



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 040

Thursday, June 11, 2026

Chair: Ahmed Hussen



Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development

Thursday, June 11, 2026

• (1545)

[*Translation*]

The Chair (Hon. Ahmed Hussen (York South—Weston—Etobicoke, Lib.)): I call this meeting to order.

Welcome to meeting number 40 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development.

[*English*]

Pursuant to the order of reference of the House of Commons of Tuesday, February 24, 2026, the committee will now proceed to the clause-by-clause consideration of Bill C-219, an act to amend the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Act, the Justice for Victims of Corrupt Foreign Officials Act (Sergei Magnitsky Law), the Special Economic Measures Act and the Broadcasting Act.

[*Translation*]

I would now like to welcome the officials who are with us today to assist the committee and answer members' questions during the meeting.

[*English*]

From the Canada Border Services Agency, we have Brett Bush, director general, immigration and asylum policy.

From the Department of Canadian Heritage, we have Charlene Budnisky, senior director of communication legislative and regulatory policy, and Pietro Cimino, acting manager, broadcasting, by video conference.

From the Department of Citizenship and Immigration, we have Matthew Sharp, assistant director of admissibility policy.

From the Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development, we have Robert Brookfield, director general of sanctions and strategic export controls. We also have Jennifer Keeling, deputy director, human rights and freedoms, as well as Vindya Seneviratne, deputy director, sanctions policy division.

Before we proceed, I'd like to provide members of the committee with a few comments on how committees proceed with the clause-by-clause consideration of a bill. This is an examination of all the clauses in the order in which they appear in the bill. I will call each clause successively. Each clause is subject to debate and a vote. If there is an amendment to the clause in question, I'll recognize the member proposing it, who may explain it.

The amendment will then be open for debate. When no further members wish to intervene, the amendment will be voted on. Amendments will be considered in the order in which they appear in the package that each member received from the clerk. Amendments have been given a number in the top right corner to indicate which party submitted them. During debate on an amendment, members are permitted to move subamendments.

Once every clause has been voted on, the committee will vote on the title and the bill itself, and an order to reprint the bill may be required if amendments are adopted so that the House has a proper copy for use at report stage. Finally, the committee will have to order the chair to report the bill to the House.

I thank the members for their attention and wish everyone a productive clause-by-clause consideration of this bill.

Pursuant to Standing Order 75(1), consideration of clause 1, short title, and of the preamble are postponed.

(On clause 2)

The Chair: The chair therefore calls clause 2.

Under clause 2 is the new G-3.

Hon. Robert Oliphant (Don Valley West, Lib.): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Before I begin, I'll say that we will be having a number of amendments that have been given notice for and maybe one or two that we will table during the meeting.

I want to start by thanking Mr. Bezan for the bill; Mr. Lawrence, who had a bill in the last Parliament; and Ms. Lantsman, who worked extensively on that bill. Raising these issues for Canadians and for the international community has been really important. We will be, in good faith, attempting to do two things as we walk through these amendments.

First, we want to strengthen some of the parts around transnational repression, which we think has been very much on Canadians' minds in a number of communities. This has been of interest to many Canadians who are worried about the safety and security of their neighbours and the ability for Canadians to exercise democracy in their daily lives without fear of some repercussion from another foreign entity.

We'll also be mindful through this bill about ensuring that there's no collateral damage that was unintended in the bill. We want to ensure that we have a bill that is responsive to the needs of human rights defenders and those who are prisoners of political conscience, while also making sure that we respect their liberties and their freedoms at the same time. We want to ensure that we do not restrict the government from being able to help Canadians in trouble—primarily—as well as citizens of other countries who may find themselves victims of repressive governments. We'll be mindful of doing that.

I come at this very much from my role as parliamentary secretary, more than my role as MP, in which I've had to work on these cases for many years. We've worked extensively with officials who do this in their daily lives. We get to pass legislation, and they have to work with it. Therefore, I also want to thank all the officials who are joining us today.

Behind these officials are hundreds of people in missions around the world who deal with complex consular cases, as well as human rights defenders from other countries. We are going to be doing that.

We also want to honour the life, work and witness of Sergei Magnitsky as we approach this bill. We want to make sure that it is honoured and that Canada can stand with like-minded countries around the world that are attempting to change the way repressive regimes work and the way we can stand up for democracy and human rights in the world.

That being said, I'm going to take the third amendment, G-3, from the government side, which is in respect to clause 2. Clause 2 begins at line 3 of page 2 and continues through until line 20 or so of page 3.

I move that clause 2 of Bill C-219 be amended by replacing line 10 on page 2 to line 13 on page 3 with the following.

It would begin—let me get this correct.

• (1550)

The Chair: There's a point of order.

James Bezan (Selkirk—Interlake—Eastman, CPC): We all have a copy of the amendments. If you want to give an explanation, fine, but I don't think we need to read them verbatim.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: Okay.

It is short. It changes it to:

cludes an outline of the measures that the Government of Canada has taken to advance human rights—and support prisoners of conscience and human rights defenders—internationally as part of Canada's foreign policy.

(5) The Minister must publish the first report under subsection (4) within 12 months after the day on which this subsection comes into force.

That would be our first amendment, and you have it as G-3.

The Chair: I place the amendment on the floor for debate.

Go ahead, Mr. Bezan.

James Bezan: We are not happy about this amendment, because it changes the front end of this on the human rights and removes some of the requirements around the reporting.

We had witnesses. Vladimir Kara-Murza said,

The one thing that never works...talking about this issue here...is so-called quiet diplomacy. When somebody tells you, "Oh, we're going to raise it privately. We're going to make sure we'll discuss it with them in a polite way", that's the best way of knowing they're not going to do anything about it. The only defence, the only hope, the only lifeline for a political prisoner who is sitting in a prison cell in Siberia, in Xinjiang, in Venezuela or wherever it may be, is publicity, advocacy and public attention.

