arctic. As everyone knows, the Arctic is increasingly important to Canada's resource and land agenda, as well as its ambitions. The Canadian Forces are ensuring that Canada has a larger and larger military presence in the Arctic.

How do you anticipate keeping the military community alive in those intermediary regions of northern Quebec and Ontario?

How will you manage that, in light of the cuts? How will you maintain ties with the community, while keeping these regiments alive?

What role do you foresee the Canadian Forces playing in the Arctic over the next few years? What are your plans as far as personnel and available funding are concerned?

Gen Thomas Lawson: Thank you for your question.

● (1620)

[English]

You make a very important point. We need to continue to connect with Canadians, even if that presence becomes difficult for us as budgetary pressures or any sort of pressures, personnel pressures, come to us. You speak of northern Ontario and northern Quebec, but it's an even larger issue. We are seeking to increase from several thousand rangers up to 5,000 rangers. We need 4,000 to 5,000 people for the Canadian armed forces, and we broadly seek that they would be representative of all of our regions and all of our heritage backgrounds.

In fact, the news is quite good. As a result of putting much greater focus on online capability for recruiting, we're finding that the majority of those who are interested in joining the Canadian armed forces are getting most of their information much more comprehensively online, and receiving responses to it very quickly. So for those 4,500 positions that we're trying to fill, that we will be filling this year, we're finding approximately eight candidates for every position.

We have to be very careful, because that's indicative right now of an economy and a combat awareness of the Canadian armed forces that we may not have in years to come. In other words, never take your recruiting base for granted. That said, we are extremely well positioned for filling our strategic intake this year and for years to come, and we're finding that online resource is helping us greatly to get to those areas that we were unable to get to even when we had small recruiting elements in some of these northern towns that you talked about—both in Ontario and in Quebec, but also across the nation.

[Translation]

Ms. Christine Moore: Do you conduct regular assessments to ensure a region doesn't slip through the cracks, so to speak? How will you make sure you don't end up in a situation where, four or five years down the line, it turns out that process didn't work and some region lost personnel, say reservists?

[English]

Gen Thomas Lawson: We do track where our recruits come from provincially, and we do find imbalances, which is probably reasonable, based on the economies in certain provinces when economies in other provinces are hurting or ailing, and we find that to be very cyclical whenever that cycle changes.

But I think by and large, as long as we are successful in meeting a mandate that has a fairly good split between our linguistic numbers, that satisfies us. We've been able to do that across both the officer corps and the non-commissioned members, so we're quite pleased with the balance we've found in that respect.

[Translation]

The Chair: Thank you, Ms. Moore. Your time is up.

[English]

Mr. Strahl, you're on deck.

Mr. Mark Strahl (Chilliwack—Fraser Canyon, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

My congratulations, General, on your new role.

We've been hearing testimony throughout the last number of months about the fact that we don't have to necessarily prepare for the war we just fought, but look to new threats on the horizon. One of the things that keeps coming up is cyberspace security, cyber threats.

What are your plans to help address this? Is this a focus as you move forward? Do you agree that this is an area that we need to do more to prepare for?

Gen Thomas Lawson: Indeed, cyber threats have the attention of the Canadian armed forces. In the larger sense, of course, it falls under Public Safety, but we are partners in this as we address it. Much of what we call our weapons system is based on an infrastructure of information technology, and what we're finding is that if not increasingly vulnerable, it's certainly under increasing attack from external agents and parties.

It does have our attention. However, I think all of our allies are coming to a realization that we're behind the game and we need to catch up. Two years ago, the Canadian armed forces opened up a new position called the director general of cyber operations, and Brigadier-General Greg Loos is holding down that role now. He is in constant and very constructive talks with General Alexander, who leads cyber command in the States. From my experience at NORAD, it was my sense that they were probably five or six years ahead of us on this.

Everyone is trying to get a grip on just exactly what the threats are and what our laws allow us to do. You will be aware that there is a cyber policy now in place that will help guide the way ahead, not only for Public Safety and all departments, but for the Department of National Defence as well. I think we can be heartened by the fact that our most secure systems have been well protected against cyber attack.

However, no system is perfectly defended against all attacks, and those attacks can be either cyber or even the man in the loop—the person in the loop. All of that speaks to cyber security, and this is something we're becoming more and more seized of, along with our like-minded allies.

• (1625)

Mr. Mark Strahl: Thank you.

General, I'm sure you know you have big shoes to fill from General Walt Natynczyk, and I have to tell you it feels nice to say that to somebody else instead of having it said to me.

I did always appreciate General Natynczyk's personal concern for the mental health of the men and women under his command. We're currently embarking on a study for care of our ill and injured, and I wonder if you could comment on that. Going forward in your role, do you plan to continue the good work that General Natynczyk did in that area?

Gen Thomas Lawson: It's one of my top priorities, and one of the four that I spoke about. Mental health, in particular, is one that we've really made great strides in. Operational stress injuries and the Canadian approach have been recognized by some of our biggest allies. They're coming to us to see how we've done it.

It's not perfect, and we know that. The ombudsman and the Auditor General have provided us with input that shows we have to get better. By and large, the joint personnel support units have stood up across the nation. They provide a one-stop shop, where in the old days you would have to travel to various sites to find support for whatever ailed...or whatever you returned from theatre with in any sort of injury. Now it all comes in the form of one case manager at a joint personnel support unit. These are tremendous steps forward.

