



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on International Trade

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 084

Tuesday, November 28, 2023

Chair: The Honourable Judy A. Sgro



Standing Committee on International Trade

Tuesday, November 28, 2023

• (1100)

[English]

The Chair (Hon. Judy A. Sgro (Humber River—Black Creek, Lib.)): Welcome to meeting number 84 of the Standing Committee on International Trade.

Today's meeting is taking place in a hybrid format, pursuant to the Standing Orders. Therefore, members are attending in person in the room and remotely using the Zoom application.

I would like to make a few comments for the benefit of the witnesses and the members.

Please wait until I recognize you by name before speaking. Those online, please mute yourselves when you are not speaking. I will remind you that all comments should be addressed through the chair. If any technical issues arise, please inform me immediately, as we may need to suspend in order to deal with any of these issues. I ask that all participants be careful when handling the earpieces in order to prevent feedback.

Today we are meeting for clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-57, an act to implement the 2023 free trade agreement between Canada and Ukraine.

We have a budget that the committee needs to adopt. Is the committee in agreement to adopt the budget for Bill C-57 in the amount of \$3,750?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC): Is it balanced?

The Chair: That's good.

It will balance for sure.

I will now welcome the officials who are with us to answer any questions we may have during the clause-by-clause consideration.

We have, from the Canada Border Services Agency, Edith Laflamme, director, trade and anti-dumping program; and Marie-Hélène Dupont, senior counsel. From the Department of Employment and Social Development, we have David Mercier, deputy director, trade and labour affairs. From the Department of Finance, we have Karen LaHay, senior economist, international trade policy division, international trade and finance.

From the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development, we have Dean Foster, director of trade negotiations for Africa, the Americas, Europe, India, and the Middle East; Adam

Douglas, senior counsel and deputy director, investment and services law; Reuben East, deputy director, investment trade policy; and Judy Korecky, deputy director, export controls policy.

We could ask all kinds of questions of all of you, and I'm sure that you could all answer them today.

Finally, from the Department of Industry, we have Mehmet Karman, senior policy analyst, investment review branch.

Thank you very much for joining us today.

I now need to provide members of the committee with some instructions and a few comments on how the committee will proceed with the clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-57.

As the name indicates, this is an examination of all the clauses in the order in which they appear in the bill. I will call each clause successively, and each clause is subject to debate and a vote.

If there is an amendment to the clause in question, I will recognize the member proposing it, who may explain it. The amendment will then be open for debate. When no further members wish to intervene, the amendment will be voted on. Amendments will be considered in the order in which they appear in the bill and in the package that each member received from the clerk. Members should note that amendments must be submitted in writing to the clerk of the committee in both official languages.

I will go slowly to allow all members to follow the proceedings properly.

Amendments have been given an alphanumeric number in the top right-hand corner to indicate which party submitted them. There is no need for a seconder to move an amendment. Once it is moved, you will need unanimous consent to withdraw it.

During debate on an amendment, members are permitted to move subamendments. These subamendments must be submitted in writing. They do not require the approval of the mover of the amendment. Only one subamendment may be considered at a time, and that subamendment cannot be amended. When a subamendment is moved to an amendment, it is voted on first. Then another subamendment may be moved, or the committee may consider the main amendment and vote on it.

Once every clause has been voted on, the committee will consider and vote on the short title, the title and the bill itself. If amendments are adopted, an order to reprint the bill may be required so that the House has a proper copy for use at report stage. Finally, the committee will have to order the chair to report the bill to the House. That report contains only the text of the adopted amendments, as well as an indication of any deleted clauses.

We will start with this process.

Mr. Seeback, go ahead.

• (1105)

Mr. Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Thank you, Madam Chair.

Before we get started on the clause-by-clause review, I have a motion I would like to move that deals with our consideration of clause-by-clause. I sent a copy of this motion to the clerk, and the clerk could distribute it now.

I am going to make one small change to that motion. I will read the motion with the change: “That all amendments shall be considered in full, regardless of the chair’s ruling on admissibility.” I’m moving this motion because there are a number of what I and my colleagues consider to be very important amendments we are trying to put into this free trade agreement. I fear, Madam Chair, that you are going to rule all of them inadmissible, therefore depriving us of the opportunity to debate or have these amendments considered.

For example, on CPC-1, what I’m trying to do is add, in the “Purpose” clause of the free trade agreement, which is the section this would go into, “strengthen cooperation on energy matters, including the export of Canadian energy to Ukraine”. In fact, the Ukrainian ambassador recently said that energy security is an issue they look forward to having more co-operation on. It would be a very important addition to the enabling legislation. It would allow this to be part of Canada’s help to Ukraine.

Also, my amendment talks about strengthening “cooperation on matters relating to nuclear technology, including the export of Canadian nuclear equipment, expertise and uranium to Ukraine.” These are things that would be critically important to Ukraine, both currently and, of course, in the rebuilding process.

Madam Chair, I believe it would serve the committee well and it would serve the Ukrainian community well if we were allowed to fulsomely put forward these amendments to the legislation and have them debated, so Canadians know where we stand on these issues.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I’d like to speak briefly to this motion by my colleague as well and to acknowledge some of the context for this discussion of Bill C-57.

I think reasonable people can disagree on aspects of a trade deal. There’s a lot of history in Parliament about constructive debates that have gone back and forth about different trade deals. What we

have seen, sadly, is outrageous hyperbole from members of the government trying to say that constructive suggestions or disagreements about aspects of a trade deal are tantamount to not supporting Ukraine, and going even further to say that somehow our opposition to the carbon tax provisions in this bill is supporting Russia. These have been outrageous, offensive and wrong comments from the government, a government that is increasingly desperate and is trying to use these outlandish accusations to cover for its own general incompetence.

Conservatives have put forward many constructive proposals related to supporting Ukraine, which government members have rejected. On March 29 of last year, for example, we proposed visa-free travel for people from Ukraine, something that was supported by the NDP and the Bloc and that was the subject of a motion adopted by a majority of the House, but it was opposed by the Liberals and never implemented. Members across the way voted against our proposal for visa-free travel for Ukrainians.

We put forward a motion at this committee to expand the scope of the bill to include provisions that would facilitate increased weapons exports to Ukraine. Liberal members have opposed our efforts to add amendments that would support increased weapons exports to Ukraine.

Last year as well, the Liberals granted a sanctions waiver to Russia allowing the export of turbines to Russia to facilitate the export of natural gas from Russia to Germany, which was bad for Canada’s natural gas sector, of course, but also bad for Ukraine. At the time—this was at the foreign affairs committee—the ambassador from Ukraine came before the committee and denounced those permits.

If we go through, we see that the Liberals voted against visa-free travel from Ukraine; the Liberals granted sanctions permits to Russia to allow the export of Russian natural gas to fund the war machine; and, just in the last week, Liberals have been blocking our amendments on weapons manufacturing. These are clear examples of how the Liberals have not sided with what we believe to be the interests of Ukraine, and yet we haven’t resorted to the kinds of hyperbolic accusations they have simply over a disagreement about a trade deal.

This shows, frankly, the divisiveness and the desperation of the government, a government that is unwilling to defend its failing energy policy and that is desperate for distractions.

On the motion specifically, here’s why this motion is important. The process is that committees decide which amendments to consider or not. That’s up to the committee to decide. There are cases, for instance, in which the chair may rule something inadmissible, but the committee may decide to consider it anyway. Ultimately, when the bill is tabled in the House, the Speaker looks at the version of the bill and if a member objects to certain amendments because they view those amendments as being out of scope, then at that point, the Speaker will make a ruling and can strike out certain amendments.

However, that issue comes up only if a member raises it in the House, so I'm calling on all members here today. If you believe that expanding weapons exports to Ukraine is important, I have six amendments that would constructively and effectively do that. I would like to move those amendments, and I would like to be able to add those amendments to this bill. Even if they are notionally out of scope, those amendments can proceed as long as no member objects to their inclusion. If, in the House at report stage, a member rises and objects to the inclusion of those amendments, then the Speaker will rule on their procedural admissibility, but the committee can, as per my colleague's motion, consider those amendments; it can adopt those amendments, and those amendments can proceed in the version of the bill that's referred to the House.

This is not an idle or an abstract consideration. I have before us—and they've been distributed to members—six different amendments that would give real effect to the need to get critical lethal weapons into the hands of the Ukrainian army to a greater extent than we have in the past. These amendments would matter. They would actually help Ukraine win the war against Russia.

