



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

Standing Committee on National Defence

NDDN • NUMBER 032 • 1st SESSION • 42nd PARLIAMENT

EVIDENCE

Thursday, December 1, 2016

—
Chair

Mr. Stephen Fuhr

Standing Committee on National Defence

Thursday, December 1, 2016

• (1200)

[English]

The Chair (Mr. Stephen Fuhr (Kelowna—Lake Country, Lib.)): I would like to welcome everybody here to our defence committee. We are looking at supplementary estimates (B) for fiscal year 2016-17.

I want to thank the Minister of National Defence, the Honourable Harjit Sajjan, for coming today.

There is a whole host of people here to support him. I am not going to run through the lineup, because it's long and we have a limited amount of time, but if you are supporting the minister later on questions, I would ask that you just state your name and what department you are from. That will be helpful for the people who are trying to keep track of what we are doing here.

Minister, thank you for coming. You have the floor.

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan (Minister of National Defence): Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Yes, I have come with a very large team. As you know, National Defence is just a small organization. It's just to make sure that we can answer all of the questions thoroughly.

I am pleased to be here today to discuss the Department of National Defence's supplementary estimates (B).

Around this time last year, I began the job as Minister of National Defence. It has been a privilege every single day to serve in this role.

My mandate letter from the Prime Minister clearly states that a top priority is to ensure that our women and men in uniform have the equipment they need. The work that we ask them to do is difficult. Supporting our service members requires not only investments into the right equipment and infrastructure, but a dedication and commitment to them and their families as well. Family members trust that we are acting in their loved ones' best interests when we make decisions about resources. I take that trust extremely seriously. The costs to fulfill that trust can fluctuate over time, but I assure you that we are always mindful of our responsibilities as stewards of the public purse when we determine, define, and redefine those costs throughout the year, every year.

Today I would like to do two things. First and foremost, I would like to explain the need for additional funding for the Canadian Armed Forces, its members and missions, but I would also like to paint a picture of DND's commitment and dedication to responsible spending.

Today also represents an opportunity for me to demonstrate how DND is advancing the government's commitments. We continue to build on the government's priorities, and we operate within a whole-of-government construct, working side by side with other departments and agencies in an extremely complex budgetary environment.

I would like to specifically highlight how we are addressing the crisis in Iraq and Syria, investing in infrastructure, protecting the environment, and investing in the Royal Canadian Navy. Allow me to begin with the big picture and the Department of National Defence's supplementary estimates (B).

In total, the department has requested new funding of \$257.8 million. Once we account for transfers to other departments, DND's total budgetary authority for the fiscal year becomes \$19.3 billion. As I will explain, the additional funds being requested are primarily investments toward defence infrastructure, environmental remediation, and support for expeditionary operations.

On that note, I will start with the largest of the items, and that is the additional funding needed for Operation Impact. This operation is our military contribution to the international coalition that is fighting Daesh in Iraq and Syria. We refocused and enhanced our contribution to the mission earlier this year in reaction to an evolved situation on the ground. The Canadian Armed Forces continue to conduct air operations using Polaris aerial refuellers and Aurora reconnaissance aircraft. A detachment of up to four Griffon helicopters has been added and is supporting the transportation of personnel and equipment. It has also become increasingly clear that a combination of security, diplomacy, humanitarian assistance, and development is required to counter the threat posed by Daesh. We have placed additional emphasis on advising and assisting Iraqi security forces in their efforts to dismantle and defeat this threat. Additional military resources were also dedicated to supporting the coalition with intelligence and headquarters personnel.

Through the supplementary estimates (B), the Department of National Defence has requested \$147.1 million in additional funding for Operation Impact for 2016-17. This money will be used primarily for regular and reserve force members' salaries and benefits, as well as for vehicles and other equipment that directly supports Canada's success in Operation Impact and our commitment to help the Iraqi security forces defeat Daesh.

Our commitment to the success of our troops on missions abroad is clear, but so is our commitment to our service members as they live, train, and work back here at home.

The second largest category of additional funding we are seeking today is defence infrastructure. DND has the largest and most complex real property portfolio in the federal government. It is responsible for approximately 20,000 buildings and approximately 2.2 million hectares of land, which is roughly four times the size of Prince Edward Island. We are requesting an additional \$36.4 million to help maintain and upgrade federal infrastructure assets. That infrastructure is of critical importance for our women and men in uniform, so we have a great responsibility to maintain and improve it. I can't emphasize enough how investing in infrastructure is an investment in good jobs for civilians in communities across Canada.

The funds requested in this item will be used in several ways. We will finance projects such as defence infrastructure in the north. We will repair airfield hangars, jetties, and other infrastructure at our wings and bases in the rest of Canada.

Eventually though, when real estate is no longer of strategic value, it then needs to be sold or disposed of. For that reason, DND is also seeking to reinvest \$19.5 million from the sales and transfers of defence properties. Strategic real property disposals are another way that DND is supporting the government's commitment to improving military infrastructure across the country.

Building and maintaining infrastructure is important to us for all the reasons I've talked about, but caring for the environment as we do that is equally important. The Government of Canada, including National Defence, is committed to protecting the environment. We always aim to be responsible in the way we assess, manage, and remediate federal contaminated sites.

That is why we have requested \$22.1 million from phase three of the federal contaminated sites action plan. With these funds, we hope to reduce DND's contaminated sites liability and minimize environmental and human health risks. The remediation projects taking place in Esquimalt harbour in British Columbia, and at 5 Wing Goose Bay in Newfoundland, are at the top of the list to receive this funding. The department will continue to address environmental legacy issues and invest heavily in the decontamination of these sites.

I would like to move from land to sea now. We know that the government is committed to strengthening the Royal Canadian Navy. It is no secret that the navy needs an at-sea supply capability as soon as possible. The contract in place to develop an interim solution will fill the gap until the more robust joint support ships enter into service in 2021-22. The interim auxiliary oiler replenishment ship will also provide capabilities such as at-sea oiler replenishment, aviation support, humanitarian assistance, or disaster relief.

DND is requesting an additional \$22 million for pre-delivery service payments related to this contract. This request supports DND's mandate and commitment to working with Public Service and Procurement Canada to strengthen the navy, and it will help grow the economy and create jobs at the same time.

Today's estimates also include additional funding for other lower-cost items. These include the improvement of security for military

operations and personnel, smaller projects on bases and properties, and reinvestments of intellectual property royalties as well.

As I mentioned earlier, the overall estimates also include transfers to and from other government organizations. The most significant transfer is \$5.9 million to the Communications Security Establishment for their support to military operations, all of which again directly support the priorities of both the Government of Canada and the Canadian Armed Forces.

In closing, Mr. Chair, I hope I have painted a picture of our commitment, a commitment to Canadians, a commitment to responsible spending, and a commitment to the women and men of the Canadian Armed Forces. Our support for them is always unwavering. Thank you for taking the time to speak with us today about the additional funds we need to support them in the work they do.

I will now gladly take your questions.

● (1205)

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Minister.

Simply to aid in how to set the tone here, the minister has another commitment following this meeting. Sir, I'd like you to stay as long as you possibly can, but to get through this, we're going to need an hour through the formal questions. I'd like everyone to get a turn. If anyone can hear this, please wrap it up in 10 seconds, and that includes the people answering the question. This will enable us to get on to the next question, and then everyone will get a chance. Please keep your comments, as best as you can, focused on what we are talking about here, which is supplementary estimates (B) for 2016-17.

Having said that, Mr. Spengemann, you have the floor.

Mr. Sven Spengemann (Mississauga—Lakeshore, Lib.): Good morning, Minister Sajjan. It's nice to have you here. I'd like to thank you and your assembled team for your important work and your service to our nation.

I would like to start by asking about Operation Impact, our effort in Iraq and Syria. It's a topic of great interest to me. I've spent a significant amount of time on the ground in Iraq. More importantly, it's a topic of interest to all members of this committee and increasingly to residents of our constituencies. In Mississauga—Lakeshore, my riding, people ask me quite regularly for updates on the effort that our women and men are engaged in on the ground.

I must say that I'm quite proud of the work that Canada is doing to help Iraq and Syria find their way forward, and equally important, to help those people who are displaced by this prolonged conflict. There's an overall commitment of \$375 million, and that includes the Global Affairs component, and our component for DND is just over \$140 million.

I'm wondering, Minister, if you could start by giving us an update on how things are going at the moment on the ground in Iraq and Syria, how Operation Impact is unfolding.

I have a few more specific questions after that as well.

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: Absolutely. Thank you for the question.

When we looked at the situation in Iraq before deciding on what type of capabilities and assets to put in, we took a very thorough approach, not towards the fight at that time, but towards what it was going to look like in the coming year, which is now. The direct request was on intelligence assets and trainers, not just any type of trainers but people specific to the ethnic breakdown and complexity of Iraq.

First of all, the intelligence components we put in weren't just about doubling the capacity. It was about putting in the right type of intelligence and getting a fusion centre in place that's going to allow for the intel to be put into proper packages that go through a very rigorous process. That process has gone extremely well and has allowed the coalition commander a much-needed intelligence capability for decision-making and targeting.

The other aspect is the training. It is critical that the right type of groups are trained at the right time. As the other cities were being taken earlier in the year, there was a lot of work we needed to do with our allies in training for the north. You can see the fruits of that labour now. As we're now about to liberate Mosul, having those right groups was critical in making sure that no additional tensions were created.

