



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

Standing Committee on International Trade

EVIDENCE

NUMBER 087

Thursday, December 7, 2023

Chair: The Honourable Judy A. Sgro



Standing Committee on International Trade

Thursday, December 7, 2023

• (1105)

[*English*]

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

Welcome to meeting number 87 of the Standing Committee on International Trade.

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

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

Please wait until I recognize you by name before speaking. For those online, please mute yourself when you are not speaking. This is a reminder that all comments should be addressed through the chair. If any technical issues arise, please inform me immediately. We will need to suspend in order to ensure interpretation is properly restored before resuming the meeting. I ask all participants to be careful when handling the earpieces, in order to prevent feedback.

Pursuant to Standing Order 108(2) and the motion adopted by the committee on Tuesday, October 17, 2023, the committee is continuing its study on the 2023 strike at the port of Vancouver.

We have, today, the Canadian International Freight Forwarders Association, Bruce Rodgers, executive director, by video conference; and Julia Kuzeljevich, director, policy and regulatory affairs, by video conference. We have with us the Canadian Meat Council, Lauren Martin, senior director, government relations and policy. Back again, from the Greater Vancouver Board of Trade, we have Bridgitte Anderson, president and chief executive officer, by video conference. Ms. Anderson will be with us for only the first hour of the meeting.

We also have the Freight Management Association of Canada, Robert Ballantyne, former president and senior adviser. From the Mining Association of British Columbia, Tim McEwan, senior vice-president, corporate affairs, is with us by video conference. Joining us also is Michel Murray, union adviser with the longshoreman union at the port of Montreal, with whom we're still waiting to connect by video conference.

Welcome to you all. We will start with opening remarks and then proceed with rounds of questions.

Mr. Rodgers, I invite you to address the committee for up to five minutes, please.

Mr. Bruce Rodgers (Executive Director, Canadian International Freight Forwarders Association): Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak with you today and to be invited to this panel.

I'm going to ask Julia Kuzeljevich to start, and I will finish the opening remarks.

Ms. Julia Kuzeljevich (Director, Policy and Regulatory Affairs, Canadian International Freight Forwarders Association): Good morning. Thank you for having us appear today.

[*Translation*]

Madam Chair, committee members, on behalf of the Canadian International Freight Forwarders Association, or CIFFA, we'd like to thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today.

[*English*]

Very briefly, for those who may not know, freight forwarders take control of shipments, be they imports or exports, and move them to the ultimate customer by whatever transport mode is most cost-efficient. We represent roughly 12,000 employees of member firms, and they handle approximately 80% of freight traffic in Canada. Also, as our association represents port truckers—called drayage operators—customs brokers and other services sectors, we can legitimately claim to represent all the key players in Canada's supply chain.

The labour disruptions at west coast ports this last summer were a fairly serious blow to our members and to our customers. We feel it was also a sign that we need to start moving beyond the traditional and wasteful pattern of labour confrontation that has characterized the Canadian port industry.

The year 2023 was certainly the year of labour disputes in ports. We saw strikes on Canada's west coast and on the U.S. west coast as well. In the southeast of the U.S., although negotiations are currently under way, the union stated that members should prepare to go on strike next October. Now, we are looking at a possible strike at the port of Montreal.

Mr. Bruce Rodgers: We canvassed our members in anticipation of this appearance, asking about the impacts of the west coast strike last summer, and got reactions such as members saying that the most frustrating part of the Vancouver situation seemed to be the complete lack of understanding of supply chains in Canada. Media coverage focused on the impact to B.C., without any understanding of the volume of cargo arriving via B.C. ports, destined for inland centres...most notably southern Ontario.

This underlines a point we want to make to the committee. The victims of strikes aren't the workers, who generally get their back pay upon settlement, nor the port and labour business managers. The victims are ordinary small businesses. Nobody compensates them for their losses.

As a specific example of impacts to a forwarder's customers, who were impacted by the Vancouver situation, an importer stated that due to the late delivery of seasonal import items, they had a customer miss a deadline and the resulting order. As these goods are seasonal, they were unable to find another buyer. This customer is sitting on this inventory, and because of the money tied up in this, is unable to purchase other seasonal goods and keep their business moving forward.

From an exporter's perspective, we heard from one who had a customer who dealt with an overseas buyer on longer contracts of sale, such as 90 days to a year. As a result of the continued supply chain issues that have been happening in Canada, this buyer is now sourcing the majority of the volume from elsewhere in the world; the Canadian exporter gets a small portion of the volume they carried, and contracts of sale are on a single shipment of limited basis, such as 30 days.

There should be no doubt in anyone's mind that disruptions divert traffic; nor should you doubt that those disruptions can lead to permanent changes in shipping routes.

In a November interview, a supply chain manager in Inside Logistics made the point that in the past two years, they've seen east coast ports steal import volume from west coast ports as shippers looked to avoid backlogs and delays.

Now, as we look forward to the possibility of another disruption at the port of Montreal, our members are seeing shippers beginning to move away and find more reliable routings. There is no telling if these moves are temporary or permanent. We believe that Mr. Miao was asking about this last Thursday, and this is one of the most worrying aspects of service disruptions.

Inflation-related costs have driven up worker demands, while traffic has begun a significant decline, a decline that continues to this day. We fear it's going to be a difficult negotiation.

To conclude our remarks, following the west coast debacle this summer, Minister of Labour O'Regan talked about an in-depth examination of the port industry, with a focus on the future of port labour. On October 19, he issued a statement confirming that Anthony Giles and Kevin Banks have been contracted to begin the first part of this review process. Their work is due by December 31, which may be a day too late for the port of Montreal.

We see European employers and unions co-operating to ensure competitiveness and decent wages, yet in Canada we seem condemned to strikes as a requirement of negotiation. We hope and believe it's time for a better approach.

That concludes our report. Thank you very much.

• (1110)

The Chair: Thank you very much.

We will move on to Ms. Martin for an opening statement of up to five minutes, please.

Ms. Lauren Martin (Senior Director, Government Relations and Policy, Canadian Meat Council): Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

Good morning, everyone. I appreciate the invitation to appear on behalf of the Canadian Meat Council.

My name is Lauren Martin. I am the senior director of government relations and policy. We are pleased to provide comments regarding the strike at the port of Vancouver.

CMC represents Canada's federally licensed meat packers, meat processors and suppliers of equipment and goods to the meat industry. Our members process over 90% of Canada's pork and beef. Our members feed Canadians and the world with some of the highest-quality protein in the world. The Canadian red meat industry represents over \$32 billion to the Canadian economy and supports 288,000 jobs across Canada.

As members of this committee well know, Canada's economy relies heavily on trade. With respect to red meat, Canada exports almost 70% of its pork and 50% of its beef to over 90 countries in the world, with lucrative trade relationships in Asian countries such as China and Japan, which are accessed via the western ports.

In 2022, Canadian processors exported \$9.5 billion in red meat products, which include pork, beef, lamb and others. We could not efficiently or cost-effectively get these goods to market without reliable transportation infrastructure: ground, air and sea. Approximately 25% of Canada's total traded goods flows through the ports in western Canada. They are Canada's largest gateway, handling over 800 million dollars' worth of cargo, which includes red meat products, every single day.

Our members spend considerable resources creating and maintaining relationships with customers worldwide. When companies cannot fulfill orders reliably, this jeopardizes those relationships. As a result of our reliance on trade and the important markets accessed via the western ports, the impact of this dispute was far more profound than that of most other labour disruptions, though we did see an almost equally worrisome situation developing in the St. Lawrence Seaway this fall.

To position Canada as a competitive trading partner in the global economy, businesses must be able to get goods to and from market efficiently and reliably, as I've mentioned. Red meat cannot sit for days—let alone weeks—without spoiling. Given the nature of our goods, our supply chain is built to ship goods to market efficiently. We do not have the storage capacity to stockpile weeks of unshipped goods.

When our members are faced with an event that exceeds our storage capacity or even comes close to exceeding that storage capacity, they are forced to shut down production. Animals cannot move off the farm, which in turn has implications for farm families and their bottom lines, not to mention the implications for animal welfare. Events like this are felt in businesses and individuals along the supply chain, and gearing back up is not as simple as the flip of a switch.

I have now illustrated the challenging decisions that businesses must make when facing uncertainty. It is unfortunate that the strike happened when it did, with industries still struggling with the post-pandemic fragility of supply chains, labour shortages, and inflation. It goes without saying that putting perishable products such as red meat at risk is also not in the public's best interests. These types of lengthy market disruptions add costs to businesses that put food on families' tables, impacting food affordability.

Canadians expected our elected officials to ensure that this labour dispute was resolved quickly. Instead, it dragged on for 35 days. The Greater Vancouver Board of Trade estimated that \$10.7 billion in trade was impacted during the 35 days of strike action this past July. While we respect the workers' right to strike, those interests must be balanced against the public interest.

In the future, the federal government must be willing to intervene much sooner than it did this past summer and use all the tools it has at its disposal to bring parties to the table. Additionally, it should consider solutions such as maintenance of service provisions, which have been granted for grain, for all perishable products, such as red meat. We strongly recommend such measures, which will protect red meat's critical paths to market, our nation's trading reputation and food affordability for all Canadians.

