



House of Commons
CANADA

Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri- Food

AGRI • NUMBER 001 • 3rd SESSION • 40th PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Wednesday, March 10, 2010

—
Chair

Mr. Larry Miller

Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food

Wednesday, March 10, 2010

• (1530)

[English]

The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Isabelle Duford): Honourable members of the committee, I see a quorum. We can proceed to the election of the chair.

[Translation]

I am now ready to receive motions for the election of the chair.

Mr. Lemieux.

[English]

Mr. Pierre Lemieux (Glengarry—Prescott—Russell, CPC): I nominate Mr. Miller.

The Clerk: It has been moved by Mr. Lemieux that Mr. Miller be elected chair of the committee.

Are there any further motions?

Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

(Motion agreed to)

The Clerk: I declare the motion duly carried and Mr. Miller elected chair of the committee.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

The Clerk: Before inviting Mr. Miller to take the chair, if the committee wishes we will proceed to the election of the vice-chairs.

[Translation]

I am now ready to receive motions for the election of the first vice-chair.

Pursuant to Standing Order 106(2), the first vice-chair must be a member of the official opposition.

Mr. Bellavance.

Mr. André Bellavance (Richmond—Arthabaska, BQ): I nominate Mr. Mark Eyking.

The Clerk: Mr. Bellavance has moved that Mr. Eyking be elected first vice-chair of the committee.

[English]

Are there any further motions?

Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

(Motion agreed to)

[Translation]

The Clerk: I declare the motion carried and Mr. Eyking duly elected first vice-chair of the committee.

[English]

I am now prepared to receive motions for second vice-president.

Madam Bonsant.

[Translation]

Ms. France Bonsant (Compton—Stanstead, BQ): I nominate Mr. Bellavance.

The Clerk: Ms. Bonsant has moved that Mr. Bellavance be elected second vice-chair of the committee.

[English]

Are there any further motions?

Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

(Motion agreed to)

The Clerk: I declare the motion carried and Mr. Bellavance duly elected second vice-chair of the committee.

I now invite Mr. Miller to take the chair.

The Chair (Mr. Larry Miller (Bruce—Grey—Owen Sound, CPC)): Thank you very much, lady and gentlemen.

I have a short statement that I need to read in terms of housekeeping. On Wednesday, March 3, 2010, the House of Commons adopted the following order:

That, for all standing committees, routine motions in effect at the time of prorogation of the previous session be deemed to have been adopted in the current session, provided that committees be empowered to alter or rescind such motions as they deem appropriate.

Accordingly, the routine motions that were in effect at the time of prorogation are reinstated. The clerk will reflect the House order in any minutes of the meeting. The committee can, if it chooses, amend any of these motions.

Finally, for information purposes, the clerk has distributed a copy of the motions to all committee members.

Mr. Lemieux.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Perhaps I could just comment on that.

There was one routine motion that I wanted to bring back in front of committee, and that was my request that the government be allowed to have a government member on the steering committee.

I would re-echo some of the arguments that we had put forward before. In order to preserve the neutrality of the chair, it's very difficult on the steering committee to be both the chair, who is expected to be neutral, and the person who advances the government position. I would also underline that in the steering committee, we as the government, if a government member were allowed to be part of the steering, would still be outvoted three to one by the opposition. So it does not pose any kind of voting threat to the opposition.

Chair, I feel it better preserves your neutrality and allows the government position to be enunciated by a government member as opposed to by the chair.

I would like to put that in front of committee. I'm hoping for their approval on that.

The Chair: Are you just asking for a discussion on that?

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Well, I suppose I could put a motion on that in front of the committee.

The Chair: I just wanted to be clear. I wasn't sure of your intentions.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Okay, then, I'll put a motion on that in front of the committee. It's concerned with the business of the day, so I think we can receive that motion. Would that be correct?

The Chair: I guess the question that the clerk put to me, and something that I was going to bring up, was trying to do a bit of business today; I guess this would come under there.

But I see Mr. Eyking's hand up. Maybe I'll hear what he has to say and we can go from there as to whether the motion is appropriate, I suppose.

• (1535)

Hon. Mark Eyking (Sydney—Victoria, Lib.): Well, I kind of respect Mr. Lemieux's tenacity in bringing this forward again. We have the same number of members here who were here before. I don't think our feelings have changed any on it. The way the steering committee is structured now reflects the House of Commons in the members who are there and the parties that are there, so we're not going to be going for that.

The Chair: Is there any further discussion?

Mr. Bellavance?

André, I should have had this out to all of you. Go ahead, André.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Bellavance: No.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. André Bellavance: For the same reasons that have already been discussed and that come up quite often, I find it inappropriate that the parliamentary secretary be present or that we change the steering committee procedure.

Under former chairs, be they Liberal or Conservative, we always found a way to function... especially since what is discussed is then presented before the main committee. I never felt that the chair had a problem with representing his or her party on the steering committee and serving at the same time as chair of this committee. In my

opinion, this issue is not deserving of further attention and no changes need be made.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you.

Is there any further discussion?

If we are in business of the day, then I guess you still do have the option of carrying forward with that, but I don't see a consensus of support for a motion. It would probably be fruitless, Mr. Lemieux.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Thank you, Chair. You're right. If I were to put forward a motion, it doesn't seem that it would pass. I'm a little disappointed. As I say, it should pose no threat to the opposition members. I would easily be outvoted three to one on any issue. The other thing is that it doesn't have to be me, necessarily; it could be any member.

However, I've heard the will of the opposition members. We're outvoted on this committee, so we'll just leave it be, Chair.

The Chair: Okay. To go back to our agenda....

I'm sorry, Mr. Storseth.

Mr. Brian Storseth (Westlock—St. Paul, CPC): As long as we're still dealing with routine motions and adopting the routine motions that were agreed upon, I would like to put forward a motion that we eliminate working meals for this committee. It's time for restraint. Plus, we are sitting at 3:30, and I don't feel that it's appropriate for us to be asking the clerk to have working meals for us. I see that it is still in the routine motions. I would put forward a motion that we eliminate this part of our routine motions.