That leads me to the ministerial liaison team. That whole-of-government approach that we were trying to take is having a tremendous impact. The ministerial liaison team is led by a Canadian general. Working directly with Iraq's ministries of defence and interior has allowed for the sequencing and some of the situation awareness to go very well. Keep in mind, a military solution is just one aspect of things and a lot of other work has gone on behind the scenes. The political situation is equally important. The work that my colleagues have done not just in Iraq itself, but in the region has had an impact. Now we need to work very hard to make sure we achieve not just the liberation of Mosul, but also the political aspect of stability.

• (1210)

Mr. Sven Spengemann: Minister, it's fair to say and from your comments that as the scenario evolves the relationships on the ground, be they military, political, or within the broader civil society in Iraq and Syria, are absolutely critical and we're deeply engaged in building those relationships.

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: Absolutely, and that is essential for anything that we do around the world. Building those relationships and having the ability to have a much deeper understanding is allowing us to have the success in the north we see today.

Mr. Sven Spengemann: Minister, I'd like to ask you a question about our air assets involved in Operation Impact, particularly the Griffon helicopters and also the Auroras. Can you make some comments on that?

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: When we put the Griffon helicopters in, we wanted to make sure our troops had all the necessary resources. The movement of personnel and equipment is essential. It saves a considerable amount of time and, from a force protection aspect, it is absolutely critical that our troops don't have to use the road that often. Even though there haven't been many significant IED threats, we don't want to be taking any risks with that, and we're just making sure that our troops have the resources.

Our air assets, like the Aurora, have been doing great work from day one. Actually, I want to highlight the air refueller. We have received significant kudos because of the reliability of our air refueller. When it comes to very important missions, I was told that they usually come to Canada because of the reliability of our air refuellers.

Mr. Sven Spengemann: Minister, on a different track, how important is the role 2 hospital in our efforts in Operation Impact?

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: When we looked at the situation, as I had my regular counter-ISIL meetings with the key contributing nations, 13 of us, we always assessed the situation and made adjustments. There was a direct need to put in some medical personnel, and that's the reason we took this role on. We have tremendous ability for it and having a role 2 capability with our personnel for a certain time has eased the burden on the coalition.

Mr. Sven Spengemann: On the force protection side, I note there's a \$6-million request for funding specifically for the area of force protection, and there's also an effort to work with NATO on counter-IED measures. To what extent are those funds going to be applied to Operation Impact and that effort with NATO to reduce the potential harm from IEDs?

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: When it comes to missions, all of those assessments are always done way in advance and making sure we have all the right tools. Regardless of where we go, those threat assessments are done, but I can have the vice-admiral talk to the direct aspects of those things.

VAdm Mark Norman (Vice Chief of the Defence Staff, Department of National Defence): I apologize to you. I'm unable to answer the specifics of where that money is going to be spent in the context of the mission, but I will take that on notice and get you an answer as soon as I can.

Mr. Sven Spengemann: It's fair to say then that force protection is definitely an aspect of Operation Impact.

•(1215)

Vadm Mark Norman: Absolutely. What specifically that line item is being allocated to, I can't say, but unquestionably, as the minister has indicated, everything we do has a robust force protection element to it. That is at the individual level and also at the operational level in how we ensure that the components that are there can look after each other.

Mr. Sven Spengemann: Thank you.

Mr. Chair, I think that's—

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: I'll talk about the security pieces.

The Chair: Minister, we're going to have to move on to Mr. Bezan for the next question.

Mr. Bezan, you have the floor.

Mr. James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): Thank you, Minister and officials, for joining us today.

The first question I want to ask relates to Operation Impact. I sent you a letter, Minister Sajjan, on November 10, about some of our troops that are based in the air task force in Kuwait. We have 300-plus troops there, and 15 of them are at a U.S. air base, Camp Arifjan. They are not getting the same danger pay or income tax considerations as the rest of our troops in Kuwait.

Are you committed to fixing this inequity and making sure that they get the same pay and benefits as all of our other troops who are in Operation Impact?

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: Absolutely. There were even some additional challenges when I first came in and then when I first visited. We were able to address some of the direct things that were under my authority and also with getting the support of the Minister of Finance. For the specific ones that you're talking about, there is some work that the military has to do with Treasury Board as well, but we are working through the complexities based on how this is done to make sure there is more equity for our troops when it comes to deployments.

Mr. James Bezan: I'll look forward to having that rectified.

In your opening remarks, you make the commitment to responsible spending, and in the supplementary estimates there is \$3 million going to the defence procurement strategy. Is that money being used for the replacement of the CF-18 fleet, and is the sole sourcing of the Super Hornets responsible spending?

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: I'll take the latter portion of the question on the Super Hornets first, and then have the deputy minister answer the more detailed questions.

I can assure you that we looked at all aspects of the fighter replacement. We looked at what we needed to do, where the risks were, what the timelines looked like, and how transition was going to go for the personnel. We are committed to replacing the entire fleet with an open competition, and that's going to be starting once the defence policy is released early next year.

We are committed to investing in the current fleet to make sure that we have the right capability, but I don't want to take any chances or risk of not meeting our commitments, and the capability gap that we have talked about extensively is real. This is going to cost more,

and to me the investment into the air force on the interim 18 Super Hornets, which the Minister of Public Services and Procurement will start discussions with Boeing on, is absolutely essential to making sure that we have all the right tools for our Canadian Armed Forces.

The DM can answer the other question.

Mr. James Bezan: I only have so much time. On the Super Hornets, how much are they going to cost?

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: The costing of it will only be determined once the discussion has started. It's too premature to be able to give you an exact number just yet. Based on the work that we have done, we have a rough idea, but we want to make sure the negotiations can happen properly so that we can get the best deal for Canada, get the best equipment, and get the right benefits for us, as well.

Mr. James Bezan: Isn't it like writing a blank cheque to Boeing when you're starting the negotiations without even knowing the price?

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: No, we want to have proper negotiations and be the best stewards of that purse and get the best deal for Canada.

Mr. James Bezan: We know Kuwait is paying \$335 million a piece for their fighter jets, the Super Hornets they just bought. Are you expecting them to be in the same ballpark?

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: Each aircraft and how you get it is very different. You can't just look at one aircraft. Each nation has its own abilities and requirements. We have our own requirements. Once those discussions have gone through and we have the costing, we will make sure that it is properly shown to you, to Parliament, and to Canadians, as well.

Mr. James Bezan: As you're aware, Lieutenant-General Hood, commander of the Royal Canadian Air Force, was before us at committee earlier this week. He made a comment that he hasn't been privy to any of the discussions on the replacement of the CF-18s or of the policy change on the number of planes needed for NATO and NORAD missions. Why have General Hood and the leadership of the RCAF been pushed—

•(1220)

The Chair: There's a point of order on the floor.

Mr. Gerretsen.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Mr. Chair, I think that the questions today should be related directly to the supplementary estimates. I would ask you to rule that's the case and ask the member to—

Mr. James Bezan: On a point of order—

The Chair: On that, initially when you linked the question back, you were heading on the right track, and then we just kept going down that road.

Mr. James Bezan: But we're down that path, and the minister has been answering the questions.

The Chair: My opinion on this is that, initially, we were. Because of the way you worded the question, you were okay. Now we've just driven into the—

Mr. James Bezan: So, let me reword the question.

The Chair: I'm going to sustain the point of order, and I'd ask you, Mr. Bezan, to get back onto supplementary estimates (B), please.

Mr. James Bezan: Mr. Chair, before you start the clock again, the minister and I were having a conversation on the Super Hornets, a conversation that started off about responsible spending. I'm still on the issue of responsible spending, which he mentioned in his opening comments.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

Mr. James Bezan: I'm on—

The Chair: You're debating—

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: I have a point of order.

Mr. James Bezan: I'm getting back to the point of order. Page 10

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: You can challenge the ruling of the chair, but you can't debate it. So if you want to challenge his ruling, challenge it. Otherwise, let's move on.

The Chair: There's been a ruling.

James, you have the floor.

Mr. James Bezan: Start the clock. I'll just remind the committee that you don't have power to censor.

The Chair: You have two minutes and 15 seconds, Mr. Bezan.

Mr. James Bezan: Okay, let's go on.

On the issue of responsible spending, there is this whole issue surrounding how much more you need, so I'd like you to talk about the infrastructure of air bases and military bases across the country. Is there going to be a change in infrastructure made to support the Super Hornet fleet and to operate this interim fleet, which is a mixed fleet now because of purchasing 18 Super Hornets?

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: The infrastructure investment is necessary to improve all aspects as we move forward with the Canadian Armed Forces. This is an investment regardless. When it comes to the aircraft, regardless of what aircraft is selected for the permanent fleet replacement, we'll require some infrastructure investment moving forward, so that will be taken into account.

Mr. James Bezan: Because of that—making the Super Hornet sole-source, which breaks the promise for an open and fair competition—you're now essentially biasing and prejudicing the next selection. Because of the infrastructure needs for the Super Hornets, it's going to be the Super Hornet that's chosen in the next round.

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: No, it's not going to pre-judge that decision. The open competition is going to be just that: a proper competition at the end of it. We've been part of a joint strike fighter program for a very long time, and the same argument could be made there. What we have committed to is a proper open competition that

we are not going to be cutting corners on to make sure that the right aircraft is selected. However, the interim fleet that we are purchasing is absolutely necessary to fill the gap and make sure that we have the right—

Mr. James Bezan: The final question I wish to ask is related to the replacement program for the CF-18s and to all the staff who are tied to that program who have been forced to sign non-disclosure agreements.

Why would you take this unprecedented move—

The Chair: We are still driving down the road that we just talked about. This does not have to do with the supplementary estimates, and you have—

Mr. James Bezan: You know the supplementary estimates' purpose is to provide money for defence procurement. The defence procurement strategy includes the CF-18 replacement secretariat, and that secretariat—

The Chair: James, there was a point of order on the table. We talked about this. You said you'd get it back on track, and you're not.