I think one of the most heartening things, and one of the things that will remain one of my top priorities, is our ability to decrease the stigma attached to mental health. When our members recognize that early treatment comes without any sort of stigma and leads to early recovery and a return to full combat-ready status, we're finding that the success rates are far greater. We're seeing the return on those investments, and those investments have been considerably more in recent years than we've had in the past.

We hadn't been used to OSIs in the numbers that we're seeing now. Even though we're out of combat now, and have been for a year, we're not finding that OSI numbers, operational stress injury numbers, are coming down yet. This is something we're coming to understand, that these things continue to manifest themselves long after our soldiers, sailors, and airmen and airwomen have returned from the places that have put this stress on them.

The Chair: Thank you. The time has expired.

I just want to say that both of you gentlemen are filling those shoes quite well.

Ms. Leslie, it's your turn.

Ms. Megan Leslie (Halifax, NDP): Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm going to give my time to Mr. Harris.

The Chair: Mr. Harris.

Mr. Jack Harris: Thank you, Chair.

Thank you, Ms. Leslie.

General Lawson, as you said, given its importance to the next generation, I'm going to turn briefly to the F-35. You suggested that the contracts aren't wired because they're done blindly without reference to aircraft, yet our experience with the fixed-wing SAR, of course, was that only one plane met the requirements, and they appeared to have been designed to meet that plane, so we had to go back to the drawing board.

In the case of the F-35, of course, the statement of requirements wasn't written until June of 2010, after several years of discussion, mostly with Lockheed Martin, and one or two meetings with the other competitors. Of course, only one plane met the requirements. They specifically discovered that a particular helmet design that was unique to the F-35 was part of that, so a lot of people are concerned because that took place there too, and the contract was awarded six weeks later.

But if, as you say, all options are truly going to be on the table, then surely the comparisons between what we were told by other manufacturers.... Stealth is important, but it's one of many factors in what's called survivability. As a pilot, you would know that. Speed, interceptor capability, stealth, how low you can fly, manoeuvrability, etc.—for many of these aspects they claim superiority. So if the options are truly going to be on the table, isn't there really a requirement to re-evaluate what your needs are in comparison to what's available today, and also to consider whether or not there could be, for example, a two-fleet option? If they're all going to be on the table, that has to be on the table too. Is that really what's going to happen?

• (1630)

Gen Thomas Lawson: I will have to claim ignorance on exactly what the secretariat is doing with options. What you've just suggested sounds like a very reasonable way forward, but I've heard from the Minister of Public Works in open press that the statement of requirements will be set aside as the secretariat does its work.

At a point in there, of course, the Canadian armed forces will give us advice in the form of a statement of operational requirements and any advice on any options that come forward, and that will be our role.

Mr. Jack Harris: Thank you. I hope you're right. We'll follow that very closely, of course.

I'll move to another area that's of great interest to me, and has been for the last number of years, and that is, as you mentioned, the Arctic. There's a recent paper on search and rescue in the Arctic, and the needs that Canada has and hasn't quite been able to fulfill and the new treaty we've signed with the Arctic Council.

One of the issues I've championed over the last number of years is the notion of response time, how quickly we can get into the air. I know your CF-18s can get into the air in five minutes on high alert. We talked before the meeting about seeing a fighter pilot running for an airplane. That's when they run for an airplane.

We have fixed-wing SAR aircraft and Cormorant helicopters that are supposed to be able to get into the air in half an hour, between 8 and 4, Monday to Friday, and up to two hours after that time. We've had debates about that in this committee.

Something I recently brought to the attention of the House is that Sweden just entered into a new contract with AgustaWestland, I think it was, the manufacturer of the Cormorants, for a different type of plane. Their country, which is one-twentieth the size of ours, with a population of about one-fifth, has five primary SAR locations. They have helicopters as well as fixed-wing aircraft. They have 15 minutes wheels-up 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. I feel we're behind the international standards.

Other countries, like the U.S. and Australia, have 30 minutes 24/7. Is that something you think needs to be evaluated, or do you think we're okay on that? I know you're an air force man, so you have some knowledge of this. We do have to get better in the Arctic. It takes four hours to get a Cormorant from Gander to Inuvik. These are long times for search and rescue missions that save lives.

The Chair: Mr. Harris, your time has expired.

Again, General, I ask if you could be as concise as possible in your response.

Gen Thomas Lawson: I will. I do thank the member for the question.

It's a very important point, and yes, the Canadian armed forces continually takes a look at all of the problems—the weather, the equipment we have, the number of crews we have. I will say that in comparison to Sweden—I think it was Sweden you mentioned—there are two things. One is that our geographical problem stands as a completely different problem from theirs, for the very reason you talked about. Ours is 18 million square miles, and theirs is one very small fraction of that. So we head out on operations knowing that those operations could be as long as 12 or 14 hours, and we need to equip ourselves with aircraft and capabilities that will meet that requirement.

But I will also say that I was the head of delegation during the negotiations of the Arctic SAR treaty that you spoke to, and what was very interesting is that of the eight nations that signed that treaty, Canada provides a gold standard for response into the Arctic that almost no other nation there even attempts. I didn't know that until I showed up and saw it. It spoke to the desire of other nations to team with Canada for the very reason that they believe there's a higher probability that Canada will get up to save one of their members somewhere around the Arctic circle than they may be able to do themselves. It speaks to the friendship and partnership in that treaty.

• (1635)

The Chair: Mr. Chisu, you have the floor.

Mr. Corneliu Chisu (Pickering—Scarborough East, CPC): Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, General, for appearing in front of our committee. I congratulate you for your excellent military career and your recent appointment.

