



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on International Trade

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 015

Monday, November 24, 2025

Chair: Judy A. Sgro



Standing Committee on International Trade

Monday, November 24, 2025

• (1530)

[English]

The Chair (Hon. Judy A. Sgro (Humber River—Black Creek, Lib.)): I call the meeting to order.

This is meeting number 15 of the Standing Committee on International Trade.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2) and the motion adopted by the committee on Thursday, September 18, 2025, the committee is resuming its study of Canada and the forthcoming CUSMA review.

We have with us today, from the Canada Organic Trade Association, Tia Loftsgard, executive director. From the Canadian Animal Health Institute, we have Catherine Filejski, president and chief executive officer. From the Canadian Institute of Steel Construction, we have Keanin Loomis, president and chief executive officer, by video conference. From the Canadian Labour Congress, we have Bea Bruske, president, and Elizabeth Kwan, senior researcher. From the Digital Media Association, we have Graham Davies, president and chief executive officer, by video conference.

We also have a past chair of international trade filling in for us today: Mr. Randy Hoback. Welcome back to your favourite committee.

Welcome to all.

You will have up to five minutes for your opening remarks, followed by questions from the different committee members.

Ms. Loftsgard, I invite you to give us an opening statement of up to five minutes, please.

Tia Loftsgard (Executive Director, Canada Organic Trade Association): Thank you, Chair and committee members, for the opportunity to speak.

I represent the Canada Organic Trade Association, the national voice for Canada's \$9.75 billion organic sector and Canada's technical lead on organic equivalency arrangements. As we approach the 2026 CUSMA review, continuity and stability must guide our decisions. This agreement has delivered strong trade and investment benefits and helped grow the organic sector by improving access and availability for consumers. We urge renewal for the full 16-year term and caution against annual reviews or wholesale renegotiation, which would create uncertainty and disrupt trade.

Canada is the fifth largest organic market globally, growing 8% in 2024, with two-thirds of Canadians buying organic products weekly. Canada is also a critical trade partner, ranking as the num-

ber one export partner for both the United States and the EU. Both of them are our largest successful trading partners, and this is built on trust and regulatory alignment. Canada has nine organic equivalency arrangements that reduce barriers to the \$200-plus billion global market and have created a level playing field. Our two most important trade partners, the U.S. and the EU, are currently under review for their organic equivalency arrangements. For the Canada-U.S. arrangement, this will be the first review since it came into force in 2009. The U.S. is the largest organic market in the world, representing about 45% of global organic sales and Canada is the top destination for U.S. exports, accounting for 40% of U.S. exports.

Our top priority is to protect organic equivalency and keep it out of the CUSMA negotiations. Since 2009, the Canada-U.S. arrangement, like all global organic equivalency arrangements, has worked as a technical and not a political mechanism. We strongly oppose bringing these technical arrangements into trade talks. Instead, Canada should invest in better tracking tools to measure economic impacts and keep our sector competitive. Organic faces unique vulnerabilities. It's a high-value industry with limited global supply chains, leaving us more exposed when trade agreements impose rigid rules that don't reflect the realities of integrated supply chains. Zero-tariff access and smooth cross-border movement are essential. Organic trade depends on rigorous standards across the entire value chain, from soil inputs and on-farm practices to processing aids and distribution and labelling. Canada cannot produce all of our demand domestically, so many organic ingredients, finished products and packaging materials must be sourced internationally, while seasonal limitations and gaps in processing capacity require integrated North American supply chains to maintain that organic integrity. Stricter rules of origin would raise costs and consumer prices, which is a major risk for such a premium sector. Domestic organic production has stagnated or declined in recent years, which creates an increasing reliance on imports.

These challenges underscore the urgency of implementing an organic action plan for Canada, of which I have a copy available here today to share with you. We just launched this in October 2025. This plan focuses on production, growth, market development and policy alignment, including better data systems, regulatory modernization and export readiness. Canada currently lacks basic organic data, with fewer than one-third of the exports to the United States tracked. This gap weakens our position in trade negotiations like CUSMA and limits investment in supply chains. Addressing this is absolutely critical for informed policy and competitiveness.

Tariff exposure is another concern. About 45% of Canadian organic exports to the United States face tariffs outside of CUSMA compliance, largely due to supply chain gaps. Meanwhile, other jurisdictions are outpacing Canada. The U.S. investments in organic competitiveness are eight times higher per acre, and the EU invests 200 times more than Canada does. Without action, Canada risks losing its market share and our export opportunities. The two-way trade between Canada and the U.S. is absolutely critical, supporting thousands of farms and processors, and ensuring year-round availability of organic for consumers. Any disruption would cause harm to both countries' organic sectors and undermine organic consumer trust.

In closing, we urge that the committee support the full 16-year renewal of CUSMA and keep organic equivalency arrangements outside of these trade negotiations. These measures, combined with investment in data and domestic capacity, are essential to maintain predictable market access, safeguard the community of the \$9.7 billion organic sector and strengthen North American supply chains built on trust, sustainability and consumer choice.

Thank you.

• (1535)

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Ms. Filejski, please go ahead for up to five minutes.

Catherine Filejski (President and Chief Executive Officer, Canadian Animal Health Institute): Good afternoon, Madam Chair and members of the committee. Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today on behalf of the Canadian Animal Health Institute, CAHI, the national trade association representing developers, manufacturers, importers and distributors of veterinary medicines in Canada. CAHI members account for 95% of animal health product sales in this country, including veterinary drugs, biologics, feed additives and pest control products. We're deeply invested in the health and welfare of Canada's livestock and companion animals and in the prosperity of our agricultural sector.

CUSMA is foundational to the stability and competitiveness of Canada's animal health industry. Healthy livestock are essential to a secure and productive food supply across North America. The medicines, vaccines and diagnostics produced by our industry form an integrated supply chain that supports food safety, public health and economic vitality. The Canadian animal health sector contributes directly to public health, food security and economic growth, with a market value exceeding \$4 billion. As of 2024, Canada maintained 12 million cattle and 14 million hogs, generating \$40 billion in livestock receipts. The availability of effective veterinary medicines is critical to this productivity.

Canada relies heavily on the United States for veterinary medicines and vaccines. Approximately 40% of all medicines and 90% of vaccines for food animals are imported from the U.S. For companion animals, at least 40% of medicines and nearly all of our pet vaccines come from our southern neighbour. This dependency underscores the vital role of CUSMA in ensuring access to affordable, high-quality veterinary medicines for Canadian farmers and pet owners.

CUSMA has delivered tangible benefits to the Canadian animal health sector. By eliminating tariffs, improving market access and establishing science-based regulatory disciplines, the agreement has lowered costs and increased access to essential products. This has led to reduced disease prevalence in both food and companion animals, higher productivity and lower food prices due to improved livestock health, and competitive advantages for Canadian producers.

Canada accounts for 15%, or about \$96 million, of U.S. exports of veterinary drugs, reflecting the efficiency and cost savings of integrated regional supply chains. CUSMA's stable and predictable framework has enabled Canadian businesses to plan investments, streamline product development and deliver innovations that protect animal and public health.

Regulatory co-operation is a cornerstone of CUSMA's success. CAHI members have benefited from Canada-U.S. collaboration during product review and approval, which reduces duplication and accelerates the availability of safe, effective medicines. We strongly support continued Canadian leadership to enhance this co-operation, ensuring that regulatory decisions remain science-based, transparent and harmonized where possible. Regulatory predictability allows companies to invest confidently, develop new products and deliver critical innovations.

To build on CUSMA's achievements and remedy the animal health industry's ongoing trade irritants, CAHI offers a number of recommendations.

The first is defending strong intellectual property standards. The current data protection provisions incentivize innovation for new chemical entities but do not adequately support research for new uses of existing drugs or minor use/minor species drugs. We urge the government to broaden data protection to include new uses, with a meaningful period of protection for new data generated.

The second recommendation is advancing regulatory reliance, moving beyond co-operation to true regulatory reliance. When an animal health product is approved in the United States, Canadian regulators should rely on that review to the maximum extent possible. The upcoming 2026 CUSMA review is an opportunity to catalyze this shift.

The third recommendation is strengthening the use of international standards. The common adoption and implementation of such international standards as the guidelines issued by the international council for harmonization of technical requirements for veterinary pharmaceuticals are essential for eliminating costly and duplicative animal studies across jurisdictions.

The fourth recommendation is aligning maximum residue limits, MRLs. Misalignment in MRLs for veterinary drugs creates costly trade barriers. The co-operation envisioned in article 28.17 under CUSMA should be more effectively applied to ensure that MRLs are established in a timely and coordinated manner between Canada, the U.S. and Mexico.

The fifth and final recommendation is modernizing domestic regulatory frameworks. That would involve actively using the retrospective review mechanism outlined in CUSMA article 28.13 to

update and improve Canada's regulatory environment for animal health products.

CAHI strongly supports a full 16-year renewal of CUSMA. The agreement has enhanced North American competitiveness, strengthened supply chain resiliency and promoted science-based regulatory alignment, benefiting Canadian farmers, animal owners, veterinarians and the broader public. CUSMA is crucial for ensuring access to essential veterinary medicines, supporting food security and maintaining Canada's position as a reliable global supplier of high-quality animal protein.

Strategic trade and economic integration with the U.S. and Mexico enhances our capacity to manage animal disease outbreaks, uphold food safety standards and protect human health.