Mr. James Bezan: I'm coming back to non-disclosure agreements. You can try to censor the questions.

The Chair: I'm not trying to censor. James, these are the rules. On page 1008 in O'Brien and Bosc, it clearly tells you what we need to do here. I gave you some latitude, and you've been asked to stay on topic. Now we're going down a different road.

You have 15 seconds left. Would you like your time, or would you like me to move on to the next person who has a question?

Mr. James Bezan: I would leave it up to the minister if he wishes to answer on the non-disclosure agreements.

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: I'm not going to get involved with how you operate the committee, so I'll leave that to the chair.

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

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: I'm always open to discussions, by the way.

Mr. Randall Garrison (Esquimalt—Saanich—Sooke, NDP): Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I have to say at the outset that we're discussing supplementary estimates for 2016-17. That's the current fiscal year. The question is whether these are adequate amounts to support the needs of the military, so I think your ruling is in fact mistaken and I'm going to go ahead with the questions that I intended to ask.

Thank you very much, Mr. Minister, for the commitment on infrastructure, and particularly the cleanup of contaminated sites. It's very important in my riding. At CFB Esquimalt, for many years the navy did things that perhaps they regret having done and now there are some big cleanup costs, so I do appreciate that.

I also appreciate the attention to the facilities on land, because many people who work in the Canadian Forces are working in substandard facilities and we have lots of problems, certainly locally, with asbestos in some of those buildings and things that need to be done. We have a backlog of that maintenance that needs to be done, so I welcome that commitment here.

One of the things in the recent Auditor General's report talks about planning. On page 2 of the summary of that report, it says that National Defence must plan above minimum needs so that it has sufficient equipment available to respond to changing circumstances.

One of my concerns, when you're talking about the navy, is that the shipbuilding strategy started out as a minimum, what we needed at minimum to meet our commitments. Now it tends to be talked about as a ceiling, that it is the maximum that we can get for the navy.

Given those comments by the Auditor General, it reinforces my concern that we not see the shipbuilding strategy as the total of what the navy needs, but as the minimum of what we need to keep the navy current.

• (1225)

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: Actually, I couldn't agree with you more. We cannot be planning the Canadian Armed Forces always at a minimum. Our men and women deserve that we make sure they have the right capability, the right infrastructure, and the right environment for them to do their work.

That's why the defence policy review was extremely important. We've gone through some very detailed discussions with experts, with Canadians, and I appreciate all the input that all of you have provided and it has been taken into account.

Whether it's for the navy or even the air force, we are not looking at planning for a minimum.

Getting back to the fighter replacement, that's why we're purchasing 18 Super Hornets. We are not going to plan for the minimum, including the navy.

However, we need to go through a very thorough assessment to make sure that we can look at not only creating the military for what's needed today, but also for the future. Until the defence policy review is released, I can't speak too much to that.

Mr. Randall Garrison: One of the things I don't find in the supplementary estimates that I want to ask you about is additional money for recruiting. Again, what the Auditor General just found is that there is a significant shortfall and the Canadian Forces remain under strength. The Auditor General concluded that by 2018-19 the Canadian Forces were unlikely to meet the number of people necessary in the forces.

Since 2008, there has been a reduction of about 20% of recruiting positions. Thirteen recruiting locations were actually closed, and I know there has been a reduction in the travelling centres that often went to first nations communities.

My question on the recruiting is that I don't see anything in the supplementary estimates, but it seems to me there is a great need to provide some more resources to recruiting to meet those targets.

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: Absolutely, there is a need, and what you just stated is the challenge I had coming in. Once resources are taken away, it is actually even more complex to ramp up.

One thing is that we will be investing in recruiting more from the attraction side, from the training side as well, and retention is also critically important. That is one part of the defence policy review that we have looked at. Certain changes have already been made, especially when it comes to the reserves and how we're bringing people in. We need to become much more efficient, but it does take resources to do so. We're going to make sure that the right resources are put into recruiting to meet our numbers and targets, with the focus on retention.

Mr. Randall Garrison: Again, it's not just the overall numbers, but there have been some concerns. I mentioned first nations, and in rural areas of Quebec and places where we've traditionally gone, a large number of people in the forces have seen reduced recruiting hours available to do that work.

In particular, the Auditor General pointed out that while the military has a goal of 25% women, there are no specifically funded programs, or directed or targeted programs, to actually achieve that target of an increase of 1% per year of women. The Auditor General's report was very clear that he didn't find any funding and any specific programs to meet those targets for women in the military.

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: A lot of your questions have been looked at with the defence policy review to making sure that we, our government, are committed to increasing more women in the Canadian Armed Forces. We're committed to having more diversity as well, as we look at retention and taking care of our troops while they serve. There's been a significant emphasis put on this at the defence policy review. It's going to require resources as well, and we're going to be investing in this.

I look forward to presenting a lot of this because this is a critical piece to the success of the Canadian Armed Forces.

• (1230)

Mr. Randall Garrison: We don't have it in the supplementary estimates this year. If it's in the defence review, then it's probably not in the budget next year. That gives us a two-year delay when we're already falling short of these numbers, so—

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: No, there's a significant emphasis that has been made towards attracting and recruiting.

Do you want to talk to this?

Mr. John Forster (Deputy Minister, Department of National Defence): Yes. There was \$26 million this fiscal year just for recruitment. It was in the main estimates, so it was in the budget of the department. That's why there's no supplemental ask for it. Certainly, the chief has put down a very firm target about the 1% increase per year over the next 10 years to get to 25% female representation in the forces. I'm sure, and the vice-admiral can speak to this, that the armed forces are going to have to put in place mechanisms and programs to achieve his target.

VAdm Mark Norman: Yes, to the essence of your question, we have sufficient resources in the current plan for the remainder of this fiscal year. What the minister is describing is a number of internal machinery recruiting changes that are under way and that are going to be implemented in the next couple of fiscal years in order to achieve the very targets that the Auditor General is referring to. It will be a more comprehensive plan.

We are well aware of the issues surrounding the mechanisms by which we actually attract targeted demographic groups, so this is an area of future investment, but to the specifics of your question, that's why it's not reflected in the supplementary estimates.

The Chair: Thank you.

I'm going to give the floor to Mr. Fisher.

Mr. Darren Fisher (Dartmouth—Cole Harbour, Lib.): Mr. Chair, I'll try to stick to supplementary estimates (B).

I see there's funding in the supplementary estimates (B) for federal contaminated sites. I remember when I was a municipal councillor, one of the biggest struggles we had was brownfield sites that sat there vacant and unused for years because people wouldn't put in the investment to clean them up. Can you provide some details on this funding, and maybe the government's policy towards these sites? I'm thinking specifically of the roles and responsibilities of DND when it comes to the assessment and remediation of these contaminated sites.

Mr. John Forster: Contaminated sites is a government-wide program, so the Treasury Board Secretariat manages a large reserve to fund contaminated sites. They assess priorities according to criteria across all departments. In the supplementary estimates we are looking for money to continue to do that work.

We're going to be spending about \$240 million over the next three years. The key projects we're going to be doing this year are Esquimalt harbour, which is a big project, at about \$40 million; 5 Wing Goose Bay remediation, which is about \$19 million; and then some other smaller ones.

The way the program works is we, the Department of National Defence, are responsible for our contaminated sites. We will go in and do an assessment to see exactly what contamination is there and what the best measures are to clean it up. Then Treasury Board will provide us funding to tackle the most contaminated sites first, and we work our way through that. It's a strong commitment to try to clean up a lot, but there's no question National Defence has a fair number of those sites to work on.

Mr. Darren Fisher: Are those lands that DND plans on keeping? What happens if land is transferred to Canada Lands? For instance, Shannon lands in Nova Scotia was transferred to Canada Lands, not

cleaned up, not remediated, and left for them to remediate. When we're speaking about the projects that we're funding right now through the supplementary estimates (B), is that just land that DND is keeping? Do we have a responsibility on land that we're transferring or selling off to the private entities to clean it up beforehand?

Mr. John Forster: Maybe I'll ask Jaime Pitfield, our ADM on infrastructure, in terms of particularly even Shannon lands, how that transferred and what responsibility we retain on what gets done.

Mr. Jaime Pitfield (Assistant Deputy Minister, Infrastructure and Environment, Department of National Defence): Thank you very much.

As part of that deal with Canada Lands, they're responsible for the cleanup, and before they did anything or would do anything with it, they would clean it up.

When we hold the land, if we intend to move it on to somebody else or to a different organization, we would either clean it up or they would clean it up as part of the deal, and the costs would be included in that transfer.

Mr. Darren Fisher: Would the cost be something that would be decided on once the level of contamination was agreed to?

Mr. Jaime Pitfield: Once it was assessed, yes. The costs would become clear, but the deal would specify which party was to cover those costs.

• (1235)

Mr. Darren Fisher: The minister spoke to \$19 million in transfers for land sales. That has nothing to do with contaminated sites, does it?

Mr. Jaime Pitfield: No.

Mr. Darren Fisher: Okay, perfect, thank you.

Our government has spoken to a commitment to improve our infrastructure. How is DND contributing to the broader goal? You spoke to \$36 million, and then you spoke to jobs and communities. Can you talk a little about some of the infrastructure investments that DND is planning?

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: I'll give you the wider picture, some of the opportunities that investment infrastructure obviously creates for our communities, and then I'll pass the question to the DM.