Brandon Silver, when he appeared, said, "more public reporting can be helpful. We've found cases in which it has, more often than not, led to release."

Marcus Kolga reflected that.

Bill Browder said, "I can tell you that in 100% of the cases, it's a good thing for governments to name and shame, to label authoritarian regimes as acting out badly and arresting people who shouldn't be arrested, and to name prisoners of conscience. It's never a bad thing."

In light of the testimony we heard and the work that all of us have done with different diaspora communities in our meetings over the years, with prisoners of conscience and with people who have faced persecution because of their political beliefs, religious beliefs or opposition to these authoritarian regimes around the world, now we're going to take out some of the definition. We're going to, essentially, at the end of the day, reduce some of the reporting requirements and what's in those reports. The only ones, really, who are going to be happy about this are the dictators, such as Vladimir Putin, Xi Jinping and the ayatollahs.

• (1555)

The Chair: Mr. Oliphant, go ahead.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: With all due respect to those witnesses—particularly Mr. Kara-Murza—who spoke about their personal experiences, people who did not testify at this committee have had a different experience, and they have not had a public profile.

I want to make sure that those who've had experiences of success—as we and the world had in that case—because of public attention.... There have been many cases that we don't hear about because they are still personal and private. We are trying to say one size does not fit all cases.

We had testimony from the Human Rights Action Group in their written brief—which was our number nine brief—from Mr. Robert Brookfield with Global Affairs Canada, as well as from Angelica Liao-Moroz on May 7. There were three different opinions that were contrary to those.

What I think the government is asking for is the flexibility to use nuance and discretion to decide when it is best to go public, and to encourage family members and NGOs to go public, and when not to go public.

In my own personal experience, three years ago, I had a very difficult case. I was working on the case of a non-Canadian citizen who was a permanent resident of Canada incarcerated in another country. There were NGOs that wanted to go public. I had to work with them very carefully to ensure the safety of that particular political prisoner, as well as many others, and we were able to bring him home. That's a case in which he was in such a situation that he would not testify at a committee like this because it would be too difficult for him.

We're trying to balance things. We believe that public declarations are, at times, extremely important and should be used. However, requiring these can put people's lives in danger. We have witness testimony that would back that up and would hold to our amendment.

The Chair: Are there any other comments on this amendment?

James Bezan: There are other written briefs, as well, from people such as Michael Kovrig, Bennett Kovrig, Grace Chen and Ariana Botha, who said it's important to send a "vital message to families that their loved ones remain a priority and [this] reinforces transparency and accountability in efforts to secure their release." They wrote in support of increased reporting requirements.

The Prosperity, Advancement, Networking and Direction Settlement Services and the Iranian Justice Collective also wrote, "A response requirement would make Canada's sanctions system more transparent, more serious, and more accessible to victims and diaspora communities."

There was also Andrea Charron and the Human Rights Foundation. They said that having a consistent reporting mechanism, reviewing the people on the list and those whom we're trying to help, making that public is ultimately in the best interest of the victims and their families.

I think it sets the standard for us as Canadians, as well.

The Chair: Mr. Oliphant is next.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: The point is taken. However, again I would say that my same argument would apply: Every family is different, and I don't believe that every family needs that to know that the government is standing with them.

I know that our consular officials work literally 24 hours a day in supporting the families, but families don't always find the support successful, because their loved one is still not home and they're in a difficult situation. As a pastor, I know that if someone is in a difficult position, you want to show your support.

Every family is different. Again, I would say that we want discretion at the hands of not only our minister in reporting, but of our consular officials in the way that they support families who are in very difficult positions.

The Chair: I see no further comments on this amendment.

(Amendment agreed to on division)

The Chair: We go next to CPC-1.

● (1600)

Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills North, CPC): Mr. Chair, I'm not going to move this amendment.

(Clause 2 as amended agreed to)

(On clause 3)

The Chair: We're on clause 3.

Mr. Oliphant is next.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: On clause 3, you're not—

Hon. Michael Chong: We have no amendments, and neither do you.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: Okay.

Hon. Michael Chong: Agreed.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: I'm just looking. I have a lot of paper here. I thought that there had been a Conservative one. I'm sorry.

(Clause 3 agreed to)

(On clause 4)

The Chair: On clause 4, we have the new G-4.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: Yes. I would amend that.

The Chair: Continue, Mr. Oliphant.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: With respect to clause 4, I move that we amend it by replacing line 1 on page 4 with the following:

4 (1) Paragraph 4(2)(a) of the Act is replaced by the following:

(a) a foreign national is responsible for, or complicit in, gross violations of internationally recognized human rights;

(2) Subsection 4(2) of the Act is amended by striking—

It also amends the clause by adding after line 6 on page 4 the following:

(f) a foreign national has engaged in activities that undermine or are likely to undermine international peace, security or stability.

The Chair: Are there any comments on that amendment?

Hon. Michael Chong: Mr. Chair, I support the amendment.

(Amendment agreed to)

(Clause 4 as amended agreed to)

(On clause 5)

The Chair: On clause 5, we have CPC-2.

Hon. Michael Chong: Mr. Chair, I move CPC-2, which all members will have.

The Chair: Are there any comments or debate on CPC-2?

James Bezan: On CPC-2, what we're trying to do is prevent the sanctions evasion tactics that are....

Am I in the right spot? I want to make sure I have the right number here. There we go.

We want to make sure that “immediate family member” is more carefully defined, and we want to strengthen it to ensure that people aren't using their family members or extended family members, whether it's siblings, their dependent children, parents or even grandparents, to hide their wealth and to avoid sanctions here in Canada.

We've had support for that.