The Chair: It's certainly not relevant because of the time of our meetings. I don't mean that your suggestion was irrelevant; it's just that meals aren't going to be here because of the time of our meetings.

The only comment I would make, Mr. Storseth, is that if we ever did have a regular extended meeting, this motion would allow us to have a meal brought in. But at the same time, we could always deal with it at the time.

Mr. Brian Storseth: Nonetheless, I would put the motion forward, because I think that as members of Parliament we can pay our own bills for lunch.

The Chair: Okay. Is it agreed that we remove this?

Wayne.

Hon. Wayne Easter (Malpeque, Lib.): I'm not going to disagree with the motion, but I do want to just put it on the record that there is certainly a double standard coming out of the budget on this matter. Brian is talking about restraint at committee, but there is a double standard because, as I understand it, Privy Council Office expenditures are going to increase by somewhere around 21%.

We're seeing the members' office budgets frozen and we're seeing this request for committees in terms of no meals, but I just think it has to be stated on the record that there is one area where there isn't any restraint being exercised, and that is in the advisory capacity to the Prime Minister's Office. Their expenditures, as was noted today in the House, are expected to go up. We know, and I think all Canadians know, that they are basically the propaganda machine for the Conservative Party.

The Chair: I don't think we'll be hosting any Privy Council meetings here, Mr. Easter.

We'll hear from Alex, and then André.

• (1540)

Mr. Alex Atamanenko (British Columbia Southern Interior, NDP): I have a question. If, for example, we have to sit until 6:30, or we're sitting longer, the provision exists for us to have a bite to eat. If the provision is not there, I don't mind paying for my meal, but do I go and buy a sandwich and come back to the table? I don't understand the mechanics of that.

This has always been there in case we needed it. We certainly haven't abused it. If we take it out, and we have to sit until 6:30 or 7 o'clock, I'm wondering how we can go about getting a bite to eat as we continue to work.

The Chair: In a case like that, a simple motion would deal with it, Alex. You could have it. You would just have to deal with each instance on its own merits or whatever.

Sorry; the clerk had a list here that I wasn't following.

I have Mr. Hoback, and then Mr. Bellavance.

Mr. Randy Hoback (Prince Albert, CPC): Actually, Mr. Chair, I'll wait.

The Chair: Okay.

André.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Bellavance: I would just like to mention to Brian that in French the routine motion reads as follows:

Que le greffier du Comité soit autorisé à prendre les dispositions nécessaires pour organiser des repas de travail pour le Comité et ses sous-comités.

In our case, the clerk is a woman, so *greffier* should be *greffière*. In my opinion, we could leave the wording as it is. Our sitting is scheduled at a time when we clearly do not need a meal. If ever we have meetings... I would even add that we do not need to order meals if we are sitting until 7 p.m. or 7:30 p.m., since we can all have dinner afterwards or later on, if we want.

Leaving everything as it is should not cause a problem. It would only help us ensure, if we ever have longer meetings, that we will have a meal, even though we know that there will be no need for one, given the scheduled committee meeting time.

[*English*]

The Chair: Mr. Storseth.

Mr. Brian Storseth: First of all, I recognize that the working meals for the committee and the subcommittee are to be authorized

when necessary, but it's been the tradition that we've had them at all meetings. I believe it's...

Well, the last session we did, Mark. During the last session, if you recall, we met from nine until eleven, and then we also met from eleven until one. In both cases we had meals. We've had 3:30 to 5:30 meetings where we've had meals.

Rather than the clerk feeling obligated to appease members, I think it should be the status quo that we don't have meals. Then, if we're going to have extended meetings and you want to have meals, so be it. I just think it's a matter of principle.

We should vote on this and get to the matter of agriculture.

Mr. Randy Hoback: Can we call the vote?

The Chair: Yes. That's what I'm going to do.

All in favour of Mr. Storseth's motion?

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: Is there anything further on routine motions?

I was hoping—we may get agreement today, as we're here anyway—to discuss future business and the direction we want to go in. Some things are still outstanding. We still have the competitiveness report to deal with at some point. There was also a commitment to move into the future of agriculture, basically young farmers. I'd like to hear some comments on that.

I have Mr. Hoback, Mr. Atamanenko, then Mr. Easter.

Mr. Randy Hoback: Mr. Chair, there are some good ideas being presented on stuff to look at, but I think it's very important that we come to completion on the report that we've been working on. I recognize the fact that some of the stuff now is starting to get two years old. You wonder if it's still relevant. In the same breath, I think it's very important that we complete that report, get it done, before we even talk about or entertain any other type of business.

The Chair: Thank you.

Alex.

Mr. Alex Atamanenko: I tend to agree with Randy, but there's not a lot of work. We can probably get through it fairly quickly. I'm trying to recall some of the changes we had; I don't think there's many more. We have the report. We have some motions that were on the table. I know I have one, and there were a couple of other ones.

Perhaps we could make a commitment to get through that, to set a time and do it quickly. We've talked, and we have some items for a steering committee agenda. Hopefully you folks have some there. We can then get together and hammer out an agenda for the next couple of months in the steering committee and probably get this work done pretty quickly.

That's just the comment I have.

• (1545)

The Chair: Mr. Easter.

Hon. Wayne Easter: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The reason the competitiveness study isn't done is that Parliament was basically shut down. Also, I don't see this as the defining issue right at the moment that's going to ensure farm survival out there. There are several very, very serious issues on which we need to make recommendations.

I have tabled with the clerk five motions, I believe it is, that need to be considered, but certainly I think one of our first priorities has to be an in-depth look at the hog industry loan loss reserve program and the hog farm transition program. They're not working and the industry is telling us that now.