As part of our wider government's efforts on investing in infrastructure, the Canadian Armed Forces has a lot of infrastructure that needs to be improved upon, from our hangars to our various bases, and to our housing, as well. In those communities, when we invest in the infrastructure, the improvements of it, it actually has a direct economic impact for the communities, as well. We're taking that into account when we look at making significant investments in our infrastructure. In some places it is desperately needed, and we're prioritizing some of this work.

Do you want to give some of the details?

Mr. John Forster: Sure. In this past budget, the government announced about \$3.4 billion for a lot of federally owned infrastructure and DND will receive about \$200 million of that over this year and next. This year's portion will be about \$30 million for defence projects and about \$170 million next year. That amount includes, for example, \$50 million for housing of the military. We'll be making upgrades and improvements to housing on bases for members of the military. We have money for armouries in several provinces and about \$106 million for defence infrastructure for the forces, such as live-fire ranges, airfields, and hangar improvements. It's a sizeable extra bump of money, on top of what we would normally do in our base budget.

Mr. Darren Fisher: Minister, the Halifax International Security Forum took place from November 18 to 21. Unfortunately, I was not able to be there. This is a major event in my province and I'm happy to see that there's funding for that through supplementary estimates (B).

Is that just for the one that passed or are there plans on investing some of that money toward next year's event? Is there a plan to continue that in Halifax?

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: When I first took on this role, I was very happy to support the Halifax security conference, because I knew the reputation of it. It was started by the previous government. I think it provides a lot of added value not just for Halifax, but for Canada's reputation as well. I'm very impressed with it. We have committed to funding it, but we have to make sure that we do make the right investment. We'll be in discussion with the president on this to make sure this forum is sustainable, because it does add a lot of value. We had the largest U.S. code, congressional delegation, attend this year.

Mr. Darren Fisher: Excellent.

I assume that's my time, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: You probably don't have time for a question and a response, so we'll leave it there.

Thank you very much.

We're going to move to five-minute rounds of questions now.

The first one goes to Mr. Rioux.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean Rioux (Saint-Jean, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Welcome, Mr. Minister.

I doubt if you will be surprised by my question, given that I come from the constituency of Saint-Jean.

In the supplementary estimates (B), there are amounts for the Royal Military College of Canada. Is there money to prepare for the arrival of future students at the Royal Military College of Saint-Jean?

[English]

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: As I mentioned earlier, for us to be able to recruit the best, and based on the importance of French in our bilingual country, it's important for us to invest in an RMC in Saint-Jean. There is a much wider plan in place, but I want to work out some of the details before announcing anything. As I stated, we are committed to making sure that it gets the university status that it once had and that it is going to be sustained.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean Rioux: I am very pleased that the commitment is being honoured, not only for the army in general, but also for the constituency of Saint-Jean.

Another subject interests us in Quebec, the Davie shipyard. A contract was awarded to that yard and it is creating jobs. I am talking about the oiler replenishment ship.

Do you feel that the timeline will be met and that it can be delivered to the navy in 2017? Can you also explain to us how this interim solution will let us wait for the two new supply ships?

● (1240)

[English]

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: That's why some of the investment that we're asking for the interim ship is important. When I talk about that capability gap that leads to a capability loss, this is that one aspect where we were faced with the decision to bring in interim capability. I think the project is going well. Time will tell, but it is absolutely necessary that the navy has this interim capability until we get the joint supply ships.

The vice-admiral can speak more to that.

[Translation]

VAdm Mark Norman: Mr. Finn can provide you with details about the interim project at the Davie shipyard. We believe that the deadline will be met and that we will be able to put this interim capability into service at the end of next year.

In terms of the large-scale needs, as the minister said, it's not a question of replacing one with another, but simply of dealing with the lack of capacity as the navy builds its own supply ships in the yard in Vancouver.

RAdm Patrick Finn (Assistant Deputy Minister, Materiel, Department of National Defence): As of now, the Davie yard project is on time. Communication with the people in the Davie yard is easy and we work closely with them. The deadline of the end of 2017 does not apply to the vessel being delivered to the navy but rather to its being put into service. As for the multiservice ships to be built on the west coast, construction will begin in 16 to 18 months according to the schedule that has been set.

Mr. Jean Rioux: The contract was for five years with the possibility of a year-for-year extension in any of the next five years. Do you still intend to invoke that clause?

RAdm Patrick Finn: As you have just said, the contract extends over five years. Options can be proposed in each of the five following years.

The goal of the plan that has been established was to provide an interim capability during construction. The timelines are essentially the same. That allows us to be flexible in case it becomes necessary to use that interim capability. Our plans have always built in that flexibility.

Mr. Jean Rioux: Thank you.

Do I have time for one more question, Mr. Chair?

[*English*]

The Chair: You don't really have time for a question and response, so I'm going to have to move forward.

I'm going to give the floor to Mr. Paul-Hus.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus (Charlesbourg—Haute-Saint-Charles, CPC): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Minister, the supplementary estimates (B) contain an amount of \$142 million for Operation Impact.

I am going to talk about the hospital in Erbil. Fabrice de Pierrebourg, a reporter who has been to the front in Mosul and elsewhere in Iraq, reports horrific scenes of people trying to save severely injured civilians and children on the hoods of armoured cars in the middle of debris-covered fields. In the meantime, the hospital in Erbil is empty.

Mr. Minister, how much did it cost to set up our hospital in Erbil? Who is able to get care there? Who decides who has to be transported to that hospital to receive care?

[*English*]

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: The role 2 hospital is a capability that was put in for our forces, but you have to take a look at all aspects of the situation there. When I visited Iraq for the first time, there was an attack that happened. It's not just looking at what we provide in terms of role 2. We have to look at the holistic picture of the Iraqi security forces, the injuries they're taking, and the civilians.

In the north they do actually have good hospitals there. Let's put the role 2 hospital aside for a second. For example, one of the biggest aspects of what the Iraqi security forces had, especially the peshmerga, was not being able to do casualty collecting points. Based on your experience, you know how important the casualty collection point is, so you can stabilize people before you put them in an ambulance. They realized during that time when they took significant hits that they didn't have this ability. We were able to send in the right people to start training them on how this is done. They wanted to just quickly send them on to the hospital, but as you know, somebody may not survive on the way.

We looked at all aspects. It's not just about the number of injuries; it's about how that treatment is going to be done for the Iraqis, the

Iraqi security forces. We have a certain responsibility, as Canadians, within that area. We are fulfilling that. The hospitals are there for the coalition, but those types of decisions are made on the ground, and they look at things. For us to judge exactly who should go in there would actually hinder their ability. The coalition itself did look at all aspects, especially when it came to displacement that was happening there.

● (1245)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus: I understand the operational perspective. However, General Vance said that civilians could also be treated at the hospital. At the moment, civilians are dying, body bags are being closed while the people in them are still alive, and no civilians are being treated in the hospital.

Given the money that the hospital has cost Canada, could it be made available to Iraqi civilians? That was the thrust of my question.

Let's go back to the supplementary estimates (B).

The government has said that \$450 million will be set aside for UN missions in Africa. Canadian troops will be going to Mali.

Which part of the amount goes to the Canadian Forces? In the supplementary estimates (B) ending March 31, 2017, which part of that amount will be invested in training for the troops who will be going to that country?

[*English*]

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: It's not in these supplementaries, but I could talk to you about the peace operations mission, which I've mentioned before. We have a commitment as a whole-of-government approach of up to \$450 million and up to 600 personnel. The decision on exactly where we're going has not been made yet.

There is a critical role for Canada to play in conflict reduction and conflict prevention, because when it comes to peace operations, what's happening in that part of the world is not happening in isolation. What's happening in Iraq is having a direct impact on what's happening in Africa, including what's happening in Europe, with the direct impact of the migrant crisis.

We are taking all this into account and making sure that when the decision is made—whether it's the military contribution, the development and the diplomacy—Canada is going to have the right impact. The investment that we have committed to is there, but we will always need to continually reassess.

Once that decision is made, we'll make sure that the cost is explained thoroughly as well.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus: You have not told me whether the \$450 million allocated to operations and planning come in part from the Department of National Defence budget.

With that said, since we are talking about operations, I would like to know why we are working with the UN rather than with our allies, as we are currently doing in Iraq. After all, we know that conducting operations with the UN is ineffective.

[English]

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: Here's the irony in all this. We are actually working with our allies. When I go to the counter-ISIL meetings talking about Iraq, it's the same partners we are going to be working with when it comes to the United Nations.

The United Nations is an organization that conducts peace support operations, but the same members that I operate with, whether it's NATO, Iraq, or the counter-Daesh meetings, are the same partners who work in police operations. We do it in the United Nations context because it provides a multilateral environment to have a certain impact. These impacts that we're having are not done in isolation. In fact, we actually have solidified our relationship to an even greater extent, because we are working within a multilateral environment.

[Translation]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus: You know—

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Paul-Hus, that's your time.

Mr. Gerretsen, you have the floor.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Following on the conversation that Mr. Spengemann started with respect to Operation Impact, do you have a sense as to where that's going in the future and what that could potentially cost?

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: In terms of the cost, no, we don't have a determination of that, but I can tell you we have looked at our involvement, even before we made the decision, of where things need to go. The military portion of the operation is one aspect. It buys you time to deal with the real problem, the political situation that's there.

A lot of the work that I've been doing with my counterparts is also focusing on that political piece. That's why we push for, and it was accepted, to have the military liaison teams that are working within those governments. As the liberation of Mosul takes place, we're also working on making sure that the unity remains, because the work that's going to be done after is going to be absolutely crucial to making sure that there's stability. These are not my words that I am about to say here, but if we don't get that piece right, we don't know what the great-grandson of al-Qaeda is going to look like.