You have combined very successfully two illustrious professions—the profession of arms and the profession of engineering—in the service of the country, and I am very pleased about this situation. I am sure that as CDS you will make good use of engineering principles in your important function.

Along this line, I have the following questions. As a former commander of the RMC, what do you think is the most important factor in a military education, and what is the best way to ensure that military education translates into effective and efficient officers in the future?

Gen Thomas Lawson: In full disclosure, I have to say that the only true engineering I've done, even though I have an electrical engineering masters degree, is to teach it as a professor at RMC—and to finish the electric wiring in my basement, which just about outpaced my capabilities.

Voices: Oh, oh!

Gen Thomas Lawson: I will say, on the question regarding education and the most important factor, I truly have come to believe, even as an engineer, that it's a balance. I think that's why the Royal Military College and the Collège militaire royal de Saint-Jean have been so successful in graduating leaders who then become very distinguished in their careers, because it's a very balanced education that has you thinking not only of the stiff rigours of the mathematics of engineering, but also about the more abstract thought that can lead you out of the box to solutions that might not otherwise have been evident on your calculator.

I think both of those things come together, so I would say probably it's balance.

Mr. Cornéliu Chisu: General, as Canada has a long and varied history in terms of how we engage in global affairs, do you think there are any areas of military engagement, whether it be via peacekeeping or perhaps in concert with our allies, where the Canadian Forces might not be able to partake in the mission?

Gen Thomas Lawson: If I understand the question correctly, you're asking if there are certain missions that may be out there that Canada may not have readiness capabilities for.

What is really quite impressive about Canadian capabilities is that even though we have been down to numbers as low as the mid 50,000s in decades recently, we've maintained a hand in just about every capability. We were out of submarines for a while, although we have them. We were almost out of tanks, although we have them, and we were out of Chinook heavy-lift helicopters, but we're back in that as well. Arguably, in just about any capability that is honed by our like-minded allies, we have a play in that still.

What is very heartening is that even as our supply line comes down somewhat, the order to me and to the Department of National Defence is to maintain all of those capabilities, so the message here is that the government and successive governments have purchased for themselves a balanced, multi-purpose, multi-role, and a combat-ready force that could provide, especially to an alliance, a very real capability almost anywhere, in any area in which one could be required.

• (1640)

The Chair: You have one minute.

Mr. Cornéliu Chisu: On the same issue, General, I'm raising this question about education. I'm going back a little bit on the education at the Royal Military College and the education of engineers. I was in an engineering unit. I have seen that we encountered difficulties in overseas operations, both in peacekeeping and in combat operations, with engineering skills, for example, construction engineering skills. As you know, the British forces are allowing engineers to have a practice of engineering before they go back on the construction engineering field.

How do you think these things can be mitigated in our forces?

Gen Thomas Lawson: Mr. Chisu, I know you were an engineer over in Afghanistan, and I thank you very much for your years of service, both in the forces and over there.

I think in a really strong economy, engineers are often a hot commodity, and we put quite a few through the Royal Military College of Canada, which allows us a very robust construction

engineering and combat engineering capability, of which you were part. That remains sound, although it may not be the case with some of our allies and partners, and that speaks to the strength of a partnership where Canada can come in with capabilities that are well honed by our training and background and not so well honed within other forces.

The Chair: Thank you.

[Translation]

We move to Mr. Brahmi. You have five minutes.

Mr. Tarik Brahmi (Saint-Jean, NDP): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

General, after Mr. Chisu, I'm afraid you're going to have to spend the next five minutes talking to an electrical engineer, as well.

I want to congratulate you on your appointment, as well as your attendance at the 60th anniversary celebration of the Royal Military College in Saint-Jean, a few weeks ago.

I had the opportunity to attend the event. Whenever I talk to former or current RMC students, they always tell me that French is in a constant state of decline among the student body.

They also talk about the recruitment of French speakers. RMC Saint-Jean is having more and more trouble finding students to fill francophone spots. I don't think that is due to an unwillingness to accept francophone students, but rather a lack of them.

You were head of the Royal Military College in Kingston. Over the years, have you observed a lack of interest in a military career among francophone students? As you carry out your new duties, what efforts will you make to reverse that trend?

[English]

Gen Thomas Lawson: Thank you for the question. Merci beaucoup.

I think you speak to the importance of Collège militaire royal in the training of our young officers, not only the francophones who come into the Collège militaire royal, but also the anglophones who go to the Collège militaire royal for a period, learn French, and then bring those capabilities back to the Royal Military College.

I look around me. When I was the assistant chief of the air staff, my boss was Lieutenant-General André Deschamps, from a small town in Quebec. He and I had flown 104s 30 years prior. The new chief of the air staff is Lieutenant-General Yvan Blondin. He and I flew F-18s for a long time. When I left NORAD, the general who took over from me was Lieutenant-General Alain Parent, from a small town in Quebec. I think we've done very well in making sure that we're very balanced across the upper ranks.

I think you speak to the importance as well of maintaining a standard at our military colleges that enhances that very balance we've been able to achieve. One of the heartening things from the Royal Military College that I can bring to the table is that fewer than 3% of the cadets who graduate from there graduate without being functionally bilingual, and many are beyond that level. That's a very good indicator and a very good start on a balance that is so important, as you mentioned.

• (1645)

[Translation]

Mr. Tarik Brahma: When I visit the Royal Military College, as I often do, I talk to officer cadets, who tell me that even students with high test scores aren't all fluent in French. The marks aren't indicative of their actual ability to work in French. So you're contradicting what officer cadets are telling me when I meet them.