That concludes my comments. Thank you very much.

• (1115)

The Chair: Thank you very much, Ms. Martin.

We'll go on to Mr. Ballantyne, please.

Mr. Robert Ballantyne (Past President and Senior Adviser, Freight Management Association of Canada): Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

The Freight Management Association of Canada has been representing the freight transportation interests of Canadian industry to all levels of government since 1916. Despite appearances, I wasn't at the first meeting.

Voices: Oh, oh!

Mr. Robert Ballantyne: The FMA is not an industry-specific association. It has a focus on freight transportation by all modes of transport—air, marine, rail and truck—that impact the supply chains of companies in all industries. We have agriculture, mining, manufacturing, food processing and retail companies within our membership. Some of our retail members are household names.

In addition, the FMA is the Canadian member of the Global Shippers Forum. Through that relationship, we are involved in dialogue with various UN agencies that impact global trade, such as the International Maritime Organization.

The term “supply chain” is a good metaphor for the complex relationships of all stakeholders involved in moving goods from origin to destination. With the growth of international trade, these chains have become ever more complex. A chain is only as strong as its weakest link. If one of those links is broken, the entire chain is impacted.

As this committee is focused on Canada's international trade, it becomes obvious that a work stoppage at a major “link” in the chain, like the port of Vancouver, will broadly impact the Canadian economy and Canada's international customers. It can also have potential impacts on the health and safety of Canadians.

While the FMA respects the rights of workers, there has to be consideration of the resulting impacts of work stoppages in many industries that are critical to the functioning of the Canadian economy and Canadian society. How do we balance the rights of approximately 7,000 west coast port workers with the rights of millions of Canadians across the country, including other unionized workers?

The Canada Labour Code goes some distance in attempting to look at this conundrum. Here are a couple of the items.

The first is essential services. Subsection 87.4(1) of the Canada Labour Code requires that, during a strike or lockout, the employer, the trade union and the employees “must continue the supply of services, operation of facilities or production of goods to the extent necessary to prevent an immediate and serious danger to the safety or health of the public.” The second one is subsection 87.7(1), which requires the longshore industry to service grain vessels during a strike or lockout.

Regarding essential services, a case can be made that these should be expanded beyond the “immediate and serious danger to the safety or health of the public.” The major impacts on Canadian society of broken links in the supply chain caused by port and rail labour disruptions are such that Parliament should look at expanding the “essential services” definition to address these widespread and major impacts.

Also, while it's appropriate that grain vessels should continue to be serviced during a strike, it is time to consider extending this requirement to other commodities and industries, as my colleague Lauren already mentioned.

In preparing for this meeting, FMA reached out to a number of its member companies regarding the impacts they have experienced. Many of our importer members report that they have had to commence taking action in advance of a possible supply chain strike. This can add significant cost. If delayed products are seasonal or time-sensitive, it can result in lost sales and revenues.

Canadian prosperity depends on our international trade, and labour disruptions are one of several issues impacting Canada's reputation as a reliable trading partner. In addition to strikes, we have seen floods and fires in western Canada that have impacted rail and trucking services in some areas. There have been instances of blockades of rail services by people protesting various issues across the country.

FMA obtains information each year from the Canada labour program on expiring transportation labour agreements. The 2023 list includes the west coast longshore agreement and the St. Lawrence Seaway agreement, which both expired on March 31. As mentioned, these agreements were not settled without strikes. It's also worth noting that, on December 31—about three weeks from now—the longshore workers contract at the port of Montreal ends, as do five railway agreements with CN, CPKC and Ontario Northland. Those will be expiring at the end of this month.

● (1120)

FMA is pleased to see the committee looking at these important issues, and we think it would be useful for Parliament to extend its consideration of labour relations to all of the links in the Canadian supply chain.

Thanks for the opportunity. I'm pleased to try to answer questions.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Ballantyne.

We'll move on to Mr. McEwan, please, for up to five minutes.

Mr. Tim McEwan (Senior Vice President, Corporate Affairs, Mining Association of British Columbia): Good morning, Chair and members of the committee.

My name is Tim McEwan. I'm senior vice-president of corporate affairs with the Mining Association of British Columbia, or MABC for short.

I'm joining you today from the shared, traditional, ancestral and unceded territories of the Tsawwassen and other Coast Salish peoples.

MABC represents 17 operating mines, two smelters and more than a dozen development projects in British Columbia. Mining is a major user of Canada's west coast ports and is the largest shipping sector by volume using both rail and marine modes.

Most of British Columbia's production volume is shipped to international customers in Japan, Korea, India and others, and accounted for 28%, or \$18 billion, of the total value of British Columbia's exports in 2022. British Columbia's mining industry employs approximately 35,000 people in our province, with an average annual salary of \$139,000.

When mines and smelters curtail operations, the impacts are felt not only by our employees but also the 3,800 businesses and suppliers in communities across the province that depend on the industry for their economic livelihoods.

Last summer's strike occurred on the heels of unprecedented supply chain disruptions during the pandemic, record wildfires and atmospheric rivers that severed rail lines and highways. The strike had a major effect on B.C.'s mining and smelting sectors.

First, it disrupted the inbound delivery of key supplies and materials for our members' operations. This included new equipment and other inputs for capital projects and materials to support ongoing operations.

Second, from an outbound or export perspective, each mining operation in British Columbia was impacted differently by the strike due to factors such as the commodity being mined, the site location and the transportation mode used to ship the commodity. A few sites were able to divert shipments to other ports, albeit with increased costs, effort and time, but other operations did not have this option available. The inability to get products to international markets caused some mines to stockpile products on site or in railcars across B.C., all with physical and financial limits to how long they could do this.

With a prolonged strike or lockout, British Columbia's mining sector risks losing international customers to producers outside of Canada. Throughout the period, international customers were frequently asking about the strike and when it would end. The longer the strike continued, it was necessary for some MABC members to plan for shutdowns or temporary layoffs.

Beyond the immediacy of the strike, disruptions also caused significant congestion throughout the supply chain that took many weeks to fully resolve. Simply put, the longer a disruption persists, the longer it takes to clear congestion, while damage is done to customer relationships and Canada's reputation as a reliable supplier.

Given the size and scope of British Columbia's mining sector, the economic and reputational repercussions for our province and all of Canada—all of these—were substantial. The strike also had cascading consequences for workers, suppliers and communities, not only in British Columbia but also in mining communities across Canada. It's important to note as well that our industry has shared objectives with the governments of Canada and British Columbia to advance more critical mineral mines and to help with climate action and national and allied security imperatives.

The critical minerals opportunity includes billions of dollars of prospective investment, thousands of well-paid, family-supporting jobs, significant partnership opportunities with first nations and new contract and economic opportunities in communities throughout the province.

Secure, certain and predictable supply chains, including fluidity through west coast ports, are indispensable in our collective efforts to grow British Columbia and Canada as a low-carbon supplier of critical minerals to domestic and international markets. Moving forward, it's clear that, if Canada wants to strengthen trading relationships and grow our export economy, including critical minerals opportunities, the federal government needs more effective options to address labour disputes impacting the national economy.

MABC sees the review initiated by the Minister of Labour under section 106 of the Canada Labour Code as an opportunity to provide these solutions. We urge the federal government to balance meaningful collective bargaining with solutions that safeguard British Columbian and Canadian supply chains and our international reputation as a preferred and reliable supplier for low-carbon critical minerals and metals.

I want to thank you today for the opportunity to provide some insights on last summer's strike at Canada's west coast ports.

• (1125)

I look forward to the question and answer session.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much, sir.

I'm going to suspend momentarily to do a sound check for Mr. Murray.

• (1125)

(Pause)

• (1125)

The Chair: Mr. Murray, you have up to five minutes for an opening statement.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Murray (Union Adviser, Longshoreman Union in the port of Montréal, Syndicat des débardeurs, section locale 375 du Syndicat canadien de la fonction publique): Good morning. I represent the Syndicat des débardeurs du Port de Montréal, a

union that was founded in 1902 and therefore has been around for over 100 years.

Pursuant to House of Commons Standing Order 108, I appear before you to discuss the impact of the Port of Vancouver strike last summer. At the Port of Montreal, we're well placed to speak to the right to strike, since we exercised our right to do so in 2020 and 2021.

I feel a bit like a skunk at a garden party, as all the previous speakers talked about the supply chain and Canada's international reputation. I have to tell you that Canada signed an international agreement on the right to organize in 1972. The right to organize recognizes the right to strike and its counterpart, the right to lock out for the employer, as a foundational element. I must also remind you that the right to strike is recognized under the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, as confirmed in the Saskatchewan decision.

With respect to restriction of the right to strike under the Canada Labour Code, I must once again remind you that the right to strike has been restricted before. In the late 1990s, further to the Sims report entitled "Seeking a Balance", the Canada Labour Code was amended to restrict the right to strike by requiring both employers and unions to give 72 hours' notice before exercising the right to strike or lock out.

At the Port of Montreal, if we were to give 72 hours' notice before a strike, the ships would be off the coast of Newfoundland. So the supply chain wouldn't be interrupted. The 72 hours' notice gives time to find a temporary alternate route and maintain the supply chain. So I'm very surprised that all the speakers are talking about restricting the right to strike in any way, shape, or form.