Just for your reference, to understand how serious this matter is, Mr. Chair, I had a meeting with the Canadian Pork Council the other day, and we're seeing Canadian exports of pork go down. We are seeing Canadian producers go out of business. We're seeing imports of American pork go up.

The last hog plant in Atlantic Canada could shut down on March 31. In P.E.I., compared to five years ago, breeding stock is down 70%. This is how serious it is. All other hogs are down 65%. In Nova Scotia, breeding stock is down 49%, with all other hogs down 91%. I have the numbers here and I'll give people copies. In Ontario, breeding stock is down 21.5% and all others down 24.4%. In Canada as a whole, we're down roughly 22%.

This is extremely serious. We're losing an industry. It's at the point in my area in Atlantic Canada that the Atlantic Grains Council is having meetings to decide what crops they can grow as an alternative to barley, because they have no market for the barley. People are going out of the beef business. They are out of the hog business. They have no market for barley. In P.E.I. alone, there are roughly 15,000 acres of contract potatoes that have been cancelled for next year. Those 15,000 acres of potatoes have no home.

I'm just emphasizing the point that we have a number of serious issues about the immediate survival of some of the farm sectors. I think we need to at least hold some meetings on that as a priority before we get to competitiveness. So I would say, number one, that we need to look at the hog industry and have some witnesses in to see if we can recommend something to the government.

I do think we need to hear.... We've tried since last October to get a motion through this committee on the specified risk material removal. We were filibustered by government members in terms of getting that through. There is some kind of proposal in the budget. We don't know what it is. We know it is not new money. We know it's money, but moved around. There's not a new dime in the budget for primary producers, so we need to look at that issue and how that's going to get out there right away. We have already lost five months from when André first put his motion.

One of the other motions I have here, with which we'll deal at another meeting, is a serious concern to all members in all ridings, I think. It is on AgriStability and how it is functioning or not functioning, especially on CAIS overpayments.

You must be hearing a lot of this, Pierre.

There were overpayments for the CAIS program in 2005 or 2006—in both years, I think.

The Chair: Just for clarification, do you mean overpayments like mistakes, or advance payments?

Hon. Wayne Easter: No, no, overpayments.

I think what happened is the pressure was on for the government to get the money out. The money went out, and I have some people receiving as much as \$23,000 too much.

The problem for us is that it is one thing to deal with Agriculture Canada, but I have one individual who actually sold off everything but his house, and now Revenue Canada is after him on that overpayment and it looks like he's going to have to declare bankruptcy in order to pay it off. This is a guy who produced food for 30 years.

So there are some real serious issues, not necessarily directly related to Agriculture Canada, but the overpayments that were paid become a liability back to Revenue Canada. It's a real problem, and we have to find some solutions. I think there are two or three issues we must deal with forthwith. Key would be the hog industry question first, second the beef SRM question, and then get to some of these others at a later time.

• (1550)

The Chair: Mr. Storseth.

Mr. Brian Storseth: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Easter raises some issues. Obviously we do at some point need to look at cleaning up the screw-ups by the former Liberal government in 2005. It has created a large problem in our area as well.

First of all, we have this report, which, as Mr. Atamanenko said, shouldn't take that much time if we all get down to it and are willing to cooperate a little bit and get this report on competitiveness done, which is very important to the industry. It also lays out one of the ways forward that our committee feels for the future of agriculture and ways out of some of the problems.

I do agree that we should talk about the hog sector and some of the things going on, but I would personally like to see us deal with the SRM issue and the regulatory disparity between Canada and the United States. I think our committee should take some time to lay out what our vision is moving forward on that and how we're going to address that. Obviously I'm sure Mr. Easter is secretly happy that rather than just talking about it we actually put some money out, \$25 million. But now we also have \$40 million that are going to be used for innovation, and I think our committee should have a say in which direction we should be going and what kind of innovation we should be getting into to address the disparity and regulatory burden, particularly when it comes to SRMs.

This is something we can have a positive spin on and maybe have a substantive voice in some current issues moving forward. So I think it is something our committee should look at fairly quickly and fairly expeditiously.

Obviously there are a lot of other issues. We had a major drought out in the prairies, and there are some issues there that we'd like to talk about and I have some motions on. We also have Mr. Shipley's motion on the future of agriculture, which encompasses all of this, which we have also agreed to talk about. I think it's important that we don't just get caught up on issues of the day. I think it's important with some of the ones that we are going to tackle that we look at things where we can put forward our voice and hopefully have some impact on things such as the new SRM regulations that are coming out and some of the regulatory disparity that we're currently seeing and the farmers need us to address.

I would think those would be some of our priorities.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Storseth.

Mr. Bellavance.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Bellavance: Regarding the agenda, we would do well to strike a steering committee as quickly as possible. We could even do that now. We would then have a steering committee for discussing the agenda, which is what we are doing right now. The steering committee should be doing this instead of the main committee.

Regarding some of the subjects that were brought up, I do not completely disagree with anything said, but we have to be realistic. If everything was going well in the agricultural community, we could spend more time on the big issues and draft long reports, but everything is not going well. Contrary to Brian, I am not in favour of discussing only the current situation, since this limits us somewhat. Right now, there are some glaring issues that must be resolved and discussed.

Another problem we are faced with is that of the time we are allowed. Had there been no prorogation, we would have had five months of work on the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Agri-Food. Instead, we only have three months of work. We are sitting until June, and I think that we have a week off during the Easter holidays. That's about it. We will nevertheless have several consecutive weeks to work and focus on current and urgent issues. Those are the issues to which we need to give priority consideration. Obviously, the SRMs and the review of programs are just a few of the topics that we have also discussed. We have had only one one-hour meeting with witnesses speaking on the subject, but it is as though we have had nothing at all. Some investments have been made into agricultural research. Research is an area that is emerging strongly in agriculture. Regarding Farm Credit Canada, all kinds of reports have been published in the media, and we should look into all these issues.