• (1110)

For all the members who have been hyperbolic in their commentary over the last week, do the right thing. Support these amendments and support this motion, which will allow these amendments to go forward, because it is weapons and not a carbon tax...it is these amendments and changes that will concretely give life to efforts to get more weapons into Ukrainian hands and actually have a concrete and meaningful impact on the outcome. I encourage all colleagues to support this motion.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

I have Mr. Gerretsen, and then Mr. Sidhu.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen (Kingston and the Islands, Lib.): Thank you, Madam Chair.

I want to correct a couple of things that I just heard Mr. Genuis mention.

The first is when he said that the Liberal Party, or the government, tried to slip a carbon tax into this agreement. Nothing could be further from the truth. There is no carbon tax implementation in this agreement. There is a reference made to the fact that both countries acknowledge that both have carbon pricing mechanisms and will continue to utilize them as they see fit in each country.

However, what's most important is a clause that is in the agreement, which I'll read out so that my Conservative colleagues can hear it, if they haven't read the agreement. It says, "Nothing in this Chapter shall be construed to authorize a Party to enforce its environmental laws in the territory of the other Party." Even if you were worried that there was some form of carbon pricing built into this agreement, it explicitly states that no party with jurisdiction in this agreement has the ability to enforce its own environmental policies in the other territory.

For Mr. Genuis and the Conservatives to, generally speaking, be making this claim ad nauseam.... By the way, they didn't even bring

it up until there was about a week before the vote, as though they suddenly discovered their out. It's just absolutely untrue.

What the member is saying is categorically false. He made the comment earlier in his intervention that there is hyperbole coming from government members about Conservatives turning their back on Ukraine. I don't personally—and, yes, I am one of those people who have been calling Conservatives out on this—hold strictly the fact that they voted against this as my justification for telling Conservatives that they turned their back on Ukraine.

I weigh into the calculation the fact that President Zelenskyy asked us to vote in favour of this, and the Ukrainian Canadian Congress asked us all to vote in favour of this. As of this morning, the Ukrainian Canadian Congress is now actively encouraging Canadians to contact their members of Parliament to encourage them to vote in favour of this agreement.

When I say that Mr. Genuis and other Conservatives have turned their backs on Ukraine, I'm saying this due to the way they have treated the advice and the call from the President of Ukraine, the Ukrainian Canadian Congress and the Ukrainian community throughout this country. It is unfortunate for them that their plan to try very quietly, without giving explanation in advance until a couple of days before.... They tried to see if they could just slip their vote in without there being much attention paid to it. Well, attention is being paid to it now.

The good news is that Conservatives have an opportunity to change that vote, Madam Chair, when this committee reports the bill back and it goes back to the House for a final vote. I would encourage them at that point to listen to President Zelenskyy, to listen to the Ukrainian Canadian Congress and to listen to Ukrainian Canadians—the two million-plus of them in this country—who are demanding that they vote in favour of this.

Thank you.

• (1115)

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Go ahead, Mr. Sidhu.

Mr. Maninder Sidhu (Brampton East, Lib.): Thank you, Madam Chair.

I find it outrageous that, again, the Conservatives are using delay tactics, so I suggest we just go to a vote, Madam Chair.

The Chair: Thank you, but I have a list here.

I have Mr. Genuis and Mr. Seeback, and then I will make a ruling.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'll be extremely brief, because I want us to get to a vote on this motion.

Mr. Gerretsen's comments, though baffling and absurd in many ways, were not on the motion itself.

He should take note of the fact that the agreement refers directly to the obligation of parties to “promote carbon pricing and measures to mitigate carbon leakage risks”. The fact, as he correctly pointed out, that the particular environmental laws of one country will not be enforced in another country doesn't take away from the fact that the agreement obliges parties to “promote carbon pricing and measures to mitigate carbon leakage risks”. That's in the agreement.

That said, let's park the fact that there are different points of view about the carbon tax around this table. My colleague has put forward a motion that would allow us to adopt amendments related to weapons and make it easier for us to adopt amendments related to weapons. Put aside the debate about the carbon tax. I encourage colleagues, if they're serious about supporting Ukraine, to support my colleague's motion, which would allow us to consider and make it easier for us to adopt amendments that would get weapons to Ukraine.

Let's work together on the things that I hope we agree on—one of which is the weapons issue—by adopting my colleague's motion.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Seeback, briefly.

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Suggesting that Conservatives, who have an objection to things like promoting carbon pricing and carbon leakage.... Carbon leakage is a far more insidious tool. It would mean that you can't have your carbon price so low as to attract investment into your country. This is exactly what Ukraine does not need. They are going to need investment. Suggesting that this is somehow turning our backs on Ukraine.... The bill is here at committee, and it's about to go back to the House. This is irrelevant.

There are things that have actually been done by the government that have significantly harmed Ukraine, for example the export of a gas turbine that was used by Russia to pump gas, when pumping and selling gas funds Putin's war machine. That is actually hurting Ukraine, and is not a Conservative vote on the trade agreement.

There is now a report out that Canadian detonators are finding their way into Russian land mines and are actually being used in the war. I'm not an expert on war, because I've never served, but I would suggest that the issue of Canadian detonators being in land mines is far more of a betrayal of Ukraine than a Conservative principled opposition vote in the House of Commons.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

● (1120)

The Chair: Next, we have Mr. Savard-Tremblay, and then I will give a ruling on Mr. Seeback's motion.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay (Saint-Hyacinthe—Bagot, BQ): Thank you, Madam Chair.

Like all the other members, I have read most of the proposed amendments. Quite frankly, I am opposed to every single Conservative amendment proposal. I'm very transparent about that.

However, I find the government's lack of transparency when it comes to trade agreements unfortunate. Each time, we are presented with a finished product; take it or leave it. We have very little

space and influence to change it. In addition, we are told that amendment attempts will be ruled out of order. I find that unfortunate.

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you.

I am going to suspend for two minutes to consult with legislative counsel.

● (1120) _____ (Pause) _____

● (1120)

The Chair: I'm calling the meeting back to order.

I have consulted with legislative counsel. Under Standing Order 117, your motion, Mr. Seeback, would be contrary to the Standing Orders.

As we go through these motions, you will still have an opportunity to speak to them before I rule on each individual motion that is before us.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Chair, I have a point of order.

Are you ruling a motion that was already moved and debated to have been retrospectively out of order?

The Chair: I was being very polite in giving you an opportunity to address the motion that Mr. Seeback moved. I could have ruled earlier than that, because it's contrary to the Standing Orders.

● (1125)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Which standing order? Is it Standing Order 117?

What does the standing order say that would suggest that this is contrary to the Standing Orders?

The Chair: It's the chair's prerogative to rule on the admissibility, and I'm ruling that it is not admissible.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Chair, again, I have a point of order.

To clarify, the motion doesn't dispute your ability to rule on the admissibility. It merely says the amendments will be considered regardless of that ruling. It doesn't deny your right to consider the admissibility.

The Chair: I'm suggesting that it's not admissible.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: In any event, I'm challenging your ruling on that in that respect.

The Chair: Do you want to challenge the chair?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Yes.

The Chair: We will take a vote on whether to uphold the chair's ruling or not.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 6; nays 5)

The Chair: Pursuant to Standing Order 75(1), consideration of clause 1, which is the short title, is postponed.

The chair now calls clauses 2 to 6.

There are no amendments submitted for clauses 2 to 6. Do we have unanimous consent to group them for the vote?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Shall clauses 2 to 6 carry?

(Clauses 2 to 6 inclusive agreed to on division)

(On clause 7)

The Chair: On clause 7, we have CPC-1 in the name of Mr. Seeback.

Mr. Seeback, do you want to move that?

Mr. Kyle Seeback: I do, yes. Thank you, Madam Chair.

I briefly talked about this during our motion to try to allow all of these amendments to be considered. This is actually in the “Purpose” section of the enabling legislation.

There are two things. One is “strengthen cooperation on energy matters, including the export of Canadian energy to Ukraine”. As discussed at committee before, Ukraine sits on the third-largest proven LNG reserve in Europe. Finding a way to co-operate with Ukraine on that would do a number of things. First, it would provide Ukraine with energy security. Second, it would allow for additional exports of LNG to Europe, which would, of course, have the effect of defunding Vladimir Putin’s war machine.

This would be a very useful thing to have included, not only in the enabling legislation, but also in the free trade agreement itself. There are things that are hurtful, I think, in this trade agreement. There are things that could be helpful. That’s one of them.