We also talked about essential services, section 87.4 of the Canada Labour Code. Essential services have already been established.

On June 8, 2020, the Canada Industrial Relations Board issued a landmark decision on the Port of Montreal. He said that there was no essential service to maintain, since there was no imminent and serious danger to the public. Of course, there is an economic impact. Who would go on strike without there being an economic impact? Of course, the right to lock out also has an economic impact on workers. The balance already exists.

If you are to look at what is happening in the longshore industry, we think you should focus on section 34 of the Canada Labour Code. How are employers' organizations composed? Why were there strikes at the port of Vancouver last summer? Why were there strikes at the Port of Montreal two years ago? Perhaps because the real decision-makers weren't at the table. When we negotiate, we talk to human resources representatives. Shipping operators and shipping lines are not at the bargaining table.

That's what I understood during the most recent conflict in Vancouver, which I followed closely. Shipping lines and shipping operators were not at the bargaining table. So before we talk about the supply chain and international reputation, we should eliminate the danger at the source and ensure that the real decision-makers are at the bargaining table.

We believe that the committee should instead look at labour relations, see what that consists of and determine who sits at the table to bargain. At the Port of Montreal, we're currently negotiating with the employer's organization, and no decision-maker is sitting at the table. Even the president of the employer's organization is not at the bargaining table. Conciliation ended two days ago, and we're now in a mediation period. The employer has not even submitted its wage offers yet.

Before we talk about supply chain and reputation, the committee should really look at labour relations and who's sitting at the bargaining tables.

Thank you very much for your attention.

• (1130)

[English]

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

Ms. Anderson was at a previous meeting and was invited back. Would the committee like her to have five minutes again to repeat her opening statement?

Ms. Anderson, the floor is yours for up to five minutes.

Ms. Bridgitte Anderson (President and Chief Executive Officer, Greater Vancouver Board of Trade): Thank you very much.

Good morning, Chair, vice-chairs and members of the committee.

I'm presenting today from the traditional territory of the Musqueam, Squamish and Tsleil-Waututh nations.

On behalf of our membership of over 5,000 businesses, I thank you for the opportunity to discuss the significant economic impacts of the 13-day strike this summer at Canada's west coast ports. This strike, the longest in almost four decades, unfolded against the backdrop of years of challenges in the supply chain, largely, outside of our control. The cumulation of these events impacted Canada's image and role as a stable partner in the global supply chain.

In March of 2020, the pandemic's effect began a tidal wave of imbalances in container trade as factories around the world shut down, leading to shortages, scarcity and hoarding. In July of 2021, wildfires damaged rail lines and brought train shipments to a grinding halt. In November of 2021, an atmospheric river caused billions

of dollars in economic damage to two class I rail links and highway systems, which have been heroically rebuilt. These events highlight the extreme pressure that fuelled inflation and caused economic stress, some of which we were able to control and some of which we were not.

We know that we need to build climate resiliency into the supply chain, and our members are investing to do just that. These investments in our resiliency and growth will mean good-paying and often union jobs.

Against this backdrop, we were concerned in the months leading up to July 1 about what the short-term and long-term economic harm of a strike at the ports of Vancouver and Prince Rupert could be. We communicated to government and port-reliant industries about the damage that could occur if the strike shut down the ports. Regrettably, those fears came to fruition with a coast-wide strike on Canada Day.

During the strike, we launched a port shutdown calculator, a tool designed to visually depict the magnitude of trade disruption. The numbers were staggering, with 800 million dollars' worth of trade being disrupted each day. Our calculator estimated the value of trade disrupted to be a remarkable \$10.7 billion.

This disruption reverberated across critical sectors nationwide, from manufacturing and retail to agriculture, energy and automotive dealers. Small businesses ran out of building and construction materials needed to build homes for Canadians. Local car dealers were awaiting shipments of vehicles and parts. Exporting industries lost their ability to move their products to market, making it more difficult to secure the global contracts that drive investment and employ Canadians. Pulp mills stood silent. Mining operations, as you heard, were curtailed, and businesses across Canada faced increased costs and prolonged wait times for goods. Moreover, the rerouting of goods destined for Canada to alternative ports not only incurred additional costs and delays for businesses but also needlessly amplified the environmental footprint of our trade.

While the strike unfolded in B.C., the effects were felt nationwide. We think of the port of Vancouver as "Canada's port", for it moves as many goods as the next five largest ports combined, single-handedly accounting for approximately 25% of Canada's total traded goods. This means that long-term disputes like the ones we experienced this summer have far-reaching consequences that affect the entire nation.

Billions of dollars in goods bypassed Vancouver for other ports, especially Seattle and other U.S. and Mexican ports, as port swaps and diversions increased. All of this cost Canada. Businesses were unable to adequately plan their operations and staffing without knowing if the ports would be open from one minute to the next. This was made worse by the back and forth of strike action.

Throughout the strike and the aftermath, we consistently urged the federal government to explore additional tools to facilitate lasting agreements during labour disruptions that affect the entire economy. The review initiated by the Minister of Labour, under section 106 of the Canada Labour Code is a key opportunity to do this.

In conclusion, I thank you once again for the opportunity to share insights into the impacts of the strike. We look forward to collaborating with the government to ensure that meaningful collective bargaining can take place without causing detrimental nationwide consequences to our economy and our reputation as a reliable and stable trading partner.

Thank you. I look forward to the questions and answers.

• (1135)

The Chair: Thank you very much, Ms. Anderson.

Mr. Seeback, go ahead, please, for six minutes.

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

I just want to state for the record, especially for Mr. Murray, that no one here is disputing the union's right to strike for better wages. That's unanimously supported by all parties in the House of Commons, but we do want to look at the economic impact of this strike. That's the whole point of this study.

I wanted to quickly follow up. I'm going to ask all three to answer—the freight forwarders association, the board of trade and the Freight Management Association of Canada.

There have been many sorts of reports on what the economic impact has been. I think the \$10 billion is the value of the goods that were disrupted. What I want to talk about is the economic impact to the small businesses and others, because I don't think we have a good understanding of what that actual impact is, which includes the fact that these businesses may lose customers because their supply of product is now unstable. Therefore, companies go elsewhere to have those goods supplied.

Could all of you comment on that and whether or not you think that's been captured in any of the calculations of the economic impact?

Mr. Ballantyne, why don't you go first?

Mr. Robert Ballantyne: I'm not aware if that specific information has been captured anywhere. We've certainly reached out to a number of our member companies. Most of them are fairly large companies, so there really aren't very many small companies that were impacted.

The general information is that there are impacts. There's the business of losing access to commodities and products that may be

time-sensitive, as I mentioned in my opening remarks, so you're either a small or a large retailer and you have....

One mentioned, and this surprised me, that they had Halloween commodities that got caught up in the port of Vancouver strike. That's probably pretty small. This was one instance where they lost commodities that were very time-sensitive. That was one issue that one of our members brought to us, but I don't have any statistics on it.

• (1140)

Mr. Kyle Seeback: I'll jump to the other two, if they want to give me an answer.

Ms. Bridgitte Anderson: You're quite right that the calculator factors in only the value of goods. The Royal Bank did some analysis and found that 63,000 containers were impacted.

When we look at the broad economic impact, though, the calculator didn't take in the lack of inventory affecting small and medium-sized businesses around their sales, production or the other kinds of impacts that really come to bear, including the catch-up time it took after.

When we look at some of the sectors that we have heard from among our members at the Greater Vancouver Board of Trade, they include mining—my colleague Tim can speak specifically about mining—potash, forestry, car dealerships, trucking and agriculture. All of these industries did speak to the economic impacts, which were significant.

As far as I know, our calculator took in the value of traded goods and not the full economic impact. I don't know if that work has been done yet.

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Go ahead, Mr. Rodgers.

Mr. Bruce Rodgers: I'll speak on that as well.

I provided in our opening remarks two examples, specific examples, one from an importer perspective and one from an exporter perspective.

The importer was affected because, when you have a 13-day strike or labour disruption, we have to understand that one day of a strike takes about seven days of recovery to get the goods ultimately to where they were going because of the backlog that's created. It's not just the 13-day impact. It's up to two or three months of impact overall.

I provided two examples. One was an importer whose seasonal goods did not arrive in time. They're sitting on the product. They can't move it. They won't be able to move it for a year. They're impacted financially due to the fact that they have this product and, again, for a small importer, that's a significant impact overall.

The other one I provided was an example of an exporter and, again, it's due to Canada's unreliability in the supply chain that the overseas buyer is now sourcing from other countries. Again, somebody who had regular product, regular inventory, is leaving the country and outsourcing elsewhere, and they've been impacted overall.

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Would you say that any economic impact analysis that we've heard so far undervalues the actual economic impact to small businesses and others? That's the sense I'm getting.

Mr. Bruce Rodgers: I would say that it does. That's correct.

Mr. Kyle Seeback: One thing we also heard today is that, as a result of this, the cost of food and the cost of building homes went up as well because of the disruptions in the supply chain. Is that correct?

Mr. Robert Ballantyne: I haven't heard anything on that.