● (1540)

CUSMA provides transparent rules and the stability needed for Canadian businesses to plan supply chains and build lasting customer relationships.

Thank you for your attention, and I look forward to any questions.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Mr. Loomis, you have the floor, please.

Keanin Loomis (President and Chief Executive Officer, Canadian Institute of Steel Construction): Thank you, Madam Chair and the committee, for inviting me back to present on behalf of the Canadian Institute of Steel Construction, CISC, representing one of the foremost sectors impacted by the ongoing U.S. trade war.

Established in 1930, the CISC is Canada's voice for the steel construction industry, representing the steel manufacturers, fabricators, suppliers, contractors, engineers and architects who are building with steel in Canada.

The domestic steel industry faces unprecedented mounting pressure from aggressive U.S. tariffs, global overcapacity and predatory trade practices. These developments underscore the need for a modernized "Fortress North America" trade agreement that reflects current risks, closes enforcement gaps and ensures long-term market stability.

It is quite an understatement to say that the past year has been a challenge for the steel sector. The unpredictable tariff policies, with no clear end in sight, have created significant instability for the sector and have made it difficult to plan for future projects. Steel fabricators risk losing contracts, undermining their ability to employ tens of thousands of Canadians. These are highly skilled, well-paying jobs, and entire communities are now at stake.

As we look toward the CUSMA renegotiation, the CISC's primary recommendations are, number one, to secure a permanent exemption from U.S. section 232 tariffs for Canadian steel; number two, to include an explicit domestic procurement clause protecting Canadian steel and federally funded infrastructure; number three, to harmonize the trade remedy in anti-circumvention rules to reflect current supply chain risks; and number four, to standardize the reporting and strict tariff application for steel product imports.

I'll go to number one first. As the cornerstone of Canada's CUSMA renegotiation, the federal government must secure a full, permanent and enforceable exemption from the application of section 232 tariffs on Canadian steel. These actions have inflicted disproportionate harm on Canadian producers, who represent the largest share of U.S. steel imports, disrupting deeply integrated supply chains and capital investments.

Canada must negotiate a binding provision in the CUSMA text that explicitly prohibits the application of section 232 to metals and commodities of Canadian origin. Without such a provision, the spectre of arbitrary U.S. trade actions will continue to destabilize the North American steel sector, undermining the very purpose of CUSMA.

Number two, the CISC has long advocated for reciprocal access to public procurement processes on both sides of the border to support North America's steel and construction market. However, as the U.S. continues to implement protectionist procurement policies at both the federal and state levels, Canada should use the CUSMA renegotiation process to secure an explicit right to prioritize Canadian steel and taxpayer-funded infrastructure projects, as is often the case with U.S. infrastructure spending.

Currently, U.S. procurement policies exclude Canadian structural steel from large, publicly funded infrastructure projects, including transit, energy and defence-related construction. Until we arrive at a reciprocal procurement and trading agreement with regard to the CUSMA, protectionist policies must be met with a protectionist response to support our domestic industries.

Number three, we must expand and maintain measures on Chinese imports. One of the most pressing challenges facing the North American steel industry is the persistent influx of dumped and subsidized steel—particularly from state-subsidized economies like China—that is designed to wipe out Canadian manufacturers. These imports are often sold below market value and are produced under weak environmental and labour standards, and they severely undercut the fair-market North American producers. This is a shared concern for both Americans and us, and it's why we should aim for a "Fortress North America" agreement.

In 2024, the CISC called on the federal government to introduce the surtax order as a measure to defend Canadian industry against

unfair Chinese trade practices, advocating for fair competition and a level domestic planning field. We now call on the federal government to expand the surtax order to cover derivative steel products—downstream steel products are steel that has been fabricated, such as the canopy that hangs over the House of Commons—safeguarding all elements of the steel value chain.

Finally, inconsistent reporting requirements and tariff enforcement across Canada, the United States and Mexico have created systemic vulnerabilities in the North American steel market. These gaps are increasingly exploited by foreign producers that reroute, dump or subsidize steel through the weakest regulatory entry point. The CUSMA renegotiations must deliver a unified and enforceable system of import data, transparency and tariff consistency. We should advocate for harmonized reporting standards across all of the CUSMA parties. We should advocate for consistent tariff application and synchronized enforcement of trade remedies on products entering the bloc. Finally, we should advocate for coordinated audit and verification mechanisms to flag abnormal trade flows and prosecute circumvention.

Without harmonization, CUSMA risks becoming a system riddled with loopholes, where the lowest standard country becomes the entry point for unfairly traded steel and undermines the entire North American steel industry.

Once again, thank you to the committee for inviting me to appear on behalf of the Canadian Institute of Steel Construction.

• (1545)

I look forward to answering any questions you may have.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Loomis.

Ms. Bruske, go ahead, please, for up to five minutes.

Bea Bruske (President, Canadian Labour Congress): Thank you, Chair and members of the committee, for inviting us.

My name is Bea Bruske, and I am the president of the Canadian Labour Congress. I am joined by Elizabeth Kwan, our senior researcher.

In the CLC, we represent over 50 different unions in every sector of our economy, including thousands of workers whose jobs depend on trade: steel, aluminum, forestry, critical minerals, agriculture, food production, energy, transportation and more.

Across the country, workers are being hit with rising costs and the fallout of an escalating trade war. Since the start of this trade war, I have met with workers in communities from St. John's to Windsor, Hawkesbury to Sault Ste. Marie, Winnipeg, Edmonton, Courtenay and Nanaimo.

Families across Canada are very worried about what tariffs will mean for their jobs, their homes and their communities, all at the same time as they are facing an affordability crisis. In this context, your committee is studying Canada's approach to the renegotiation of CUSMA. I'm here to tell you that Canada's workers want their government to protect their jobs, to protect our country and to protect workers' futures.

I agree with the Prime Minister that Donald Trump's strategy is to weaken Canada to own Canada. He is trying to force us into concessions that undermine our sovereignty. Appeasing Donald Trump, we have seen, does not work. Each single concession that Canada has made, from cancelling our digital services tax to dropping countertariffs, has been followed by more attacks from Trump.

Canada has to approach these CUSMA negotiations with a very strong backbone and a clear sense of our leverage that we bring to that table, leverage ensuring that no worker, no industry and no region is left behind, and we do in Canada have that leverage.

The American economy we know can't function without Canadian inputs. America cannot farm without our potash. It cannot keep the lights on without our electricity, and it cannot run without the oil, gas and critical minerals that we supply. It certainly cannot replace the Canadian aluminum that it has chosen to tariff.

We have to think about it in this way: If America wants our potash, it should buy our cars, and if America wants reliable access to Canadian energy and minerals, then Canada needs to secure fair access to our lumber, steel, pharmaceuticals, movies, food and manufacturing to the U.S. That is how leverage works in negotiations and at bargaining tables, and workers expect this government to stand firm.

To guide that work, the CLC recommends three core principles for this round of negotiations.

First, trade must be worker-centred, worker-first. Canada has to insist on strong, enforceable labour chapters with strong protections for women and migrant workers with clear provisions for addressing gender-based violence, and robust occupational health and safety rules. This approach aligns with Canada's industrial strategy that prioritizes jobs, skills and fair labour practices.

Second, we have to preserve our policy and our regulatory space. Trade negotiations must increase our capacity to build domestic industrial and manufacturing capacity. We need to be able to increase value-added production. We need to be able to tax multinational corporations, including tech giants, fairly. We need to be able to require companies that profit here to produce and maintain jobs in Canada. We need to regulate AI in the public interest, and we need

to be able to set our own tax strategies, including our ability to tax wealth. We need to meet our climate commitments, and we need to expand our public service.

Canada must never fall into the Trump trap to trade away economic sovereignty in the hope of regaining unimpeded access to the U.S. market. The U.S. is intent on restricting Canada's policy space in taxation, climate regulation, industrial development and digital governance. Canada has to protect that space and not bargain it away. Government investments and industrial strategies have to come with conditions, and those conditions have to be good union jobs, community benefits, Canadian procurement and guarantees that jobs stay in Canada.

Third, we need to protect our public services from privatization and from trade-related constraints. We need to understand that public dollars must deliver for the public good: public health care, child care, housing, transit, clean energy and employment insurance that allows families to weather the economic storms that we are facing. We cannot build reliance for individuals by hollowing out the very systems that support families during hard times.

In CUSMA negotiations and in all trade dealings with America, Canada needs to be able to respond with confidence in those negotiations. We can build reliable and resilient supply chains. We can build stronger domestic industries and a fairer economy, but that requires refusing concessions that weaken workers' rights or undermine our economic independence.

Canadian workers built our country, and they built our country's prosperity. They expect their government to defend it and to negotiate with strength, clarity and a solid backbone.

● (1550)

Thank you. I look forward to your questions.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Mr. Davies, please go ahead.

Graham Davies (President and Chief Executive Officer, Digital Media Association): Chair, Vice-Chairs and members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today.

My name is Graham Davies. I'm the president and CEO of the Digital Media Association, representing the leading music streaming services in Canada, including Amazon, Apple Music, Spotify and YouTube.