The other issue is “strengthen cooperation on matters relating to nuclear technology, including the export of Canadian nuclear equipment, expertise and uranium to Ukraine.” Again, energy security is a very critical issue for Ukraine. It has lost 40% of its electricity-generating capacity in the course of the war. Both Canada and Ukraine have a proud history of nuclear technology. Canada could absolutely help Ukraine in further developing its electricity generation capacity through nuclear technology.

Ukraine actually used to be an exporter of electricity to Europe. Again, this would be a net benefit to Ukraine. They would have increased energy exports, which would be revenue for the government in the middle of a war. Those electricity exports would further reduce the reliance on Russian gas in Europe, thereby defunding Putin’s war machine.

These amendments are very strong, purposeful amendments that are helpful for Ukraine. I would hope that all members of the committee would support them.

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

I will now rule on the admissibility of that.

Bill C-57 seeks to implement the 2023 free trade agreement between Canada and Ukraine. Clause 7 of the bill states, “The purpose of this Act is to implement the Agreement” and it provides a summary list of the objectives that are elaborated through its provisions.

The amendment seeks to add to that list two additional objectives. The first is to strengthen co-operation on energy matters, which would include the export of Canadian energy to Ukraine. The second is to strengthen co-operation on matters relating to nuclear technology, which would include the export of Canadian nuclear equipment, expertise and uranium to Ukraine.

According to *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, “An amendment to a bill that was referred to a committee after second reading is out of order if it is beyond the scope and principle of the bill.”

In the opinion of the chair, the addition of the aforementioned objectives would create new concepts that are beyond the scope of the bill. Therefore, I rule the amendment inadmissible.

• (1130)

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Chair, I’m going to challenge that ruling.

The Ukrainian ambassador very clearly said recently that energy security is an issue they want to work on with Canada, so I’d like to challenge the ruling.

The Chair: There’s been a challenge to my ruling, so we will have to vote on that.

This is to support the ruling of the chair that the proposed amendment by Mr. Seeback is out of order.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 6; nays 5)

(Clause 7 agreed to on division)

The Chair: There are no amendments submitted for clauses 8 to 15.

Do I have unanimous consent to group clauses 8 to 15 for the vote?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Shall clauses 8 to 15 carry?

(Clauses 8 to 15 inclusive agreed to on division)

The Chair: We have a new clause from the Bloc member.

Do you want to speak to that, Monsieur Savard-Tremblay?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: I’ll be very brief.

As was mentioned in the testimony, there is a chapter on corporate responsibility. We know that Ukraine is grappling with a corruption problem. Saying that is not a matter of pointing fingers at the country; we know that it wants to address the problem.

The purpose of this proposal is to strengthen the necessary transparency and control mechanisms that must be imposed on Canadian companies operating abroad.

I won't reread the text, since you have it in front of you, but the idea behind this proposal is to set up an expert panel to, among other things, ensure compliance with the principles and guidelines of the agreement.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Savard-Tremblay.

Mr. Seeback.

Mr. Kyle Seeback: I certainly—

The Chair: Before Mr. Seeback speaks, I do need to inform you that I will be ruling it inadmissible, and I will read out the reason that it's inadmissible.

Bill C-57 seeks to enact the act to implement the 2023 free trade agreement between Canada and Ukraine. The amendment proposes, among other things, the appointment of “a group of experts responsible for...ensuring that Canadian companies operating in Ukraine comply with the principles and guidelines referred to in section 15.14 of the Agreement”.

As *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, states on page 772:

Since an amendment may not infringe upon the financial initiative of the Crown, it is inadmissible if it imposes a charge on the public treasury, or if it extends the objects or purposes or relaxes the conditions and qualifications specified in the royal recommendation.

In my opinion, the amendment proposes a new entity, which would impose a new charge on the public treasury. Therefore, I rule the amendment inadmissible.

[Translation]

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Madam Chair, I, too, respectfully and politely challenge your ruling.

• (1135)

[English]

The Chair: I have never had so many challenges as I am getting today.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 6; nays 5)

The Chair: Thank you very much.

We are now on to CPC-2.

Mr. Genuis, go ahead.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I am optimistic that you'll make the right decision this time.

This is an important amendment that would seek to give effect to the desire of many Canadians to allow Ukraine to have access to the weapons that it needs to effectively prosecute its war against the illegal, genocidal invasion of the Putin regime.

This would add the following new clause 15.1:

Report

15.1 (1) Within 30 days after the day on which this section comes into force, the Minister of Public Works and Government Services must prepare a detailed plan to increase production in Canada of defence supplies, as defined in section 2 of the Defence Production Act, particularly defence supplies required by the Ukrainian armed forces or the Canadian Forces.

(2) The Minister of Public Works and Government Services must publish the plan, or give notice of its availability, in Part I of the Canada Gazette and in any other manner that the Minister considers appropriate.

The effect of this would be to require the government to develop a plan, and to report on that plan, to increase defence production. This is very important because in increasingly fraught and challenging times globally, which include the war in Ukraine, we need to have the munitions, the military supplies, to defend ourselves, and Ukraine is in vital need of those supplies.

Getting to where we need to be on this requires a plan around defence production, and industry requires certainty and clarity from the government about what that demand is going to be over the long term. There have been messages sent to industry by the government about what the needs may be, but the kind of certainty and predictability that would be associated with the detailed plan that we're calling for would help Ukraine. It would also help Canada because it would provide industry with the certainty it needs to make investments in production that are going to meet Ukraine's needs and Canada's needs over the long term.

This is a good amendment that responds to a vital need—that is, for Ukraine to have the munitions it requires and for the government to lay out a plan in advance that would facilitate the increase in defence production in Canada that would get us towards that objective. This is a common-sense amendment that I don't think anybody should oppose, so I hope we'll have the agreement of the committee to allow the amendment to proceed and to be adopted.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

I am going to suspend the meeting for a couple of minutes while I ensure I have consulted with legislative counsel.

• (1135)

(Pause)

• (1140)

The Chair: I call the meeting back to order.

I have consulted with legislative counsel and I will make the following ruling.

Bill C-57 seeks to enact the act to implement the 2023 free trade agreement between Canada and the Ukraine. The amendment seeks to mandate the preparation of a plan to increase Canadian production of defence supplies required by the Ukrainian armed forces or the Canadian Forces.

As *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, dictates on page 770, “An amendment to a bill that was referred to a committee after second reading is out of order if it is beyond the scope and principle of the bill.”

In the opinion that has been well thought out, I say that the aforementioned plan contains a new concept that is beyond the scope of the bill; therefore, unfortunately, I rule that the amendment is inadmissible.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Madam Chair.

With great deference to your office, but taking into consideration what may be some reluctance to rule it out of order, I will do us all a favour and challenge the ruling so the amendment can be allowed if members are willing.

The Chair: All right.

Shall the ruling of the chair be sustained?

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 6; nays 5)

The Chair: All right.

I have CPC-3.

Does the member want to move it?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Madam Chair.

This introduces a new clause regarding the donation of surplus military equipment to Ukraine.

It says:

For as long as any territory of Ukraine is occupied by armed forces of the Russian Federation, the Minister of National Defence must periodically review Canada's inventory of military equipment and offer to donate to Ukraine any military equipment that that Minister deems to be surplus or no longer useful to Canada.

Madam Chair, it's simple and straightforward. If we have military equipment that is no longer useful to Canada and would be useful to Ukraine in their existential struggle for the defence of their territory and their people, we should be providing that equipment. Conservatives have been consistently advocating on this issue in the past in instances where we would have an opportunity to revitalize our own stockpile by purchasing new state-of-the-art equipment for our military and sharing with Ukraine older equipment we would likely not use that could be used by the Ukrainians right now. Better it be used in the battlefield defending Ukraine's people and territory than gathering dust in a context where it is very likely to not be used here in Canada.

The amendment is not highly prescriptive. It simply says the Minister of National Defence should periodically take a look at our stockpiles, at our inventory, and make an assessment about what can be contributed. I think this is helpful and constructive. It would make a difference. It would make a real, concrete difference for Ukraine in its defence of its territory and its people, so I hope this amendment will find the support of members.

Thanks.

• (1145)

The Chair: Okay. Thank you very much.

We'll do the ruling now.

Bill C-57 seeks to enact the act to implement the 2023 free trade agreement between Canada and Ukraine. The amendment proposes that the Minister of National Defence donate to Ukraine any Canadian military equipment that is deemed to be surplus or no longer useful to Canada.