Gen Thomas Lawson: I hope not.

[English]

I understand that the levels set by the public service are standard across the military and the public service. Certainly those who achieve them I think achieve them with full faith in the fact that they've met a standard that's been very rigorous. The hundreds of hours that anglophones have put in on French training at the Royal Military College and that francophones put in on English training go into achieving those levels.

In terms of anecdotes that suggest that once having achieved those levels, those levels are somehow tainted by a lack of quality...I haven't heard about this and am not sure where to go with that. I know that standardization for colonels and generals is at a higher level, a university level, CBC, I think we call it in the public service. That comes with a level of quality that, until now, I thought was unquestioned.

The Chair: Thank you. Time has expired.

Mr. Norlock, you have the floor.

Mr. Rick Norlock (Northumberland—Quinte West, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

To the witness, thank you for appearing today. It's good to rekindle old relationships. It's good to know that someone, the top person, is very familiar with Canada's pivotal air base, that being CFB Trenton 8 Wing. It gives me some confidence that if I find a letter going your way, you'll know what I'm talking about.

General, as you know, National Defence is working towards the acquisition of new equipment—and I say “the acquisition”, but I think we've taken delivery of almost 70% or 75% of the new J model Hercules. We have taken delivery, I believe, of some Chinooks, Cyclone helicopters, and tactical armoured patrol vehicles. Vessels built under the national shipbuilding procurement strategy are on the way. With these new capabilities, what do you think the impact will be on our Canadian armed forces? Do you think that with this new equipment Canada's role on the global stage will change?

Gen Thomas Lawson: Mr. Chair, I'll answer the last part of the question first.

I don't think Canada's role on the international stage will change; I think it will be fortified.

We have been successfully employing old fleets to great effect. You speak of the Cyclone coming in, Mr. Norlock. They're working on a couple that are on the ground right now. They aren't being flown operationally yet, but they're on the way. As we're waiting for them to arrive, the tremendous work that continues to be carried out by the very aged Sea King is very impressive. Our Sea Kings are really in quite good shape. They're being held together in many cases with a lot of work behind each hour, that's for sure, but they work. They are supplying what the ships need when they go out. The F-18 is aging as well. It provided tremendous service over Libya, and it provides tremendous service in the protection of the sovereignty of Canada.

I think Canada has developed a reputation that says we will use our equipment. We will maintain our equipment very well, it will be interoperational, and we will be able to use it to great effect. But it becomes easier when we retire fleets that have been retired. Our old E models that you and I got to know so well in Trenton are now replaced by the J models. Some H models are still there, working quite well. These allow us to maintain that capability much better.

Some are coming online. You spoke to the Chinooks, the first of which will arrive this summer. That will refurbish a capability that we once had and leased from the Americans with the D-model Chinooks for the last part of our time with the air wing in Afghanistan. We will now have that as part of our fabric and have that for Canadian emergencies, for continental emergencies, and for expeditionary requirements as the government requires.

I don't think our role will change. I think it will be enhanced, because we will probably be able to get out the door with more, and more quickly.

• (1650)

Mr. Rick Norlock: Great, and I couldn't agree with you more.

I have another question on a different plane altogether.

I understand that negotiations are ongoing regarding the settlement of the class action suit under the Canadian Forces Service Income Security Insurance Plan, commonly called SISIP. Could you explain to the committee how these changes will impact current and former members?

Gen Thomas Lawson: I am peripherally aware of the work going on with that class action suit, and I will get back to this committee with what details we can, but I am not able to speak with any level of detail on the effects that will have going forward. I'm sorry.

Mr. Rick Norlock: I know it's a question that has come up here.

In a similar vein, in the caring...you had two priorities. I think we discussed the preparation with the new equipment. Going further with Mr. Strahl's question, I've seen the new medical facility for CF families right across from the runway in Trenton. I wonder if you could talk more about the military's investment in medical health professionals. I know we've heard from the chief of medical personnel clinicians, as well as many others. I wonder if you can expand further on how you plan to continue the level of care that you believe is required to support our brave men and women in uniform.

Gen Thomas Lawson: We now have infrastructure in place—and you spoke to a little bit of it there at 8 Wing—at many wings across the country, small clinics that meet family requirements. As you know, with families moving so frequently, it's tough to get on a list long enough to actually get a family doctor, and these small clinics that you speak to address that by drawing on some of the capacity of the local community, as is the case in Trenton, bringing them in, and then looking after the clientele at the base first. That's a great step forward for families.

You also speak to military family resource centres, which provide such great services to those whose members are deployed, and provide help to the families in a way that we weren't really into 10, 15 years ago.

On health care in particular, we're now up to 36 clinics across the Canadian armed forces, 26 mental health clinics, and 24 of these joint personnel support units. As the ombudsman has said, "It's great that you've done it. You're undermanned at some of those clinics, which makes it very difficult, then, to meet the standards that you're seeking to meet." That's our next challenge. All of Canada is short in some areas, and we experience the same thing.

We work very hard on that. It's a very heartening story. Now that we've got the story out there, we need to make sure we continue to work on decreasing the stigma related to operational stress injuries. That will be part of my narration as I visit wings and bases across the country.

Mr. Rick Norlock: Thank you.

The Chair: Mr. Komarnicki, you have the floor.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki (Souris—Moose Mountain, CPC): I have just a couple of questions.