This isn't my first time appearing before this committee. I participated a year ago to raise concerns regarding the implementation of the Online Streaming Act. My fear was that it would not only be bad for Canadian consumers, artists and the music industry, putting at risk the growth of this sector, which has made streaming nearly 80% of total recorded music revenues, but it could also cause issues with Canada's trading partners. At the heart of my concerns then, and central to the examination of trade irritants and barriers between Canada, the United States and Mexico you are considering today, is the fact that the implementation of the Online Streaming Act is harmful to the economic relations among the parties involved.

Streaming has enabled Canada to attain the position of the third-biggest exporter of digital music in the world. Sustaining growth and strengthening Canada's broader economic, competitive and technological leadership requires a predictable and non-discriminatory framework for digital products and services.

It was a step in the right direction when Canada dropped the digital services tax earlier this year, but the Online Streaming Act remains. It requires streaming services that make more than \$25 million a year in Canada to pay 5% of their gross revenue into Canadian cultural funds, while Canadian-owned services are exempt from this requirement. New discoverability conditions, local content requirements and additional spending obligations will likely be required on top of this contribution, which could increase. These new obligations fall primarily on foreign streaming services, requiring them to make financial contributions to the Canadian content funds, to which they have no access. This approach creates a two-tiered system that distinguishes between domestic and international services, placing the latter at a structural disadvantage within the Canadian marketplace.

The online streaming sector does not operate through spectrum scarcity or traditional programming models. Instead, it thrives through openness, data-driven discoverability and global collaboration.

The Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission has sought to apply legacy broadcasting rules to global, on-demand music streaming services, which will constrain innovation and limit investment in Canada. It has ignored the fact that music streaming services pay the majority of their revenues to artists and rights holders via intermediaries. By way of comparison, the contribution of my members is around eight times higher than that of Canadian independent radio stations, and 1.5% of this is to be used to subsidize local broadcast radio news production. This obligation is unrelated to the operations of music streaming services, which are not active in the news business, and effectively redirects resources from digital innovation to legacy media.

Streaming services do far more than distribute music; they provide the exposure, analytics and market access that sustain creative careers today. This has reversed the fortunes of an industry that was in steep decline due to piracy in the early 2000s. According to in-

dustry analysis, for every dollar of economic value generated by streaming, related sectors gain an additional \$1.65. Streaming sustains thousands of creative professionals and businesses.

Our concerns have been echoed within Canada's creative and business communities, noted by international partners and shared by lawmakers in the U.S., where members of the U.S. House Committee on Ways and Means have said the act looks like a barrier to digital trade. They have tied it to the broader CUSMA discussions now under way.

This isn't a choice between supporting Canadian culture and respecting Canada's trade commitments. Adjusting the implementation of the act to ensure that rules are fair and consistent with CUSMA and aligned to how digital markets work would keep cultural goals on track, while avoiding unnecessary risks to growth and trade problems.

The joint review presents Canada with an opportunity to demonstrate leadership by identifying and addressing barriers where they exist.

Thank you. I look forward to your questions.

• (1555)

The Chair: Thanks very much, all of you.

We'll go to the members, with Mr. McKenzie, please, for six minutes.

David McKenzie (Calgary Signal Hill, CPC): Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

Mr. Loomis, there was a rumour started back in the spring of this year that Canadian consumers didn't need steel. I think that was a bit of a misunderstanding. Perhaps there was some clarification.

I'd like to understand a bit more about your industry and the integrated nature that I suspect it has with U.S. producers and customers.

Keanin Loomis: Yes, as you point out, we weren't appreciative of that particular comment. We have had the opportunity since then to educate everybody across the country, really, as to just how much steel is in pretty much everything that you and I take for granted on a very daily basis. It's my members who are building this country's infrastructure: our hockey arenas, our bridges, our schools, our hospitals, our buildings, etc. We've had that opportunity.

We've also had the opportunity to help politicians and decision-makers understand what we don't make here in Canada, such as wide flange beams, for example. We are heavily reliant on U.S. imports for those beams, and that has been a huge disruption this year for us and has resulted in increased costs due to our infrastructure.

On the other hand, we do a lot of work in the United States, because they just don't have the capacity to meet all of their domestic infrastructure needs. We help, especially at times of peaks, to build some of their buildings as well. We have long-standing relationships in the United States and we are known as being really good at the work we do.

There have been a lot of disruptions over the course of the last year. It's been highly lamentable. The one thing we take solace in is that our friends in the U.S. are also feeling these disruptions. There are very few people, other than the main producers of steel in the United States, that have been advocating for this.

There are very few within the downstream part of the industry in North America who are benefiting as a result of these tariffs. There are a lot of increased costs, and there is a lot of regulatory burden as well. Previously, we never had to worry about sending shipments across the border. Now, we have to hire lawyers, we have to hire brokers and we have to figure out what the latest developments are in the tariff war. There is a lot of regulatory burden.

This is just all about rent-seeking as well. This encourages corruption and encourages people to get their grievances addressed and to try to find loopholes within the system. You have to hire lobbyists as well to be able to carry on business as usual.

We're hopeful that we can get back to this. We're hopeful that there's an understanding in the United States that this is not sustainable at all and that Canada is the U.S.'s number one customer. A lot could be done to bring stability back into the U.S. and the North American continental economy if we can get back to free trade between our countries, to the benefit of all our countries and to create a "fortress North America"—as I said in my testimony—against the biggest common challenge that we have, which is unfairly dumped Chinese steel coming into the North American market.

• (1600)

David McKenzie: In respect of that, our Prime Minister has brought some new energy, perhaps, to conversations with China.

Has your industry been made aware of whether or not your concerns about Chinese steel dumping in North America have been part of those conversations?

Keanin Loomis: We've certainly had the opportunity to express the issues and to help people understand the nature of this industry. Obviously, there are many other interests to be balanced. I don't envy the job that our key decision-makers have.

Yes, that would be a big concern for us, just as it would be a big concern for us to go down the path of a "fortress North America" type of approach and have the U.S. president also thaw relationships with China.

That's a big concern for us. We will continue to express our desire to ensure the steel that is done here and the reciprocal procurement arrangements that we have are on a fairly balanced basis. We're not looking for protectionism here. We're looking to compete on a fair basis.

David McKenzie: I just want to understand. I think it has just about become common knowledge that, in the integrated North American automobile construction sector, the parts may cross the

border numerous times as they are developed into larger components.

Is the same true in your industry, or is it to a lesser degree than it is with automobiles?

Keanin Loomis: It's true to a lesser degree. There are fewer components, I guess you would say, in fabricated steel. Nonetheless, we do, as I said, import a lot of American beam into Canada and fabricate and engineer it here according to the highest quality standards in the world, and then we send it back across the border to projects in the U.S. That certainly does happen. As I said, this has been a highly disrupted time for us in the last year.

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

Mr. Lavoie, go ahead.

[*Translation*]

Steeve Lavoie (Beauport—Limoilou, Lib.): Thank you, Madam Chair.

I'd like to thank the witnesses for being here. We're very grateful to them.

My first question is for Ms. Loftsgard and Ms. Filejski.

Can you hear me okay, Ms. Loftsgard?

[*English*]

Tia Loftsgard: I can.

[*Translation*]

Steeve Lavoie: Okay. I'll continue.

Ms. Loftsgard, you talked a lot about supply chains, and I'm very interested in that subject. I'd like to have some concrete examples of that.

I have a two-part question.

In concrete terms, what problems are you currently seeing? I wonder if you could briefly give me one or two examples.

What actions could be taken to provide assistance right away? What could be done in the longer term?

My question is for Ms. Loftsgard and Ms. Filejski. If any of the other witnesses would like to answer my question as it relates to their field, I would welcome their comments, too.

Go ahead, Ms. Loftsgard.

• (1605)

[*English*]

Tia Loftsgard: Certainly, with organic, of course, you need to have certified ingredients and you need to have manufacturers that are certified as well.

When it comes to packaging options that are available in Canada, they are very limited, especially with such long supply chains and limited tropical ingredients, perhaps. We are seeing products that, for instance, can only be made in Italy because there is no manufacturing equipment such as that available in Canada.

These products, of course, are coming in. They're trying to trade with the United States, and, of course, they're 10 times the size of us, so we have clients who are practically going bankrupt right now from trying to actually ship their products overseas or to the United States.

Also, there are other products, like coconut milk, which is made in Sri Lanka and, of course, could never be...but it's a Canadian company, and they're bringing in products that are manufactured on their family farms. That's a completely Canadian company that is getting hit very strongly with these tariffs right now.

In the short term, obviously I think our government is trying its best to negotiate away these tariffs, with good reason, and we wish for that to be resolved. I think, in the long term, we've had a very positive trading relationship with the United States. Our biggest long-term ask is to keep that going the way it has been, because our organic equivalency arrangement has facilitated so much trade around the world, including with countries outside of Canada and the U.S., because we recognize each other's regulatory adherence as well as our standards.

Catherine Filejski: With respect to veterinary pharmaceuticals and biologics, the global supply chain is extremely complex. It has to do with economies of scale, and we are not the only country that's in this position.

Most active pharmaceutical ingredients, which are the building blocks of modern veterinary drugs, originate in India, China or somewhere in eastern Asia. They are then shipped to manufacturing sites, which are often either in the United States, in the European Union or in other countries, and then they move out as finished products.

One of the biggest challenges we have with respect to that is the Canadian requirements for each stage of that global supply chain, particularly for drugs, often are misaligned with the larger markets. There are good manufacturing practices required for low-risk veterinary pharmaceuticals that far exceed those of the European Union or the United States, and that makes it problematic for Canadian companies to actually source what we want to bring into this country.