Brandon Silver gave some really great testimony on this. He said:

On a per capita basis, Canada is one of the leaders in sanctions implementation, but we are lacking in enforcement.... By adding in visa bans on immediate family members, we're helping to close some of those gaps”.

He also said:

I want to comment that their assertion around dependent family members does not reflect the practice of allies. The European Union has associated family members, which goes beyond dependents, and the United States also goes beyond dependent family members.

Vladimir Kara-Murza, in talking about what's happening in Russia, said that they “all hid behind not dependents but siblings, adult non-dependent children or spouses and so on.” That's for making sure they can hide their illicit wealth.

That's where we need to go to ensure Canada is not being used as a safe haven to allow those who have already been named and sanctioned to use the back door in using their family members to access our better property market or our safer banking system.

The Chair: Are there any further comments on CPC-2?

Go ahead, Mr. Oliphant.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: Our side will not be supporting the amendment. We have a concern that it introduces a wide-sweeping definition of “family member” not currently recognized by the IRPA. It is different, and it would use authorities in a different way.

Our concern is with regard to the mechanisms and operations of government. We believe that there is power under the Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, administered by the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, that would accomplish this work without us doing it. Therefore, we will not be supporting the amendment and ultimately will not be supporting clause 5.

I want to give Mr. Sharp, an official from Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship Canada, the chance to offer his comments on this.

• (1605)

Matthew Sharp (Assistant Director, Admissibility Policy, Department of Citizenship and Immigration): Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The challenge we see with this is that the bill, as worded, talks of visas and documents, but it doesn't speak to admissibility, which is ultimately the heart of how we enforce the IRPA. My colleague, Mr. Bush, can speak more to that.

This government passed Bill S-8 in 2023, which introduced a new inadmissibility provision that covers all of the sanctions legislation. That's the Sergei Magnitsky Law, as well as the Special Economic Measures Act, which makes people who are sanctioned inadmissible to Canada.

If we were to deny a visa.... Suppose, looking at this list of relatives, we were to miss somebody somehow. For example, H is a foreign national who resides permanently with the foreign national in question. They could come to Canada, and we would lack an ability to enforce against that person because that person wouldn't actually be inadmissible under the IRPA. As a result, we would propose that sanctioning these individuals through the sanctions legislation would be a more effective tool to prevent their travel to Canada.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: I would just say that we are in agreement with our siblings in the other department in that we also think there are some other problems with this with respect to dual citizens, who may be in a different position and be able to come into Canada another way. We think that sanctioning is the better tool for stopping them. That doesn't mean we are not concerned about family members being safe harbour for funds or other assets that we need to be concerned about. We are concerned about it.

We also want to respect the work. As a machinery of government issue, it would be impossible to do. One of our problems with the bill as it forms is that it's an omnibus bill that is addressing several pieces of legislation, but not the IRPA. If there were some fine tuning under the IRPA, they could do it there, but we still think our acts are the best place to do this work. We will really take it under advisement to make sure that we are sanctioning the appropriate family members who don't harbour assets.

The Chair: Is there any further debate on this? Okay.

(Amendment negated on division)

The Chair: Shall clause 5 carry?

Hon. Robert Oliphant: No, we will not support clause 5.

James Bezan: You will not support clause 5, even without the amendment. You're cancelling clause 5. Okay.

Hon. Michael Chong: Mr. Chair, I propose an amendment for clause 5.

I'm sorry. Let's back up here. You're asking if clause 5 is going to carry unamended.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: Yes, and we're saying no.

Hon. Michael Chong: Okay. We support clause 5.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: We will be voting against clause 5.

(Clause 5 negated on division)

(On clause 6)

The Chair: We're moving on to clause 6 and to G-4.1. Are there any comments?

Hon. Robert Oliphant: We have, again, an amendment to clause 6. We would amend it by replacing....

I just have to get my other paper here.

The Chair: Are you moving G-4.1?

Hon. Robert Oliphant: Yes, we're on G-4.1.

It states, as item (a), that Bill C-219, in clause 6, be amended by replacing line 20 on page 4 with the following:

4.4 (1) Within 24 months of the seizure or restraint of private

That's changing it to 24 months.

It would then, as item (b), replace line 22 on page 4 with the following:

the Minister must apply for forfeiture of the private property un-

It would also, as item (c), replace line 24 on page 4 with the following:

(2) The Minister must dispose of the private property forfeited

Those are our changes to proposed subsection 4.4(1).

● (1610)

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Bezan.

James Bezan: We want to move a subamendment to the amendment.

Regarding subsection 4.4(1), it would say, “the restraint of private and public”. Under item (b), it would say, “apply for forfeiture of the private and public”. Under item (c), it would say, “(2) The Minister must dispose of the private and public property forfeited”. This ensures that government assets.... Oh, I guess it's not even going to be government assets, because it's not always public.

I'm moving a subamendment to add...because they're just talking about private assets. They're not talking about government-held assets. If you think about it... Maybe the word “public” isn't appropriate. I think it should be “government” or “foreign government”.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Oliphant.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: We would not be in favour of that, because there's a separate set of international law that governs government or public property, which is quite distinct from private property—the object of our sanctions and forfeiture activities. I'm not sure whether we have an expert on this here.

Maybe Mr. Brookfield could talk about that for us.

Robert Brookfield (Director General, Sanctions and Strategic Export Controls, Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development): I am not the expert on international diplomatic law, but I can say that, in general terms, this issue was also raised in the other place, in a related bill.

There is a spectrum of property that can be owned by a government. Some of it can be commercial and may be subject to certain activities, but some of it is of a more “state” nature. The most classic example is diplomatic property, but there are others. Central banks are another question. It would be a violation of public international law to have seizures of that property.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: The example sent to me was this: The official residence of an ambassador, or an embassy, would be protected. It would be a complex thing under the Vienna Convention. It would be a different understanding, so we would like to stick to the basic point: 24 months, as opposed to 12. It would remain just “private”.