If we were to really look into the report on competition, I am sure that we could spend hours on end discussing the subject. I think that we should not give priority to this report or to the study on young farmers, since, as I have said before, Minister Blackburn went on a tour and took care of this. I would like him to report on his work rather than us going over this matter and re-doing what has already

been done. I believe that there are priorities that we must consider as more urgent than conducting major studies that will take up our time, as our time is limited. The government's decision to prorogue the House really pulled the rug out from under our feet.

• (1555)

[*English*]

The Chair: Just on the topic of the report, I mean, we did that with the idea of a report coming out. I think that in fairness to the witnesses we had and the analysts who have prepared it—and I'm sure it's taking up room in their offices—if you don't want to deal with the report, then let's just have a motion and throw it out altogether or set a reasonable date to deal with it. I think that in fairness we should do that.

Nobody, including me, or specifically not me, is going to dispute a number of the issues that are out there, but that doesn't mean we can't reasonably carry forward for the report. That's just a comment more than anything.

Mr. Lemieux, and then Mr. Atamanenko.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Thank you, Chair.

I'd just like to correct the record on a few points, or at least start with these comments.

Mr. Easter mentioned that we didn't get the report completed because of prorogation, and that's not quite right. In fact the government position was that we should indeed finish the report before breaking for Christmas. That was our steady position. What the opposition kept doing, Chair, was throwing motions on the table. It was motion after motion after motion, which was actually obstructing our ability to finish the report.

I remember clearly we had one meeting where we went through as many motions as we could to get them off the table so we could move on with the report, and then more motions were thrown on the table. So the prorogation had nothing to do with whether or not this committee was able to complete the report before we rose for Christmas.

The second thing that needs to be stated for the record, Chair, is that Mr. Bellavance and Mr. Easter both said that prorogation has caused a five-month delay, and that is quite an exaggeration. Prorogation was 22 working days, that's it. Here we are, and just to listen to the comments of Mr. Bellavance and Mr. Easter, we're right back in the scenario of where we were before Christmas, which is before we tackle the report there were all of these motions. Mr. Easter has kindly put five motions on the table. Mr. Atamanenko has two motions on the table. If we start dealing with these again before the report, I just think it's not paying tribute to the work we have invested in the report to this date.

I would like to remind my colleagues that we have worked on this report for over a year. We have pulled in witnesses from across the country from all sectors of the agricultural community. I could ask the analysts, but I imagine we have hundreds of pages of testimony, and we have a draft report that has already been prepared and we are part-way through it. I agree with Mr. Atamanenko: I don't believe there's a lot of work left to do on that report. I think we should make that our priority because of the time and the money that has been invested in that report and that study to date. Then we can move on with these other issues Mr. Easter has mentioned, because there are other priorities.

I agree that there are priorities that we need to look at as a committee. But my fear—and it's the same fear that actually came to be realized before Christmas—is that if we keep dealing with motions it will never end. We will never get around to the report, because once we do the motion we have to work on that motion. So we should finish the report. Let's focus on that as a committee. Let's publish the report. We owe that to our farmers. We owe that to the Canadian public. Let's table our report in the House and then move on with other business.

I think if we get that order mixed up, Chair, we're going to run into the same problem we ran into before Christmas, which is time will pass, the report will remain undone, and that's a discredit to the committee, because we have worked quite collaboratively on that report. I actually feel it was a very constructive exercise for the committee and I think there are good recommendations in there for farmers that can be tabled in the House. It would be to our credit to do that sooner rather than later.

• (1600)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Lemieux.

We've had Mr. Easter and Mr. Bellavance speak to prorogation and we've had the rebuttals from Mr. Storseth and Mr. Lemieux. We used to have a reasonably non-partisan committee. Let's try to work towards the issues at hand. I ask everybody that, with your cooperation.

Having said that, Mr. Atamanenko, you are next on the list.

Mr. Alex Atamanenko: I'm only going to mention that word once. There's probably no one who was more opposed to prorogation in this country than me, but that's in the past. I think we have to move forward. That's why we're here. We can discuss the merits or pitfalls of whatever happened.

I don't know if I want to spend an hour and a half today just going around the table bringing our wish list forward. I think we have a mechanism called the steering committee, and we've talked a bit and people have ideas for the steering committee. I think we can come up with a reasonable agenda, which would include the report, motions, and getting at these serious issues if we were to hammer that out.

I would suggest that we get on with that as soon as possible. I don't know how productive it is to sit around here for another hour and a half talking about what's important and what's not important. This should be going to the steering committee and we should be hammering out that agenda so we can get going and get that started as soon as possible. That's my thought on this matter.

The Chair: I have every intention of calling the steering committee at the first available time that works for everybody.

The reason I asked to go into this was to have a general discussion of where we wanted to go. I don't think that's inappropriate. I couldn't go ahead and call a steering meeting prior to the elections, as you know. We're going to do that steering committee very, very quickly. Having a general discussion here today and hearing the input...Wayne mentioned some things, and André did, and I don't think there's anything wrong with that. It gives everybody here that isn't at the steering committee a chance to hear some of that.

Mr. Shipley, and then Mr. Valeriote.

Mr. Bev Shipley (Lambton—Kent—Middlesex, CPC): I won't take long, because I'm going to put a motion forward at the end of it.

Members, I think at some point in time we've got to learn a lesson. The report we have done is a long report, and the report is long because we kept inviting witnesses back in, the same people sometimes, which indicates to them that we don't listen very well or we don't understand. I don't think that's a good indication from this committee.

We've asked organizations and individuals to take time away from their businesses, their farming operations, to come in and sit through the day sometimes while we did this in the midst of when they should have been witnesses. I don't point fingers at anyone; it happened.

I'm saying that we've got a long report. It is a priority.

When I look at the motions that Wayne has in front of us, I don't have an issue with dealing with those motions because some of those are actually in the report. We've just got to get to the report, and that will help us deal with aspects of these motions.