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Would anyone want to cast a thought onto that? Would this have had an impact on the cost of homes and the cost of food for Canadians?

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

We have Mr. Arya for six minutes, please.

Mr. Chandra Arya (Nepean, Lib.): Thank you, Madam Chair.

Mr. Murray, listening to you has raised my concern. I strongly believe that unions are required in any society. Unions have played a great role in protecting the rights of workers and providing benefits. However, listening to you now, I hear the casual attitude in your speech towards Canada's reputation and the supply chain disruptions, with no regard for the tens of thousands of workers affected by the strike of a few hundred workers.

Coming to the economic impact, probably later I'll go back and read your actual words. The words you used were that a balance exists.

How can I accept that? We talk about calculating the total economic impact of the disruption in trade as being worth \$800 million a day with a cumulative effect of about \$10.7 billion. If this is the attitude of the workers—whose right to unionize and right to strike I agree with—then maybe I should accept Mr. Ballantyne's proposal that we need to expand the definition of essential services.

Canada is a prosperous country, but 65% of our GDP comes from trade. We need trade to be flowing freely. There's a highly competitive world outside. We don't have the natural advantages we used to have once upon a time. It's a very competitive market out there and the Vancouver port, in the worldwide rankings on port efficiency, is ranked 347 out of 348.

We may quibble with the performance indicators and what have been considered to be the factors. However, we are not even close to anywhere near the top 25%. We are at the dead end and this is noted. In 2019, on the industry perceptions of export transport infrastructure quality, we came down from the top 10 to 32. When this is the case and when the unions are saying in a very casual manner that balance exists when it comes to economic impact, I'm really concerned.

If you have any thoughts on this, would you like comment for one minute? I have very limited time, and I have other questions to ask.

• (1145)

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Murray: It is totally within your rights to say that I have a casual attitude. However, what I clearly said was that Canada's reputation was not only economic, but also related to the international treaties it has signed concerning the right to organize and the right to strike. However, the international agreement that was signed clearly states that ports and transportation are not essential services. A tribunal in Canada has determined what essential services are, it's called the Canada Industrial Relations Board, or CIRB. It has already ruled on what constitutes a danger—

[*English*]

Mr. Chandra Arya: Thank you, Mr. Murray. I have very limited time and I have questions for other witnesses. Thank you.

Mr. Ballantyne, I know that “essential services” basically means we have to consider the safety and health of the public.

Should we not consider the livelihoods and how many people are directly affected by a strike in very critical infrastructure? As well as the losses.... I can understand the corporate losses, like those that Ms. Martin mentioned with the red meat, with its very limited life cycle, going to waste.

I can understand that, but should the livelihoods of tens of thousands of workers being directly affected be part of the consideration when we define essential services?

Mr. Robert Ballantyne: Yes, I think there is a good case to be made for expanding the definition of an essential service.

I'm not a lawyer, but my understanding is that the Supreme Court of Canada has always given a very tight definition of an essential service under that section of the Canada Labour Code. There has to be an immediate impact on public health and safety.

Mr. Chandra Arya: Thank you, Mr. Ballantyne.

I have one last question for Ms. Anderson. We may have lots of free trade agreements with countries that represent 61% of the world's GDP, but we don't have the free trade agreement within Canada. I'm glad that the premiers touched upon the long-term national trade infrastructure and transportation corridor.

How important is it that the provinces work together, along with the federal government, to create a seamlessly operated infrastructure corridor that helps not only the trade within Canada but with our international exports?

• (1150)

Ms. Bridgitte Anderson: I think it's incredibly important. It comes as no surprise to anybody on the committee that there are interprovincial trade barriers that exist, but in regard to the port strike, yes, we did see some of this highlighted when it was very difficult to get goods across the country. It's important to note that, while this was a strike at the port of Vancouver, it really is Canada's port. We did see that trade was disrupted across Canada, and goods could not reach other provinces as well.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

We'll go on to Mr. Blanchette-Joncas, please.

You have the floor for up to six minutes, sir.

[Translation]

Mr. Maxime Blanchette-Joncas (Rimouski-Neigette—Témiscouata—Les Basques, BQ): Thank you, Madam Chair.

It's a pleasure to join you on this important study. Good morning to my colleagues and to the witnesses who are with us this morning.

Before asking my questions, I'd like to set the record straight. Earlier, my colleague Mr. Seebach mentioned that his party wasn't against the right to strike. However, if someone isn't against the right to strike, they don't ask that Parliament be recalled to pass a bill to end a strike. However, that's what the leader of the Conservative Party did last July during the Port of Vancouver dispute. In their defence, I remind the committee that the premiers of Alberta and Saskatchewan did the same thing. I want to put things in context for the people watching us. So we can dispense with the pleasantries.

I will now ask my questions. Mr. Murray, you talked about the importance of getting to the root of the problem. If we want to avoid disputes, we need to bring the stakeholders to the table. In your presentation, you talked about the use of special legislation, something you experienced at the Port of Montreal, for example. That didn't happen at the Port of Vancouver but, as you point out, Canada has a dismal record when it comes to passing special legislation to force workers to return to work. You experienced it in April 2021.

Can you tell us about the consequences of passing special legislation on workers' rights during the dispute at the Port of Vancouver last summer?

Mr. Michel Murray: Special legislation was imposed on us by Minister Filomena Tassi. I need to describe the circumstances of the dispute at the time. We had said that the employer had taken three measures against us and that if it withdrew them, the union would withdraw its notice to strike and people would return to work. The employer didn't withdraw them, the government legislated them and we had special legislation passed.

It imposed arbitration of disputes, which took place at the Port of Montreal. All that has resulted in is that all demands, both employer and union, that were on the bargaining table in 2020 and 2021 have been postponed to 2023. The problem has just been put on hold. It's a well-known fact that arbitrators avoid very specific

places in collective agreements for fear of upsetting the balance between the parties.

The arbitrator took a year to hear us, and now that arbitration of disputes is done, the vast majority of respective claims are back on the bargaining table this year. So nothing was resolved by imposing arbitration of disputes through special legislation.

I don't want anyone to say I have a casual attitude, but I must point out that the legislation was passed when the Liberal government had a majority, whereas it did not when the strike happened at the Port of Vancouver.

Mr. Maxime Blanchette-Joncas: Thank you, Mr. Murray.

It's important to get the facts straight. *Je me souviens*, "I remember", as we say back home in Quebec. It's not just on our licence plates; it's our motto.

Mr. Murray, you also talked about the problem of not having real decision-makers at the table.

Why do you think they aren't there?

Mr. Michel Murray: The current section 34 of the Canada Labour Code was written in 1970, following a royal commission called the Picard commission.

The good old days of employers' organizations, where people were hired by the shipping companies to do the work, are gone. There's no representative of shipping lines and shipping companies at the bargaining tables. It's as if your committee or a minister of international affairs had to negotiate an international treaty with another country, but sent the parliamentary gardener to negotiate. We should send department officials or the minister himself. In our case, during our negotiations, the real decision-makers were not at the bargaining table. The same thing happened in Vancouver; the BC Maritime Employers Association had exactly the same problem.

Have you heard of any problems at the Port of Halifax? You have not. Halifax has been negotiating for the last two years, and there was a settlement this year. You know what? Representatives of shipping lines and shipping companies were at the bargaining table. There was no disruption at the Port of Halifax to get a four-year contract. At the Port of Montreal, as in Vancouver, we have to go back to the root of their absence. The reason there are problems with labour relations is that the real decision-makers are not sitting at the bargaining tables. If ever there was one special law that should be passed, it's the law that would force the real decision-makers, the representatives of shipping companies and shipping lines, to take a seat at the bargaining table.

• (1155)

Mr. Maxime Blanchette-Joncas: Thank you, Mr. Murray.

You are no doubt aware that we're currently considering an anti-scab bill. This is a long-standing request of the Bloc Québécois. It's been tabled a number of times. We did it with our NDP colleagues and tabled in the House in early November. I'd like to hear your comments on the bill. In your opinion, why is it necessary?

What do you think of the 18-month delay before the bill comes into force, receives royal assent and can be enforced?

Mr. Michel Murray: I have a great deal of respect for any parliamentarian in Ottawa who supports anti-scab legislation. In Quebec, we're covered by anti-scab legislation and, as we have seen, it has nevertheless improved labour relations and potential disputes. In a dispute, there's nothing worse than a scab coming in to do the work of a person who is on strike or locked out. At the Port of Québec, workers have been locked out for 14 months, but absolutely nothing is happening at the bargaining tables. In addition, nothing is happening in Parliament in Ottawa either. There are people who are locked out, and there are scabs who work every day. I have a great deal of respect for the Liberal Party, the NDP and the Bloc Québécois, who supported the anti-scab bill. I also have a great deal of respect for Minister O'Regan, who sponsored the bill.

That said, I wonder why someone would want to enact anti-scab legislation if they only want to enforce it in 18 months. If you want to marry the workers, you don't send them a wedding invitation in 18 months. From the workers' point of view, if the Liberal government wants to marry workers, it must do so immediately. With all due respect, I don't understand the huge delay before the coming in to force of the—

[English]

The Chair: Thank you very much, Mr. Murray. I'm sorry to interrupt.