We will be voting against the subamendment.

James Bezan: To get this clarification, I will ask Mr. Brookfield, if I may, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Go ahead.

James Bezan: The Russian central bank holds something like \$20 billion in Canadian currency, which we understand is not considered, right now, to be usable by them. It's one thing that has been sanctioned. At the same time, we're forcing any forfeiture of that asset. It still belongs to the Russian central bank.

It's as Mr. Oliphant said. We have a court case in Ontario. The Ontario Superior Court ordered compensation for the victims of Ukrainian International Airlines flight PS752. As you know, over 55 Canadian citizens were killed, most of them of Iranian descent. Permanent residents were also on that flight. Some of those assets are the Iranian embassy, offices and residences they have in Toronto, Vancouver and here in Ottawa.

[Translation]

Hon. Mona Fortier (Ottawa—Vanier—Gloucester, Lib.): Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

[English]

James Bezan: Those would not qualify for forfeiture.

The Chair: Go ahead, MP Fortier.

[Translation]

Hon. Mona Fortier: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I recognize the importance of this private member's bill and the desire to advance certain ideas. The problem is that the subamendment was not received in both official languages or explained.

I think we were discussing the amendment. So I'm wondering about the procedure at this stage. Honestly, I'm a bit confused. I just want to know a little bit about the procedure.

[English]

The Chair: I will turn to the legislative clerk for an answer to that.

Hon. Michael Chong: Mr. Chair, on the same point of order, it is procedurally in form for a member to introduce amendments or subamendments orally during the clause-by-clause process.

The Chair: My understanding is that the member can do that. The issue is that after the member does that...

Unless there is an agreement to withdraw the subamendment, we have the option of suspending, and—

● (1615)

[Translation]

Hon. Mona Fortier: Mr. Chair, that's when I'll have more information in writing so I can fully understand the subamendment. Is that correct?

[English]

The Chair: I will suspend briefly so that we can—

James Bezan: I'll withdraw it. Robert has already said that you guys are voting against it, and I don't want to lose time.

The Chair: Okay. That was part of what I was trying to measure, to see if it was necessary.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Mona Fortier: Thank you very much.

[*English*]

The Chair: We'll go back to amendment G-4.1.

(Amendment agreed to on division)

The Chair: We are now on G-4.2.

Do we have any comments or debate?

Hon. Robert Oliphant: Yes.

Continuing on with clause 6, we propose to add an exemption to the prior proposed subsection in clause 6 in order to accommodate due process concerns. We want to ensure that this is feasible and doable, as in the above proposed subsection, recognizing, however, that “do not apply in cases in respect of which legal proceedings are ongoing” would not put the minister in conflict with the law.

The Chair: Are there any other comments on G-4.2?

(Amendment agreed to [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: I would like to ask for direction and agreement from members. There is a vote in 28 minutes and 54 seconds. I'm asking for the permission that would allow us to continue until such time as we can vote from our phones.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Thank you.

(Clause 6 as amended agreed to)

(On clause 7)

The Chair: We are at amendment G-4.3.

Do we have any comments or debate?

Go ahead, Mr. Oliphant.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: Yes.

G-4.3 is our written amendment. It moves to amend clause 7 in Bill C-219 by deleting line 32 on page 4 all the way through to the end of line 29 on page 5.

I will just say that we support the aligning of the tabling time-lines at the beginning of the clause, but we're proposing the deletion of this. We think it would require that a new statement accompany every tabling of a sanctions order regulation, including the evidence or criteria used, enforcement details, coordination with allies and the number of properties seized or frozen.

We have proposed a deletion of this clause, which would have required that a response to the recommendation of a committee be provided. We can give a policy rationale, but we are attempting a fairly large deletion on that.

The Chair: Do members have any comments or debate on that?

Hon. Michael Chong: Mr. Chair, we don't support the removal of that. We don't support the amendment.

I'll just leave it at that.

(Amendment agreed to on division)

The Chair: Go ahead, Anita.

Anita Vandenberg (Ottawa West—Nepean, Lib.): Thank you. I know it's already been voted on, but I did wish to speak to that.

I just wanted to say that as Parliament, we have this power already. I've been on the subcommittee on international human rights, and at the end of our reports, we name different people who should be sanctioned. We then request a government response.

Parliament already has this power.

The Chair: Thank you.

(Clause 7 as amended agreed to)

(On clause 8)

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Oliphant.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: We have an amendment for clause 8.

The Chair: Is there unanimous consent not to have Mr. Oliphant read the amendments? That way we can move faster.

Some hon. members: Agreed.

The Chair: Okay.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: I am proposing the deletion of clause 8 because of the problem of machinery of government again and the policy directive of telling the RCMP or FINTRAC to do something to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, which would take it out of the appropriate wheelhouse for their activity.

It's not an amendment. It's a deletion.

The Chair: Shall clause 8 be negatived?

James Bezan: I would like to speak to—

Hon. Michael Chong: On a point of order, Mr. Chair, I want to point out that the deletion is not in our package.

• (1620)

James Bezan: They're voting against the clause.

Hon. Michael Chong: I understand, but it is in order.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: It is in order. I was thinking amendment, but I guess I have a paper here. It's not a deletion. We will be voting against the clause. Sorry, that was my mistake.

James Bezan: I'd like to speak to why it's important to have it.

Part of it is that if you look at the performance report of Global Affairs Canada's sanctions operations of 2018-24, it says, "Canada's sanctions legislation did not articulate a role for the FINTRAC", which is clause 9. Clause 8 says we need to work with "improved coordination with other government departments," such as the RCMP, FINTRAC and CBSA.