As you know, the economic climate is such that the government has taken a number of steps to ensure that the federal budget is balanced. I wonder if you could touch on some efficiencies that you see the Canadian armed forces being able to make in order to help meet that goal.

• (1655)

Gen Thomas Lawson: The defence renewal team, which holds so much promise for us, will be working on new ways of streamlining our defence processes. I speak hesitatingly about that because it's a new business for us; however, we know that it holds potential for high profit. This week alone, the deputy minister and I, together with the vice-chief of the defence staff and the co-leader of our defence renewal team, were in Toronto speaking with some of the leading businessmen in Canada who have gone through these very difficult transformations that relied on business process renewal. We're ripe for that, and I'll speak a little bit. As I was the wing commander in Trenton, for instance, I worked in a silo. I owned not only where the

rubber met the road on base for our Hercs and our search and rescue aircraft and our C-17s, but I also negotiated with the shop stewards. I was well trained for the first, not so well trained for the second, and had to learn very quickly.

There are a lot of other things in taking care of a base—and we have 27 of these bases and stations across the country—that we believe we can probably do better. Rather than being in a silo, we can do it across our 27 bases and stations. That's only one of the business processes that we think show room for great profit in streamlining the process. There are others. The infrastructure and engineering processes and real property processes are ripe for renewal of these business processes.

I think that's where we're going to find the next tranche of efficiencies so that we can reinvest back into "tooth".

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: Having said that, and we're sort of focused on that on the other side of the equation, are there specific types of equipment upgrade that you foresee the forces requiring going forward?

Gen Thomas Lawson: Yes, there are. The chief of force development is a two-star admiral named Rear-Admiral Ron Lloyd. He has a team that continually develops recommendations for the armed forces after studying future, potential battlefields and arenas that we may fight in. They have 18 they work through right now. They base their observations on the conflicts that we've recently come out of. They make an assessment of new technology in defence business, and they continually upgrade recommendations. We assess this from the Capability Development Board. We then go over to our chief of programs, Major-General Ian Poulter, who then says, "Yes, but we now have a line under which we need to live." That's a yin and yang that every Chief of Defence Staff has worked with from time immemorial—with growing budgets and decreasing budgets.

The area that will show greatest profit as we move ahead with interoperability is this connective tissue we talk about: intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance. That could come in the form of satellites, unmanned aerial vehicles, downlinks and data links, and things that allow us a better idea of the approaches inside our own nation and on the continent when we deploy the battlefield around us. We're very excited about the potential of that area for great advances in the coming years.

Mr. Ed Komarnicki: Thank you.

I'll turn it over to Mr. Alexander.

Mr. Chris Alexander: Two hundred years ago, there was the War of 1812. We're celebrating it today. Thank God we haven't had to defend our own border since then. In 1912, no one knew that Vimy Ridge was ahead. Now there's that painting behind you. Today there are lots of conflicts in the world and potential pressures. But we know our European allies have taken €50 billion out of their defence budgets in the last five years. This is a concern within NATO. The U. S., under any scenario, will be making rather dramatic defence cuts, we think. We increased but are now reducing, to some extent, to balance our budget. Does that concern you? What new pressures do you think there might be on Canada in the years ahead as a result of that rebalancing of effort within NATO?

• (1700)

Gen Thomas Lawson: It will always concern military leaders when budgets are decreasing, especially in the face of a seemingly more hostile and uncertain world. But as you point out, Canada is not in a unique space. All of our allies are in a similar space. We have grown in the last six years from about \$14 billion to about \$21 billion. Some of that, as has been pointed out, has come with new fleets. Therefore, you really can't return to the old budget, because your new fleets come with an added budget for operations and management. But there's a heartening message that others in similar territory don't have. As you're well aware, the British forces have undergone a very significant cut that ate into their capabilities. Recently, they stood down their long-range patrol aircraft. In fact, during the war over Libya, Canada was asked to provide our Aurora aircraft to make up for some of the capabilities that had been given away by others.

Yes, I'm very concerned about a decreasing budget, as we may well be called upon as part of an alliance. However, I am heartened by the way I've been given the order to do it, and that is through efficiencies. They will be hard to find, but we will find them. I'm becoming more and more certain of the areas in which we will find them as we go forward.

The Chair: Thank you.

We have finished our second round. We're going to go to our third round, where each party is given another five minutes.

Mr. Harris.

Mr. Jack Harris: Thank you.

General, you mentioned O and M in your last statement. There's a need for support and readiness associated with that. The Union of National Defence Employees have complained that the military has been contracting out work that used to be done by these employees, resulting in significantly greater expense. I just read a report complaining that O and M may be suffering at Defence and that this could affect readiness.

Isn't that counterproductive? Is that something you're prepared to look into, to see that we're not spending more money contracting out work that could be done cheaper by existing employees?

Gen Thomas Lawson: Thank you for the question.

I'm not aware of the reports that have said that the contracts we've taken on have been more expensive than would otherwise have been if we had remained with our former capability.

Mr. Jack Harris: I'll get you a copy of that.

Gen Thomas Lawson: Thank you.

But I certainly do believe that as we trim contracts in the way forward as part of our debt reduction action plan, we will need to look at all options for maintaining that portion of the capability if that needs to be maintained.

If it can be shown to have been "tail", then wonderful, we've stepped forward and become more efficient. But there are very few things that have been contracted or brought on that were entirely "tail", so we can become more efficient. For example, we contracted out our pilot training about 10 to 15 years ago. That contract will be coming to an end in 2020. We will be looking at all options that are available as we go ahead on that one as well.