Mr. Cannings, you have six minutes, please.

Mr. Richard Cannings (South Okanagan—West Kootenay, NDP): Thank you.

Thank you to all the witnesses here today.

I'm going to continue with Monsieur Murray.

We've heard a narrative here throughout this study that Canada's reputation is tattered and then a list of reasons why: that it's the pandemic, that it's climate change, the atmospheric rivers and the fires, and then that it's this strike we had in Vancouver. We haven't had a strike at the port of Vancouver since 1969, so things have been going well there. In 2010, as we heard in our last meeting, the BCMEA, this group of employers, ran the negotiations for the employers. They weren't the decision-makers, and that has caused delays.

I'm not sure if that was the reason why workers were locked out in 2018, but we heard from the union in Vancouver that they would put in their response to a position within a day and it would take seven or 10 days for the employer to come back. That's what causes these delays.

It seems that everybody is quick to blame labour for a labour disruption when we have container shipping companies and container ports around the world making record profits and we see inflation at record levels. The workers want a share of those profits to be able to handle that inflation, because they want to continue living acceptable lives, yet they're the ones who get the blame when the employers don't negotiate in good faith, it seems, or at least not in an efficient way.

I'm wondering if you could comment on that bit of a rant of mine, especially around this narrative that it always seems to be the union's fault when there's a strike.

• (1200)

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Murray: You're absolutely right. I don't think there's a union in Canada that's happy to go on strike. It's a pressure tactic we use on our employers and shipping companies. No one gets any pleasure out of it. We do it to get a settlement more quickly.

You're absolutely right that the management structure, both at the BCMEA and the Maritime Employers Association, or MEA, prevents us from talking to the real decision-makers.

I will say it again: In Halifax, the real decision-makers are at the bargaining table, and there's been no labour dispute. It's the same thing with the longshoremen in Vancouver. They have union demands, and the people at the bargaining table don't make a decision and have to forward those demands to a board of directors, which is a kind of star chamber. We never meet with a board of directors like that.

I'll go back to my original point. Section 34 of the Canada Labour Code really needs to be reviewed if we want to eliminate or minimize possible labour disputes. It's the same for us at the Port of Montreal; before 2020, the last disruptions dated back to 2000, 20 years ago, when management imposed a seven-day lockout. We really need to review the management structure so that the real decision-makers are at the table.

You're absolutely right. It's very easy to blame the workers who go on strike, to call them “casual”, as a member did a little earlier, but we don't do that for fun. We really want to negotiate better working conditions for our people, and that's the only role that unions must play.

Mr. Richard Cannings: Thank you.

[English]

I want to pick up on the anti-scab legislation. We had the Canadian Chamber of Commerce here before us in a previous meeting urging us all to vote against this anti-scab legislation. It was the NDP that put this in the agreement with the Liberals to get this through.

You mentioned we've had anti-scab legislation in Quebec for years, as well as in British Columbia. It's a general thought that anti-scab legislation actually shortens labour disputes, because management can't bring in replacement workers.

Can you comment on your experience in Quebec?

[Translation]

Mr. Michel Murray: In our last dispute, in 2020-21, one of the companies used scabs; circumstances led to some incidents that no one wanted. This created a lot of tension on the picket lines and at the bargaining table, since a number of scabs had been used during the longshore strike at the Port of Montreal.

I think everyone knows the story. Before anti-scab legislation was put in place, there was confrontation, there was violence, and no one wanted that. However, when you go on the picket line or are locked out and people come in to do your job, obviously things get a little heated and people get a little more aggressive. That's not desirable at a bargaining table. No one wants external events to disrupt what's going on at a bargaining table. I believe that anti-scab legislation will certainly defuse all the tension that may exist.

In 2020, we experienced tension with scabs with a company owned by Logistec, in Quebec. That created a lot of tension, which necessarily disrupted negotiations.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Next, we have Mr. Martel, for five minutes.

[Translation]

Mr. Richard Martel (Chicoutimi—Le Fjord, CPC): Thank you, Madam Chair.

I'd like to thank the witnesses for being here with us.

Before asking my questions, I'd like to come back to what my colleague next to me said and tell him that we never wanted to force workers back to work during that strike. People blamed the government for not taking action.

I was surprised to see that my colleague was very upset and that he wanted to put on a show. That really surprised me.

My first question is for Mr. Rodgers.

In your opinion, how can we define what essential services are? From what I'm hearing, the economy is not an essential service.

[English]

Mr. Bruce Rodgers: We didn't address essential services in our opening remarks. We are very neutral on the process. We understand there are matters to be negotiated on both sides. Our position is that we just want an agreement. We want the parties back at work. We don't take the side of labour, and we don't take the side of the company in this case.

From our perspective, we want constructive negotiations to occur. In certain cases, we feel that as long as they're negotiating in good faith—we mean both sides negotiating in good faith—we think the process should continue. It's when there are issues and negotiations are not occurring in that manner, that we believe there should be some intervention to get the parties back to the table to conclude a settlement.

• (1205)

[Translation]

Mr. Richard Martel: Mr. Rodgers, I'll address you again.

If I understand correctly, one day on strike puts a company six days behind, I believe. That's what you said earlier.

This strike, which was settled after 13 days, put things three months behind schedule.

After that strike, the economy didn't return to normal. Business owners continue to suffer losses.

Can you tell me how much the strike has cost? Do you have any figures on that?

[English]

Mr. Bruce Rodgers: Unfortunately, we don't have that level of information on how that would affect each importer or exporter from a business perspective.

[Translation]

Mr. Richard Martel: It's had a huge impact on small businesses. I think they were hit hardest.

Can you tell me if a lot of small businesses closed down after that 13-day strike?

[English]

Mr. Bruce Rodgers: I think you're going to see some impact. I don't have the numbers on how many companies have gone out of business as a result of this, but there are significant impacts to the import community. We'll talk about imports at this point in time. When you have that disruption on the vessels being off-loaded and on moving that cargo inland, for the most part there is an impact. There is an impact not only in terms of the delays in transit but also significant demurrage and detention charges on the import community by the ocean carriers.

We have seen cases and we have had charges in the millions of dollars for delays in containers being returned due to the fact that we have this labour disruption and the resulting inland congestion. It just compounds from that perspective.

I don't have specific numbers of dollars impacted or companies that have gone out of business, but there is an impact.

[Translation]

Mr. Richard Martel: My next question is for Ms. Martin.

We do a lot of exporting in your field, which is meats.

When a strike like this happens, what is your second option?

Do you choose another port?

[English]

Ms. Lauren Martin: Yes, that would be the other option. It would be to explore alternative routes, which of course—as you can rightly imagine—would come with costs and the potential perishing of goods that don't make it on time due to the lengthier routes.

The Chair: You have seven seconds remaining.

[Translation]

Mr. Richard Martel: Thank you.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you very much.

We go now to Mr. Miao for five minutes.

Mr. Wilson Miao (Richmond Centre, Lib.): Thank you, Madam Chair.

Thank you to all the witnesses for being here today.

I'd like to go back a little bit. Before the strike happened at the port of Vancouver, as we know, postpandemic there was a huge impact on the supply chain due to the pandemic. I remember a stakeholder in my riding of Richmond Centre telling me that a cargo container was costing more than \$10,000.

Since the strike began in July, are we still looking at the impact of the recovery from the pandemic?

Maybe Mr. Ballantyne or Mr. Rodgers can share some comments with us on that.

Mr. Robert Ballantyne: Yes, I'll start.

The information on that is always somewhat variable, and it may vary from company to company or industry to industry.

One of our member companies indicated that for that 13-day strike, there was about a 14-week impact in total. Because things have to start changing several weeks in advance, a lot of companies will start making alternative arrangements before a strike, because they want to be prepared in case the strike happens. Then, as has been stated previously, there is the time to recover from the actual strike. I think Bruce mentioned that there was something like a week for every day of a strike, something along those lines. That seems to be the general consensus.

• (1210)

Mr. Wilson Miao: Thank you.

I'll go to Mr. Rodgers online.

Mr. Bruce Rodgers: In answer to your question, I think we are out of the pandemic catch-up phase—I'll put it that way—due to a number of different factors, but inflationary constraints on consumer spending habits have changed significantly. People now moving toward goods and on to other services has had an impact as well, but in answer to your question, we are largely out of the pandemic catch-up at this point in time.

Mr. Wilson Miao: Thank you.

One of the reasons why the strike occurred was also concern about automation at the port of Vancouver. The International Longshore and Warehouse Union has stated that this will result in job losses.

Maybe to go back to you, Mr. Ballantyne, can you share your perspective and maybe comment a bit on how automation will affect and have impacts on our future trade?

Mr. Robert Ballantyne: That's a pretty general question, and looking into the future isn't particularly easy.

There will always be a need for longshore workers. I think we can say that no matter what happens with the possibility of more automation, but like almost every business, there are changes in technology and the changes in technology often lead to improvements in productivity.

I think it would be reasonable for the terminal operators and the port authorities and so on to be looking at the sensible introduction of technology. Hopefully, that would make the productivity of the longshore workers better.

I can't give a more precise answer than that.

Mr. Wilson Miao: Thank you.

Mr. Rodgers, can you comment a bit about the automation piece?