That's what this is all about. It addresses the concerns that were raised in the performance report and the evaluation of Global Affairs Canada's sanctions operations. The report said that, looking at reports coming from the Senate and House of Commons committees, there was "a lack of clarity of departmental roles in sanctions enforcement. An underlying issue is the tension between authority and power for enforcement."

This is helping address those shortfalls. All we're asking for is better reporting between these government agencies to ensure that the sanctions bureau is operating across the responsibilities within the whole-of-government approach.

The Chair: Are there any further comments on clause 8?

(Clause 8 negated on division)

(On clause 9)

The Chair: We're on clause 9.

Go ahead, Mr. Chong.

Hon. Michael Chong: Mr. Chair, I'd like to move amendment CPC-3.

Sorry. There's a new clause, clause 9.1.

The Chair: We have to deal with clause 9 first, and then we'll go to 9.1.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: I would add that I believe you will find that CPC-3 and G-5 are similar. They are very close, so I think we'll be finding agreement on that.

The Chair: We're not there yet. We still have to deal with clause 9.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: Before we get to 9.1, I'd advise you we'll be voting against clause 9, just so you know. There'll be a new clause that will replace 9, which is no longer 9 anyway.

The Chair: All right.

(Clause 9 negated on division)

The Chair: Now we can go to new clause 9.1 and amendment CPC-3.

Hon. Michael Chong: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I move CPC-3.

The Chair: Are there any comments or debate on CPC-3?

Since CPC-3 was moved, G-5 cannot be moved, as they are identical. That deals with the next item.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: Could we get advice, Mr. Chair, from the legislative clerk?

We think CPC-3 and G-5 are so similar that we would simply withdraw G-5. Is that how that would work?

The Chair: My understanding from the clerk is that because G-5 is identical to CPC-3, it cannot be moved anyway; there's no point in withdrawing it, because it can't be moved to begin with.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: We're happy to have CPC-3 be moved first, and we would support it.

(Amendment agreed to [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(On clause 10)

The Chair: We're on clause 10.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: We will not be supporting clause 10, but we will be making a change in clause 11.

• (1625)

The Chair: Are there any further comments or debate on clause 10?

James Bezan: We heard from witnesses that we have to make sure we are sending a strong message with the long and short titles of SEMA. Brandon Silver said:

First, changing the short title of the Special Economic Measures Act to the Sergei Magnitsky global sanctions act not only honours the sacrifice of Sergei Magnitsky but reflects the reality of our sanctions regime. Human rights violations and corruption would not be sanctionable offences under SEMA if not for the adoption of the 2017 Magnitsky law amendments.

Vladimir Kara-Murza supported the renaming of it.

Bill Browder called for it. He said, "When every other country calls it a Magnitsky act and Canada does not, that alignment becomes harder than it needs to be." He also said, "When his name is embedded in law, it tells the world—every abuser, every corrupt official and every torturer—exactly what these sanctions are for and exactly whom they are named after. That clarity has a power."

By not using the name "Magnitsky".... Again, why are we trying to appease Putin?

Hon. Robert Oliphant: We have a response, because we thought that was coming.

What we are suggesting is not clause 10. We're going to be suggesting we defeat clause 10 and amend clause 11. I've given you some new paper on clause 11, which is with respect to the SEMA. Instead of being this way, it would read, "This Act may be cited as the Global Sanctions and Special Economic Measures Act (Sergei Magnitsky Law No. 2)".

We're trying to do both of these things. We're going to end up—and I will just give you advance notice—with three Sergei Magnitsky laws. We have the existing one that we call the Magnitsky law, which will retain its short name afterwards. SEMA will add “Sergei Magnitsky Law No. 2”, and this law, once passed, will be called “Sergei Magnitsky law no. 3”, which enacts changes to others. There will then be three Sergei Magnitsky laws, including the original one—the victims law—and SEMA, which will be renamed with a short title of the “Global Sanctions and Special Economic Measures Act (Sergei Magnitsky Law No. 2)”.

I will tell you that's partly financial. We looked at the cost of up to \$50,000 to change all of that. We thought that was not a good use of the money, but then we would also honour this private member's bill by referring to it as “Sergei Magnitsky law no. 3”. We'll get to that when we get to the preamble and the title of this act. There will be three.

The Chair: Are there any further comments?

James Bezan: I'm not happy about it.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: It was going to be the James Bezan law.

James Bezan: No, I don't want my name in it.

(Clause 10 negatived)

(On clause 11)

The Chair: We're on clause 11.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: I will propose that amendment at this point.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Oliphant.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: Did it get to our side as well? I'm not sure.

I move that Bill C-219 in clause 11 be amended by replacing lines 29 and 30 on page 6 with the following: “This act may be cited as the Global Sanctions and Special Economic Measures Act (Sergei Magnitsky Law No. 2)”.

The Chair: We'll take a brief suspension so folks can digest the amendment.

James Bezan: I think we're good. They know what they're doing. It's short and sweet.

The Chair: Okay.

Therefore, I pose the question to members: Shall clause 11 as amended carry?

• (1630)

James Bezan: We have the amendments first and then the clause.

The Chair: Apparently we're calling the amendment that has just been moved by Mr. Oliphant new LIB-5.1.

(Amendment agreed to on division [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clause 11 as amended agreed to)

(On clause 12)

The Chair: Are there any comments or debate on clause 12?

Hon. Robert Oliphant: Could you give me one moment, please?

Yes, we are supporting clause 12 with no changes, but then we are going to make an addition.

(Clause 12 agreed to)

The Chair: We now move on to amendment G-6, which proposes a new clause 12.1.

Mr. Oliphant, go ahead.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: You will find that in G-6.