As *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, states on page 770, "An amendment to a bill that was referred to

committee after second reading is out of order if it is beyond the scope and principle of the bill."

In my opinion, donation of Canadian military equipment represents a new concept beyond the scope of the bill. Therefore, I rule the amendment inadmissible.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: All right. Let's challenge the chair, then.

The Chair: Do you want to challenge the chair, Mr. Genuis?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I do.

The Chair: That's absolutely surprising.

Mr. Kyle Seeback: We feel we might have a chance this time.

The Chair: I took a suspension to think about it and make sure there wasn't any way and made my ruling.

Shall the ruling of the chair be sustained?

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 6; nays 5)

The Chair: Okay. We will move on now.

We have another proposed amendment by the Bloc.

Mr. Savard-Tremblay, do you want to move that amendment?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Yes, absolutely.

The wording of the amendment is quite clear. It is very similar to the one I proposed earlier on setting up an expert panel, which was rejected. This does not involve new spending. It has no impact on the public purse.

It means that the minister must now ensure that Canadian companies operating in Ukraine comply with the principles and guidelines referred to in article 15.14 of the 2023 Canada-Ukraine Free Trade Agreement.

[*English*]

The Chair: Do any other members wish to speak to the motion by Mr. Savard-Tremblay?

Hon. Mona Fortier (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Is it admissible?

The Chair: It is admissible.

Ms. Fortier, go ahead.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Mona Fortier: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Given that the amendment is in order, that it seems to be appreciated and that it will support the desired approach, we have no problem with it.

[*English*]

The Chair: Is there any further debate or discussion?

Go ahead, Mr. Seeback.

• (1150)

Mr. Kyle Seeback: There is already a robust dispute resolution section in chapter 28 of the agreement. In fact, there is a whole subsection that deals with these types of matters, so I don't see that we need to add this into the agreement.

Conservatives don't support this amendment.

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Savard-Tremblay, go ahead.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: I would just like to add that, in this regard, there are only references to the principles of corporate social responsibility strictly on a voluntary basis. There are no binding provisions. The goal is to add one because the least we can do is move from principles to actions.

[*English*]

The Chair: Shall amendment BQ-2 carry?

(Amendment agreed to on division)

The Chair: Thank you. That is very much appreciated.

Shall clause 16 carry?

(Clause 16 agreed to on division)

The Chair: We now have new clauses, as proposed in amendment CPC-4.

Is there a member who wants to move that?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Madam Chair.

The amendment we're proposing deals with the issue of export permits. It amends the Export and Import Permits Act.

It says:

Despite subsection (2), any type of munition that is intended for export to the United States and that is excluded from the Export Control List shall not be included on the Export Control List if it is intended for export to Ukraine.

It also says:

For as long as any permit issued under subsection (1.1) to export any type of munition to the United States is in force, the export of the same type of munition to Ukraine is also permitted, subject to the terms and conditions described in that permit.

Essentially, this amendment would streamline the rules around export permits for weapons and ammunitions intended for Ukraine by applying the same standard of review that is applied in the case of the United States. There are various provisions that regulate export permits for munitions and there are some variations in the standard of review that's involved, depending on the country in question.

Ukraine is an important ally. We want to see weapons delivered as quickly as possible, and that is why we think applying the review standard for Ukraine that is associated with most other NATO partners is sensible and reasonable. The review standard that is applied to our other partners could be applied to Ukraine, and this would have the effect of significantly streamlining that review process, allowing weapons and munitions in general to be delivered to Ukraine more quickly.

Again, this amendment would have concrete effect for the brave women and men on the front lines fighting the illegal, genocidal invasion by Russia. I hope that members will be supportive of this amendment proceeding through the process.

If I can, in the context of speaking to this amendment, I would remind members of the processes around amendments. If the committee chooses to adopt this amendment, we can also seek the concurrence of the House to accept it even if it goes beyond the formal parameters of scope. I've been involved in legislative reviews in the past where committees have decided that expansions of scope are necessary and important and have sent requests to the House to expand the scope. Motions have been adopted in the House or there's simply been unanimous consent at report stage.

I recall the work that was done in Bill C-41, for example. We agreed on certain amendments that did, formally speaking, go beyond the scope of the bill at second reading, and therefore there was unanimous consent at report stage to allow those amendments to go through.

We have all the tools available to us to adopt these amendments. There is no fundamental impediment to us adopting this, or any other amendment that we wish to adopt, provided there is a will to do so. Sadly, what we've seen so far is that there hasn't been a will to adopt these important amendments that support weapons exports. We had motions last week from Conservative members that would have allowed these amendments to be deemed necessarily in scope. We tried to put those motions forward to make the process easier. Liberals and New Democrats opposed those motions.

Today, again, we're seeing opposition to our efforts to adopt these important amendments, but it is important to underline and get on the record that if the committee wanted to move forward with these amendments, we could. The only reason we're not moving forward with them, in most cases it seems, is that Liberals and New Democrats are voting against our efforts to move those forward.

I hope that on this amendment, a common-sense amendment to get munitions to our allies in Ukraine more quickly, we'll see more support from colleagues around the table.

Thank you.

• (1155)

The Chair: Thank you very much.

I will do the ruling. Let me just assure members and anyone who is watching that the House of Commons has very strict rules about what can be done and what can't be done. As the chair, it is imperative that I follow the rules that are set down for all committee chairs and all committees.

Amendment CPC-4 seeks to amend sections 3 and 7 of the Export and Import Permits Act. As *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, states on page 771, "an amendment is inadmissible if it proposes to amend a statute that is not before the committee or a section of the parent Act, unless the latter is specifically amended by a clause of the bill."

Since sections 3 and 7 of the Export and Import Permits Act are not being amended by Bill C-57, it is therefore my opinion that the amendment is inadmissible.

Thank you very much.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'll challenge the chair.

The Chair: Of course.

Shall the ruling of the chair be sustained?

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 6; nays 5)

The Chair: Next, we have CPC-5.

Would the member like to move it?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I would, Madam Chair. Thank you.

CPC-5 is similar to the previous amendment. It amends the Export and Import Permits Act by saying that:

For as long as any permit issued under subsection (2) is in force to broker any type of munition that is to be imported into any country specified in the permit for end-use in that country, brokering the types of munition specified in that permit that are to be imported into Ukraine for end-use in Ukraine is also permitted, subject to the terms and conditions specified in that permit.

The effect of this is.... For those less familiar with the arms export process, there are so-called open policy countries that are designated for having a more streamlined review process for the export of weapons. Open policy countries are most of our NATO allies, as well as our Five Eyes partners. I believe South Korea is on that list as well. They are mostly our NATO partners, as well as some of our Asia-Pacific partners that are already on that list subject to a more streamlined review process.

That means that weapons exports get there substantially faster. If a weapons export is intended for one of these designated open policy countries, the typical standard for the timeline of that export is about one-quarter of the time for exports to countries that are not on the open policy list.

What we're proposing to do.... The effect of this amendment would be to add Ukraine, an important ally fighting an existential struggle for its survival, to that open policy list of countries, so that weapons would get to Ukraine faster.

I've been surprised before, but I don't see why anybody would have a reason to oppose this amendment to remove red tape. It would streamline and speed up the process of allowing essential munitions to get into the hands of Ukrainian soldiers.

Thanks.

• (1200)

The Chair: Thank you very much. I will now give my ruling.

Amendment CPC-5 seeks to amend section 7.1 of the Export and Import Permits Act. As our *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, states on page 771, "an amendment is inadmissible if it proposes to amend a statute that is not before the committee or a section of the parent Act, unless the latter is specifically amended by a clause of the bill."

Since section 7.1 of the Export and Import Permits Act is not being amended by Bill C-57, it is therefore my opinion that the amendment is inadmissible.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I challenge the chair.

The Chair: Shall the chair's ruling be sustained?

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 6; nays 5)

The Chair: Next, we have CPC-6.

Is there a member who wants to move it?

Mr. Genuis, go ahead.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Madam Chair.

We are concerned, based on reports we hear, that there has been a lack of interest from EDC and BDC in supporting investments that build up weapons-manufacturing capacity in key partners where such investments would be appropriate and aligned with the national interest of Canada and the vital strategic interests of the countries in question.