Mr. Bruce Rodgers: Yes. I'm going to be as neutral as Mr. Ballantyne on this one as well. It's difficult for us to comment on, but as Mr. Ballantyne indicated, we have to keep up. We need to improve efficiencies overall, and we have to be a very productive port.

A comment was made earlier about the ranking of the port of Vancouver. That's a significant telltale sign that we are not keeping up, and there are a lot of things we could do to improve that performance overall.

Mr. Wilson Miao: Thank you.

Last week—

The Chair: You have 14 seconds.

Mr. Wilson Miao: Okay. I'll pass. Thank you.

The Chair: We'll go on to Mr. Blanchette-Joncas.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maxime Blanchette-Joncas: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Mr. Murray, I want you to talk again about the importance of implementing the anti-scab bill as quickly as possible and not waiting 18 months.

What would be the consequences of waiting 18 months?

Mr. Michel Murray: Scabs could be used again in any dispute, whether it be a strike or a lockout affecting workers under federal jurisdiction.

That's what we're currently seeing at the Port of Québec.

At the risk of repeating myself, the employees of Quebec Saint-Laurent, or QSL, have now been locked out for 14 months. They're going to spend a second Christmas on the picket lines, and scabs have been doing their job for the last 14 months.

If the goal is to soften labour relations and to create winning conditions for everyone so that the parties reach an agreement as quickly as possible, the anti-scab bill should come into force immediately after it receives royal assent.

The special act, An Act to provide for the resumption and continuation of operations at the Port of Montreal, came into force immediately after royal assent.

So I don't see why 18 months are needed to implement such fundamental provisions for workers under federal jurisdiction.

• (1215)

Mr. Maxime Blanchette-Joncas: Thank you.

As part of this study, we are also looking at port-related innovations that could contribute to efficiency and performance.

Your colleague from the Greater Vancouver Board of Trade told us during his last appearance that he was concerned about the impact of automating port operations, which could also have an impact on jobs.

Can you tell us if there are any concerns about automation, which seems inevitable in the medium term?

Mr. Michel Murray: I think all longshoremen—

[English]

The Chair: Just one moment, sir. I think Mr. Cannings wasn't getting the translation.

Also, Mr. Blanchette-Joncas, I think you were going too fast for the translator to keep up with you.

[Translation]

Mr. Maxime Blanchette-Joncas: Mr. Murray, were you able to understand the question?

What are your fears about potential job losses if technological changes are made?

Mr. Michel Murray: Longshore workers all over the world are concerned about automation. It poses a risk to jobs and productivity.

A study in Europe showed that automation was less productive than human operators who use machinery parts. All longshore workers who earn their living from this profession are concerned about automation. I would be pleased to send you the study after today's meeting.

It may be Finland, I'm not sure, but one country found that longshore workers who came in close contact with mechanized machinery faced much higher health and safety risks, and that lives had been lost.

[English]

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

It's on to Mr. Cannings for two and a half minutes, please.

Mr. Richard Cannings: Thank you.

I'm going to turn to Mr. Ballantyne to try to get some idea of the bad reputation or the declining reputation of Canadian ports. Here we are on a study about the port of Vancouver. It seems to me that the problems in the ports.... We've heard that it's the pandemic and climate change, but then we have one strike and suddenly, the workers are the problem. We haven't had a strike since 1969.

I'm just wondering if you could let me know why we have a bad reputation at the port of Vancouver, as opposed to the other ports in North America.

Mr. Robert Ballantyne: I think that was a short-term, temporary thing. That's my understanding.

Whether it was the follow-up from the pandemic primarily that led to whatever that global thing was.... They looked at a number of different ports in different parts of the world and ranked them. I don't have the details, but my recollection is that the ranking had to do with delays in ships being able to come to port, and possibly de-

lays in when they were ready to leave again. I think that was temporary.

Mr. Richard Cannings: It might have been other parts of the supply chain, rail traffic and things like that.

Mr. Robert Ballantyne: Possibly, but I think that ranking was really quite a temporary thing.

Mr. Richard Cannings: We just heard again—I forget who mentioned this—that there are threatened job and labour disruptions in the United States. Presumably, part of that is due to the fact that it seems cargo companies and container ports are enjoying record profits, and the workers are faced with inflation, so they're demanding more money.

Is that a trend you see around the continent?

Mr. Robert Ballantyne: Yes. I think we see that trend quite broadly in various elements of the global supply chain.

Certainly, the container shipping lines during the pandemic seemed to really do extremely well. It's reasonable that employees who work for those would say, "Hey, maybe it's time for me to get my share of this as well." The bargaining takes place, depending on all kinds of things, including what information there is on the profitability of the companies themselves.

• (1220)

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

It's on to Mr. Jeneroux for five minutes, please.

Mr. Matt Jeneroux (Edmonton Riverbend, CPC): Thank you, Madam Chair.

Thank you to all of the witnesses for taking the time to be here today.

I want to begin with Mr. Rodgers or Ms. Kuzeljevich.

The impact, as we've heard it, on the shipment side is about \$13 billion, with a net economic loss of about \$1 billion. It seems a lot of that's due to the unpredictability and uncertainty that the strike, or the lead-up to the strike, caused.

Going back to when the collective agreement expired on March 31, 2023, would you not agree that there's certainly potential for that to be much higher than those numbers? Are there potentially lingering effects that then continue on poststrike?

Ms. Julia Kuzeljevich: I would agree about the cost of uncertainty. Certainly in our efforts to have information for our members that cost of uncertainty, which is difficult to determine as a lot of the panellists have commented just given the way that data is gathered and how we can obtain it even from our own members.... We can certainly determine, since that period of time when we started to mount our campaign with information for members, that uncertainty cost is huge.

I will echo what my colleague Mr. Rodgers said: To shut down a railway, for example, is a three-day process, and to ramp it back up again is a three-day process. In the intervening days and weeks before that, it's determining whether you are going to change a destination port, and then whether you are going to have to add trucking costs to get your shipment elsewhere. Those costs are pretty easy to forecast as well, but there are a lot of undetermined costs in the supply chain that are affecting our members.

Mr. Matt Jeneroux: I will quickly sum up for you that, essentially, it has the potential to be much higher than what has been indicated here, even at this committee.

I would like to switch quickly to Ms. Martin.

Along the same lines of questioning, the uncertainty that this causes, particularly in your industry where you indicated that you can't have fresh meat or meat sitting on a barge for an extended period of time per se, walk us through how your industry was impacted at the economic cost level, but also where that then puts you guys in terms of uncertainty when it comes to future strikes.

Ms. Lauren Martin: When we think about the meat supply chain, we think about it all the way down from the piglet to the fresh cut of meat that's on your plate. When there's an impact like this that gives some level of uncertainty at the end of the supply chain, the reverberations really go all the way back to that piglet stage. Are we going to need this many piglets to go onto the next stage of production? Are more or less of those sows that were gestating those piglets going to be required? Are we going to have to potentially have a cull at any point in the system, because, as I mentioned earlier, the system is very much set up for those products to get as quickly to market as possible.

If there's any backup in that chain, there's nowhere for the backup to go at any point in time. That's just a flavour of how, from the very beginning of the system all the way to the very end, it really has a significant impact.

Mr. Matt Jeneroux: It impacts the farmer is essentially what you are saying.

Ms. Lauren Martin: I have mentioned the impacts to the farmer, yes, but it is the processor as well. If they will need to stop production, yes, that impacts the farmer, but it is the processor's livelihood as well when the line is shut down.

Mr. Matt Jeneroux: I will just use my last 30 seconds. I know my colleague here from the Bloc is new today, but it was certainly not the position of the Leader of the Opposition to call back the strike. What he was doing was simply pointing out that the Minister of Transport was on the front cover of *The Globe and Mail* showing off his new pair of shoes, and that the Minister of Labour was apparently running on the seawall and spending time in his hotel room and not participating in the negotiations as we were encouraging him to.

That's just to correct the record, Madam Chair.

• (1225)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Jeneroux.

Ms. Fortier, go ahead, please.

[*Translation*]

Hon. Mona Fortier (Ottawa—Vanier, Lib.): Thank you, Madam Chair.

We're talking today about finding measures or solutions to ensure that, in the future, the negotiation process can continue at the table. I think that we all agree that the best negotiations happen at the bargaining table.

The government tabled Bill C-33, An Act to amend the Customs Act, the Railway Safety Act, the Transportation of Dangerous Goods Act, 1992, the Marine Transportation Security Act, the Canada Transportation Act and the Canada Marine Act and to make a consequential amendment to another Act.

To make sure that we're all on the same page, I'd like to say the following. The bill aims to amend current legislation and modernize the way Canada's marine and railway transportation systems operate; remove systemic barriers to create a more fluid, secure and resilient supply chain; expand Canada port authorities' mandate over traffic management; position Canada's ports as strategic hubs that support national supply chain performance and effectively manage investment decisions for sustainable growth; improve the government's insight into ports and their operations; and modernize provisions on rail safety, security and transportation of dangerous goods.

In its current form, the bill is a win-win approach. Of course, the bill could be strengthened. That's our focus right now.

I want to hear the witnesses' views on this matter.