This is where we're hoping that we actually bump up the bill a notch. We think it will replace clauses of SEMA, ensure that it captures both state and non-state actors, and align the language with new and updated triggers proposed in the bill. I move the following:

12.1 Section 3.1 of the Act is replaced by the following:

3.1 The purpose of this Act is to enable the Government of Canada to take economic measures against certain persons in circumstances where an international organization of states or association of states of which Canada is a member calls on its members to do so, international peace, security or stability has been undermined or is likely to be undermined, gross and systematic human rights violations have been committed in a foreign state or acts of significant corruption involving a national of a foreign state have been committed.

We're broadening it to try to make it a bit richer based on.... We think it's still within the scope of the bill.

Hon. Michael Chong: Mr. Chair, I support the amendment.

(Amendment agreed to [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(On clause 13)

The Chair: Now we move on to amendment new G-7.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: Yes, I will continue in that vein.

In clause 13, we are proposing an amendment. As you can see, it is fairly extensive. Clause 13 would be amended by replacing, as you'll see, lines 12 to 20 with the text that you have in front of you and “by adding after line 25...the following”, as it is in the written document.

(Amendment agreed to [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clause 13 as amended agreed to)

(On clause 14)

The Chair: Next is amendment CPC-4. Are there any comments, questions or debate?

Hon. Michael Chong: Mr. Chair, I'll move CPC-4.

James Bezan: Again, this is similar to what we did earlier. It reflects our amendment to clause 5 in the bill. It provides that wider definition. We've already heard the argument from the government, so I'm not going to waste a bunch of oxygen on it.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: We appreciate your sensitivity to our needs.

James Bezan: Don't read it that way. It's about picking your battles.

The Chair: Shall CPC-4 carry?

(Amendment negated on division [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

(Clause 14 negated on division)

(On clause 15)

• (1635)

The Chair: We have G-7.1. Are there comments or debate?

I have Mr. Oliphant.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: What we are proposing is that in clause 15 be amended by replacing line 1 on page 8 with the following:

5.6 (1) Within 24 months of the seizure or restraint of private

In addition:

the Minister must apply for forfeiture of the private property un-

and

(2) The Minister must dispose of the private property forfeited

It's the same as what we did in the earlier clause.

The Chair: Are there any comments?

James Bezan: We're opposed to G-7.1, but they have the votes.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: We're in favour of it.

(Amendment agreed to on division [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

The Chair: We're on G-7.2.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: Similarly, in G-7.2, it's that clause 15 be amended by adding after line 6, as we did earlier in the bill, that:

(3) Subsections (1) and (2) do not apply in cases in respect of which legal proceedings are ongoing.

This is to ensure that the minister doesn't get into trouble.

(Amendment agreed to)

(Clause 15 as amended agreed to)

(Clause 16 and 17 negated on division)

(On clause 18)

The Chair: We're on G-7.3.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: You'll see that, at G-7.3, we move that Bill C-219, in clause 18, be amended by deleting lines 7 to 13 on page 9.

We keep the first part of it, and then we delete from lines 7 to 13.

The Chair: If G-7.3 is adopted, CPC-5 cannot be moved. This is due to a line conflict.

As *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, fourth edition, states in section 16.71, "Once a line of a clause has been amended

by the committee, it cannot be further amended by a subsequent amendment as a given line may be amended only once."

(Amendment agreed to on division)

The Chair: I've already addressed CPC-5.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: We've struck those lines.

(Clause 18 as amended agreed to)

(Clause 19 agreed to)

(On clause 20)

The Chair: On clause 20, we have G-8. Is there discussion on G-8?

Hon. Robert Oliphant: Yes. I have an amendment with respect to clause 20 that it be amended by replacing line 24 on page 9 with the following:

missible in evidence in a prosecution under this Part in re-

I just need to have the act, because these are odd little things.... What we are attempting to do is change the word "Act" on line 24 to "under this Part" to be more accurate in what is actually happening.

It would then read: "The original or a copy of a bill of lading, customs document, commercial invoice or other document is admissible in evidence in a prosecution under this Part". It really refers to part of the act, but that's the legal way of doing it, apparently—the "Part"—and it's "in relation to any dealing with respect to goods, or services". It takes out "Act" and puts in the word "Part".

(Amendment agreed to)

(Clause 20 as amended agreed to)

(On clause 21)

• (1640)

The Chair: We're on clause 21.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: Just give me one minute. Sorry, where are we at with the votes?

The Chair: It's less than five minutes.

We'll suspend.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: It's five minutes until the vote's called, and then we have 10 minutes. Okay.

Sorry, I have a question on clause 21. In this, we have already replaced the name by an earlier amendment that we added under clause 11, and so it seems to me that this doesn't apply now under 21 because we've already changed the short title. I need help on this.

James Bezan: I know what you're saying, Robert.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Bezan.

James Bezan: This would go to the legislative clerk. It's that the short title of "Special Economic Measures Act" has been changed now to the "Global Sanctions and Special Economic Measures Act (Sergei Magnitsky Law No. 2)".

You're saying that it's not the short title that has changed in any of the other pieces of legislation. That is why you're saying that clause 21 is now no longer relevant.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: That's what I believe.

James Bezan: I have a question, because that's a legislative issue.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: We've already changed the term.

The Chair: We'll do a brief suspension to allow the legislative clerks to look into this. We have to vote anyway.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: Our main concern, so you know, is that clause 11 has now been changed. What do we do with terminology then after?

The Chair: It's a brief suspension.

• (1640) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1720)

The Chair: We are resuming the meeting.

I'm asking for agreement among members to set aside clause 21 and clause 22.

Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

(Clauses 21 and 22 allowed to stand)

We will consider clause 21 and clause 22 on Tuesday at 5:30. The clerk has agreed to ask for extra resources for that day.