Mr. Jack Harris: Thank you, General.

You mentioned that the well-being of the Canadian Forces is very important. The Canadian Forces Grievance Board is one method of settling disputes and improving morale, in fact. But we came across a problem when the committee was studying this a couple of years ago, in that you, sir, as the Chief of the Defence Staff, are the final authority for the settlement of grievances; yet you're not given the authority to even tell a person that a claim for an allowance of \$500 shall be paid to him. You don't have the financial authority at all. Do you see that as a problem? Will you be seeking to change that?

• (1705)

Gen Thomas Lawson: In that area, I work within the policies that have been developed for me to work within.

Mr. Jack Harris: Let me tell you, sir, that that's regarded as a very significant problem. I'll give you one example.

The home equity allowance program is for someone who is forced to move as a result of being given a different assignment and loses equity in their home because there's been a depression in the market. They can lose \$60,000, \$70,000, \$80,000 from the purchase and sale of the home. They aren't able to get...even though the policy is supposed to be there to get up to \$15,000 if there's a small change in the market, and if there's up to a 20% change in the market, it's 100%...

Yet I'm told that of the 150 people who applied for this in the last five years, not one of them have been approved, although the former CDS supported them receiving what's supposed to be paid in the policy.

This seems to me to be a problem. Would you be prepared to look into that and see whether something can be done about it?

Gen Thomas Lawson: You're speaking, of course, of *ex gratia* payments—

Mr. Jack Harris: No, this is a policy, a benefit that's supposed to be available to soldiers who are moved from one location to another. They are forced to sell their family home in a market and move to another location. The home equity loss is supposed to be covered by the military because the military made them move and the market has gone down.

We've seen a significant change in housing markets across the country of late. I'm told that virtually nobody is getting 100% of their losses because Treasury Board or somebody else has decided that there are no depressed markets in Canada, even though it can be demonstrated.

I'm saying that we have a situation where, even though the CDS agrees with the results of a grievance on these matters, no result comes forward because that's handled by somebody else.

Obviously, you don't know the details, but would you be prepared to look into that and see whether something can be done about it?

Gen Thomas Lawson: I'm well aware of the home equity policy, but I'm not aware of the numbers you spoke of. However, I am aware of grievances that have come up to me. In fact, what you speak to is the ability then of the CDS to provide an *ex gratia* payment in response to a grievance that he agrees with.

That is limited, and that's why I return to my first statement that it's something that has been looked at by my predecessor. It was questioned and we were told to live within the authorities given.

The Chair: Your time has expired.

Mr. McKay.

Hon. John McKay: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I've had some time to think about your response. Frankly, you caught me by surprise by saying that the Minister of Public Works hasn't actually asked you for a restatement of the statement of requirements; therefore, for the foreseeable future, decisions will be made upon the current statement of requirements.

What's confusing me about this current and possibly future statement of requirements is the status of stealth in that statement of requirements. Is it a high-level mandatory...? Is it a *sine qua non* of the next generation fighter?

Gen Thomas Lawson: Stealth, in itself, speaks to a quality, so to write in that stealth is a requirement cannot stand alone. What requirement can be written in is some level of stealth, and therefore it cannot be written in that the plane must be stealthy.

Hon. John McKay: Is there only one airplane that can meet the standard of stealth that's set out in the statement of requirements?

Gen Thomas Lawson: No.

Hon. John McKay: There is more than one airplane that could meet that—

Gen Thomas Lawson: All aircraft, even fourth generation, provide a level of stealth.

Hon. John McKay: Okay, thank you. That's helpful.

The other question that keeps coming up, particularly with respect to the F-35, is the military profile of Canada as a nation, and particularly as it relates to stealth. The question becomes why Canada needs stealth, because we generally don't lead missions. Even in Libya, we didn't lead the mission. It's usually the Americans or the British who lead the mission, so one can see the argument for the U.S. needing stealth, and possibly Great Britain, but for Canada and our military profile, why has stealth become such an important element?

• (1710)

Gen Thomas Lawson: First I'd just like to correct the impression that Canadians don't lead missions. In fact, in the figures of 10 years earlier, in Kosovo, Canadians were leading 20% to 25% of the missions, and I think it would be near the same...but I will get that for the committee. Canadians were leading missions over Libya.

Hon. John McKay: You and I may have a different idea of leading a mission, because I'm thinking of first in. Am I incorrect about that?

Gen Thomas Lawson: We have the same idea of a mission, and of course the leadership went all the way up to the—

Mr. Chris Alexander: On a point of order, Charles Bouchard was the commander of the mission. That counts as a leader.

Hon. John McKay: Well, that's really helpful.

The Chair: That's not a point of order.

Hon. John McKay: Why do you allow this stuff?

The Chair: General, if you wish, continue on, please.

Gen Thomas Lawson: Thank you very much.

The question is the importance of stealth going forward, and I think it really speaks to what the Canadian armed forces assesses as potential threats that we will face. When you look at that set of scenarios, those who would stand as being the greatest probability of... If not our peer competitors, then our suppliers of competitors are developing a level of stealth aircraft that would put our aircraft at an entire disadvantage if they had not some level of stealth.

Hon. John McKay: Interestingly enough, anti-stealth capability is possibly developing as quickly as stealth capability, so the question then becomes what you give up in order to be able to have that stealth capability.