That is one of the reasons we have seen the loss of some of the foundational veterinary drugs that are used by the livestock industry in particular and have been for decades. It's things like injectable vitamins and injectable supplements, like vitamin A and vitamin D, that just cannot actually be brought into Canada anymore because we cannot find foreign manufacturing sites that will meet the good manufacturing practices requirements that were implemented in 2017, which, again, exceed anything the other major global markets require.

[Translation]

Steeve Lavoie: Thank you.

My next question is for Ms. Bruske and Ms. Kwan.

It's important to protect our workers and our businesses.

Budget 2025 provides funding for the "buy Canadian" initiative, which is similar to the American initiative. The government decided to eliminate interprovincial barriers.

I'd like to hear your thoughts on that.

Do you think that's a good thing?

[English]

Bea Bruske: On the issue of trade barriers between the provinces, we have many different thoughts on that particular point.

We want to ensure that worker protection, whether it's in interprovincial trade or trade with foreign countries, does not mean a race to the bottom in terms of worker protections and regulations. We're always very cognizant, when we're talking about why various different regulations exist, as to what it means to remove some of those. Labour is very clear that we need to protect good jobs and that we need to make it easier to trade within Canada, but it can't be at the expense of things that are there to protect workers. That's what I would offer on that particular point.

There were many good points of the budget that we were hopeful to see and there were some points that we were a little bit dismayed about.

• (1610)

[Translation]

Steeve Lavoie: Ms. Kwan, do you have anything to add on this subject?

[English]

The Chair: Answer briefly, Ms. Kwan.

Elizabeth Kwan (Senior Researcher, Canadian Labour Congress): The one thing that's needed with regard to interprovincial trade and labour is that we need to have a study to actually sort out what that really means. I think that right now the approach has been very patchwork, so the results are going to be very patchwork. We really need to have one big study to ask what, in terms of labour mobility, works or doesn't work.

Instead of the race to the bottom, it would be the race to the top.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Mr. Savard-Tremblay, go ahead, please.

[Translation]

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

Good morning, everyone.

I'd like to thank the witnesses for being here today, and for their testimony.

My first questions are for the Canadian Labour Congress.

We've seen a new trend emerge, particularly in relation to the Canada-United States-Mexico Agreement, or CUSMA, and that trend consists in having just one chapter on labour. This chapter is quite well documented and well supported. There might be a little too much focus on principles and not enough on concrete measures. You're here to discuss that with us, since today's focus is all about the review of CUSMA, or even the renegotiation of the agreement.

First of all, what could we improve in this area, particularly with regard to workers' right to freedom of association?

[English]

Bea Bruske: It is critically important that the labour chapter in CUSMA upholds the standards set by the International Labour Organization in terms of freedom of association, and the ability to form a union and negotiate collective agreements to ensure that labour standards are lifted, to ensure that workplace safety and health protections are there within those workplaces and sectors, and to ensure that workers can bargain for a better future for themselves and their families.

We know that unionized jobs create a better paycheque, create pathways to retirement and build up communities. That is what we need. We need the CUSMA labour component to very strongly speak to worker rights and worker protections.

[Translation]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: You're talking about alignment with international agreements, of course.

In concrete terms, what measures could we put in place?

What else could we add to the chapter beyond what's already there?

[English]

Bea Bruske: Critically, it is the right to organize. Giving people the right to actually form a union is critically important. That is under attack in many countries across the globe. We don't see the United States necessarily being very labour friendly in terms of its legislation, whether it's statewide or at the federal level.

Safeguarding that is critically important because it starts and ends at the bargaining table in terms of what employees are able to negotiate with their employer—to have good jobs, to actually safeguard those jobs and to provide pathways to additional education and training that is required, as our economies shift and change, to be able to be responsive to those shifts and changes.

[Translation]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: What would be the consequences of guaranteeing the right to freedom of association in such an agreement?

What does that mean in concrete terms?

[English]

Bea Bruske: That leads to workers having confidence that government understands what is needed in order to actually create good jobs in Canada. Workers are feeling under attack in every single sector of our economy. Certainly, in the trade-affected sectors peo-

ple are feeling under attack. We see youth unemployment rates getting significantly higher. We see the value of entry-level jobs being pared down time and time again to temporary jobs, term positions and part-time jobs, rather than full-time jobs that lead to being able to actually buy a house, pay a mortgage, rent a place and put food on the table.

Workers are feeling very stressed in every single sector of our economy. Having strong labour protections in CUSMA shows what we actually want for workers. This is good family- and community-sustaining jobs and an actual pathway to achieve that. When we talk about smaller communities that are facing sky-high unemployment already in the Windsor area, in particular, we need to be able to offer those workers a future, a plan and a pathway to good employment. That also means having an industrial strategy that connects all of the different kinds of components that lead to these nation-building projects and being able to source Canadian content that workers work on. That starts with strong bargaining units and strong collective agreements.

• (1615)

[Translation]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Beyond the legal and formal status of workers and workers' associations, the issue of unfair competition, also known as dumping, has repercussions on workers in all countries.

Do the rules of origin also need to be changed in that regard?

[English]

Bea Bruske: Absolutely.

Rules of origin are critically important. First of all, making sure that for Canadian projects we are procuring the manufactured items and the raw materials here in Canada is critically important. It's important that we are sourcing them from good workplaces that are unionized and that pay a prevailing wage, providing that health and safety component that we need. We want to make sure that we are not allowing foreign entities to dump things in Canada, like Chinese steel, Chinese aluminum and Chinese autos. That's critically important.

If we want to actually have good jobs in Canada that are community-sustaining jobs, we need to ensure that those workers are being supported at every single component.

[Translation]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Are you concerned that Canada could be a gateway for Chinese vehicles?

[English]

Bea Bruske: For Chinese vehicles that has not yet been the case because there are tariffs on Chinese vehicles and they need to remain. If we want to continue to have an auto industry in this country we need to support the auto workers and the various different plants in this country. We need to also make sure that when we are providing corporations with government funding in order to stay, or in order to build, this has to come with strings attached to safeguard those jobs to remain in this country and to make sure that our investment is worth what we're getting for it. This means that we need to focus on Canadian procurement and supporting those jobs.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

We go now to Mr. Mantle, please, for five minutes.

Jacob Mantle (York—Durham, CPC): Thank you, Madam Chair.

Thank you to our witnesses for appearing and for their helpful testimony.

Before I begin, I would like to ask the clerk if we have had a response from the Minister of Industry respecting her appearance at this committee.

The Clerk of the Committee (Grant McLaughlin): Yes. The department has indicated that the earliest the minister would be able to appear would be January.

The Chair: Is that the first meeting in January?

The Clerk: Yes. The committee schedule might change so we haven't been able to pick a date yet. There's a standing invitation that hasn't been extended because we don't know the exact time that that would be yet. That needs to be determined by the whips first.

Jacob Mantle: I see. Thank you for that update.

By that time we will have exhausted the meetings with respect to this study. Unfortunately, our view, and my view as the mover of the motion, is that the minister should appear before the winter break. If she is not willing to make herself available then I'm going to move the motion that I put on notice on Monday, November 17, Chair.

As the members know, it's been moved and proper notice has been given since November 17. I wanted to provide sufficient time so that we could hopefully get a response from the minister. I understand that she may make herself available in January but, as this committee is aware, it was a unanimous motion by this committee to undertake this study and to request the Minister of Industry to appear.

The Minister of Canada-U.S. Relations and the Minister of International Trade appeared without issue. It has not been made clear to me why the Minister of Industry has not prioritized this committee with an appearance before this committee. As the Minister of Industry, she is responsible for key sectors that have been a topic of discussion at this committee table, including from some of our witnesses today, namely, our steel, aluminum, forestry, autos, canola, aquaculture, seafood and other sectors.

I think it's incumbent on us to express our view that the minister should prioritize an appearance before this committee, so I move that motion today.

The Chair: Thank you very much. It's totally in order to do that.

For the information of the committee, I—and I think, others—have been speaking to the minister's office about the first opportunity. My understanding is that she has not even appeared at her own committee because she has been travelling extensively. Her obligation is also to her own committee, which she hasn't been to.

Her commitment that came back was to make herself available for the first meeting we would have in January, as soon as we come back. I was not able, as your chair, to make it any earlier than that. That's the best I have been able to do.

Do we want to deal with this at the conclusion of the witness testimony?

• (1620)

Jacob Mantle: I'd like to deal with it now, Chair.

The Chair: All right.

Does everybody have the motion that Mr. Mantle moved? I believe it was September 18.... What was the date?

Jacob Mantle: It was November 17.

The Chair: The initial one was in September.

Jacob Mantle: The initial motion was in September, yes.

The Chair: Could we have that distributed or pulled up on your iPad?

The Clerk: Yes, it was distributed at that time.

The Chair: Does anyone want to speak to the motion?

Mr. Naqvi, please go ahead.

Yasir Naqvi (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Thank you very much, Chair.

I appreciate the gist of, and the reason behind, the motion that my colleague has brought forward, and I'd like to speak on that as well.