We're proposing an amendment to the Export Development Act designed to facilitate the building up of Ukraine's domestic munitions-manufacturing capacity. The amendment is as follows:

In carrying out its purpose under paragraph (1)(c), the Corporation shall give preference to the development of munitions manufacturing capacity in Ukraine.

I think that's fairly straightforward. Again, we want to see EDC and BDC—we will also have a separate amendment on BDC—be able to look at and consider and move forward with supporting investments that make sense and that would build up the munitions-manufacturing capacity of Ukraine so that it's able to have a secure, domestically sourced supply of the munitions it needs to be able to sustain its struggle for as long as required and liberate its territory and its people.

I hope this amendment will find support.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Amendment CPC-6 seeks to amend section 10 of the Export Development Act. As *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, states on page 771, "an amendment is inadmissible if it proposes to amend a statute that is not before the committee or a section of the parent Act, unless the latter is specifically amended by a clause of the bill".

Since section 10 of the Export Development Act is not being amended by Bill C-57, it is therefore my opinion that the amendment is inadmissible.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'll challenge the chair.

The Chair: Shall the chair's ruling be sustained?

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 6; nays 5)

The Chair: There are no amendments submitted for clauses 17 to 33. Do I have unanimous consent to group them for the vote?

• (1205)

[Translation]

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: I would like a recorded vote on clause 27, please.

[English]

The Chair: Do we have unanimous consent to group clauses 17 to 26?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Shall clauses 17 to 26 carry?

(Clauses 17 to 26 inclusive agreed to on division)

(On clause 27)

The Chair: Shall clause 27 carry?

[Translation]

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: I request a recorded vote.

[English]

The Chair: We'll have a recorded vote on clause 27.

Mr. Kyle Seeback: I would like an explanation from our officials on clause 27, if we could.

Mr. Adam Douglas (Senior Counsel and Deputy Director, Investment and Services Law, Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development): I'm happy to provide one. Thank you.

Clause 27 lists the Commercial Arbitration Act, which reflects the international commercial arbitration code and implements it into domestic Canadian legislation. Including arbitration provisions within the Canada-Ukraine free trade agreement and listing it in the Commercial Arbitration Act allows for the judicial review and enforcement of arbitral decisions taken underneath the Canada-Ukraine free trade agreement.

I should note, though, that the listing provided is inclusive, meaning that even if the Canada-Ukraine free trade agreement were not listed, arbitration decisions taken under its provisions would still be captured by the Commercial Arbitration Act.

I hope that's helpful.

The Chair: We'll have a recorded vote on clause 27.

(Clause 27 agreed to: yeas 9; nays 2)

(Clauses 28 to 33 inclusive agreed to on division)

The Chair: We have new clause 33.1. It's CPC-7.

Is there a member who would like to move it?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I'll do it, Madam Chair.

I'm warning members that this is their last chance to support one of my amendments. If they were planning on supporting one of them, this is it. This is the time.

Mr. Gerretsen, if you wish to support it, you can maybe consult with your whip to sub in. I won't go any further down that rabbit hole.

Madam Chair, the amendment I'd like to put forward is effectively the same as the previous amendment, except in this case it applies to BDC instead of EDC. This is to support BDC in making investments that would help develop domestic munitions-manufacturing capacity in Ukraine.

I think these changes are substantial and important. I hope that members will, at this late stage, have a clarification of conscience and do the right thing by supporting one of the many amendments that I have put forward, aimed at facilitating weapons export and manufacturing in Ukraine.

As we've said previously, what Ukraine needs most is not a carbon tax. I would say Ukraine doesn't need a carbon tax at all. What Ukraine needs is not provisions on carbon leakage that would effectively create the mechanism by which there could be pressure to further increase that. Rather, Ukraine needs the munitions and the support to prosecute this war and to achieve a decisive victory.

This is why we have put forward a series of amendments that, if adopted, would have significantly improved the process involved in munitions exports and supporting investments in munitions in Ukraine.

In all seriousness, I do hope that, rather than just voting against these measures, Liberals and New Democrats will take a serious look at what is required to support our partners and allies in Ukraine and support this amendment.

Thank you.

• (1210)

The Chair: Thank you very much.

I appreciate your not going on too terribly long.

In spite of that, amendment CPC-7 seeks to amend section 4 and paragraph 14(5)(b) of the Business Development Bank of Canada Act. As *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, states on page 771, "an amendment is inadmissible if it proposes to amend a statute that is not before the committee or a section of the parent Act, unless the latter is specifically amended by a clause of the bill."

Since section 4 and paragraph 14(5)(b) of the Business Development Bank of Canada Act are not being amended by Bill C-57, it is therefore my opinion that the amendment is inadmissible.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I will challenge the chair.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 6; nays 5)

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Now we have the last few clauses of the bill.

There are no further amendments submitted for clauses—

Mr. Kyle Seeback: I've submitted an amendment to the clerk for clause 40.

The Chair: Let's do clauses 34 to 39.

There are no amendments to clauses 34 to 39. Do we have unanimous consent to group them for the vote?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Clauses 34 to 39 inclusive agreed to on division)

The Chair: They are carried on division.

We will suspend momentarily so we can distribute the amendment.

• (1210) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1220)

The Chair: I'm calling the meeting back to order.

Mr. Seeback, would you like to speak to clause 40?

(On clause 40)

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair.

I would like to move an amendment to clause 40 to add something at the end. The section now reads, "Subject to subsection (2), this Act comes into force on a day to be fixed by order of the Governor in Council." I will add "after all references to carbon pricing and carbon leakage have been removed from the modernized Canada-Ukraine Free Trade Agreement".

The Chair: Mr. Savard-Tremblay, do you have the amendment?

[Translation]

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Where is the motion? Was it sent by email?

I have not received a notification.

[English]

The Chair: The clerk has sent it.

It would be helpful for some of us if we always had them in paper copy. I'm sure next time we will.

[Translation]

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: I have not received a notification.

[English]

The Chair: Do you have it now? Okay.

All right, we'll go back to Mr. Seeback.

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Yes. I'll start again.

This is an amendment to clause 40, which currently reads, "Subject to subsection (2), this Act comes into force on a day to be fixed by order of the Governor in Council." My amendment would add to it the following: "after all references to carbon pricing and carbon leakage have been removed from the modernized Canada-Ukraine Free Trade Agreement".

What we know is that carbon taxes in Canada have caused enormous misery for Canadians. We have seen just recently that 800,000 Ontarians are now going to the food bank as a result of the carbon tax causing massive increases in food prices. Canadians are suffering deeply as a result of the carbon tax here in Canada.

We do not know why carbon pricing and carbon leakage were included for the first time ever in a Canadian free trade agreement. It's not in a single free trade agreement that Canada has. It's not in our free trade agreement with the United States and it's not in CPTPP. It's not in free trade with the European Union.

I've also been advised that any attempts to include this kind of language with countries we're currently negotiating with, for example Indonesia and others, is a non-starter. It's not happening.

This is something that the Prime Minister has asked to be included in this trade agreement as he pursues his ideological agenda on carbon pricing, carbon taxes and carbon leakage, which is doing long-standing damage to the Canadian economy and to Canadians.

Liberals say they want unity on this. If this amendment were to pass and these references were removed, they would have unanimous support for this free trade agreement. Our objection is to putting the kinds of things into free trade agreements that should not be there, that have never been there, and that cause harm, not good.

We've tried to improve the free trade agreement by adding sections on munitions, munitions production, energy security, etc. This would complete what should be done, which is removing that.

Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

• (1225)

The Chair: Thank you very much. Thank you for introducing that.

My ruling on your amendment to clause 40 is that your amendment attempts to add a condition regarding when the bill comes into force. As *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition, states on pages 773 and 774:

An amendment intended to alter the coming into force clause of a bill, making it conditional, is out of order since it exceeds the scope of the bill and attempts to introduce a new question into it.

It is my opinion that the amendment is a new concept that is beyond the scope of the bill; therefore, the amendment is inadmissible.

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Madam Chair, not surprisingly, I'm going to challenge the chair's ruling on that.

I have a good feeling this time.

[Translation]

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Before we vote on your ruling, I would like to ask you a question, Madam Chair.

I haven't looked into this myself, but how is it that, in the case of an agreement between Canada and Colombia, an amendment was made to delay its coming into force until the situation in Colombia was resolved?

Can you explain to me how that works procedurally?

[English]

The Chair: I'm sorry, Mr. Savard-Tremblay; it's not subject to debate. I've made the ruling that it is inadmissible.