Gen Thomas Lawson: That's a great question, and actually, we should probably simplify the idea of stealth. All stealth is, truly, is a set of technology steps that decrease the amount of energy that hits the aircraft and returns to a receiver. That's all it is, and there is a lot of technology in that, but when we speak in terms of anti-stealth, all we're talking about now is developing a radar with either different frequencies or more power in order to see through that.

An aircraft with stealth—that is stealthy—will be more difficult to see, no matter what radar is developed, no matter what power is put into that radar or whatever capabilities. So it will be the case that a stealth aircraft, whichever new fighter aircraft is selected for Canada, will provide a level of stealth beyond what the CF-18 has right now and will be harder to see than the CF-18 right now. But you make a very good point, and that is that in 10 years you will be able to see it at a greater distance, but far outside when you would have seen a less stealthy aircraft.

Hon. John McKay: My final question has to do with your budgetary pressures. You rightly say the Prime Minister is asking for less “tail” for less money. I have two questions out of that.

One, what will be your “less money”?

Two, some of the procurements that you are now receiving are very expensive platforms to operate. What will be the potential of any new or current platforms to be parked and not operated?

The Chair: General, the time has expired, so again, could you be very concise in your response?

Gen Thomas Lawson: The moneys that have been assigned to strategic review and to the debt reduction action plan are the cuts to the budget that add up to \$2.5 billion going forward. The indications from the government to me now are to work within that plan and find efficiencies to reinvest.

It is my opening plan, a month in, to hold onto the capabilities we have and to introduce those capabilities that have been endorsed within the Canada First defence strategy and to maintain the operation costs of those fleets under that supply line.

• (1715)

The Chair: Mr. Strahl, you have the floor for the last question.

Mr. Mark Strahl: In response to Mr. McKay's questions, do you think Canadian pilots should have the same level of protection and survivability as U.S. and U.K. pilots? They seem to insinuate—

Gen Thomas Lawson: Yes, I believe that should be the case.

Mr. Mark Strahl: It would seem to be common sense that we would all agree on that, but apparently not.

I want to talk as well about smart defence a little more. I know you touched on it earlier in relation to NATO. What do you think that means in the Canadian context? I know in some smaller countries they talk about combining capabilities. Some have suggested that perhaps Canada doesn't need to maintain the full range of capability that we currently have. So what do you think smart defence means for the Canadian Forces?

Gen Thomas Lawson: Mr. Chair, it's a very interesting discussion. NATO is moving towards the smart defence that Canada is very interested in—simply because of the name, if nothing else. But it is difficult in our situation to determine how we can work smart defence into our capabilities when everybody lives so far from us, except our number one ally to the south. I think that speaks to the reason that successive governments in the last 50, 60, 70 years have sought to maintain Canadian capability in just about every area that there can be capability, because there's an awareness that Canada needs to maintain some capability to defend itself across the entire spectrum.

But the smart defence that we speak about here could be used by our number one NATO ally, and that's the United States. There might be some room for discussion in coming months and years. And our American friends aren't yet aware that we're positing this, but there might be some use for the smart defence concept with American allies in future years.

Mr. Mark Strahl: Thank you.

The Chair: You're going to pass it on to Mr. Chisu?

You have three minutes.

Mr. Corneliu Chisu: As you're aware, the economic climate is such that National Defence, like other ministries, must examine ways to be more efficient in order to do its part to balance the federal budget. How is this influencing the military infrastructure, such as bases, armouries, ranges, which are the easiest way, usually, to chop costs, and then we regret this in the long term?

Gen Thomas Lawson: You may be aware that the Department of National Defence is one of the largest landlords in the country. With our 21,000 buildings and property, it adds up to a couple of times the size of P.E.I. The point you make is that many of those buildings are of great use to us and have been under-maintained as a result of moneys being funnelled off by the army, navy, or air force to other requirements.

There is a need to rationalize our buildings so that we can focus more clearly on those that are absolutely required for our future. We think this is another area for profitable return of tail to tooth, figuring out just exactly which ones can be taken off the books and making sure we don't do it wrong and require them later on. But you're probably aware that it's a very complicated thing. Some of those buildings are armouries, which are now heritage buildings. Some of them are very expensive to maintain. All of them come with a payment in lieu of taxes, which are very important to the local economy. So all of that's going to have to work into this very clear rationalization of our twenty-some-thousand buildings.

Mr. Corneliu Chisu: Thank you very much, General.

The Chair: You have a minute left, if you want it.

Mr. Corneliu Chisu: Thank you.

Going back to our NATO allies, I would like to ask you how we can get more command positioning in the NATO structure. Are you envisioning anything coming up in which a Canadian will lead a significant NATO command or have a significant NATO command role?

• (1720)

Gen Thomas Lawson: Thank you for the question.

You will have seen in the past in NATO operations that Canadians have been very highly placed. Some people call it punching above our weight. We spoke of Lieutenant-General Bouchard, but there have been many of our generals before him in Afghanistan who have been given, for instance, the troops of allies to command, which is the greatest faith a nation can show in the leadership of another nation.

You ask how we can go ahead with that without investing in it. This speaks to one of the tremendous training vehicles we have coming up in the coming year. It's called JOINTEX. Right now in Kingston there is phase 4A of JOINTEX, which is a week-long professional development course with 150 of our youngest and brightest majors, right up through one-star and two-star generals, who we're bringing all of our lessons back to so they'll be better prepared to take on these leadership roles.

One of their mentors, one of the subject-matter experts, is Lieutenant-General Bouchard. We also have Rear-Admiral Roger Girouard, who led a combined navy task force some years back, and we have Brigadier-General Andre Corbould, who recently led in Afghanistan.