We do need to have a lot of focus on the development, the displaced folks there, and the political situation is going to be essential. How we support Iraq and the region is going to be critical, but we're not going to do it alone. We need to be doing it with our coalition partners.

• (1250)

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: What is the role of special forces in that?

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: Right now?

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Yes.

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: It's an advise and assist function. They have trained certain units up to a very good level and they can then conduct operations on their own, and we've seen the great impact of this. The Mosul operation wouldn't have been possible if it weren't for the great training that was given and the advise and assist function for the peshmerga. Once the operation is complete, we will

then do another assessment of where our military needs will be. The goal always, once the success is there, is to do less with the military and start bringing in more of the development and governance work that's going to be absolutely crucial.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Turning to some of the transfers that are going out, in terms of the number of transfers that have been requested.... Actually these are transfers from other organizations, and then there's one that's going out. There are three in particular that are from other organizations to help support research at RMC.

I don't know who wants to answer that, you or one of your officials, but I'm curious if you could expand on that and whether it is commonplace for that to happen, and what more specifically the funds would be used for.

Mr. John Forster: The granting councils under the Ministry of Industry, Science and Economic Development run programs that fund chairs in universities right across the country, so it will be an application process. They'll choose the best chairs and provide funding to a university to have a very esteemed professor for a certain amount of time to do work in an area, biotechnology and so on.

The Royal Military College, like other universities in Canada, is eligible to apply to that program, so they would submit applications to either the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council or to the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: That money is coming in as a result.

Mr. John Forster: It's coming in, so they are a recipient, like every other—

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: It's not necessarily a regularly budgeted thing. It depends on the application process.

Mr. John Forster: They would have to apply. They are going to compete against all universities in the country.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: I also noticed, albeit it's a relatively small amount, that just under \$100,000 is being transferred out to Shared Services, and in particular, it's going to core information technology services with Canada and missions abroad. Can you explain that?

Mr. John Forster: Sure.

Shared Services provides, as you know, the computer infrastructure for the whole government. When we put people in missions abroad, our defence attachés, for example, Shared Services has to provide the computer, the hookups, and the technology for that person. They get to bill us for that cost. That's \$83,000 to reflect that we have people overseas who need a computer.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Okay.

My last question—

The Chair: You're out of time, Mr. Gerretsen.

Ms. Gallant, you have the floor.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant (Renfrew—Nipissing—Pembroke, CPC): Mr. Chair, if I have any time remaining at the end, I'll share it with James.

Minister, when our troops leave Operation Impact for home, what is in place in terms of decompression? We can't expect our troops to go from the front-line battlefield to trimming the Christmas tree at home in just the span of time it takes to get from Iraq back home.

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: Absolutely. That decompression is essential, and I've gone through it a number of times. I'll let the vice-admiral talk to the details of it.

I also want to take this opportunity to mention that as we look at the operations we are conducting now and into the future, we need to be able to continue to learn about decompression, what works and what doesn't, and continue to evolve for when they come back home.

As we talk about post-deployment, we need also to look at pre-deployment. It's going to be a much bigger look at this to make sure we give all the tools to the Canadian Armed Forces so that they leave healthy and resilient and come back healthy, as well.

• (1255)

VAdm Mark Norman: The actual mechanism is coordinated between joint operations command, who are employing the forces in theatre, and the units from which they are generated back home. They all have the same standard, and they all go through a decompression, but it's different depending on what specific part of the mission they have been on, what rotation cycle they are on, and who their host of origin is. The air components go through a slightly different process than the special operations folks, and—

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Do they have time in some place where they can talk to people—

VAdm Mark Norman: Yes.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: —they need to talk to, and get—

VAdm Mark Norman: Exactly as the minister said, based on our extensive experience from over a decade of doing this. Yes, ma'am.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Thank you.

Once Daesh is driven out of Mosul, what plans are in place on the part of Canada to go after them in Raqqa?

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: I didn't hear the last bit.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: What plans are in place to go after Daesh once they are driven out of Mosul to Raqqa?

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: For...?

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: What plans are in place for our troops?

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: Right now we have no plans for this. The situation in Syria is extremely complex. Right now, if you talk about Syria in general, you have Russia's involvement and you have Turkey's as well. It is extremely complex.

Now is not the right time to be sending any troops into Syria and into Raqqa. Our efforts right now are in Iraq.

If the situation in Syria does change, we will always assess the situation based on consultations with our allies, but right now, we do not have, or intend to have, any involvement in Syria.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: For the purposes of expenditures in supplementary estimates (B), was anyone from the Canadian Armed Forces or DND required to sign a non-disclosure agreement?

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: For supplementary estimates (B)?

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: For expenditures in supplementary estimates (B).

Mr. John Forster: No.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: James, go ahead.

Mr. James Bezan: Thank you.

In vote 1(b), there is a transfer to support joint research grant projects. What would those grant projects entail, and would they be in support of the replacement of our CF-18 fleet?

Mr. John Forster: Which transfer are you referring to, specifically?

Mr. James Bezan: Vote 1(b) from National Defence to Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council.

Mr. John Forster: I can speak to that.

Mr. James Bezan: It's \$192,000.

Mr. John Forster: Yes, there's \$192,000 this year. None of that, as far as I know, is related to the CF-18s. We will give it to NSERC to transfer to universities or others to do grants in areas of interest and priority to us.

Mr. James Bezan: In vote 5(b), there's a transfer in National Defence to a number of different government agencies for responding to and providing advice to the Government of Canada's public safety and security policy imperatives.

Was any of that security policy related to the need to increase the number of fighter jets available for the defence of Canada and North America?

Mr. John Forster: To the best of my knowledge—we manage a program on behalf of the government. Other departments submit applications for research in the areas of national security. As the money is going to the RCMP, Natural Resources, Canadian Food Inspection Agency, Nuclear Safety Commission, they wouldn't be doing—

Mr. James Bezan: Also under 1(b), there's \$3 million for the defence procurement strategy. Does that include the Super Hornets?

Mr. John Forster: It doesn't explicitly.

The money is for the defence procurement strategy. Industry Canada is to set up an office to study defence analytics and for value-added propositions related to defence procurement. That was never funded previously. It was in budget 2016. That money will go to Industry to set up that shop.

Industry will be involved in doing the value proposition work related to fighter procurements, but it's not explicitly for that purpose, no.

The Chair: That's your time.

Thank you for the answer to that.

Mrs. Romanado, welcome. You have the floor for five minutes.

Mrs. Sherry Romanado (Longueuil—Charles-LeMoine, Lib.): Mr. Chair, my apologies for the delay; I was running from one meeting to another.

It's a real pleasure to see you again, Minister, and to your colleagues, thank you so much for being here today.

My colleague across the way touched on one of the subjects I wanted to question regarding NSERC and SSHRC transfers.

I understand the NSERC transfer for joint research grant projects is for regular universities doing research on behalf of DND or in areas of interest. With respect to the SSHRC and NSERC transfers, I see they are for research chairs at RMC and managing research enterprise at RMC.

Can you elaborate a little on what you mean by the research enterprise at RMC and if any of this research chair money will also be flowing to the Collège militaire royal de Saint-Jean?

• (1300)

Mr. John Forster: We already discussed that a bit earlier, before you came—

Mrs. Sherry Romanado: My apologies.

Mr. John Forster: No, no, that's all right.

RMC applies to the program, to the granting councils. I don't have the list of exactly what the chairs are, but we'd be happy to provide it to you. Whether it's all in Kingston or there's a chair in Saint-Jean, I'm not sure.

VAdm Mark Norman: A small amount of money will go to Saint-Jean in those estimates, but the bulk of it is going to RMC, based on the program that the deputy minister described earlier.

Mrs. Sherry Romanado: Okay. Thank you.

With respect to the \$6 million allocated toward funding to improve security for Canadian Armed Forces operations and personnel, we had a briefing in camera regarding security of our bases. I can't discuss what was discussed, but is this in relation to our military installations here in Canada or also abroad? Could you elaborate a little on what that is?

VAdm Mark Norman: I'll take that one because one of your colleagues asked the question and I misunderstood the question and the context of how it was asked. I thought it was related to Op Impact specifically but it is about an ongoing security program to make not just our physical facilities but all our security processes more robust here in Canada.

We spend approximately \$23 million on an upgrade program. There are other expenses as well.

That \$6 million you're seeing is specific to this subsidy process to add to those security initiatives you're referring to.

To clarify your colleague's question, it's not related to operations as I thought it was, which is why I couldn't answer his question earlier.

Mrs. Sherry Romanado: I understand that the health, well-being, and safety of our troops is of the utmost importance for this government, and I'm delighted with that.

In the funding for personnel and so on that's talked about in the supplementary (B) application, can you talk to us a bit about the importance of increasing that support to our military personnel in terms of their health and well-being?

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: This one aspect has been very important for me, for the chief of the defence staff, and for all of us, because I've always said that we end up talking about capabilities, ships, and purchasing things, but our number one capability is our troops, investing in them and making sure that we continue to evolve. We can't just take one strategy and say that we have it. We have to have a structure in place that continually learns to evolve and that we can continually change, and we are doing that now.

A lot of these detailed answers will come out of the defence policy review, which I know all of you had a hand in, but regardless of what's going to be decided, that is going to be a key component moving forward. We're not just talking about next year. We're trying to talk about what type of support our personnel need all the way through into the future.

Another aspect we're going to be addressing is the family. What we find is that for somebody to be effective at work, the family needs to be doing extremely well. One aspect of things is that for the regular forces member who has to get posted regularly, losing a doctor is not easy. It's difficult to find a new doctor, so we're looking at programs to look after these things.