The mover has asked for a recorded vote on whether the ruling of the chair should be sustained.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 6; nays 5)

(Clause 40 agreed to on division)

The Chair: All right. We'll see if we can get a little bit further here.

Shall the short title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: On division.

The Chair: Shall the title carry?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: On division.

The Chair: Shall the bill as amended carry?

(Bill C-57 as amended agreed to: yeas 7; nays 4)

The Chair: Shall the chair report the bill as amended to the House?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: On division.

The Chair: Shall the chair order a reprint of the bill as amended for the use of the House at report stage?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

An hon. member: On division.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Sheehan.

• (1230)

Mr. Terry Sheehan (Sault Ste. Marie, Lib.): It is a new matter.

The Chair: Okay, it's a new matter.

We have completed Bill C-57. Thank you very much. In spite of all the challenges, we managed to get here.

Go ahead, Mr. Sheehan.

Mr. Terry Sheehan: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I have submitted to the clerk the following motion, which I will read. It will be distributed in both official languages.

I move that:

Whereas Canada is not imposing a price on pollution on Ukraine;

Whereas Ukraine already has a carbon pricing system;

Whereas Ukraine is a sovereign nation and, via President Zelenskyy, has signed the modernized Canada-Ukraine Free Trade Agreement;

Therefore, the Standing Committee on International Trade supports Bill C-57, the 2023 Canada-Ukraine Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act.

Madam Chair, as I motivate this, I want to draw it to everyone's attention. There has been a lot said here. Ukraine has had a price on pollution for well over a decade, since 2011. Ukraine is fighting this illegal, unjust invasion by Russia. They're fighting for their people today. They're fighting for their children tomorrow. At the same time, President Zelenskyy came here and signed this CUFTA agreement, which has a price on pollution that fights climate change. It fights climate change today. It fights climate change for the children of Ukraine and the children of the world. Canada stands with Ukraine. We ought to stand with them.

That is why this motion is tremendously important. It demonstrates, underlines and highlights the importance of the fight against climate change and—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order, Madam Chair.

Mr. Terry Sheehan: I am telling you that President Zelenskyy... I don't know why His Majesty's official opposition thinks they know better than President Zelenskyy.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order.

The Chair: Yes, go ahead on a point of order.

I have Mr. Seebach and Mr. Gerretsen, who also want to speak.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Chair, it's just a point of order.

I commend the member on his dutiful adherence to his instructions from the Prime Minister's Office, but is he actually proposing a motion that the committee agree with a thing it just did? We just did clause-by-clause on the Canada-Ukraine free trade deal. It has passed. Now he's proposing a motion to say, "Let's also adopt a motion saying that we agree with the thing we just did."

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: That's not a point of order.

Mr. Terry Sheehan: This is debate, Madam Chair.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Is that really what he is doing?

The Chair: He has the right to do that.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's just absurd.

Mr. Terry Sheehan: I motivated this, and it is on the floor.

Open up the speakers list and we can debate this.

The Chair: Thank you.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: I know that Mr. Sheehan has the right to do that, but as the sumo wrestling match in mud that is starting could last until the end of the meeting, I want to let you know that I also have a motion to move. I already sent it last Friday.

Could we talk about it?

[*English*]

The Chair: Right now, I'm hopefully going to Mr. Seeback and Mr. Gerretsen. At that point, I hope we'll close off this discussion and find time to deal with Mr. Savard-Tremblay's motion, which he wants to speak to.

Go ahead, Mr. Seeback.

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Thank you, Madam Chair.

What I think is particularly contemptible is the attempts by Liberal members and this Liberal government to say that His Majesty's loyal opposition.... Opposing things is an act of loyalty, if we see something bad in a particular piece of legislation, which we do in this legislation.

What my friend probably doesn't understand is what the effect of carbon leakage is. Carbon leakage would mean that Ukraine could not have a carbon tax or a carbon price so low as to attract investment, because that's considered carbon leakage. It's a company choosing to invest in Ukraine because its carbon tax or carbon price is too low. That's how it's defined.

What Ukraine has is a tiny carbon price on select industries. It does not have a broad-based carbon tax like the punishing carbon tax this Prime Minister has imposed on Canada. It's a carbon tax he intends to quadruple as 800,000 Ontarians go to a food bank. That would be the fourth-largest city in Ontario—a city entirely dependent on going to a food bank for food. That's what carbon taxes do, Madam Chair. That's what they're doing to Canada.

These Liberal members suggest that our objection to that is somehow not supporting Ukraine. Quite frankly, it's despicable, because this Liberal government granted an export permit waiver for a gas turbine to be exported and to be used to pump Russian gas. Let that sink in for a minute, everyone. To the folks in the media who are here today, you should report on this. They allowed a gas turbine to go to help pump Russian gas. What does Russia use to fund its illegal war in Ukraine? It's the sale of gas and the profits from the sale of gas.

The Liberals granted the permit and they have the audacity to sit here and say that us voting against this agreement, which has now passed out of committee, is somehow betraying Ukraine. No. Giving Russia a gas turbine betrayed Ukraine.

Do you know what's worse? We now have a report that came out yesterday, saying that Canadian detonators are being used in Russian land mines. That's right. The government is so inept and incompetent in applying sanctions that Canadian detonators are finding their way into Russian land mines. Do you know what Russian land mines do? They kill Ukrainian soldiers. If you want to talk about what's actually harming Ukraine, it's the incompetence of this government. It's absolutely shameful, despicable incompetence.

To then try to come to the House of Commons and the committee to suggest that our vote, which did nothing.... Guess what? It got to committee, and it just got out of committee. It's causing no harm whatsoever.

We get to oppose bad pieces of legislation. We get to oppose your ideological obsession with carbon taxes, carbon prices and the absolute misery they've imposed on Canadians. Canadians are skipping meals because of the carbon tax. Farmers are being beaten into submission because of the carbon tax. There are farmers who are paying \$10,000, \$20,000 or \$30,000 a month in carbon taxes. That gets passed on to Canadian consumers.

Guess what? Our vote is not doing anything to harm Ukraine. We are principally opposed to you guys ramming in this terminology for the first time ever in a trade agreement. That's what we object to. We get to object to that. That does not cause a scintilla of harm to Ukraine. Do you know what does? It's giving Russia a bloody gas turbine and detonators used in land mines.

You guys should all watch what you say, because your behaviour on this is despicable and you don't have a leg to stand on.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

• (1235)

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Gerretsen.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Despite the fact that everything Mr. Seeback just said about the price on pollution in Canada is patently incorrect, the Conservatives' issue with the carbon tax is just another red herring. We've hit a new low when Conservatives are trying to avoid talking about a motion by starting to actually talk straight to reporters in a committee meeting and telling reporters what they should be reporting on.

We've hit a new low, because Conservatives are now in a position where they are having some serious buyer's remorse over the way they voted on this. These four members have now voted—not once, but twice—against Ukraine, just moments ago.

As I was sitting here, Madam Chair, because I had a lot of time to think about this during the last hour or so, I was thinking that Mr. Genuis and all the Conservatives were talking about supporting Ukraine by providing weapons. It's funny, because in the 2022 budget the Government of Canada put \$500 million into supporting Ukraine with weapons, and every single Conservative member voted against it. I know it's easy to say, well, it's the budget, so they had to vote against it. That kind of does make sense. I can understand that.

Do you know what I did, Madam Chair, in the time I was sitting here? I went back and looked to see how Mr. Seeback, Mr. Genuis, Mr. Baldinelli and Mr. Martel spoke on the budget of 2022. They all spoke to the budget. Well, I should put it this way: None of them spoke about the weapons that we were providing to Ukraine in the budget. Even if they had supported the weapons going to Ukraine, in which the government invested half a billion dollars in the last budget, you would have thought that at least one of them who was so passionate about the issue would have stood up during that time of the budget and at least said, “You know what? I don't support the budget, because I can't, because I'm in the opposition, and that's just what we do. However, I want to say that I support the aid going to Ukraine.”

They didn't. Why didn't they, Madam Chair? It's because the issue right now about how we should be talking about ammunition and weapons is a red herring. That's it. They're looking for justification to prove to the over two million Ukrainian Canadians why they voted against it before and why they're doubling down on it now.

I got a real kick out of it when I heard Mr. Genuis earlier say, “what Ukraine needs”. Actually, what Ukraine needs is for Conservatives to start listening to the Ukrainian President when the President tells them that they need this trade agreement. What Ukraine needs is for Conservatives to listen to the Ukrainian Canadian Congress when they say what they need. What Ukraine doesn't need are people like Vladimir Putin or the Conservatives who tell them what they need.