I'm next in order to ask questions. This is in respect of all our witnesses, who are present and who have made some really thoughtful points around this study. I was really hoping Mr. Mantle would agree to have this discussion at the end of this panel so that we would not waste their time. These are all important and busy individuals with very thoughtful jobs to do. We should have the benefit of their expertise while we can, and then go back to speaking on this motion.

The Chair: Mr. McKenzie, please go ahead.

David McKenzie: Thank you, Chair.

I take my friend's points well. I actually believe it's quite a simple and direct motion. It does not compel the minister to appear. It's simply that this committee report the status of affairs to the House. I think it's appropriate for us to vote on that now, and then we can move on quickly to our witnesses.

The Chair: Mr. Naqvi, it's back to you.

Yasir Naqvi: Chair, I think you quite ably shared the status as to the minister's availability. You are absolutely correct that the minister is willing to appear before this committee. She feels that this is an important review taking place and that she has information to share. However, she is the Minister of Industry so of course has a very busy schedule.

She's been asked twice, on different matters, to appear in front of the industry committee, which she is responsible to report directly to. I believe she has made one appearance already to that committee, and she will be making another appearance, before the holiday break, at that committee as well. She's travelling and, I believe, just this week, she's out of the country doing important work on behalf of Canada.

It's not that she doesn't want to appear before this committee; she does actually want to appear before the committee, but there are scheduling challenges. The government takes this responsibility seriously, as do all ministers, I believe, who have been asked to appear.

We've already heard from the Minister of International Trade and the Minister responsible for Canada-U.S. relations. They spent a significant amount of time answering very thoughtful questions from all sides of this committee. I have no doubt that Minister Joly wants to do the same.

I think that's a very detailed explanation. I still think we should welcome her when she comes in the beginning of the new year. We're just starting the process of writing the report of this committee, so I think her input at that time would be extremely beneficial to the work that we are doing.

I think that should be a sufficient update in terms of what Mr. Mantle has asked so that we can continue with the work of this committee.

Thank you.

The Chair: Okay.

I apologize to the witnesses. Please have a bit of patience. I have five people on the list to speak to this.

Let's keep in mind what we're trying to accomplish here.

Mr. Hoback, please go ahead.

Randy Hoback (Prince Albert, CPC): Thank you, Chair.

I apologize to the witnesses. Hopefully, we can get this done right away and get back to the importance of listening to what they have to bring to this meeting.

Whether we vote later or now, it doesn't matter. Let's just get the vote done, move forward and get back to the witnesses. That is my advice at this point in time. We can debate this. The minister is busy. We get that. I know the chair does her utmost best to get people in front of this committee as quickly as possible, and maybe this will help her speed that process along and give her another tool in her tool belt to make that happen before Christmas. That's all it's doing.

• (1625)

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Fonseca.

Peter Fonseca (Mississauga East—Cooksville, Lib.): Thank you, Madam Chair.

I'm glad to go after MP Hoback. It's great to see Randy here, back at our committee.

I understand that we all want to hear from the minister here at our committee. As you said, Madam Chair, we heard that the minister has not yet even had the opportunity to appear before the industry committee, and I can understand why.

We have our witnesses here—and we thank them for the testimony they've given us. This is so important in informing us, in terms of this CUSMA review.

However, if you've heard the minister, be it in the House or as she's travelling to many different countries as we look to diversify our trade, it's always about upholding those Canadian standards. We're talking about the highest standards when it comes to labour, trade and the environment. Therefore, we are hearing from the minister. I know her testimony here at this committee would be invaluable. I'm sure she wants to be here. Madam Chair and the clerk have reached out to the minister. The minister has made a commitment for January, which is not too far away. We are coming to the end of this session. We're going to be rising mid-December and will be back in January. The minister would be able to come before us to provide a very informed, detailed understanding of the work she's doing. I think we should give her the opportunity to do that.

This committee has worked in a very collaborative way. I was here with MP Hoback when we were going through our first NAFTA negotiations. That was a busy time for a lot of ministers. We did ask, of course, for the Minister of Trade at the time, the Minister of Industry, etc., and there was an understanding amongst this committee that the important work those ministers were doing needed to get done. There was always leniency and understanding, as we took on a very team Canada approach. That team Canada approach has done us well in the past, and I hope we continue that approach.

We're looking to bring in ministers here to this committee, as our witnesses, to know that, together, we're that much stronger in addressing those issues. We want to allow ministers to come here, when it is appropriate and when they have the time, to share our team Canada story.

I know I speak often about how a united front is so important, not just at this committee but at all committees here on the Hill, when it comes to our CUSMA review. The one thing we need to do is stand strong together—that's labour, business and government all working together. Those who are watching our proceedings want to see that we are a unified team and we support our ministers. Whatever political stripe we may have, we want to put our best foot forward and understand that we're making a compelling case for how NAFTA and now CUSMA have worked so well for all three countries: Canada, the United States and Mexico. The way it works well is when we work together. I would ask, in that spirit, that this committee continue to work together.

I really cherished my time here listening to MP Mantle; he has great expertise in this field. He has brought in amazing witnesses. I'm sure, to some of the witnesses here today, Jacob has requested your presence, and we really want to hear that testimony. That testimony will shape our report and help us as we look to travel down to Washington.

• (1630)

I know that when we go to Washington, D.C., we all want to be again a united front. We all know that together this is how we are going to accomplish what we're looking for, and that is to make CUSMA that much better and to take that approach and that spirit down to the table in Washington.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

The Chair: Thank you.

I have Ms. Lapointe next and then Mr. Lavoie and Mr. Van Popta.

Ms. Lapointe, please.

[*Translation*]

Linda Lapointe (Rivière-des-Mille-Îles, Lib.): Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

I would have liked to discuss the motion during the time reserved for committee business, in other words, starting at 5:00 p.m. I would have been happy to do so.

I'd really like to hear what several witnesses have to say. I'd like to ask them some questions. They've set aside time this afternoon to be with us. They've come prepared. They have all prepared remarks to share information with us and to answer our questions. That's the point I wanted to make. The courteous thing to do would be to listen to all these individuals who've gone out of their way to appear before the committee.

I believe Minister Joly wrote to the clerk to inform him that she was out of the country this week. She is in Korea and will then travel to Japan, precisely to meet with representatives of the automotive industry, a very important sector here in Canada, particularly in Ontario. In addition, she appeared before the Standing Committee on Industry and Technology fairly recently, on November 3. That committee's mandate is to deal with matters related to her department. She will be hosting a G7 industry ministers' meeting in Montreal next week.

She needs to be present in a lot of places, but she'll still come and meet with us. She said she'd make sure she was available to appear before us in January. If we had postponed the discussion on the motion to 5:00 p.m., we could have moved amendments, but at this point, I would prefer that we focus on the witnesses who've taken the time to come and share their views on our study. That's my opinion.

It's not that the minister doesn't want to come; it's just that she's travelling outside the country to make sure that our auto sector jobs are protected. I would have preferred that we wait until 5:00 p.m. to discuss all this calmly and take the time to do things right.

Right now, I want to focus on the witnesses who are here.

[*English*]

The Chair: Mr. Lavoie, please go ahead.

[*Translation*]

Steve Lavoie: Thank you, Madam Chair.

This is the first time I have served on a committee. I was elected for the first time—

[*English*]

The Chair: Mr. Lavoie, just hold on a second.

I'm looking at the clock. It's 26 minutes to five and we have to deal with Mr. Chambers' motion from last week. Could we hold this one until five so they can complete the testimony? Otherwise, by the time we get to vote, it's going to be a quarter to five. This is just out of respect for the six witnesses we have.

Jacob Mantle: Does anyone have anything else they want to add on this?

I don't think we have any further comments.

The Chair: I had Mr. Lavoie who just started, and I have Mr. Van Popta next.

Jacob Mantle: Do you need to speak?

Tako Van Popta (Langley Township—Fraser Heights, CPC): I don't need to.

The Chair: Well, I interrupted Mr. Lavoie to see if that would have bought us a bit of time so that we wouldn't lose all of the witnesses.

I have to go back to Mr. Lavoie. This is his time.

[*Translation*]

Steve Lavoie: I can wait. That's not a problem. Like my colleague, I think the witnesses should be given priority. That's why I'm a bit surprised. I have a lot to say, but I don't want to take any time away from the witnesses.

Out of respect for the witnesses and to make sure they have enough time, I'll wait until they're gone to say what I have to say.

Is it possible to return to witness testimony now and then resume the discussion on the motion at 5:00 p.m., as planned?

• (1635)

[English]

The Chair: I proposed that.

Mr. Mantle would prefer to continue the discussion until we complete it so that we can have a vote on it.

Jacob Mantle: To be clear, Chair, I don't believe our side has any further comments. If anyone is going to be continuing the discussion, it will be the other side, but we're prepared to vote on this now.

The Chair: They're not prepared to suspend the discussion now.

[Translation]

Steeve Lavoie: Like my colleague, I would have liked to take the time to listen to the witnesses.

As we all know, the minister is very busy. The purpose of the motion is to invite her to appear before the committee. She said she would come in January, so I think the situation is pretty straightforward.

Having said that, this is a new experience for me. It's always nice to take the time to chat with a minister and ask them questions.

I'm new to the committee, but I worked for 20 years in banking and more than 10 years in commerce, working with businesses. It's interesting to speak with a minister, but, in my experience, you learn more and accomplish more when you speak with stakeholders like the ones here today and the ones we've heard from over the past few weeks. These witnesses can keep us better informed about the real challenges that lie ahead and help us plan better and improve the things that really matter.