(On clause 23)

The Chair: We're on CPC-6.

Hon. Michael Chong: Mr. Chair, I move CPC-6, and I'd like to speak to it briefly.

The first point to make is that airwaves are publicly owned. I believe that comes from a very old decision by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, which ruled that—

[*Translation*]

Sébastien Lemire (Abitibi—Témiscamingue, BQ): Mr. Chair, I'm sorry to interrupt Mr. Chong, but interpretation is currently not being provided in French. I can hear the member speaking in English, not in French.

• (1725)

[*English*]

The Chair: We will briefly suspend to make sure it works.

• (1725) _____ (Pause) _____

• (1725)

The Chair: We are resuming the meeting.

We were discussing CPC-6.

Go ahead, Mr. Chong.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Michael Chong: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to thank my Bloc Québécois colleague for emphasizing the importance of both official languages.

[*English*]

Mr. Chair, I want to speak to why I'm moving this amendment.

The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, back in the 1930s, very clearly ruled in their decision that the spectrum licensed in Canada is public property and is owned by the Government of Canada. It's considered a public property.

The reason I point this out is that, while we all support freedom of expression here, the government is under no obligation to provide public space to authoritarian state broadcasters. For example, the Government of Canada is under no obligation to provide facilities for rent by Russia Today to host events. The same thing goes for public property, like the spectrum that the CRTC licenses. This is why the Government of Canada issued a directive in March 2022, under section 15 of the Broadcasting Act, in response to Russia's invasion of Ukraine. It directed the CRTC to study whether Russia Today should remain on the list of broadcasters of non-Canadian programming services and stations authorized for distribution.

The purpose of this amendment is to make the government's broadcast policy one that is of even more general application. This amendment doesn't single out any particular state-controlled broadcaster, such as Russia Today.

Rather, it adds, under section 7 of the Broadcasting Act:

The Governor in Council must, by order under subsection (1), issue to the Commission a direction that state-controlled broadcasters from foreign states that have committed grave breaches of international peace and security, transnational repression, gross and systemic human rights violations or acts of significant corruption, not be on the List of non-Canadian programming services and stations authorized for distribution.

It's consistent with the direction the government issued under section 15 four years ago. It would make that direction of even more general application and would likely capture authoritarian state-controlled broadcasters like CGTN.

The reason this is important is that, among many of our allies—the United Kingdom, for example—both Russia Today and CGTN have been pulled off the airwaves. That's not the case here. Russia Today is no longer broadcasting as a result of the section 15 direction from four years ago, but CGTN continues to broadcast. The challenge is that it has aired forced confessions on its broadcast. It is also editorially controlled by the Chinese Communist Party.

That is the purpose of this amendment. I hope members of the committee will support it. It also fixes the existing drafting problem.

• (1730)

The Chair: Are there any comments on CPC-6?

Go ahead, Mr. Oliphant.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: We have a few concerns about this.

I would say that my first concern is that it is somewhat outside my expertise, as a member of the committee, to be dealing with this because it's not been our [*Inaudible—Editor*]. However, it also seems to push the scope of the bill and the intent of the author. We think it could be ruled out of order because it would open an unrelated provision of the Broadcasting Act, which deals with the power of the Governor in Council to issue directions under general application on broad policy matters, and this is not within the original scope of the bill.

We have some other problems with clause 23 even as it's written, in that it requires the CRTC to do a number of things that are outside its expertise and its mandate, including an evaluation process with respect to the integrity of someone on the list. We don't issue licences to broadcasters that are foreign; we put them on the list of broadcasters that can be added to a licensed broadcaster. We think that this is not the best place to do it. It's becoming an omnibus bill. We think that the amendment itself is not within the scope of the bill as it's been presented. Even if it were, we would be concerned about it giving authorities that it may not be within the power of the CRTC to do.

Given that, I would like to turn to officials from Canadian Heritage to make sure I'm not wrong.

Hon. Michael Chong: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

Could we get the legislative clerk to tell us whether the amendment I moved is in order?

The Chair: Upon the advice of the legislative clerk, I'm told that the amendment is in order.

Hon. Michael Chong: It's in order.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The Chair: I'll turn back to Mr. Oliphant's request for the officials to comment.

Charlene Budnisky (Senior Director, Communication Legislative and Regulatory Policy, Department of Canadian Heritage): Thank you very much for the opportunity to comment on this amendment that would be proposed to the Broadcasting Act.

You're absolutely right. Section 7 of the Broadcasting Act does, in fact, allow the Governor in Council to issue binding policy directions to the CRTC “of general application on broad policy matters” related to “broadcasting policy” or “regulatory policy” objectives. Accepting this amendment would place the CRTC in a position of assessing complex matters such as war crimes, human rights abuses and corruption, which fall outside the expertise of a broadcasting regulator.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: I accept the chair's ruling that it's in order, but I would say that it is outside the expertise of the CRTC—and its mandate—to do that. It would put the CRTC, as an independent agency, in a position of doing something it cannot do. I also worry that it gives cabinet—even though I know people there—a power of censorship that I think is not something we would be moving toward in this country. We want to find ways to ensure that the CRTC acts when there is any odious activity, or to be supportive of that, but I would still be very careful on a censorship issue.

• (1735)

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Bezan.

James Bezan: First of all, as we just heard from witnesses, they already take their direction and policies through orders in council that get issued by cabinet. In this amendment, this is still a cabinet decision by Governor in Council. It's still very specific on Mr. Oliphant's concerns about censorship, but it's tied to “breaches of international peace and security, transnational repression, gross and systemic human rights violations or acts of significant corruption”. It's very well defined, and we trust cabinet in drafting regulations. Regulations all become public at some point in time, and everybody gets to comment on them.