I'm going to be having discussions with the Canadian Forces liaison council on how, with the great business network we have, they can assist with providing companies that are out there to ease the burden of finding new jobs when people are posted. This is going to be a significant focus for us.

The Chair: That's your time, Ms. Romanado.

A three-minute question goes to Mr. Garrison.

Mr. Randall Garrison: I'm going to ask again about something that I don't find in the supplementary estimates, which is about additional funding for training. The Auditor General's report pointed out that part of the problem for retention in the Canadian Forces was the delay in training.

I want to ask very specifically about peacekeeping training. Despite my Conservative colleague's lack of confidence in UN peacekeeping operations, I know that some have been very successful. Certainly UNAMET in East Timor was a very successful mission, so while there is a mixed record, there are great successes out there.

My concern is that under the Conservatives, peacekeeping training was cut back and was allowed to wither. There was the elimination of the Pearson peacekeeping centre. My concern is about wherever we're going in Africa where we're peacekeeping, it would take the same preparation. Is the training being done? Why is there nothing in these supplementary estimates to promote further peacekeeping training for these upcoming operations?

• (1305)

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: When we look at peacekeeping operations, we're going to be looking into the future. Part of this is going to be on the decision we make for peacekeeping operations. Discussions are ongoing with our allies. Canada is going to be hosting the next peacekeeping summit. The training aspect of things is not just about opening up the centre, or sending a few people here, we need a comprehensive approach to looking at things. We need to look at the challenges. There are challenges within the UN. There are significant challenges, which they recognize, as to how we assist in bringing new, innovative ways of peacekeeping, because today's peacekeeping is not the peacekeeping of the past.

We need to look at how to bring a whole-of-government strategy. The military looks at sending peacekeeping troops and how the training is done. How do we integrate a whole-of-government strategy? What does it look like, and how do we demonstrate that, as a nation? How do we bring other nations together into this?

There is going to be a comprehensive approach that we're going to be putting forward, but we want to evolve it into something that's far more than just looking at training peacekeeping troops or having our training centre in Kingston. We are going to be looking at the wide aspect of how to move forward capacity building to troop contribution training, and how to integrate some of the development work properly into the areas that we do select.

Mr. Randall Garrison: I appreciate the high-flying answer, but my concern is that we're going to ask Canadian Forces members to do difficult and dangerous jobs, and we have to make sure they have both the equipment and the training they need to do those jobs, so I'm disappointed we are not moving on the training at this point. Waiting for a larger strategy wouldn't really affect the training you would do—

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: When we make the decision on where we're going, that's when the detailed planning starts for the type of training that needs to be done and the type of equipment that's needed to make sure we meet the necessary requirements. That will be decision dependent, as well. A lot of work has been done on that, but I don't want to get ahead of myself before we make a decision.

Vice-Admiral, do you want to talk to some of the aspects of it?

Vadm Mark Norman: Again, not unlike your previous question, sir, the training that you're referring to is happening inside the line organizations that deliver training today. It will be supplemented and modified, as required, based on the specifics of the missions as that operational planning and those government decisions unfold, but we are continuing to do that type of thing. In particular, the army has an ongoing component of their routine training that includes many of the traditional elements of peacekeeping operations as you would have understood them in the question.

Mr. Randall Garrison: Thank you.

The Chair: Minister, I'm sensitive to your time commitments, so I'm going to suspend for a couple of minutes to let you leave, and we can resume with the officials.

Thank you for coming today.

Hon. Harjit S. Sajjan: Thank you.

• (1305)

_____ (Pause) _____

• (1310)

The Chair: Welcome back. We have a quorum, so I'd like to get started with the remaining time we have left.

We can start a round as we did before. We'll run out of time or I can reduce the questions to five minutes. I know there wasn't a will to do that last time, but I'd ask if we could do it this time. It's up to the committee.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Okay. We'll resume in the same order with five minutes. Again, everyone, try to keep it to supplementary estimates (B). Link it back to supplementary estimates (B). That's why we're here. For people who have questions off topic, there's question period and other formats that we can discuss. I would ask everyone to keep that in mind as they formulate their questions.

Starting off with a five-minute period for questions is Mr. Spengemann.

• (1315)

Mr. Sven Spengemann: Gentlemen and madam, I'd like to take you back to Operation Impact. At the moment, the mission has been extended until March 31, 2017. What are the factors that are currently at play that would dictate or drive further extensions? What would be the associated funding requirements, some of which may be reflected already in the supplementaries but others that may be new? Are there a lot of unknowns? Is there planning for post-Daesh, and if so, what capabilities, as we see them currently reflected and funded in the supplementary estimates, could be applied in the next phase of Operation Impact that are not already being applied?

Vadm Mark Norman: The deputy minister and I will tag-team the answer. I'll speak to the evolution of the mission and the potential requirements going forward.

In the last round, the minister spoke to the nature of the mission. Clearly, as the situation in Iraq, particularly in the context of Mosul, the liberation thereof, evolves and we get a better sense of what the emerging needs are of the Iraqi security forces themselves, we'll have to look at the nature of our current contribution to the coalition, and the number of options related to how we either reinforce certain things that we're doing or potentially shift forces or shift the focus.

As it relates to any specifics, it really is too early to tell. It is such a dynamic and fluid situation on the ground that it would be premature of us to be speculating as to what we may or may not do.

Ultimately, as the current mandate comes to its end, we have to come back to government and provide advice as to how we would or would not want to extend the mission, and what that extension may or may not look like in the context of how the operational situation is evolving. Then, as it relates to the costing of that, that would be another step in the process.

Mr. John Forster: In the last budget there was money provided. There was the \$360 million for this year's operation.

Keep in mind that when we put somebody into that theatre for a year, there are always follow-on costs for the next two years after to replenish stores, supplies, munitions; so the money in the supplementary estimates is for this year, for the mission to run to end of March. When the government takes a decision on whether to extend the mission and to do whatever, we'll put in a new request, and the budget would announce money for that for next—

Mr. Sven Spengemann: Thank you for that.

Under Operation Iraqi Freedom—that takes us back into the mid-2000s—the U.S. forces actually had personnel, mostly officers, in the field who were reservists and who were equipped to advise the Iraqi government on questions of governance. Under the current allotment of \$147 million to Operation Impact, do we have the capacity to potentially walk down that avenue, to not only provide military advice but to provide, through our reserve forces, should they be deployed in theatre, governance advice to elements of the executive branch of the armed forces that may involve policing, that may involve military training, but also, increasingly, questions about multi-level governance, civil administration, and those kinds of questions?

Vadm Mark Norman: In the current footprint of Operation Impact, we've actually set conditions for that conversation through the ministerial liaison team that the minister referred to earlier. It's a small team of serving officers at the moment.

The extent to which that could evolve and the extent to which that could be supplemented by reservists are both valid questions that go back to my previous response in terms of how we see this evolving as we potentially shift from a more kinetic set of actions to a more supportive set of actions in terms of advising.

• (1320)

Mr. John Forster: To add to the vice chief's comments, there's an advisory team in Iraq, advising the Iraqi government, and the budget allows for a similar kind of capacity-building team in Jordan and Lebanon, as well, to help with the kind of capacity building in the region, to help those countries cope with it.

Mr. Sven Spengemann: That's good to know and helpful. To take that one step further—

The Chair: You're going to have to give the floor up. You have seconds left. We won't get a question and response.

I'm going to give it over to this side. Either Mr. Paul-Hus or Ms. Gallant, you have the floor.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Chief Bossenmaier, DND is requesting authorization to transfer \$5.9 million to CSE. What is the rationale for the transfer, and how will it be spent?

Ms. Greta Bossenmaier (Chief, Communications Security Establishment): Thank you for the question.

CSE, as you may know, has a long history of supporting the Canadian Armed Forces. We're actually very proud of our contributions to help the men and women of the Canadian Armed Forces in their operations.

This is a transfer that's being asked for this year, and it will allow us to continue to support the Canadian Armed Forces in their operations.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Okay. What type of support to the military operations will CSE be providing?

Ms. Greta Bossenmaier: This would be under our foreign signals intelligence mandate, so part *a* of our mandate.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Pardon me?

Ms. Greta Bossenmaier: This would be part of our foreign signals intelligence mandate, under part *a* of our mandate.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Okay, and I'll be transferring the remainder of my time to Mr. Paul-Hus.

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus: Thank you.

The Chair: You have the floor.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus: The minister's presentation mentioned an additional budget of \$147.1 million for Operation Impact, but, in this document, it says \$142 million.

Which of those two amounts is correct? I imagine that it is the \$142 million.

[*English*]

Colonel Claude Rochette (Chief Financial Officer and Assistant Deputy Minister, Finance, Department of National Defence): The amount is \$142 million plus \$5 million for statutory, the employee benefit plan.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus: Okay.

You say that the \$142 million are mostly going to be used to pay the salaries of regular force and reserve force members. But the salaries are already paid.

Can you explain to me how that works?

Col Claude Rochette: Thank you very much.

Actually, when the minister said salaries, he was talking about danger pay that our soldiers receive.

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus: Okay. This is danger pay, and it is part of the \$142 million.

[*English*]

Col Claude Rochette: Exactly.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus: But surely, danger pay does not come to \$142 million.

Col Claude Rochette: Oh, no.

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus: Can you tell me how the major amounts are allocated? We're talking about equipment, and I would like to know whether that includes any weapons purchased for the Iraqi army.

Col Claude Rochette: Of the \$142 million, \$25 million are payments to our soldiers.

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus: Okay.

Col Claude Rochette: There is an amount of \$90 million to cover travel costs for our troops when they have to travel to and back from the field. There is also an amount for military vehicles.

There is also an amount of \$4 million for commercial payments for some vehicles.