Do you know who else tells—

• (1240)

Mr. Tony Baldinelli (Niagara Falls, CPC): Do your due diligence.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Do you know who else tells—

The Chair: Mr. Gerretsen has the floor.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order.

The Chair: Go ahead on a point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: I raised a point of order first, Madam Chair.

[*English*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis: You never talked about Ukraine unless you were using it as a partisan matter. You didn't care before and you don't care now. You're just a partisan hack.

The Chair: It's Mr. Seeback, and then Mr. Savard-Tremblay.

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Madam Chair, right now in the House of Commons there is a point of order with the Speaker about Liberals suggesting that somehow we are with Vladimir Putin because of how we're dealing with this.

The member just implied again that Conservatives are with Vladimir Putin. This is absolutely unparliamentary, and he should not be making those references, because absolutely no Conservative supports Vladimir Putin. It's a disgusting reference, and he should withdraw any comments like that.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: If I may, on the same point of order—

The Chair: Wait just one second.

I have Mr. Savard-Tremblay on a point of order.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Yes, it's on a completely different topic.

I think we forgot to tell our valiant senior officials that they can go. The bill was passed.

They are not required to attend a show as ridiculous as this one on top of that. Can we thank them for their time and tell them they don't need to stay?

[*English*]

The Chair: I think you're great. Thank you so much.

To the officials, thank you for your patience and thank you for being with us today.

You are free to leave if you choose to.

Mr. Gerretsen—

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Mr. Douglas has something to say.

Mr. Adam Douglas: With apologies, thank you, Madam Chair.

I just want to say, on behalf of my wonderful colleagues here at the public service, that we are very happy to provide any support to the committee.

We thank you for having us here today, and we wish you well.

The Chair: Thanks to you all for being here.

Mr. Gerretsen, you still have the floor. Please finish up.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Thank you.

Madam Chair, I never said that Conservatives support Vladimir Putin. I never said that.

I realize that there is some real concern over the way things look for Conservatives, but what I said, Madam Chair, was that what Ukraine doesn't need is people who are telling them what they need. One of those people is Vladimir Putin, who we know continually tells them what they need. We know that Conservatives also do that.

I'm not coming to this conclusion on my own. I'm literally quoting the words that Mr. Genuis used in this meeting about an hour ago. He said “what Ukraine needs”, and then he went on.

• (1245)

Mr. Garnett Genuis: That's your position.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Madam Chair, I don't think the President was—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order, Madam Chair.

The Chair: Mr. Gerretsen, perhaps you could wrap up.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Yes.

The Chair: I have several speakers after you, and we have a motion by one of the members that we'd like to deal with, which is time-sensitive.

Perhaps you could wrap up, sir.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order, Madam Chair.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: I'm going to try to wrap up. I do have a couple more things to say, Madam Chair. I appreciate that.

To my point, what I was saying was that—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: —what Ukraine doesn't need is people to tell them what they need. They're very capable of determining that on their own, which we have seen.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I have a point of order.

The Chair: I am sorry, but there's another point of order.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Chair, the member is being completely dishonest about what I said. He's misleading the committee, so I want to clarify what I said, which was that precisely what Ukraine has said it needs are weapons. I don't think anybody disputes that Ukraine wants weapons.

The Chair: That's just part of the debate.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I am repeating what Ukraine has said it needs.

The Chair: I think it's just more of the debate.

Mr. Gerretsen, please complete your comment—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: This member is highly dishonest in everything he's saying.

The Chair: —because I have to go to Mr. Sheehan.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Thank you, Madam Chair.

To this motion, it reads:

Whereas Canada is not imposing a price on pollution on Ukraine;

That is very clear. In the agreement that you just sent back to the House, it specifically states that's the case.

It says:

Whereas Ukraine already has a carbon pricing system;

Again, that's totally true. You can debate how much it is and where it is, as the Conservatives want to do, but it doesn't change the fact that it is a true statement.

Then it says:

Whereas Ukraine is a sovereign nation and, via President Zelenskyy, has signed the modernized Canada-Ukraine Free Trade Agreement;

Again, this is another very true statement. Nobody can argue that this is not true, despite the fact that you might think you know better than President Zelenskyy what he needs for his country.

It finally says:

Therefore, the Standing Committee on International Trade supports Bill C-57, the 2023 Canada-Ukraine Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act.

It's very simple. If you want to vote against it, vote against it, but it's as cut and dried as that.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Sheehan.

Mr. Terry Sheehan: Let's just vote on this.

Mr. Kyle Seebach: There's still a speakers list.

The Chair: Next I have Mr. Genuis, and then I have Mr. Seebach.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I would like to read briefly, for the interest of the committee, an article from July 12, 2022.

The headline is “‘Manifestation of weakness’: Zelenskyy condemns Canada for return of Russia-Germany pipeline turbines”.

Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy is personally condemning Canada over its decision to grant a Canadian company a “time-limited and revocable permit,” allowing them to return turbines from a Russian pipeline that supplies natural gas to Germany.

Zelenskyy said that Canada's decision is about more than wrongly deciding to hand over the turbines, but that it was an “absolutely unacceptable exception to the sanctions regime against Russia.”

“If a terrorist state can squeeze out such an exception to sanctions, what exceptions will it want tomorrow or the day after tomorrow? This question is very dangerous,” Zelenskyy said in a video and accompanying statement on Monday, that also stated the Ukrainian Ministry of Foreign Affairs “had to summon Canada's representative to our country.”

“The decision on the exception to sanctions will be perceived in Moscow exclusively as a manifestation of weakness. This is their logic. And now, there can be no doubt that Russia will try not just to limit as much as possible, but to completely shut down the supply of gas to Europe at the most acute moment,” he continued.

The turbines, part of the Nord Stream 1 pipeline, had been sent to Siemens Canada in Montreal for repairs, but once the federal government imposed sanctions on Russian state-owned energy company Gazprom, the company was restricted from sending the equipment back.

Canada faced pressure from both Russia and Germany to return the turbines, fearing the risk of further energy instability. Natural Resources Minister Jonathan Wilkinson's weekend announcement of the permit....

The story goes on with further details.

The Chair: Could you come to a close, please, Mr. Genuis?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Chair, I will come to a close at the time of my choosing as per the rules of the committee.

Where was the member for Kingston and the Islands? Where was Mark Gerretsen when the Canadian representative in Ukraine was summoned by President Zelenskyy? Did Mr. Gerretsen take to Twitter? Did he stand up in the House of Commons to tell his government to listen to President Zelenskyy? No. He was silent.

Where were the other members of this committee? Where was Yvan Baker? Not a single member of the Liberal caucus criticized the Prime Minister's decision to supply a turbine that was designed to facilitate the export of Russian gas to Europe and was a sanctions exemption. This was condemned roundly and personally by President Zelenskyy. He described it correctly as a manifestation of weakness. He summoned the Canadian representative to Ukraine. We had the ambassador to Ukraine before the foreign affairs committee denouncing that decision as it related to the turbine.

This isn't the first or the last time this government has ignored the needs of Ukraine—not what I say Ukraine needed, but what Ukrainians said they needed. It wasn't the first time and it would not be the last.

On March 29, earlier that year and very shortly after the invasion, Conservatives put forward a motion in the House to allow visa-free travel for Ukrainians fleeing the war. This motion, by the way, was supported by all of the opposition parties—Conservative, Bloc and NDP. That meant it passed. The House of Commons passed a motion calling on the government to allow visa-free travel for Ukrainians. The Liberals not only voted against it, but they failed to implement it, even after the expressed will of the majority of the House of Commons was decisively stated on that.

Mr. Gerretsen is here. How did Mr. Gerretsen vote? He voted no. A month after the invasion, he voted against our motion for visa-free travel for Ukraine. All of the Liberal members either voted against or didn't bother to show up for that vote. We had the refusal of that support from this government and a refusal to implement the will of Canada's elected House of Commons.

In the summer, the government was denounced and condemned by the President of Ukraine for breaking western sanctions unity, and there were no statements whatsoever from members of the government, backbench or otherwise. It's no surprise, because while members of this government across the way are interested in trying to use something for political points, they have consistently voted against our proposals that would have made a concrete difference to help Ukraine.