That's why I'm here. I'm pleased to have been elected and to serve on the Standing Committee on International Trade. It gives me the opportunity to help bring about change, to meet with witnesses such as those here today and the ones here last week. This could make a real difference for the many businesses represented by the witnesses.

We talked about the supply chain. I asked for concrete examples earlier that would help the average person understand better. It's important to have concrete examples. Sometimes it's better to be grounded than to have our heads way up in the clouds.

It'll be very nice to have a visit from a minister, and we'll be hearing from Minister Joly in January, but hearing from witnesses is even more important, I think. Their testimony enables us to propose recommendations in our report and inform the government on measures to be taken to help businesses and to facilitate trade. What we are experiencing today is exceptional.

I was a banker during the 2008 crisis, and it was nothing like what we are experiencing today. We saw that crisis coming, and when it happened, financial mechanisms kicked in. It demonstrated beyond a shadow of a doubt that the Canadian banking system is the best in the world. However, what we are experiencing today on a global scale is nothing like the 2008 crisis or any other crisis we've experienced. Other witnesses who appeared have said that what we're experiencing here is unprecedented. The word I've used

most often in this committee is "predictability". However, the predictability of the past no longer exists.

We're talking about a minister's visit, but I would have liked to ask the witnesses some questions today. If I had had a chance, I would have asked them the following: "Given the unpredictability of the world we live in, what can we do right away?"

I can't ask the witnesses that question, but I can still talk about it. I had the opportunity to give a speech on the budget last week in the House. I mentioned the book *Who Moved My Cheese?*, which clearly explains that the cheese has disappeared. We're talking here about security, the robustness of supply chains and compliance with rules, not only by the United States, but also by other countries around the world.

We serve on this committee to hear from witnesses and ask them what we can do in this new era of unpredictability. Will we wait for the cheese to come back, or will we try to find ways to turn things around to enable our businesses to move forward and to protect our workers? It's important to protect our workers and to allow our businesses to adapt so they can increase productivity. We have to look for ways to achieve this.

What we're experiencing today is unprecedented. We don't know how the trade rules that we've come to know for the past few decades can be adapted.

The minister has confirmed that she'll appear in January, and I look forward to hearing what she has to say. That will be nice.

• (1640)

[English]

The Chair: Mr. Lavoie, I'm sorry to interrupt here. I think everybody is trying to see if we can find a solution to this issue right now. Mr. Mantle has caught my attention, so take a breath.

Mr. Mantle, please go ahead.

Jacob Mantle: Take a breath and recharge if we need another round; hopefully not.

I want to offer this. I hear your comments about working collaboratively, and I agree. This is the first committee I've been on, and I want to maintain that collaborative spirit. It's an important issue, with important witnesses as well. I will offer the following as a potential solution to this. Perhaps we could get unanimous consent from the committee that we would resume debate on this motion following the conclusion of witness testimony at today's meeting, provided we spend no more than 20 minutes for further debate on this motion, my motion, and that at the conclusion of that debate the chair would put the question to dispose of my motion. Therefore, we can have all the final witness testimony and questions and answers. We'll reserve a few minutes at the end of this meeting, and stay for those few minutes at the end of this meeting, so that we can dispose of this motion.

I think that's a fair compromise. You can have further witness testimony, but we won't exhaust all our time and therefore artificially bump this motion to a future meeting.

The Chair: We do have Adam's motion as well. I'm just trying to figure it out timewise.

I think that's a great idea. Thank you for that suggestion to try to resolve this.

I realize that I'm interrupting you, Mr. Lavoie, but we have a suggestion on the table that we continue until five o'clock, which is in 15 minutes; finish with our witnesses; and then at five o'clock go back to Mr. Mantle's motion.

Yasir Naqvi: Can we get a moment of suspension to consider this and then get back?

The Chair: We will suspend for two minutes, if that's all right.

Jacob Mantle: That's fine.

I will cede the rest of my time in my block so that you can have some additional questioning time, if you need it.

The Chair: Thank you. That is a period of five minutes.

I will suspend.

• (1640) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1645)

The Chair: I call this meeting back to order.

On this list, there is Yasir and Mr. Fonseca.

You have the floor, Yasir.

Mr. Mantle was kind enough to come up with a decent suggestion, but we're eating up all of the time anyway, so either we're going to do something with it or we're not.

Yasir Naqvi: I will suggest a friendly amendment to Mr. Mantle's motion. I think it should be agreeable to all of us, and it still accomplishes what he's trying to do.

I'm looking at his motion right now. It reads as follows:

That the Standing Committee on International Trade

—and here I would replace “report to the House” with “express”—

its disappointment that, despite a unanimous request by the committee, the Minister of Industry has failed to appear before it in respect of its study on the forthcoming review of the Canada-United States-Mexico Agreement (CUSMA); and that the committee recalls its opinion, expressed in its motion of September 18, 2025, which specifically identified the Minister of Industry as a responsible minister in respect of its study, that the Minister of Industry's appearance is necessary for the committee to complete its review of the CUSMA, particularly given the critical importance of that agreement to the Canadian economy including those industries for which the Minister of Industry is responsible such as the automotive, forestry, energy, critical minerals, steel, aluminum, and agricultural industries and their workers.

Then I would add “; and that this committee write a letter to the minister expressing our disappointment and requesting her appearance to this committee—”

• (1650)

The Chair: That would be as soon as possible.

Yasir Naqvi: “—as soon as possible.”

There are two suggestions there. One is right in the first line, “That the Standing Committee on International Trade express its disappointment that despite a unanimous request by the committee”, and the second is to add a letter from this committee “expressing our disappointment” and asking her to appear “as soon as possible”.

The Chair: Mr. Naqvi is proposing an amendment to Mr. Mantle's original motion

Jacob Mantle: I take it that we do not have unanimous consent for my proposal and that you would prefer to talk out the rest of the meeting.

Yasir Naqvi: I'm moving an amendment to your motion. I think it strengthens your motion. We can accept it, and we can move forward.

Randy Hoback: I have a point of order, Chair.

The Chair: Wait just a second here.

Are you referring to the motion that Mr. Mantle proposed—that we go to five o'clock—or are you talking about the original motion?

Yasir Naqvi: I'm trying to resolve this issue, Chair, as quickly as possible so that we can spend the rest of the committee with our witnesses. I looked at the motion. I understand what he's trying to accomplish. I've provided some changes that, I think, beef it up by saying that we should actually write a letter. I hope that's agreeable to him and that we can vote on that motion as amended.

The Chair: I have a point of order from Mr. Hoback.

Randy Hoback: It looks to me like he wants to get into debating this right now instead of waiting until five o'clock like the motion that member put through. I guess that's the question that you need to answer first, Chair: Are we going to let the witnesses proceed—which I think we should—or are we just going to get into this?

The Chair: What are the wishes of the committee? Do you want to continue this until five o'clock? The witnesses, then, will be dismissed. There are five minutes left.

Jacob Mantle: I'm happy to debate my motion after the witnesses leave, which is why I suggested that we reserve 20 minutes at five o'clock. However, I'm not going to debate your amendment because that would require debate. I put forward this idea of hearing from the witnesses and then coming back to debate things after five o'clock. That's my proposal. If you want to debate an amendment to my motion, then we will use the rest of the time.

The Chair: I took the floor away from Mr. Lavoie when we got into all of this.

Jacob Mantle: You can have the rest of the time to ask questions if you like or to talk about my motion.

Yasir Naqvi: I can't speak for other members, but I am having a challenge in agreeing to an automatic vote and depriving other members of an opportunity to speak if they wish to speak. From a procedural perspective, the parliamentarian in me has difficulty with that.

The Chair: We're back to the original motion and the whole discussion on this motion.

Randy Hoback: Why don't we let the witnesses go? If we're going to—

The Chair: Yes, I'm thinking. We have Mr. Savard-Tremblay here. To complete round two, it would be Mr. Naqvi and Mr. Savard-Tremblay. That would be five o'clock, and this would be over.

Just so our witnesses leave not being pleased with us, take your five minutes, and Mr. Savard-Tremblay will take his two and a half minutes. Then we will suspend and go into the discussion.

• (1655)

Yasir Naqvi: Is this to address the witnesses?

The Chair: You have five minutes. Well, let's say you have three minutes for the witnesses and Mr. Savard-Tremblay has two minutes.

Yasir Naqvi: Great, thank you very much.

Thank you, witnesses, for being here. My apologies for this.

I want to start with you, Ms. Bruske. I listened to your submissions very closely. You talked about three elements that were really important. One was around worker-focused trade. The second was around policy and regulatory space. Last was to protect public services. I think they're all very good points.

It's the second one I want you to elaborate on more, because I was trying to follow your thinking around what it entails in that policy regulatory space you're speaking of in this review process. Can you explain that a little further and perhaps give some examples that you may want to provide from your perspective?

Elizabeth Kwan: I'm going to take that question.

One thing we have to realize is that we don't know what that review negotiation is going to be like.

We want to make sure that, in the procurement chapters and in the national treatment chapters, there is due diligence shown to ensure that, whatever gets negotiated and whatever the outcome is, it protects the good stuff and enables Canada to proceed with domestic industrial policy. For instance, on procurement, it's the WTO government procurement agreement that we have for that relationship under CUSMA with the U.S. We have a different one, CPTPP, with Mexico.