Not all of the witnesses came in front of us asking for money. Actually, many of them asked about what kinds of regulatory changes we could help them with in terms of levelling the playing field so they can be more competitive. I have a motion on that, and I won't deal with it now, but it's basically one of those things. Witnesses sat in front of us and told us to level the field a little bit and help them with regulatory changes.

The disservice to these individuals by not proceeding with what everyone at this table said was a significant and important process, to develop a report so that we could get it done.... These individuals and their organizations took the time to come in and present to us. We at least owe them the opportunity; we at least owe them our responsibility as a committee to deal with it. We can deal with this report in the long term or we can actually sit down and deal with it.

Alex and Malcolm were there. I agree, we can sit down and do it. We're actually going to have to set some politics aside, folks, and just get to it. Quite honestly, I'm not prepared—not because I don't want to deal with the motions; I want to deal with what is the priority, and I think we as a committee have a responsibility to our rate payers across this country and to the organizations that we solicited or who asked to come here.

Mr. Chair, I'm going to put a motion on the floor. That motion is that we would finalize the competitive report before we move ahead on any of the motions, and that you would move, with the steering committee's help, to address that. Honestly, the other part of that, Mr. Chair, will be that if we don't, then I think we should just dispose of it and get rid of it. I think that would be a travesty for the agriculture people and the organizations that took their time, including the young farmers who came in.

I think, folks, we need to sit down, bite the bullet, and do the job that we said we would do when we asked people to come in and they asked us to do it.

I put the motion forward.

•(1605)

The Chair: Would you be so kind as to put a completion date on it?

Mr. Bev Shipley: We've got two meetings a week, so whenever you set up that schedule and the first meeting starts, we would have three meetings to complete it.

The Chair: Okay.

We have a motion on the floor that the report be dealt with, and the report would be complete on Monday, March 22.

The Clerk: So it would be three meetings?

An hon. member: What date in March?

The Chair: It's March 22.

Hon. Mark Eyking: Well, I think there's some middle ground here on this motion.

I want to speak a little bit to your motion. I'm kind of concerned. For one thing, the steering committee is set up to set guidelines. If we start doing stuff here, it kind of throws out the steering committee.

But that being said, I think there are a couple of things. We all want to do the committee report, but I think that with what's transpired here in the last few months and also with what has happened with a lot of farmers, there's a change in the situation. What I would like to see over the next couple of weeks is that we would deal with some of those issues, find out what's happening in the industry, and then say that there are a couple of weeks in April, put a timeline on it for two weeks in April, and do the report. That's what we'd focus on.

So we can get some of this stuff done, get a kind of a sense of what's going on in the industry, and get that done. Then, for two weeks in April, we say we're going to do the report and we get it done, whether we have to do a few evenings or whatever. I think that would be somewhere in the middle. We say we're going to do a report and we're going to have a timeline on it, but we're also going

to address some of these issues up front in most of March. I think that's somewhere in the middle.

But I think we should just give direction to the committee on that. If you're going to have a motion here, I don't know.... If we go to the steering committee and change it, I think it's going to cause a bit of confusion.

•(1610)

The Chair: Mr. Bellavance.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Bellavance: I find that it is rather ironic to have a motion to discuss the agenda when Mr. Lemieux has just said that motions are or were preventing us from doing our work. I would like to remind Mr. Lemieux that motions are usually not a problem. During the previous session of Parliament, Mr. Lemieux's motions were all adopted. All of Pierre's motions were adopted. Therefore, there should not have been endless discussions about this. When the government was not satisfied, as usual—I am referring to my motion on SRMs—there would be a problem, and the government would filibuster. Aside from this, regarding motions, we can usually adopt a half a dozen of them in a few minutes without much difficulty. We are sending a message to the government. I believe that the consequences are not so serious as all that, but it is certainly important for us. For the agricultural community, it is important that we can continue having these motions. Therefore, we will not stop this practice.

There is something else to point out: some people have said that we should not talk about the past. I do not mind saying that we have wasted time. First of all, I never said that we lost five months; I said that we lost two months. I said that we will have three months of work in committee instead of five because of prorogation. I will not hold back from saying this, and nobody else will stop me from saying it because that is what happened. It is a problem for us.

There are priorities that should be discussed by the steering committee before we move motions here for managing the agenda and before presenting our report on which we will spend much time before we deal with certain current priorities, priorities that agricultural producers are asking us to deal with and on which we could not focus because we were not sitting. Now that we are back at work, we have priorities and we need to go over this report. We should reserve some time on the agenda for the report, but there is no reason why we cannot do that in May or June, or at some other time. Why start with this item? We know that each page of the report may have us arguing for hours on end, wasting time in the process, not discussing the issues and saying no to moving motions during the discussion of the report. In my opinion, this is out of the question. The agenda should be discussed by the steering committee. We should set aside some time for the report, but we have priorities that must be discussed before we get to the report.

[*English*]

The Chair: Does anybody else want to speak to the motion?

Mr. Valeriote.

Mr. Francis Valeriote (Guelph, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

First of all, I want to commend you on your comments about the urgency of being less partisan in this committee, reflecting on those times when we were less partisan and more work got done. I would encourage all of us, at all times—and that's everyone, from every party—to resist preceding any comment with “well, you know, the Conservatives did this” or “the Liberals did that”. That's for all of us.

The Chair: Wouldn't that be nice?

Mr. Francis Valeriote: It would be lovely.

We all know it comes from all of us, including me. Frankly, I would hope that the chair at some point might even step in and say, “We don't need to hear that, so let's move on to the real business”.

The Chair: But I'm being partisan if I do that—

Mr. Francis Valeriote: No, no, because you'll hold us all to that—

The Chair: Well, okay.

Mr. Francis Valeriote: —and I would encourage you to do that, Chair. I'm pleased that you've made those comments.