Again, I think it provides direction and policy for the CRTC, and it refers to the list that is provided to those that are providing services to Canadians across this country for their TV watching. I think this falls in line with government policy. It definitely strengthens this bill, and it ensures that, again, it's in the hands of cabinet to make the decisions on who, on those bases—which entities—should be removed from those lists.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: Mr. Chair, I would add, though, that the CRTC has a system and series of processes whereby every decision they make in this sort of line has hearings, and there are appeal procedures. This gives cabinet absolute power to do something by directive to the CRTC, and we don't believe CRTC has the investigation power. This is something we're very concerned about.

Even from the government side, we think that the CRTC needs to be protected as independent. When concerns are raised by the public, the CRTC has to deal with them, but not by direct order from the cabinet to make a decision. That's our concern, but I would turn to the officials to correct me or not.

Charlene Budnisky: Yes, that is absolutely correct. In fact, the CRTC has a number of measures that it can put in place to bring a licensed Canadian broadcaster into compliance. For instance, if there was some suspicion of influence, or vulnerability to influence, the CRTC could issue orders. It could monitor things; it could ask for information, or it could issue administrative monetary penalties. These are all of the tools that it has available to it to bring a licensed Canadian broadcaster into compliance. Yes, certainly this would be the procedure that the CRTC would use to do so.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: Thank you.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Bezan.

James Bezan: When was the last time CRTC actually sanctioned, banned or fined a non-Canadian broadcasting entity?

Charlene Budnisky: I would have to do some research on that. I do not have the answer available to me.

James Bezan: It took forever to get RT removed.

Charlene Budnisky: If I may respond to that, it took two weeks to remove RT once the—

James Bezan: After an order was given....

Charlene Budnisky: —section 15...was issued.

James Bezan: Some of us have spent years asking that RT be removed.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Chong.

Hon. Michael Chong: The amendment doesn't actually ask the CRTC to adjudicate whether grave breaches of international peace and security, transnational repression, gross and systemic human rights violations or acts of significant corruption have taken place.

What the amendment says is that the Governor in Council must issue a direction regarding state-controlled broadcasters from foreign states who have done those things. Presumably, this is not going to be the exact wording of the Governor in Council's direction. It is going to issue direction in line with this law, and that direction will be worded in a way that the Privy Council Office thinks is consistent with the other measures in the Broadcasting Act. That will be signed by certain ministers and then provided to the CRTC.

This clause is not mandating that the CRTC is going to adjudicate the items enumerated here; the government is going to issue a direction to the CRTC regarding state-controlled broadcasters that have undertaken or committed these acts. I just want to point that out, because I think that's an important point to make.

• (1740)

The Chair: We have Mr. Oliphant.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: I'm afraid I read it differently. It says, first of all, that “The Governor in Council must, by order under subsection (1), issue to the Commission a direction that state-controlled broadcasters”—and this is undefined; we're still not always sure exactly what state-controlled and not state-controlled are, because some of them are grey—“from foreign states that have committed [these atrocities] not be on the List”. It's not giving discretion to the CRTC. It gives a direction saying that if this has happened, they are no longer on the list, so they're taken off with no recourse, no hearings, no anything.

What I would say is that we, on this side of the House, have heard and seen it. I think we have to go back to the government to say that if this is defeated here, the government—not this committee necessarily—has some work to do on the Broadcasting Act so that Canadians have a way into this discussion to find out how we can ensure that our broadcasting system is not used by malevolent state actors. I think it's a good warning. It's a good signal. We just think that this is not the appropriate place to do it, and it is going to be difficult. We would be against the amendment; even if the amendment failed, we would still be against clauses 23 and 24.

Hon. Michael Chong: Mr. Chair, debate has been exhausted. I think that's clear.

The Chair: Absolutely.

(Amendment negated on division)

(Clause 23 negated)

Hon. Michael Chong: It's not on division. It's defeated, period. There's a problem with clause 23.

(Clause 24 negated)

(On clause 1)

The Chair: We are on the short title.

Hon. Robert Oliphant: We would just like to hold for now, because there's a relationship between the SEMA change of title—we added Magnitsky 2—and the short title of this bill, which we would like to do as Magnitsky 3.

However, we recognize that clause 11 is still in play in terms of how it affects the later two clauses. If we have to come back to the bill, we could come back to these two clauses—clause 21 and clause 22—in a separate meeting, as well as the short title and the preamble, so that we make sure to clean it up appropriately.

That would be our suggestion.

The Chair: Go ahead, Mr. Bezan.

James Bezan: It's just a request.

If you're changing the short title, can you put on the record what the amendment will look like, even though we aren't going to vote on it today?

The Chair: My understanding is that the clerk has also sent out that amendment.

James Bezan: Do we have it?

Hon. Robert Oliphant: I have it here. This act may be cited as the “International Anti-Corruption and Human Rights Act (Sergei Magnitsky Law No. 3)”. We take the title, but we put “Magnitsky” in brackets.

We'll have three bills: number one, Raynell's bill; number two, SEMA; and number three, Bezan.

James Bezan: We don't need to put—

Hon. Robert Oliphant: It will be called “Bezan”. You know that. We call the other one “Andreychuk's bill”. It is “Andreychuk”.

Hon. Michael Chong: I have a point of order.

We're not going to consider G-1 and G-2 right now. We're going to set those aside until—

Hon. Robert Oliphant: I would suggest that we put them on hold.

The Chair: That's the suggestion, but again, it will depend on the will of the committee.

Hon. Michael Chong: We agree.

The Chair: Based on that decision, there's no more work we have to do today, in terms of the bill.

This concludes the business of the day.

Thank you. The meeting is adjourned.

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

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

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

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

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

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

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

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

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

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

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

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

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

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante :
<https://www.noscommunes.ca>