We're bringing all of these things back, bringing the training onto home soil, where typically we've learned these things offshore at the facilities of others. We'll continue to do that, but we want to grow this homegrown capability to build our leaders.

Mr. Corneliu Chisu: Thank you.

The Chair: It's not too often we have time left, so as chair I can ask a few questions. I'd like to take that opportunity now, General.

You mentioned earlier coming up with JOINTEX as an operation between the different components of the Canadian Air Force, the navy, and the army, and also using some of the UAVs. Definitely the UAVs have proven themselves in theatre for our army in Afghanistan.

Would you be prepared to discuss some of the other attributes of UAVs in maritime surveillance and Arctic surveillance, and how you see them coming to greater use in the Canadian armed forces?

Gen Thomas Lawson: You're probably aware that we have a UAV capability onboard HMCS *Regina* in the Arabian Sea right now, to great effect. It's a leased capability, as was our capability in Afghanistan. That has proven our ability to work that into operations.

When we look ahead, the Canada First defence strategy lays out a requirement to develop a system of systems for intelligence, surveillance, and recognizance to the approaches of Canada, and a portion of the Arctic as well. That stands ahead as a project we will be very excited about. Whether it's high-altitude, long-endurance aircraft, or medium-altitude, medium-endurance aircraft is to be determined. But these are things that will now fit into a capability we've already developed through a leased solution, both in combat and in Combined Task Force 150 in the Arabian Sea right now.

The Chair: As to future operations using UAVs, how do you see it working in Arctic sovereignty, especially as we see more activity in the Arctic because of a shrinking icecap, and how may that play into greater challenges for the Canadian armed forces to do maritime patrol up there, or even to do air force patrols? How do we incorporate UAV into that strategy?

Gen Thomas Lawson: That will be part of the doctrine we'll have to develop. Of course, running these things in a relatively small theatre, represented by Afghanistan or a portion of the Arabian Sea, within miles of a ship is a much different thing from now running them across 2,000 miles of very harsh area. That is a challenge we're looking forward to having as we develop recommendations for the government on which unmanned aerial vehicles would best meet the requirement.

I think what's also heartening about the Canada First defence strategy is that it foresaw a system of systems, which was probably a little ahead of its time in 2008 when it was published, because that system of systems, although many countries speak of it now, has been slow to develop. As you're aware, we really only have the Aurora long-range patrol aircraft that can get up to the north with presence and remain in an area. What we need, of course, to back up a long-range patrol aircraft, whichever one replaces the Aurora, would have to be a mix of high-altitude/medium-altitude unmanned aerial vehicles.

This also speaks to our developing capabilities in space, with the Canadian Space Agency. That really does provide us with more of a "through the straw" look. If it's queued by the north warning system and radar capability, then you can be looking in an area, have a UAV come over to look more carefully, and then have a response from a queued Aurora, which right now would be queued by nothing except the need to put a patrol aircraft up there at this time.

This system of systems is a very powerful way forward. We're looking forward to the technologies catching up to what we saw or hoped they would be when it was written into the Canada First defence strategy in 2008.

• (1725)

The Chair: General Lawson, you also mentioned the new Chinooks we're going to be receiving shortly. What about some of the other kit we've been talking about? I understand the Leopard 2s are here and the Strathconas have a group. There are some over at Gagetown, I believe. I'm wondering how that's working out. And also maintaining some of the kit we have, the LAV-III upgrades in particular, and whether or not we're on the right timetable to continue with the upgrades....

Gen Thomas Lawson: The equipment that has come back from theatre is tired. We're in the process right now of refurbishing that and bringing that back up.

You speak to the way ahead. The tactical armed patrol vehicle is the way forward for the army. They'll be very much looking forward to receiving those trucks as that procurement system gets back under way. The Leopard 2s are being delivered, and the LAV upgrades program has been very successful.

It also speaks to a refurbishment of capabilities that were well practised and well honed in Afghanistan.

The Chair: Thank you, General. Your comments today and interchanges with our committee members really played into everything we've been doing at this committee.

We are just finishing off the readiness study, and we'll be tabling that report shortly. We are wrapping up our look at NATO and the strategic concept. We are in the middle of the care of the ill and injured study. You've talked to that component as well. You also alluded to some of the work we plan on doing with the defence of North America, NORAD, and to maritime surveillance with the United States.

We appreciate your testimony today. We've also been very impressed with all the members of the Canadian Forces who have testified before committee and have helped us do these studies. We are very impressed today with your testimony as well.

I want to again add my congratulations to your appointment as CDS. We can see there is a great deal of expertise you're bringing to the table and leadership you're going to undertake as commander for all components of the Canadian armed forces.

I want to pass on our best wishes for a merry Christmas and a happy new year. I ask that you share that with all members of the Canadian armed forces, whom we're very proud of and whom we keep in our thoughts and prayers at this time of year.

A point of order, Mr. Harris.

Mr. Jack Harris: On a point of order, Mr. Chair, I didn't want to interrupt the witness, but I just want to put on the record an objection to using points of order to interrupt a witness and actually give evidence. Mr. Alexander did that. I think that's an inappropriate use of the committee's time.

The Chair: You called it a point of order. I called it out of order.

An hon. member: So moved.

Hon. John McKay: It was a point of interruption.

The Chair: It was a point of interruption. Point taken.

With that, can I have a motion to adjourn, please?

The Chair: We're out of here.

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>