I also want to say, in response to something that Mr. Storseth said, that frankly I commend.... I resist saying too much about it, because I don't want my words lifted off of the blues and put somewhere else, but I do commend your government for having put \$40 million into technology to deal with SRMs. That was something that was discussed. It was mentioned by Dr. Gord Surgeoner as a wonderful way, over time, to deal with the issue in introducing technology. But we all know that there's more to do.

Having said that, speaking specifically to the motion, I'm of the opinion that I don't want this committee to supercede the jurisdiction of the steering committee and the efforts they undertake. If we start allowing motions to determine what's up next, then we do supercede the jurisdiction of the steering committee, and I just don't want that to become a precedent.

I'm of the belief that there are certain motions that need to be dealt with immediately. Frankly, I'm not certain what's happened to some of those motions. I'm not going to use the P-word. I'm not interested in using it in this committee. But I'm not sure what happened to some of those motions because of it.

I had a motion that I presented on November 27 about transportation out west and the closing of the 53 designated producer car loading sites. I don't know what happens with that.

The Chair: Any motions that were out there are no longer there. You have to re-present them, re-table.

Mr. Francis Valeriote: My point exactly. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

That's one of those important motions—

•(1615)

The Chair: Sorry, I have a point of order here.

Mr. Storseth.

Mr. Brian Storseth: It's just a point of clarification more than anything.

I understand that that's the Marleau and Montpetit definition. Now, I could be corrected on this, but I was of the understanding

from other committees that the House leaders made an agreement to put the motions that were already in place back in the same spot as they were. I could be wrong on that, but that's what I had heard in other committees.

The Chair: It's only routine motions, Mr. Storseth, to my understanding.

Mr. Brian Storseth: Only routine motions?

The clerk is 100% positive that there hasn't been an agreement?

The Clerk: Yes.

Mr. Francis Valeriote: If that's the case and this isn't a routine motion, then I'm hoping that it and the other motions that were important and were brought up before will get back into the same priority they had been given. Nothing has happened that reduces the urgency of those motions. We should have the same order that prevailed before, get those motions dealt with quickly, and then move on to that report. I think that report is important.

I would urge the chair to do one more thing. Maybe I don't understand parliamentary committee protocol enough, but on any board where I was either a chair or a member in the past, before becoming a member of Parliament, the chair had the authority—they used it judiciously, but they had the authority—to say that we're not going to have any more discussion about this.

You needn't fear being accused of being partisan. We know very quickly where a lot of us stand on a lot of issues. We know very quickly. Yet we choose to continue to debate and debate, going on endlessly, wasting a lot of valuable time and a lot of dollars, frankly, at taxpayers' expense.

Having said that, I would ask...and I believe that we can deal with these motions. We can deal with the rest of the committee work, including the completion of that report. I will honour your decision, whatever it might be, when you say, “We've had enough discussion. I'm calling the vote.”

The Chair: I appreciate that, Mr. Valeriote. I do believe that should be up to the chairman's discretion, as long as he isn't deliberately trying to cut someone out. But I will have to have that same support from everybody, not just from you.

There comes a time in a general discussion, I think we all know as adults, when you're just beating a dead horse a second time. But a lot of times, when I have tried to say move on or end discussion, I get reminded by someone around the table that, “Hey, I was on the list. I want to speak.”

So I need to be backed up if you want that. I have no problem doing that. I'll try to be fair on it.

Mr. Francis Valeriote: I'll declare my support right now.

The Chair: Okay.

Mr. Easter, then Mr. Shipley, and hopefully we're going to end the discussion on this motion.

Hon. Wayne Easter: Mr. Chair, I do believe the discussion on the report is going to take longer than the timeframe you've outlined there.

The Chair: I'm sorry, what was that comment?

Hon. Wayne Easter: I said I do believe the discussion on the report is going to take longer than the timeframe you've outlined there.

Listen, when we do the report it needs to be the best work that we can do. I know I have a lot of problems with several of the recommendations. Also, I think there are quite a number of witnesses who are not quoted, and the quotes will have to be inserted. I can tell you right now it's going to take some time.

The Chair: You're saying that the three days allotted for it—

Hon. Wayne Easter: Is probably not enough.

To be honest, I don't mind if we could even take a committee meeting that starts at 3:30, if it were possible. I wouldn't even mind going into the evening to try to get through a fair bit of work, but that's up to the committee to decide.

I do think that before the break week, which starts Easter Monday, we absolutely have to meet on the hog crisis for a couple of meetings. We need to give some direction to the government. We need to hear from the industry where it's at. We're losing farmers every day.

On the SRM issue, which has been on the go a long time, unless somebody can tell us where the government's at.... I do know of two plants that are in trouble over SRM. I don't want to end up meeting some of these people on the Easter break week, wondering why in the hell we're not anywhere on the issue. I really do think it's urgent that we deal with at least those two questions specifically, the SRM removal and the hog industry question, right off the bat so that we can make some recommendations to the minister.

Just a question. Pierre's not here, but maybe somebody.... When do we have to have the estimates dealt with?

• (1620)

The Chair: Do you mean the estimates or the supplementary estimates?

Hon. Wayne Easter: The supplementary estimates. We had to move some....

The Chair: They have to be reported back to the House by March 23.

Hon. Wayne Easter: March 23. So we have to have a meeting in that regard too, because we all have to be able to ask questions to the department, or the minister, or whoever. That's certainly going to take a meeting.

I want to get the competitiveness report done, but I think there are two or three urgent priorities we have to meet on first, and then let's try to get it done.

I'm going to vote against the motion and leave it up to the steering committee to sort out, to put in the days, and maybe make a recommendation that we meet longer.

Mr. Sukh Dhaliwal (Newton—North Delta, Lib.): Is it your motion, Bev?

The Chair: Mr. Shipley.

Mr. Bev Shipley: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I won't take much time.

Let's look at the calendar. I want to try to accommodate the issue that Wayne just brought up in terms of the supplementary estimates—and it will be one meeting. We have a meeting on March 15, a meeting on March 17, and a meeting on March 22. If the supplementary estimates have to be done by March 23, pick one of those meetings. We will work on the report for the other two.