First, do they agree that the best agreements are made by the parties at the bargaining table?

Second, I would like to ask each witness to comment on the legislation. Some witnesses have already made suggestions, but others haven't yet had the opportunity to do so. What does it mean for the members and sectors that you represent?

Ms. Martin, I'd like you to answer the question first. The other witnesses can then respond.

[*English*]

Ms. Lauren Martin: Thank you very much for your comments. I hope I am summarizing them correctly. Essentially, the question is that you would like to understand....

Actually, could you rephrase the question? Thank you.

Hon. Mona Fortier: It's two things.

First, do you agree that negotiations are best negotiated at the table?

Second, for the current law presented, Bill C-33, are there things in there you agree with and think would help, or are there things you might want to see in there in order to make sure we strengthen the law?

Ms. Lauren Martin: I appreciate the question.

I feel ill-equipped to answer, unfortunately. As someone who is not a labour expert, I don't think I would be well served in answering that.

Thank you.

Hon. Mona Fortier: Mr. Ballantyne.

Mr. Robert Ballantyne: I think the best agreements are the ones negotiated at the table. If that can be done in a reasonably speedy way, it is far and away the best. The situation is that society more broadly is impacted when it can't be done or when a strike results. I think those are issues that have to be considered by Parliament, moving forward. There is the right of the workers. There is the right of the employers. There's also the right of the Canadian economy and the broader Canadian community. The only agency that can deal with this is the Parliament of Canada.

I think that's what needs to be done.

Hon. Mona Fortier: Thank you very much.

Mr. McEwan.

Mr. Tim McEwan: Thanks very much for the question.

I'm ill-equipped to speak to Bill C-33.

I would say that, generally, our association—and I personally—support free collective bargaining. It is constitutionally entrenched in this country.

In this circumstance, though, when matters bargain to an impasse, there need to be—and we're very pleased to see the review the minister is undertaking under section 106 of the Canada Labour Code—tools that can be used to keep parties at the table so they can come to a fair and equitable resolution. In some cases, that may mean binding arbitration, final offer selection arbitration or other means to resolve a dispute.

• (1230)

Hon. Mona Fortier: Mr. McEwan, unfortunately, my time will be cut.

If the other witnesses want to share answers to my question, please don't hesitate to send them to the clerk, if possible, if they didn't get a chance to answer.

Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

We have Mr. Baldinelli for five minutes, please.

Mr. Tony Baldinelli (Niagara Falls, CPC): Thank you, Madam Chair.

Thank you to the witnesses for being with us today.

I just want to follow up on some of the questions earlier and some of the comments that were made by the Canadian International Freight Forwarders. They talked about issues such as the potential impacts, for example. There's this notion that it always feel like, instead of avoiding strikes, strikes become a requirement of negotiations, which only ends up hurting businesses.

Mr. Rodgers, you said, with the possible threat coming to Montreal, that you're already understanding that the freight suppliers and so on are already moving and transitioning supplies to avoid Montreal because of this threat.

Can you detail that? Would you know, for example, how much has already been moved away from that in terms of the cost or how much that represents in terms of costs?

Mr. Bruce Rodgers: I don't have those numbers, but we can look at the port of Montreal and their volume statistics to see where they are relative to a year ago and watch the declining volumes coming through the port.

With the situation in the global economy today, the volumes are significantly down. As a result of that, ports have capacity, especially in the U.S., so what's happening is that people are diverting cargo from Montreal and going into ports in New York or New Jersey to move their cargo, because they cannot afford another disruption in Canada at this point in time.

While I don't have the exact specifics, you can see it in the port of Montreal's dashboard report.

Mr. Tony Baldinelli: If you could share some of that with us, that would be greatly appreciated.

Ultimately, the worry is that those companies won't come back. What they'll do is end up finding those alternative routes and then ultimately just continue to avoid the port of Montreal, which hurts both sides. To our point here all together, that's why I think it's incumbent on both sides to work together amicably so that they can get a resolution and a fair agreement that benefits all. Ultimately, if we lose that business, it will never come back.

On the notion of one day of the strike and seven days to recover, we had the Global Automakers here the other day, and they basically confirmed those statistics by saying that it just added another 60 days in the backlog to their delivery. My concerns are that situation as well.

Mr. Rodgers, I think in your opening remarks.... You haven't come forward with ideas, but you said that there has to be another way to avoid this. I was just wondering if you had any concrete ideas or suggestions on how we can avoid this continual labour strife that we find at the ports?

Mr. Bruce Rodgers: I truly wish I did. Unfortunately, I do not.

Again, we have the parties at the table, so there has to be a willingness. We've been through this for the last hour. There has to be a willingness on both sides to conclude an agreement. If you get that, then the best deals are done at the table. We support that as well, but I do not have other concrete examples of what could be put in place other than what's been suggested today.

Mr. Tony Baldinelli: Yes, I think you had some excellent comments when you said that the victims, when resolutions occur, are never the workers or those doing the negotiations on behalf of the port authority. It's always those small businesses that are greatly impacted.

I think my colleague talked about getting a greater understanding of what that full economic impact is on them, because, ultimately, the \$10.7 billion just in the port of Vancouver doesn't touch all the small businesses along the supply chain. An example, Ms. Martin, are some of your stakeholders and the impact they feel.

Ms. Anderson, you talked earlier—

• (1235)

The Chair: Ms. Anderson has left us. She was only here for the hour.

Mr. Tony Baldinelli: I had one good question for her.

The Chair: You have 12 seconds.

Mr. Tony Baldinelli: Okay. I'll pass.

The Chair: We will move on to Mr. Sheehan for five minutes, please.

Mr. Terry Sheehan (Sault Ste. Marie, Lib.): Thank you very much to all the witnesses.

The thing about going towards the end or last is that lots of my questions have been asked.

There is one question I'd like to ask our panellists, because we've been discussing lots of things. Would they agree with our government's position that the best deals, when it relates to labour, are at the bargaining table?

I'll just go around the horn here for a yes or a no from everyone. It's a question that we've put forward. It's our strong belief that the best deals are made at the bargaining table.

I'll start with Mr. McEwan, because you're right there on my screen.

Mr. Tim McEwan: Yes, I would agree with that.

Mr. Terry Sheehan: Mr. Rodgers.

Mr. Bruce Rodgers: Yes, we do.

Mr. Terry Sheehan: Is Mr. Murray there?

[*Translation*]

Mr. Michel Murray: Of course, we fully concur that agreements are made at the bargaining table. However, I have one final point.

If parameters are included, such as final offer selection arbitration or a time frame for the negotiation process, employers will simply sit back and wait for government intervention.

[*English*]

Mr. Terry Sheehan: Who else do we have here? I'll ask the people on the floor.

Is there an agreement, yes or no?

Mr. Robert Ballantyne: The answer is yes. I think the best agreements are the ones that are negotiated directly between the union and the management.

Mr. Terry Sheehan: I think I got everyone.

No, I'm sorry.

Ms. Lauren Martin: I avoided that question earlier. My answer would be yes, but the caveat is that we are here in support of business continuity. That would be our position and key message today.

Mr. Terry Sheehan: Thank you for that.

The reason I ask is that everyone seems to be in agreement with that statement. What we have heard—and it's backed by further evidence from before—is that replacement workers prolong strikes or lockouts, because it takes the focus off the table. We're not getting

serious negotiations. That's an issue, and it prolongs things. There is evidence again and again throughout Canadian history.

I put this on the floor. If we do not want to see long-term strikes or lockouts, and they're happening under the current system, we ought to be changing it so there is a focus at that table that everyone agrees to.

While I have the floor, I just want to mention as well about Canada's reputation. I'm also co-chair of the Canada-Japan...and as such have quite a bit of dialogue with politicians from Asia, as well as businesses. They were here just recently at the end of August and September. They view Canada as a very reliable partner, especially with Russia's illegal war against Ukraine, and with what China is doing in the South China Sea and the East China Sea.

It's not just the Japanese. The people in the area are very excited about the Indo-Pacific strategy, because they're identifying not only peace and security but opportunities for trade.

One of the questions I would have for the group is about the capacity of our west coast ports, because they really want to do more deals with Canada. They see us as having a great reputation. We're stable. We're like-minded on democracy and capitalism. What is the capacity? Do we need to invest more in infrastructure to make sure we can meet the needs of our friends from very ASEAN countries—the Philippines or Japan—as they're looking for more safety and security and coming to Canada? What is our capacity?

As well, what are any of the threats? I always think of SWOT—strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. One of the people here had identified some of the climate changes that are happening, including rising or lowering sea levels and fires.

I'm going to start with Mr. McEwan, because I think he was one of the people who talked about weather events and such and how they could disrupt supply chains.

• (1240)

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Sheehan, but you've run out of time.

Maybe if the other witnesses, in answering somebody else's question, want to throw in a point, that will be up to them.

Monsieur Blanchette-Joncas, you have two and a half minutes, please.

Mr. Terry Sheehan: I'm sorry, Chair. On a point of order, could the witnesses put it in writing?

The Chair: Yes. If any of the witnesses would like to answer Mr. Sheehan, send it to the clerk, please, for all committee members.