An amount of \$1.3 million is to cover the costs of camps and support for our troops.

An amount of \$10 million is for equipment for our special forces.

As for the rest, there is an agreement for the purchase of equipment, weapons, and so on.

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus: I know that there have been problems with firearms. The intent was to buy some firearms from the outset. I don't know whether we are talking about C7s. I would like some details and to find out the amount involved.

Col Claude Rochette: That's \$9.5 million.

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus: Okay.

[*English*]

Mr. John Forster: The amount was set aside for small arms, basically, to give to the peshmerga, so that when we're training them there, they have small arms.

One of the conditions of that program was that the Iraqi government had to approve in writing that it was okay for Canada to provide that equipment. That just came through very recently. I think it was last week. The actual transfer of any equipment hasn't taken place yet.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Pierre Paul-Hus: Are the firearms C7s or C8s?

VAdm Mark Norman: No, not exactly, but they are similar light weapons.

RAdm Patrick Finn: Mr. Paul-Hus, I would just add that these are the weapons that Canadian special forces use for training purposes. We also have to make sure that we provide arms and munitions that can last a long time, meaning after the end of this mission. We try to be precise in the model we choose, so that it can be used for a long time.

• (1325)

[*English*]

The Chair: There's not much time left for a question and a response, so I'll move on to Mr. Garrison.

You have the floor.

Mr. Randall Garrison: I notice in the supplementary (B)s there's an amount for reinvestment of revenue from the sale and transfer of real property. Since my time on city council, locally we've always been concerned about the divestment of DND property. Of course, naval commanders—I won't name anyone specifically whom I dealt with in the past—were always concerned that they don't make more waterfront land, so we remained concerned about divestment of land as a short-term way of raising revenues when there may be long-term needs down the road.

My question is really about the time frame that's used in making those decisions to declare property surplus.

Mr. Jaime Pitfield: Thank you for the question.

These decisions are driven totally by the operational requirements of the forces.

Mr. Randall Garrison: In what time frame?

Mr. Jaime Pitfield: That's a good question.

I think five to 20 years would be reasonable, but we have been hoarders, so the thrust at DND right now is to release land that we're not using.

Mr. Randall Garrison: I guess I fall on the hoarder side, for the very obvious reasons that navies are very constricted. Certainly, in both Halifax and Esquimalt, there's not a lot of places for them to go if they have future needs.

VAdm Mark Norman: If I may, we're both extremely cautious and realistic in the appreciation of the long-term requirement for land. In past years we've been a little too quick sometimes to divest land. In some cases we've had to actually go back and try to re-acquire some land that we divested.

To Mr. Pitfield's answer, we do have a process. It's part of a robust, long-term capability planning process which typically uses a 20-year planning horizon. The real property component of that is integrated into those discussions. That's the kind of cycle you're seeing. Many of the divestments that are reflected in the supps now are indicative of decisions, or at least advice, around the divestment of property which predates many, if not all of us, sitting at the table today.

Mr. Randall Garrison: I also have a concern about the treatment of tenants. A lot of this land has been leased, and when you go to divest the land it has a big impact. In my riding, probably the most important issue right now is Royal Roads University, which was DND's university before, and has now been declared surplus. We have a university sitting on a very long lease and they're trying to make decisions about infrastructure investment and trying to use some public-private partnerships. There's a great deal of concern for them as the tenant about the insecurity of both their lease and who might eventually be the landlord.

How do we take care of those interests of what have been long-term and very good tenants of public property?

Mr. Jaime Pitfield: I met two or three weeks ago with the president of the university when he came to Ottawa. As we discussed the future of that big piece of land, which is a very valuable piece of land, and also the subject of high interest from a number of first nations, we are trying to make sure that stakeholder groups, particularly Royal Roads and two of the first nations, are very aware of what is going on. Communication is very good.

The lease is a 99-year lease and they're at year 85 in that. We respect that lease, and whatever happened to the land, the lease obligations would go along with it, but we're years away from resolving this.

Mr. Randall Garrison: Thank you.

The Chair: I yield the floor to Ms. Romanado.

You have the floor for five minutes.

Mrs. Sherry Romanado: Mr. Chair, if there's time remaining, I will share it with my colleague, Mr. Spengemann.

I want to talk a little bit about infrastructure. I heard earlier that part of the infrastructure funding that you were talking about does involve some of the PMBs—I'm sorry; it's military-speak—the housing for our military. When I was visiting Bagotville, we saw an interesting model—I want to say a campus—a little ecosystem of a community around the base in Bagotville. I'm curious to know if it's something that you're going to be putting funding into in terms of getting more housing for our military, because you did mention infrastructure. We see there's a problem every time they are deployed into new movements. It's difficult for the families to find affordable housing and so on.

Could you elaborate a little bit on that, regarding some of the initiatives you're taking?

Thank you.

• (1330)

Mr. Jaime Pitfield: Thank you.

National Defence has 12,500 houses for the use of military members and their families, and they're scattered across the country, not always in the right places, according to requirements. We are in the midst of using operational requirements from base commanders and from the three environments to determine where we need the appropriate number of houses, and then we're going to try to rebalance the portfolio. That's the big answer.

National Defence got through the budget this year and received \$50 million to upgrade the infrastructure quality of our houses. That would be new construction and renovations. We have spent significant amounts of money over the last five years, in the range of \$500 million. The impact on the portfolio has been quite good. The demand used to be for four-bedroom houses for big families. Now it's more one- and two-bedroom apartment-style accommodations. So we are doing that.

We're trying to follow the techniques of modern markets. The one you're speaking about in Bagotville, I'm not sure if that is government-owned or if it's owned by the private sector. We are seeking to rely on the private sector to provide housing of the right quality and the right affordability, which is possible today. It wasn't possible in the fifties. It's a different model that we're trying to move towards. At the end of the day, the welfare of the troops and their families, the affordability, what we provide through houses, the neighbourhoods and that kind of thing—all these are paramount.

Mrs. Sherry Romanado: Thank you.

I'll share my time with my colleague.

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

Mr. Sven Spengemann: I'm back for one more round on Operation Impact with Mr. Forster and Admiral Norman. There was \$375 million in funding: \$233 million for Global Affairs and \$142 million for DND. How important is their work to yours? How important is your work to theirs? Could you talk about the civil-military planning process, both inside the Government of Canada and on the ground in Iraq?

I'm not giving you a lot of time to answer that.

VADM Mark Norman: I will give you as short an answer as I can, because I think the deputy can speak better to the coordination in the town. On the ground it's absolutely essential. The minister alluded to it in some of his previous comments and responses to questions. The success will come from integrated solutions. It's not just planning and execution from here in the capital. It's on the ground where all of the efforts of development, diplomacy, security, and defence are lashed together in an integrated plan. That's what we're trying to achieve on an ongoing basis as we conduct our current missions and plan future missions.

Mr. John Forster: In the bigger picture, when the government came to office and looked at Iraq, they asked us to come back with more of a whole-of-government package. You saw it in the renewal of Operation Impact. There was a lashing up. We're seeing it even more as we look at options for peace support operations in Africa. You're seeing National Defence. You're seeing foreign affairs on the diplomatic side. You're seeing international development. You're seeing Public Safety on the policing side. It's much more integrative. Defence is part of a whole-of-government approach. It's a growing trend and it's a really good thing.

Mr. Sven Spengemann: Thank you both.

The Chair: That's close to five minutes. We'll keep going down the list, and we'll move into five-minute rounds again.

Mr. Rioux, you have the floor.

[Translation]

Mr. Jean Rioux: Thank you for being here and for your valuable information. It is always appreciated.

I have three questions and I will ask them at the same time. You can answer them in any order you like.

The Arctic is an important issue and the one that will have the most impact. In the supplementary estimates (B) for 2016-2017, an amount of \$2.6 million will be transferred to Natural Resources Canada to support the Canadian Armed Forces training centre in the Arctic. Can you give us more details about that amount?

Up to this point, how much money has been spent to build the Canadian Armed Forces training centre in the Arctic?

Is the centre going to include the three services: the army, the navy and the air force?

• (1335)

Vadm Mark Norman: The \$2.6 million are for the Canadian Armed Forces Arctic training centre at Resolute Bay. Most of the military activities involve the army. That is its training base. That said, the centre is close to the sea and accessible for the air force. The centre's role is to support training efforts in the area, including the Canadian Rangers.

The \$2.6 million includes an amount of about \$1 million to support Natural Resources Canada's programs. The training centre is actually a joint facility, a project in partnership with Natural Resources Canada, which explains why resources are being transferred.

There are also costs for building maintenance, operations, and so on.

Finally, some funds are allocated for improvements scheduled during the period covered by the budget.

Mr. John Forster: Natural Resources Canada built the centre. To date, the costs are about \$25 million.

Mr. Jean Rioux: Given global warming and the importance that the Arctic is going to have, can we expect that there will be even more operations at that centre?

Vadm Mark Norman: Yes. In addition, let's not forget the naval facility at Nanisivik, which is under construction and renovation and will be available for the Canadian Armed Forces towards the end of 2018. Geographically, considering the distances in the Arctic, those facilities are quite close to each other.

In a word, there will be more and more activities in those two centres, as well as elsewhere in the Arctic.

Mr. Jean Rioux: So, as I understand it, the training is mostly for the army. For the navy, you have your boats, your ships, and I imagine you have training too.

Vadm Mark Norman: Yes. As with all our facilities, no matter where they are, the entire armed forces can have access, whether it is the army, the navy or the air force. Each of our facilities is primarily for one of the services, but the others can always go there for training or anything else. No base is exclusively for one service of the Canadian Armed Forces.