Just last week at this committee, the Conservatives put forward a motion that would have expanded the scope of Bill C-57, which would have allowed us to move forward with constructive amendments that would remove red tape and ease the process of weapons sales to Ukraine. Liberals opposed that motion. Liberals and New Democrats, unfortunately, together blocked our efforts to expand the scope of the bill. That would have made a real, concrete difference to the people in Ukraine.

The member across the way says to look at who's talking about Ukraine in the House. Okay, let's look at who's talking about Ukraine in the House. I did a search here on who's talking about Ukraine. Since getting elected, I have talked about Ukraine 240 times in the House of Commons, which is well over three times as much as the member for Kingston and the Islands talks about Ukraine. I suspect that most of that talk has just been in the last week or so when he's decided he wants to wear the hat of being the one doing the attacks. I don't think the government has much to offer, which is why they've gone into full-on mindless attack mode. I don't think Canadians are going to be fooled by that.

Going back further, Ukraine was invaded in 2014, and Stephen Harper led the world in mobilizing a response. At that time, the role that Canada was playing in response to the illegal invasion of Crimea was widely recognized.

● (1250)

When the Liberals took power, they were bent on warming up relations with Russia, while Ukraine was already partially occupied by Russia. We had then minister Stéphane Dion eagerly pursuing the warming up of relations. In fact, one of the first things this government did was that they cancelled the sharing of RADARSAT satellite images. Under the Conservatives, we had RADARSAT satellites that were sharing images that were of strategic use to Ukraine. The Liberals, upon taking office, cancelled that program of assistance.

Prior to the further invasion at the beginning of last year, we were consistently calling for tougher sanctions. We've also called for increased investments in our military. Liberals, from the beginning of being in government, were talking about having a leaner military in their first budget. Liberals have consistently failed to support Ukraine. They've consistently opposed the vital investments in our military and in NATO co-operation that would ensure our security and the security of our allies. They voted against visa-free travel for Ukraine. They earned the condemnation of the Government of Ukraine by granting the Siemens turbine sanctions permit exemption, and they opposed our efforts to allow weapon exports.

As I said before, I think reasonable people can disagree on the particulars of a trade agreement. Our view is that the explicit references to carbon pricing and carbon leakage are enough of a problem that we cannot support the deal as it is. I think reasonable people can disagree about that.

What is clear is that on much more fundamental issues, on which the Ukrainian government has repeatedly and explicitly spoken, these Liberals have been totally indifferent. Their use of this issue for political purposes demonstrates their fundamental insincerity when it comes to Ukraine and issues of international peace and security in general.

With that in mind, Madam Chair, I will likely have a couple of amendments to propose to this motion. I will start with the following amendment, to add to the beginning of the text of the motion “Whereas on March 29, 2022, Liberals opposed a Conservative motion to allow Ukrainians visa-free travel to Canada”.

I'll leave it there.

● (1255)

The Chair: Mr. Seeback.

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Thank you, Madam Chair.

The Chair: Are you speaking to the amendment that Mr. Genuis moved?

Mr. Kyle Seeback: I'm speaking to the main motion.

The Chair: Right now we're debating the amendment.

Mr. Gerretsen.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Can we just get a copy of that? Is it in writing?

The Chair: Yes, can we get it in both official languages, please?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Chair, the rules permit me to move an amendment verbally. I do not have it in writing in both official languages, because I became aware of this motion when it was moved about 15 minutes ago.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: Can you repeat it slowly?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: The former minister as well as the parliamentary secretary should be aware of the rules. The amendment has been duly moved.

The Chair: You can introduce it.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: I didn't ask for it—

[*Translation*]

Hon. Mona Fortier: In French—

[*English*]

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: —in both official languages. I just asked for the motion so I could read and understand it before I vote on it.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Mona Fortier: Why are you upset? It happens to us all the time, in French.

[*English*]

The Chair: It would be helpful if we have it in writing.

Read out your amendment slowly so the translators can get it effectively.

Go ahead.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis: If the Liberals want to facilitate participation in both official languages, they can propose their motion in advance.

[*English*]

The Chair: We have the translators, so please read it slowly.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: All right.

The motion is, “Whereas on March 29, 2022, Liberals opposed a Conservative motion to allow Ukrainians visa-free travel to Canada”.

The Chair: Mr. Gerretsen, go ahead on the amendment.

Mr. Mark Gerretsen: I don't think the amendment is in order. It doesn't even reflect the original motion that was proposed.

If the Conservatives want to litigate this particular red herring that they're bringing up right now, then they can do that on their

own at a later point. The amendment does not lend itself in any way, shape or form to the motion that's at hand. I'll vote against it.

If they want to bring forward another thing and to discuss their red herring at another time, they can do that.

• (1300)

The Chair: Okay.

I suggest we call a vote.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I want to speak to the amendment.

The Chair: You spoke to it already.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: I want to speak to it again.

The rules provide me with the ability to do that.

The Chair: Okay. Keep it up.

At two o'clock there is question period. Keep going. I'm fine.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: That's fine.

Madam Chair, the problem I have is that the member seems to think that this amendment is outside the purpose of the motion. I'm not actually clear what the purpose of this motion is, because, as I said previously, this committee has—

Mr. Chandra Arya (Nepean, Lib.): I have a point of order, Madam Chair.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Arya.

Mr. Chandra Arya: Madam Chair, I have other things to attend after one o'clock. It is one o'clock now.

The Chair: Yes, I'm hearing from two committee members that they have to leave shortly.

If we want to try to wrap this up and bring it to a vote, I suggest that would be appropriate, but you have the floor right now and then I have Mr. Seeback.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: Madam Chair, I have the floor and I do have more things to say on this matter, but if members...I don't want to stand in the way.

I think, based on conversations with my colleague, there's another matter that the committee wanted to address before adjourning, so I will just move to adjourn debate on the present matter, if that facilitates the committee's moving forward as it wishes.

I'll move to adjourn debate so that we can get to the other matter before the meeting is adjourned.

The Chair: There's a suggestion that we adjourn this debate.

Is everyone in favour of adjourning the debate on the amendment that was introduced by Mr. Genuis?

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: The debate on the amendment is adjourned.

We now have the motion—

Mr. Garnett Genuis: On a point of order, Madam Chair, you cannot debate the motion if you've adjourned debate on an amendment.

If you adjourn debate on an amendment, then you've adjourned debate on the matter. The clerk can confirm that.

The Chair: But it still leaves the motion.

Mr. Garnett Genuis: No, the debate on that has been adjourned.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: In that case, may I please ask that the debate on the motion be adjourned, as well?

[*English*]

Mr. Garnett Genuis: They're not separate things. They happen at once.

The Chair: The clerk will confirm. We follow the rules.

I'm not waiting for an answer.

Is everyone in favour of adjourning the debate on the motion introduced by Mr. Sheehan?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's already been done.

The Chair: Is everyone okay with that so that we can get to the other members?

Mr. Garnett Genuis: It's happened already.

The Chair: I'm trying to accommodate Mr. Savard-Tremblay, because he has a time-sensitive motion that he introduced a week ago.

Mr. Savard-Tremblay, you have the floor.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Thank you.

I won't waste any more of this committee's time.

I think the motion speaks for itself. It says, “in its Budget presented in March 2023, the government announced its intention to

introduce, by 2024, a bill to eliminate forced labour from Canadian supply chains and to strengthen the ban on the import of goods produced by forced labour”.

As we know, there are less than three weeks left in the parliamentary session, and that is why I am moving this motion. It's as simple as that.

• (1305)

[*English*]

The Chair: Thank you.

Madame Fortier.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Mona Fortier: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I see no problem with most of this motion.

However, it is the Minister of Labour and Seniors, the Hon. Seamus O'Regan, who, according to his mandate letter, is responsible for introducing a bill to eliminate forced labour from Canadian supply chains. So I would like to move an amendment that the letter be sent to him.

If you want, I could read the mandate letter, but given the amount of time we have left, you could also look at it later.

Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: So you are suggesting that the letter be sent to the Minister of Labour and Seniors rather than to the Minister of International Trade.

I agree with that.

Hon. Mona Fortier: That is my suggestion, yes.

[*English*]

The Chair: Okay, thank you very much.

All those in favour of Mr. Savard-Tremblay's motion, please raise your hands.

(Motion agreed to)

The Chair: It carries unanimously.

Thank you all very much.

The meeting is adjourned.

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

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

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 House of Commons website at the following address: <https://www.ourcommons.ca>

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

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

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 des communes.

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 de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante :
<https://www.noscommunes.ca>