We then have meetings on March 24, 29, and 31 before the break. That gives us three more meetings. Wayne, I'm suggesting that we still take those three meetings. That leaves two meetings, then, to deal with the issues that you want. I don't have an issue with dealing with your motions, but some of those will hopefully get rectified even in our report. That gives us two meetings at the end to deal with the motion. I don't think anybody will be concerned about staying if they can. If we know far enough ahead, there will be consensus to extend the meeting to deal with the report.

All I'm saying is that if we're actually really serious about doing the report, then let's make the accommodations around getting the report done rather than the accommodations around the motions. I believe we can do both of them if we put our minds to it.

March 15 and 17, we'll give you one of those days or March 22 to do the supplementary estimates. We'll come back on March 24, 29, and 31. We can finish the report on, say, March 24, which gives you March 29 and 31, or you can finish the report on March 31 and do your motions on March 24 and 29.

All I'm saying is we have a timeline. We have some time back here. Let's make the best use of it. Let's put our time on the table, get the report done and get to the motions that affect the pork and beef industries. I'm not opposed to that.

That's my motion. I'm going to keep the motion on that it still be three meetings. If we want to extend it, the steering committee can change it. I have a motion on because I think we need to get serious about getting it done.

Mr. Francis Valeriote: May I ask a question?

The Chair: If there's any stomach—that's the word I'll use—for what Bev is posing, I would have asked anyway that if you come up with dates for three meetings, or for whatever, we be committed to that, and that literally they'll be extended for as long as it takes to get this done so as not to jeopardize another date.

Another suggestion I would throw out here is that we not waste our next committee meeting time on a subcommittee, that we use it for business. We'll meet prior to that or something with the subcommittee so it doesn't eat up committee time. I think we could do that.

Frank, you had a question.

Mr. Francis Valeriote: Bev, you were talking about the subcommittee and then you introduced the idea of the time spent on the report and the motions. If the time had to be extended to finish the report, if we needed more time for the report, would it be at the expense of the days delegated for the motions, or would it go over or past on the other end, at the end of those motion days?

•(1625)

Mr. Bev Shipley: I'll leave that for the steering committee to sift through. I'm saying that we have three meetings. You can make those three meetings longer to get through the report, because in the midst of that we have to do the supplementaries for the budget.

Isn't that it?

The Clerk: Yes.

The Chair: We can do it in one day and have a maximum of three meetings—

Mr. Bev Shipley: So we do the maximum of three meetings, which gives you March 15, 17, and 24. We come back for two meetings, then, on the motions. I guess if we get to March 24 and the whole committee says we need more time, then either we extend it at the end of the meeting we're in or we come back at the end, whatever the steering committee decides, after March 31. If we're going to start to put times on it, then I think we also should put on times in terms of dealing with the motions.

I'm just trying to move things ahead. I feel that we have an incredible obligation to the agriculture industry and the people who came in here. If I were sitting out there listening, I'm not so sure I'd be convinced that we're going to take them seriously about the commitment, time, information, and resources they've put forward in terms of giving us information for that report. I think we should deal with it.

The Chair: Mr. Hoback.

Mr. Randy Hoback: Mr. Chair, I'm going to make a suggestion here, because I'm looking at all these things coming forward here and at the timeliness. Wayne has pointed out some very important things. There's some stuff going on that I think needs to be addressed in a timely manner.

I would strongly suggest that we say next week that this report is done. So if that means we sit here Wednesday and Tuesday and then come back Thursday night and stay here till three o'clock in the morning, that's what we do: we hammer it out and we get it done. Then the steering committee can take on its responsibilities and schedule the following meetings accordingly, keeping in mind that we will have estimates coming in, which will take a meeting.

I look at this and say that if we're going to go three meetings or six meetings, we're just going to delay, delay, and delay. I think we need to actually lock the door here and just get it done. I would strongly suggest that we do this next week. Let's get it out of the way and then get into the motions. Then the steering committee can decide which motions and which items we're going to address at that point.

But I think we need to get this report done first and get it out of our hair. If that means we have to be here until two o'clock in the morning on Friday, so be it.

The Chair: That's even tighter than Mr. Shipley's motion.

Is there any commitment to Randy's suggestion about finishing this next week?

Mr. Easter.

Hon. Wayne Easter: Look, I hear what you're saying, but... Bev has said that if you're a producer, someone out there who has made a

presentation on competitiveness, and you're listening, you'd say, "God, won't they get this done?"

But I'll tell you that if you're a hog producer out there right now or like some of these managers of these plants with SRM who just don't know what they're doing.... For some of the guys who called me on hogs, if I call them up and say, "Well, guys, we'll get around in two or three weeks to the hog issue because we're going to deal with the competitiveness report", I'll tell you what they're going to tell me. They're going to tell me, "Competitiveness is going to be no good for me because I'm not going to be in business".

I've outlined the numbers. There are a hell of a lot of people not in business now.

On Bev's proposal, I would agree with it, turned on its head. Let's try to get them all done by the break week, but let's deal with the hog issue first because that's the one we need to have answers on right now. I have no problem with going that way.

The steering committee has heard the discussion. I'm not going to support the motion, but the steering committee has heard the discussion and can make a decision accordingly.

I agree with you, Larry. I think that our first meeting on March 15 should be a full meeting on something, wherever the steering committee goes, so the steering committee should meet today, tomorrow, or Friday.

The Chair: Alex, you're next on the list. Do you need to speak to the motion any more?

Mr. Alex Atamanenko: I guess I'm a little bit confused, but that's nothing new.

We have a motion that says three meetings, and then, Randy, you're suggesting to hammer it out over two meetings. Then we have the....

So I'm not really sure. The motion says three meetings starting next Monday. Is that correct, Bev?

•(1630)

Mr. Bev Shipley: Yes.