It's complicated and definitely beyond my capabilities. We need to be very sure that we're able to go ahead and do the things that we say we're going to do in terms of building up the industrial policy, not only to keep good jobs but also to create more good jobs.

Yasir Naqvi: Thank you.

Mr. Loomis, I was particularly caught by your proposal around trade remedies and how we deal with oversupply of steel around the world. Can you flesh out precisely what you are proposing to do? Are you thinking that the elements of the Special Import Measures Act that has the trade remedies—dumping, countervail—should be amended in a particular way as it relates to China and other markets where we may see overcapacity of steel in order to protect the Canadian industry?

Keanin Loomis: Specifically, our advocacy has been that everything that's been announced thus far vis-à-vis China, both the surtax that was announced last year and the other measures that were announced earlier this year like the TRQs and all of that, be applied to downstream derivative steel as well.

They've been applied to primary steel, which we support but, unless you close the loophole and apply that to all of the various elements within the steel value chain, you're not really doing what's required to support our producers at this point in time.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

We have Monsieur Savard-Tremblay for two and a half minutes, please. That will be the completion of the questions.

[*Translation*]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Thank you, Madam Chair.

My question is for the representative from the Canadian Animal Health Institute.

In the animal health sector, industry representatives have indicated that Mexico serves as a gateway for inputs that are much less regulated than in Canada.

If that's the case, do you believe that the health traceability of veterinary inputs should be improved?

If so, how can we do that?

[*English*]

Catherine Filejski: I think there are mechanisms in place that would allow Canada to work more closely with Mexico in terms of harmonizing the regulation of veterinary medical products. There's a body called CAMEVET, which is essentially the regional American harmonization initiative that allows governments to work together. Canadian participation in CAMEVET, particularly in recent years, has been fairly limited. It's one thing that is an opportunity for us, with respect to closing that loophole, if possible.

I think that we still have fairly stringent requirements with respect to products that would be entering into Mexico and then getting into the food chain through that portal.

I think closer Canadian government participation in harmonization with the rest of the Americas—not just the United States—would be a step in the right direction with respect to addressing that concern.

• (1700)

The Chair: You have one minute left.

[*Translation*]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Certain animal products used for veterinary purposes that come from Asia, I believe, may be considered problematic.

Is there anything we can do under CUSMA to better filter and monitor that?

[English]

Catherine Filejski: I think it always comes back to implementation of existing international standards with respect to the technical requirements for the production of any type of molecules, whether they are human active pharmaceutical ingredients or veterinary. Canada itself sometimes plays a little bit loose with respect to following the international guidelines, so I think we have a position where we can certainly work with other jurisdictions.

The reality is that we are always going to be dependent for the building blocks of pharmaceuticals on countries like China and India. They supply the global market. They don't just supply us; they supply the United States and the European Union.

I think it's a question of engaging with them. Also, from the industry perspective, there are a number of initiatives right now, particularly through VICH—the international council for harmonization—that are looking at actually engaging the Chinese regulatory bodies to clamp down on some of the problematic manufacturing practices that may raise concerns with respect to those types of molecules entering.

The Chair: Thank you to all six of our witnesses. I apologize for the delay, but that's democracy in action. We appreciate your testimony very much and who knows? Committee members can always call you back or contact you if they have any questions.

We will suspend for a moment while the witnesses leave the room, please.

• (1700) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1715)

The Chair: Before we do anything, we need to approve the budget of \$22,000 for the forced labour study.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Now we're back to our meeting, and we have Mr. Mantle.

Madame Lapointe, please go ahead.

Linda Lapointe: Is it possible to speak to the committee?

Jacob Mantle: I'd gladly yield my time.

[Translation]

Linda Lapointe: I would like to move a motion.

Would you like me to read it?

[English]

The Chair: Okay, go ahead quickly.

[Translation]

Linda Lapointe: The motion is proposing a study on trade diversification with North and West Africa.

That, pursuant to its mandate to promote Canada's international trade interests, the committee undertake a study on opportunities to diversify Canada's trade with North and West Africa, in order to capitalize on the regions' economic momentum, strengthen Canada's presence on the African continent, and leverage the Francophonie as a strategic channel to expand trade and partnerships.

That the study examine, among other topics:

a) high-potential sectors for Canadian businesses, including SMEs;

b) existing and potential trade tools, including export financing, trade facilitation, and reduction of non-tariff barriers;

c) partnership and innovation opportunities between Canada, the provinces, and regional African organizations;

d) sustainability, governance, and inclusion considerations to ensure mutually beneficial outcomes;

e) Canada's role in supporting regional value chains and industrial co-production;

f) opportunities within the Francophonie to facilitate trade, including institutional cooperation, business and innovation networks, mutual recognition of standards, and mobility of talent.

That the committee hold up to four (4) meetings, invite witnesses from government, industry, academia, and civil society in Canada and the regions concerned, and report its findings and recommendations to the House of Commons.

[English]

Adam Chambers (Simcoe North, CPC): I have a point of order, Madam Chair.

Linda Lapointe: I am finished. I have it in French and English.

The Chair: Are you just tabling it with the committee?

Linda Lapointe: Yes.

The Chair: Then we will deal with it at some other point. You're not moving it; you're just tabling it.

Jacob Mantle: For future reference, Chair, I'm happy to let the member table it, but I believe we had a motion on the floor, and that's not a proper point to table another motion.

The Chair: I was interrupted.

Mr. Mantle, I'm not sure where we are. Are we still in discussion, or have we been able to find a way?

Yasir Naqvi: I think we have an understanding amongst all three parties.

Jacob Mantle: I think we have reached an agreement. I'm happy to provide what I think the content of that agreement is orally. We did not have a chance to write it down, Madam Chair, but if it's acceptable to the committee, then I would withdraw my original motion.

Before doing that, I would seek agreement from the committee on the other motion to bring forward, which would be as follows:

That the committee direct the chair to draft a letter requesting the Minister of Industry to appear before committee on its study of Canada and the forthcoming CUSMA review, consistent with the motion the committee previously adopted on Thursday, September 18, 2025;

That the minister be asked to respond by noon on December 4, 2025;

That, if the minister fails to respond or responds that she will not appear—

—the committee would automatically report to the House the text of the motion I moved and is on the record now, and that would be reported to the House on December 4, as well.

Did I capture that correctly?

• (1720)

The Chair: Is everybody okay with that?

Whoever communicates with the minister, we must see that happens very quickly.

Jacob Mantle: I believe that would be you, as the chair.

The Chair: It will be communicated.

We are now at 5:22 and we have to go back to Mr. Chambers.

Adam Chambers: I'm sorry, we had too many motions on the floor at once.

My understanding is that the original motion has not yet been officially amended by my Bloc colleague, but I would be willing to accept those amendments, subject to revision that would reduce the language to make it more palatable for my Liberal colleagues, as I explained or read into the record last meeting.

The Chair: Did you revise the original?

Adam Chambers: I provided what I would be willing to accept as amendments.

The Chair: You should read it into the record.

Adam Chambers: I did that last meeting, but I can do that again.

Jacob Mantle: While Mr. Chambers does that, Madam Chair, I just want to make sure that what we put forward as agreement is minuted in the committee's record of this meeting.

I know sometimes there's discussion of whether the transcript is sufficient, but I just want to make sure that it's minuted.

The Chair: It's good that you ask to make sure that it's reflected in there.

Adam Chambers: Okay, for the second or third time, “That the committee report to the House that it condemns the unjustified American tariffs on Canadian steel, aluminum and softwood lumber industries, and that it call upon the government to live up to the promise it made in the election to “negotiate a win”, and that all parties wish to see the government succeed in getting a good deal for Canada and its workers.”

This is exactly what I read at the last meeting, which is also what I communicated to all members of the committee.

The Chair: Could you read that last line again?

Adam Chambers: Yes. I don't want to forward via personal....

The Chair: Can you make sure the committee has it or hears it?

Adam Chambers: Sure.

The Chair: I have it now.

An hon. member: I'm sorry, I misunderstood where we were.

Peter Fonseca: I don't know if I have that one.

The Chair: I'm going to read it out, if you like—what I see of it.

How many do we have?

[*Translation*]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: I believe he was reading my amendments.

[*English*]

Adam Chambers: I'm quite happy to accept the Bloc's motion that's in front of you, but I don't expect the Liberals would do that.

We can vote on the Bloc motion, if you like, right now.

Yasir Naqvi: I'm a bit confused.

Adam Chambers: I'm sorry.

We can vote on the Bloc amendments—

The Chair: Which are...?

Adam Chambers: —which are in front of you right now.

The Chair: Is that this one? It adds the softwood lumber.

Adam Chambers: That is correct.

Yasir Naqvi: I don't think it's been moved.

I think—I look to the chair for clarification—we have Mr. Chambers' original motion. I don't know if there are any official amendments being tabled, unless he's replacing his motion with this amended motion.

I have concerns that I'm going to speak to. I have suggested amendments as well.

● (1725)

Adam Chambers: Okay.

The Chair: I have one here, and then I have the one that was amended to include the softwood lumber.

It doesn't have a name on it. It was still from you, right?

[*Translation*]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: The amendment was not only about that. There was one about softwood lumber, but it was not the only amendment I submitted. The ones in blue that were just distributed are mine.