Thank you.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Maxime Blanchette-Joncas: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Let me set the record straight once again. I heard some comments from my colleagues, particularly from Mr. Jeneroux, who thinks that I don't know much because I'm new to the committee.

I would like the analysts to remind us who introduced and who supported Bill C-29, An Act to provide for the resumption and continuation of operations at the Port of Montreal. The bill was introduced for first reading on April 27, 2021, and passed during the second session of the 43rd Parliament. It was special legislation.

[English]

Mr. Kyle Seeback: On a point of order, Madam Chair, it's not for the member to ask analysts to answer questions during a committee study.

The Chair: Thank you, Mr. Seeback. I was just about to say that.

[Translation]

Mr. Maxime Blanchette-Joncas: I understand that it's hard to respond when faced with the truth, Madam Chair.

Here's the situation. People are spreading misinformation. When they're confronted with the truth, they raise points of order and they don't want the analysts to help us with our work.

I have no choice but to ensure that the people in this room and the people tuning in receive the correct information. Bill C-29 passed third reading on April 29, 2021. As you might expect, it received royal assent. This special bill was introduced by the government, meaning the Liberal party, with the support of its friends in the Conservative party. It's troubling when one of my colleagues tries to make me look ignorant because I'm new to the committee, and tells me that his party doesn't support special legislation. It's very dangerous.

I'll turn to Mr. Murray. We can't ask the analysts questions, but we can certainly ask the witnesses questions.

Mr. Murray, you were involved in the labour dispute covered by this special legislation. Do you remember who introduced this bill? Who supported it? We mustn't believe that things were done automatically. It was a minority government.

Mr. Michel Murray: You're bringing up a very bad memory for the longshore workers of the Port of Montreal.

This bill was introduced by Filomena Tassi, who was the labour minister at the time. It was supported by the Conservatives. We had the chance to speak with the Conservatives. They helped us remove the final offer selection arbitration, the worst thing in labour relations.

I spoke to people around the table at the time. We managed to remove this item from the bill. I want to thank everyone involved in the process.

[English]

The Chair: Thank you very much.

Mr. Cannings, go ahead for two and a half minutes.

Mr. Richard Cannings: Thank you.

I'd like to turn to Mr. McEwan. You made a good case as to why mining is important now. One of your members, Teck Resources,

has a big smelter in my riding that's very important for all the reasons you said, plus it's one of the biggest employers in my riding.

I also want to ask you what your members face when it comes to the whole supply chain. Shipping ports, obviously, are important, but I'm just wondering. Rail service, especially, seems to be critical for mining. It deals in big heavy stuff that has to be transported.

To get through the narrative that all the problems with supply chain issues seem to come down to workers who want a fair share of profits, I want to ask you about the other issues facing your members when it comes to supply chains.

• (1245)

Mr. Tim McEwan: Sure. Thanks for the question, Mr. Cannings.

Our members, as I said in my opening remarks, in the past few years—as we all have—have faced supply chain challenges from the pandemic and from the wildfires and the atmospheric rivers. There were supply chain disruptions as a result of the atmospheric rivers particularly.

Mr. Sheehan spoke to this earlier. As we think about the trade opportunities in the Indo-Pacific, we need to ensure—particularly in British Columbia—that our roads, rails and ports are resilient in the face of those challenges, so we've advocated to both orders of government the need for investment in those areas.

In respect of the strike situation last summer, our position would be that we do support free and collective bargaining and we do believe the best outcomes are achieved at a bargaining table, but we also support business continuity. It's absolutely critical that the waterfront in our west coast ports be accessible and be fluid to support the export of our commodities and the inbound materials we need in order to operate.

A strike of any duration—or a lockout, for that matter—should not be tolerated, and that's why the section 106 review is timely—to figure out what the tools are that can be deployed when we bargain to impasse and what the timing points are around the deployment of those kinds of tools.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

We'll go on to Mr. Seeback for five minutes, please.

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

I was really happy that Mr. Sheehan decided to bring up the question of infrastructure with respect to our trade infrastructure.

I have a paper from the Canada West Foundation that talks about the port of Vancouver strike. In that paper, they say that in 2013 Canada had the 10th-best global trade infrastructure in the world and that, as of 2023, it has the 32nd-best trade infrastructure. Canada's trade infrastructure, after eight years of this Liberal government, has plummeted from 10th to 32nd.

I was wondering if any of the witnesses today would like to comment on whether or not there is a desperate need for trade infrastructure here in Canada.

Mr. Bruce Rodgers: I'll jump in on that one initially.

We believe there is. There's a significant impact overall. On the earlier comment about the expansion progress and whether we have capacity, we know that the Roberts Bank terminal 2 project in Vancouver is going to add 1.6 million containers into that port sometime in 2030.

Part of the problem Canada has is the amount of time it takes for some of these projects to be approved and put into place. When the Roberts Bank terminal 2 expansion project was first presented... It's going to take 20 years from concept until actually starting to operate, which is far too long. We can't wait that long.

What we are doing now and how we're trying to position it, knowing that there are going to be 1.6 million more containers in about the next seven to eight years, is, do we have the right infrastructure? Do we have the rail connections? Do we have the roads? Do we have the terminal operations? Do we have the land available? All of these things have to be taken into consideration now.

We can't wait until the container terminal is built and the containers hit the ground to try to figure out what we do with them. We're well aware of it well in advance, and we have to start taking those initiatives today.

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Mr. Ballantyne, do you want to add to that?

Mr. Robert Ballantyne: I agree with everything Bruce has said in his comments. He was very eloquent in what he had to say, as he always is.

I would just add that this is a continuing issue that needs to be addressed by the private sector and by government going forward.

We've seen things in the past that have been somewhat imaginative and good. For example, CN and CP operate between Kamloops and Vancouver collectively. I think the eastbound trains of CN and CP all run on CP, and the westbound trains run on CN. That was a smart move. That was done quite a long time ago—several decades ago—and that kind of thing is important.

There does need to be continued investment in all of the links in the supply chain.

• (1250)

Mr. Kyle Seeback: Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

The Chair: We have Mr. Sidhu, please, for five minutes.

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

Thanks to our witnesses for taking the time to be with us this morning. My first question is for Ms. Kuzeljevich.

Many of your members are based in the Peel region. I know that many of my constituents work at the good companies that your association represents. I also had the pleasure of working in the trade industry for 13 years before my journey into politics here, so I'm very familiar with and appreciative of your work and the work that your members do.

Could you share with the committee your feedback on what you were hearing in real time during the labour negotiations? How quickly did your members bounce back?

Ms. Julia Kuzeljevich: That's an important question because one major issue we faced was a lack of information. There was a concerted effort on the part of Transport Canada to get stakeholders on a daily call, which was immensely helpful. However, there was a good degree of silence behind some of the negotiations taking place, and there was a lack of cohesive information. One day it was on and then one day it was off. One day there were threats of layoffs at one of the railways and the next day that was off.

Relaying that information back to our members is part of my job and it became problematic because there seemed to be this lack of transparency. Understandably, when negotiations take place we can't hear all about it, but there needs to be a mechanism to deliver that information we talked about. What could make the negotiation process better for all the stakeholders is relaying some sort of concrete information back to the affected stakeholders within a reasonable time frame.

Our members were affected by that uncertainty. Although we can't calculate it, there is definitely an uncertainty cost to the length of time that these negotiations and decisions take.

On one of the earlier questions, an improvement could be determining a timeline around these negotiations.

Mr. Maninder Sidhu: I understand that, in the coming April 2024, your organization will hold the 75th anniversary conference with the theme "Leading the Path Forward".

Could you provide the committee with an overview of this event and the value of bringing the industry together to help shape the future of supply chains in Canada?

Ms. Julia Kuzeljevich: Thanks for the opportunity to promote the conference. We are really thrilled to be an association that prides itself on working well and collaboratively with our other sister associations such as the FMA. We do not like to point fingers. We don't want to be reactive. We want to be proactive.

The conference is meant to gather all of our members and associate members. Amongst them are major air, truck and marine carriers across the country, all of our sister associations, employer associations, unions and all the people involved in making the supply chain fluid and providing continuity.

Mr. Maninder Sidhu: Thank you.

My next question is for Ms. Martin.

As you know, Canada exports almost 70% of its pork production and 50% of its beef production to more than 90 countries.

Could you share with our committee your organization's position on free trade and how agreements like the modernized Canada-Ukraine free trade agreement can help your industry reach more markets and expand their reach?

Ms. Lauren Martin: We are certainly in favour of free trade.

I can illustrate a little bit as to why Canada's red meat supply chain exports as much as it does, when there are Canadians here at home who enjoy our products as well. It is because different markets in the world enjoy different aspects of our products. Some things that Canadians don't eat are enjoyed by other consumers elsewhere. It allows us to get a better price for our product and,

overall, be a better industry for it, which allows us to offer prices more competitively to Canadians here at home.

• (1255)

Mr. Maninder Sidhu: Thank you, Madam Chair.

The Chair: Thank you very much.

For the information of the committee, if the committee wants to receive any briefs or information, I'm suggesting that the deadline would be by next Friday at 4 p.m. That's December 15.

Could we have any briefs that are to be submitted on the port study by that date, please?

I'll move adjournment. Thank you all very much.

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>