Mr. Alex Atamanenko: Maybe we should just put a maximum time for the report and then let the steering committee decide where exactly they want to plug it in. Maybe it should come in the week after next, so we can address at least one issue. There would be a week on the report and then we get on with.... That, to me, seems like a bit of a compromise. We limit the time. We've waited all this time. Another week probably won't hurt. If in fact it appears that we should be discussing the pork industry, let's just do it next week and move on and do the report the week after.

The Chair: I did hear a suggestion from Mr. Easter, or I think it was a commitment, to at least deal with a couple of the items that have been proposed, including the hog industry and including the report, by the Easter break. Of course, we have to remember that we have the supplementary estimates to deal with in there for at least part of one meeting, if not a whole meeting.

Mr. Bev Shipley: Mr. Chair, I'll agree with that, but I want a commitment that we're actually going to put time in and finish the report by the Easter break.

The Chair: I'll keep you here till three in the morning, if that's the way we have to do it.

Can we get a consensus around the table to that kind of a commitment? We'll work out the timing of all of them, but at least we'd have deadlines to deal with some of these. That way we have the flexibility to deal with something like the hog industry early. Do we have that commitment around the table?

André.

[*Translation*]

Mr. André Bellavance: You may decide by majority to proceed with the discussion of the report, but I believe that there are many other priorities we should consider first. As I was saying, I believe that we will be able to find some time on the agenda to complete this report by the end of June. However, I stress that there is not only one priority that must be considered before the report; there are many.

[*English*]

The Chair: I think that's understood, André.

We have to vote on Mr. Shipley's motion. There have been so many suggestions thrown out there.

The consensus out there seems to be on the commitment we just discussed, Mr. Shipley. It would probably be best to have you withdraw that. It looks like your motion, in the manner it is in, is going to be defeated. However, it's still up to you.

Mr. Bev Shipley: My concern, Mr. Chair, is that I started out with a timeline that I think is responsible for committee members. Then I gave and I said, okay, I'll change. Now when I give, it's gone to June.

The Chair: No.

Mr. Bev Shipley: Well, I mean, that's a concern I have. As soon as we give something, all of a sudden we're going to lose, and this report now isn't important enough to do.

Mr. Chair, I'm not going to withdraw the motion. I'm going to put the motion forward because I think we need to be held accountable, to do what we have been commissioned to do.

The Chair: Would you amend your motion to have the report done by Easter?

Mr. Bev Shipley: Yes, and I said I would.

Mr. Randy Hoback: But not Wayne Easter.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Bev Shipley: Let me clarify that, then.

The Chair: So the motion would be amended to be worded that the competitiveness report will be completed by March 31, and the details, which aren't part of the motion but just for the purpose of understanding, the actual timing of the different issues, will be scheduled by the steering committee.

Mr. Francis Valeriote: Provided it's not at the expense of those other motions that need to be heard, leaving you with the discretion to extend the meetings into the evenings so they get done.

The Chair: Oh, absolutely. I can tell you that's going to happen.

In fact, I don't think we should waste any more than the suggested three meetings maximum. If we have to extend the hours, we will do that.

You've heard the friendly amendment. I'm going to call the question on the amended motion.

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: Thank you very much.

With that, unless there's something else...

You have a question, Wayne.

● (1635)

Hon. Wayne Easter: On the supplementary estimates, I know we're only looking at money...

The Chair: It's okay for somebody who's independently wealthy to say.

Hon. Wayne Easter: We're looking at the money in the supplementary estimates. Would CFIA be here as well in terms of the estimates?

The Chair: I don't know. Would they be?

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: If the committee calls them.

Hon. Wayne Easter: Well, no, on the supplementary estimates, who would be expected to be here? Would it be Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada or CFIA? There are some serious questions that have to be raised with CFIA on some of them.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: I'll have to get back to you. I don't know off the top of my head who would be here.

Mr. Randy Hoback: Make the request, Wayne.

Hon. Wayne Easter: We don't have time in our schedule if we have to request them separately.

There are some serious problems with the movement of potatoes.

Mr. Randy Hoback: You're there to talk about the supplementary estimates, not about potato problems.

Hon. Wayne Easter: Yes, but they can come up in that discussion.

Mr. Randy Hoback: Those are two different meetings.

The Chair: Order, please.

Alex is next.

Mr. Alex Atamanenko: Just so I understand, we're trying to get back on track as of next week, so between now and next Monday we need to have a steering committee meeting.

The Chair: There will be a regular business meeting at our scheduled time, starting on Monday. Right now, unless we can make something work tomorrow for a steering committee—I'm not going to be here Friday—my plan is to have a steering committee meeting on Monday before QP. That's my intention at this point, Alex.

Mr. Alex Atamanenko: Then we come here. If the steering committee isn't meeting, do we have something for the agenda for next Monday so we can get going, or are we just going to sit around and talk more about what we have to do? Are we going to get down to business next Monday at this meeting or not? If we are, let's get something going here.

Mr. Pierre Lemieux: Let's do the report.

The Chair: Mr. Shipley.

Mr. Bev Shipley: Mr. Chair, just for clarification, unless the steering committee goes, we have the report we can start Monday.

The Chair: Yes. If the steering committee decides on Monday or whenever it has the meeting, Alex, that it wants to move to other business at the Wednesday meeting, we can do that.

Mr. Alex Atamanenko: So we're going to come here Monday ready to get on the report, then.

The Chair: Yes, basically we would deal with the report on Monday. If you want to deal with another issue on Wednesday, that's totally up to the steering committee. Fair enough? Okay.

There being no other business, I'd entertain a motion to adjourn.

An hon. member: I so move.

The Chair: The meeting is adjourned.

MAIL  POSTE

Canada Post Corporation / Société canadienne des postes

Postage paid

Port payé

Lettermail

Poste-lettre

**1782711
Ottawa**

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

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

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

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

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

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

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

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

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

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

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

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

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

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

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

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