Mr. Jean Rioux: Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Mr. Bezan, you have the floor.

Mr. James Bezan: There is \$22 million going to the interim auxiliary offshore replenishment ship. Can you give us a quick update on where we are on that and whether we're on time to deliver this capability back to the Royal Canadian Navy?

Mr. John Forster: Maybe I'll ask Pat to do that. We had discussed it a bit earlier. However, yes, generally it appears to be in reasonable shape.

RAdm Patrick Finn: Thank you, sir, for the question.

Yes, we're on track. Again, it's a service to be delivered in the fall of 2017. Federal Fleet Services, as the company is now called, with whom we are in contract, for whom the Davie shipyard is a subcontractor, is very open. We're there monthly and have a third party overseeing it.

They are telling us quite openly that a lot of what remains is the disassembled part of the ship, the MV *Asterix*, starting to pull it together. At the end of the winter of 2017, they will be bringing over what we call a major piece of the structure, the house, which has been built in Scandinavia. It will be coming over and put onto the ship.

They are reflecting that there is risk ahead, as there is in anything this complex, but are very open. Currently, notwithstanding some schedule risks that we see in all our projects, it is on track to be able to provide that service to the navy in the fall of 2017.

Mr. James Bezan: Okay, good.

There is \$9.5 million going to the Middle East strategy. Can you tell me where that falls within the purview of National Defence as to what staff is there from the Canadian Armed Forces, from National Defence?

• (1340)

Mr. John Forster: I'm sorry, that's \$9.5 million for...?

Mr. James Bezan: In supplementary estimates (B), in the listing of transfer payments, there are contributions and support to the Middle East strategy. What is that program, and who from National Defence is participating in that? How many staff are assigned to it?

Mr. John Forster: Sorry, Mr. Chair, I'm not sure which item the member is referring to. I don't see that one.

Mr. James Bezan: Does anybody?

Vadm Mark Norman: We're not seeing it in any of our documents.

Mr. James Bezan: It's in the Library of Parliament documents on page 247.

Col Claude Rochette: This is vote 10. It's for the transfer of the \$9.5 million we were talking about earlier for Operation Impact to purchase small arms and ammunition.

Mr. James Bezan: That does apply to some of our allies, I suspect?

VAdm Mark Norman: That's correct.

Mr. James Bezan: It would be for the Kurds?

Mr. John Forster: That's correct.

Mr. James Bezan: Mr. Chair, I know you gave some leniency to Mr. Garrison in asking questions that were outside of what's in the supplementary estimates.

The Chair: The committee gave him that latitude.

Mr. James Bezan: Okay, although there was one time you intervened for me.

I would ask for some leniency here, because I think Canadians want to know more about these non-disclosure agreements that have been signed. We did talk about the replacement of our CF-18 fleet, and how everyone assigned to that project has had to sign non-disclosure agreements. I would like to get an answer from our officials as to why that's necessary.

The Chair: Before you go down that road, I am prepared to allow it, but again we're here for a very specific reason. You know the rules as well as everyone else here, so if we want to deviate and—

Mr. James Bezan: This applies to the replacement of our CF-18s.

The Chair: If everybody's okay with that, that's fine, but if they're not okay, I would rule that it's not in order.

If everyone could indicate to me—

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: It's a procedural matter. You're the chair. It's either procedurally correct or it's not.

The Chair: I'm asking you if you want to give Mr. Bezan some latitude. If you don't, just let me know.

Mr. James Bezan: Could I make the argument that we did talk about the replacement of our CF-18 jets, which is on the table—

The Chair: James, the question's been asked and answered. If you're asking for some latitude from the committee, then you go ahead and ask them.

Mr. James Bezan: It ties to that though. It is part of—

The Chair: Okay, so I see an answer. Mr. Gerretsen, are you willing to change your position on that or not?

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: I don't have a position on it.

Mr. James Bezan: Okay, I'll ask the question. These non-disclosure agreements are not a normal function of government. We do have the National Defence Act, as well as the Security of Information Act. Do the non-disclosure agreements go beyond that? Does this violate the rights of any of our staff that's provided to them under the Public Servants Disclosure Protection Act, in the event they want to be a whistle-blower?

Mr. John Forster: Mr. Chair, they're not uncommon on major procurement projects when your procurement officials are dealing with sensitive commercial information, financial information provided by proponents or suppliers, as well as national security information.

In terms of the work being done this past summer, where the government said it wanted to update its information from various suppliers, an interdepartmental tiger team was pulled together from Defence, Public Services, Justice, ISED, and in going out to the companies, as well as to our allies, we were going to be collecting

commercially sensitive financial information, as well as classified sensitive security information from the U.S. and other partners. The non-disclosure agreements were signed by the members of the team to make sure they understood their responsibilities in protecting that information.

The Chair: That's your time. That's your question and that's your answer.

I'm going to give the floor to Mr. Gerretsen. If you have a question, you have five minutes.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: As it relates to the overall budget being just over \$19 billion, do you know offhand what that represents in percentage of GDP?

• (1345)

Mr. John Forster: For this year, I don't. I believe for the previous year, Canada was about 0.98% of GDP in its defence spending.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: That was last year, but you don't know—

Mr. John Forster: For this year, I think it would be roughly about the same, but I haven't done the updated calculation.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: According to the minister's statement at the beginning, the department had requested new funding of just over \$250 million. Do you have a sense as to what that is as a percentage of the overall budget?

Mr. John Forster: I'll ask Claude to do the math.

Col Claude Rochette: It's \$250 million on \$19 billion, so it's—

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: No, I can figure that out.

That's all I have, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: We have some time left. Does anybody else on this side want to pick up? You have about three and a half minutes.

Mr. Darren Fisher: We have to adjourn. We have question period in 10 minutes.

The Chair: I'm conscious of the time. I want to give you guys an opportunity to run your time out. If you have a question, then I want to give everybody an opportunity.

Then I would next move to Ms. Gallant and then Mr. Garrison.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: I have a quick question. With respect to the transfer going to the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission, what specifically is that being used to pay for?

Mr. John Forster: That's under the security program. Again, we kind of run this program on behalf of the whole of government, so departments apply to us to do research in areas of national security. They can apply. We rate the proposals with Public Safety, and then we're kind of the holder of the funds.

The Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission requires an elemental analyzer to measure oxygen, nitrogen, and hydrogen in ore materials. I'm not sure that helps. It doesn't make me understand it exactly, but that's the project. We can give you some more information on it, if you'd like.

Mrs. Cheryl Gallant: Thank you.

I guess James wants to use the rest of the time.

The Chair: James, you have the floor.

Mr. James Bezan: I want to move a motion in relation to the supplementary estimates:

That the Committee request that the Parliamentary Budget Officer provide the Committee with a general analysis, within twenty-one (21) calendar days after the adoption of this motion, in regards to the decision of the Government of Canada to sole-source the Boeing F/A-18 Super Hornet for National Defence; that this analysis include, but not be limited to the Department of National Defence's estimates on the cost of the F/A-18 Super Hornet for:

- a. Acquisition;
- b. Maintenance, training and operations;
- c. Lifecycle costs;
- d. Associated costs of operating a mixed fleet of fighter jets; and

That the Committee order the Government of Canada to provide the Committee with electronic copies of the following:

1. All documents that outline acquisition costs, lifecycle costs, and operational requirements associated with the Boeing F/A-18 Super Hornet;
2. All potential industrial losses if the Memorandum of Understanding in regards to Lockheed Martin's F-35 JSF program were to be altered and if industrial benefits were to leave Canada.

On that—

The Chair: Just a second, James. I'm going to suspend for a second to make sure this motion's in order, and then I'll get back to you.

After conferring with the clerk and pulling the book out to make sure that we do the right thing for the right reasons, I have concluded that this motion doesn't refer back to supplementary estimates (B). There are a bunch of supporting documents that the clerk is saying we would need, and because it doesn't relate directly to what we're talking about here, I'm going to rule it out of order. You're welcome to table something similar in the future if you would like to discuss this particular bill.

To be fair, I think somebody else wants the floor, so I'm going to rule this out of order.

Mr. James Bezan: Can I just—

The Chair: No, because I don't have time, and I want to make sure that everyone gets a chance. This particular motion is out of order.

Mr. James Bezan: [*Inaudible—Editor*]

The Chair: We accept that motion on notice. That's fair. You can do that.

Mr. Garrison, you have the floor.

• (1350)

Mr. Randall Garrison: Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I move that the Standing Committee on National Defence reject the DND supplementary estimates (B) for 2016-17 on the basis of its failure to provide sufficient funds to meet the recruiting needs of the Canadian Forces, including targets for recruitment of women.

The Chair: May we have the text?

The Clerk of the Committee (Mr. Philippe Grenier-Michaud): Would you repeat that for us?

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Would you do us the pleasure that James did so that we know what we're voting on?

Mr. Randall Garrison: [*Inaudible—Editor*] because I hadn't heard from the minister and the officials.

The Chair: You have the floor. Could you repeat it for the rest of the committee?

Mr. Randall Garrison: I move that the committee reject the supplementary estimates (B) for 2016-17 on the basis of failure to provide sufficient funds to meet the recruiting needs of the Canadian Forces, including targets for recruitment of women.

The Chair: On that particular one, these have actually been reported already, so this was an opportunity for us to talk to the officials and the minister. This was reported, I believe, on Tuesday.

The Clerk: Monday.

The Chair: They have been reported already, so it's out of order in the sense that this has already occurred.

Mr. Randall Garrison: What you are saying, Mr. Chair, is that we missed the deadline.

The Chair: That's correct.

Is there anybody else? Can I get a motion to adjourn?

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: The meeting is adjourned.

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.

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.

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