[*English*]

Adam Chambers: If the government members don't want to accept them, they can speak.

The Chair: Does everybody have them and know what we're talking about here?

What I have is under Adam's name. It says, “That the committee report to the House that it condemns the unjustified American tariffs on the Canadian softwood lumber, steel and aluminum industry, and that it highlight the prime minister's inability to live up to the promise it made in the election to “negotiate a win” and to put in place adequate support programs for the workers whose livelihoods depend on a good deal for Canada.”

[*Translation*]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: That is the modified version, which included my amendments.

[*English*]

The Chair: That's the one you're moving.

Adam Chambers: That's okay. I don't believe the government will accept the motion as it currently reads.

I am offering to further revise, subject to the language I just suggested, which accomplishes the goals of Mr. Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay, as well as ours and as well as the government's. I'll leave it to the government members to decide how they'd like to proceed.

The Chair: Would you mind reading out the one that we're going to be asking to vote on? That will include—

Adam Chambers: Well, I think it's up to the government to decide how they want to deal with Mr. Savard-Tremblay's amendment.

The Chair: I know, but I don't know that they're clear as to what they're voting on.

Adam Chambers: The only thing we have right now is the Bloc's amendment on the floor.

The Chair: That's what I was saying. What was the original one, then?

Mr. Naqvi, please go ahead.

Yasir Naqvi: I need some clarification here. I'm a bit confused.

First of all, Mr. Chambers moved a motion. Then, in an in camera meeting, he made a suggestion that he was amalgamating a few thoughts that were being discussed. Now, in a public session, he's reading a draft, I think, in pursuant of that suggestion. There was an in camera discussion, and now we're here in public, so that's one thing.

Second, I'm confused. Is he withdrawing his original motion and putting forward a new motion? I too have suggestions to his original motion, which may be agreeable to everyone in this room. A bit of clarification would be appropriate so that we can all understand what's happening. I'm just concerned about the in camera discussion and now the public discussion that's taking place right now.

The Chair: Well, I'm glad you're confused, because so am I. I have the two here.

This is the one that is under Adam's name, with softwood lumber in it. This is the other one. Those are the two I have in front of me.

Adam Chambers: Perfect. We'll happily entertain the government's comments on the motion on the floor, which is the original motion. I believe Mr. Savard-Tremblay has amended that motion.

The Chair: Then we have your motion, and we have Mr. Savard-Tremblay's motion.

Adam Chambers: Yes, amendments to the original motion.

[*Translation*]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: So my amendments should be dealt with before anything else.

[*English*]

The Chair: Absolutely. We will deal with yours.

Yasir, please go ahead.

Yasir Naqvi: I still remain confused, because I don't recall Monsieur Savard-Tremblay moving his amendments. My hand has been up because I have amendments to suggest as well. I haven't heard him speak yet. I don't see when he moved his amendments.

In my mind, we're still at the original motion that Mr. Chambers submitted.

● (1730)

The Chair: That's why I'm confused as well.

When did you move this? Not when we were in session, or did you give us notice?

[*Translation*]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: The amendments that have just been distributed were submitted ahead of time.

[*English*]

The Clerk: The short version is that, yes, Mr. Savard-Tremblay's office did provide me with the amendment. My understanding is that he wanted me to distribute it to committee members and so it was distributed just now. Everybody has a copy of it.

The Chair: Everybody has a copy of an amendment to Adam's motion.

We also have an indication of amendments to come from Yasir as well.

Do we vote down one first, or do we hear what Yasir's are?

[*Translation*]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Normally, we are supposed to be debating my proposed amendments.

[*English*]

The Chair: Our meeting ends at 5:30, which I'm a stickler for, as you know.

If this is going to be debated for another hour or two, then I'm going to suggest that we have this on our agenda on Thursday. We'll have to bump the witnesses if necessary, but this will have to be dealt with on Thursday.

Adam Chambers: Just so we're clear, when we come back we will be debating the motion as has been amended by the Bloc—

The Chair: It will be the amendment as proposed.

Adam Chambers: It will be the proposed amendment. That's what we'll be debating.

I'm making it very clear that we support the Bloc's amendment, so if the government does not want that to pass, it has a choice. We can waste the time and talk it up, or we can take the fallback position that I've clearly articulated in order to not have a logjam. However—just to underscore—the Conservatives support the motion as amended by the Bloc. I would like us to be clear that when we come back, that will be debated.

The Chair: The first point of debate will be Mr. Savard-Tremblay's amendment.

Jacob Mantle: I have a point of order.

Forgive me. This is a bit of a newbie question.

I understand that we can ask about whether the committee has resources to continue its discussion this afternoon. If it does have resources available, the committee could decide to continue this discussion until those resources are exhausted. Is that correct?

The Chair: You can ask, if there's an issue that you want to extend, and then I would have to ask the clerk if there are resources. I would also have to ask if the committee is in agreement.

Jacob Mantle: I would like to ask the clerk whether the committee has resources, and if there are, then I think there are probably five votes here to continue.

Adam Chambers: Or we can vote now.

The Chair: Mr. Clerk, can you check to see if there are resources?

[*Translation*]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Madam Chair, why not simply go to a vote since everyone is clear on what our positions are?

[*English*]

The Chair: Mr. Naqvi has indicated that he will want to speak to the amendment and to the main motion, and he has amendments. That is going to take time. I don't have time to spend another hour here.

Jacob Mantle: Adam is the vice-chair if you choose to depart. Mr. Savard-Tremblay has his study on Thursday. If we wait until then, this will eat up his valuable time, which is a much shorter study than the CUSMA one.

I think it's preferable, if we can, that we stay and try to.... If you want to talk the time, then talk the time, but we're here to vote.

• (1735)

The Chair: Thank you.

Mr. Naqvi, please go ahead.

Yasir Naqvi: I have a couple of things.

First of all, I still don't think that the amendment from the Bloc that has been discussed has been appropriately moved. It may have been distributed just now, but it has still not been moved. That's one thing.

As I suggested, I'm on the list to suggest that I move some of my amendments. Even if the chair thinks that it's been properly moved, we need some time to review this and come up with our response. I think your suggestion that we adjourn now and come back this Thursday will allow all of us sufficient time to move forward with this.

However, I'm not sure whether the Bloc's amendment has been appropriately moved. I've been waiting my turn to move amendments to Adam's original motion. Maybe the clerk can help us with this

The Chair: [*Inaudible—Editor*] say that the parties would come to a compromise on language because I certainly know that Mr. Chambers is making every effort to do that, and I believe Mr. Naqvi has some amendments that he wants to move. This means we're going to have a full hour, if not more.

[*Translation*]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: Madam Chair, I formally move these amendments.

[*English*]

The Chair: You've now formally moved your amendment, which means it is now up for discussion and debate.

It's 5:40.

[*Translation*]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: I preferred not to interfere with our study.

[*English*]

The Chair: From what I see here, this is going to go on for a while. That's just the reality.

Jacob Mantle: I don't think we can prejudge how debate may unfold.

The Chair: Absolutely, we could never suggest that.

What's the wish of the committee? Does the committee want to see if we have extra time to stay another hour, or whatever it is?

We can have access to interpretation and the system for an hour if that's the wish of the committee.

I have to ask the committee. For me, we would not.

Yasir Naqvi: Chair, I'm feeling a bit exasperated right now for a couple of reasons. Number one, we all do have personal commitments as well and I have a really important personal commitment. I'm already fairly late to pick up my children from their mother's home and get on with the next part of the evening. That is a very important obligation on my part.

Number two, I've been on your list for some time to move amendments. I just feel like I've not been given the opportunity as we are trying to do these procedural things. It would benefit this committee if we had the next couple of days before the Thursday meeting to be able to go through everything that's in front of us and see if there's a path forward.

The Chair: Is it the wish of the committee to adjourn for today and resume on Thursday and spend the first hour on this?

[*Translation*]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: What happens with Thursday's study then?

[*English*]

The Chair: We would use an hour on this, if necessary. I would hope that between now and Thursday, the parties would find a way to resolve this so that we wouldn't have to take away from other valuable time. The first hour we would have committee witnesses, and the second hour we would deal with this, as a suggestion.

[*Translation*]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: The proper way to deal with this would be to go to a vote. I believe that everyone's positions are pretty clear.

• (1740)

[*English*]

The Chair: Mr. Naqvi has amendments that he wants to move.

[*Translation*]

Simon-Pierre Savard-Tremblay: I realize that, but the motion was sent in a week ago. I wrote down my amendments and submitted them. It's not like this motion is coming out of the blue. We all knew it had been moved.

[*English*]

The Chair: You've just moved them now. We have them before us.

If we were going to continue, we would start with your amendment. If it passed, it would then go to the motion as amended.

Mr. Lavoie, please go ahead.

[*Translation*]

Steeve Lavoie: Contrary to what my colleague just said, none of this is clear to me at all. There are things I don't understand. Contrary to what my colleague said, I'm absolutely not ready to vote.

It would be much wiser to take some time to look at everyone's amendments and try to make sense of all of this.

[*English*]

The Chair: As the chair, I'm going to adjourn the meeting for today. We will come back on Thursday.

If I have to pull together a quiet meeting together in some room—

Are we being taped here?

The Clerk: We're in public.

The Chair: —a quiet spot to try to resolve this issue, that's what I'm going to do.

I move adjournment. The meeting is over for today.

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>