



HOUSE OF COMMONS  
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES  
CANADA

44th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

---

# Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development

EVIDENCE

**NUMBER 021**

Monday, May 16, 2022

---

Chair: Mr. Ali Ehsassi





# Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development

Monday, May 16, 2022

• (1105)

[*Translation*]

**The Chair (Mr. Sven Spengemann (Mississauga—Lakeshore, Lib.)):** Good morning, honourable members.

Welcome to meeting number 21 of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development.

Pursuant to the motion adopted on May 5, the committee is meeting to discuss the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria.

[*English*]

As always, interpretation is available through the globe icon at the bottom of your screens, and for members participating in person, please keep in mind the Board of Internal Economy's guidelines for mask use and health protocols.

[*Translation*]

I would like to take this opportunity to remind all meeting participants that screenshots or taking photos of your screen is not permitted.

Before speaking, please wait until I recognize you by name. When speaking, please speak slowly and clearly. When you are not speaking, your mike should be on mute.

A reminder that all comments by members and witnesses should be addressed through the chair.

We are pleased to welcome our first witness this morning, Françoise Vanni, director of external relations and communications for the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria.

[*English*]

Madame Vanni, you have a five minutes for your opening remarks, after which we will proceed to questions from the members. The floor is now yours. Please go ahead.

**Ms. Françoise Vanni (Director, External Relations and Communications, Global Fund To Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria):** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair and members of the committee, for the opportunity to testify before you today.

My name is Françoise Vanni and I lead the external relations and communications team at the Global Fund. I had the honour to testify before this committee three years ago in the context of the sixth replenishment of the Global Fund, and I'm really grateful to have this opportunity again today as we run our seventh replenishment campaign for the Global Fund.

Let me start by expressing my gratitude on behalf of the Global Fund and our partners around the world for your long-standing support and leadership in the fight against HIV, TB and malaria and in global health more broadly.

Canada is a founding donor of the Global Fund and has always been one of our strongest partners. Our fifth replenishment, hosted by Canada in 2016, was the most successful ever at the time, and Canada was our sixth-largest donor in 2019 in Lyon when we broke that record by raising \$14 billion for the sixth replenishment. This was made possible by the strong, consistent support we have received from our allies in the Canadian Parliament, so thank you.

In addition, in 2020 and 2021, Canada supported the Global Fund's COVID-19 response to assist over 100 low and middle-income countries. The Global Fund is now the primary funder for all the non-vaccine components of the COVID-19 response, including tests, treatments, medical oxygen and personal protective equipment for health workers, among others.

The Global Fund recently marked our 20th anniversary, and the programs we fund have helped save over 44 million lives since our creation in 2002. Also, the combined death rate from the three diseases has been reduced by more than half in countries where the Global Fund invests. This is proof that global commitment combined with community leadership can force deadly diseases into retreat and advance the 2030 sustainable development goals.

Over the last couple of years, of course, the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic has been devastating, particularly for the most vulnerable. For the first time in the Global Fund's history, key HIV, TB and malaria programmatic results declined. Malaria deaths, for example, increased by 12%, which is about 69,000 more deaths, the vast majority of them children under five in Africa. It could have been much worse without our agile response, but it's still devastating, and even more so knowing that these diseases are preventable and treatable.

The direct cost of the war in Ukraine is another major human tragedy, and its knock-on impacts on lives and livelihoods around the world will also be severe. They include food crises, energy crises, debt crises and so on. These will, again, disproportionately affect the most vulnerable—those already most exposed to HIV, TB and malaria.

In that context, the Global Fund's seventh replenishment this year is crucial. We need to raise sufficient resources to regain lost ground and get back on track in the fight against HIV, TB and malaria towards the 2030 targets, while also building stronger systems for health that ensure countries are better prepared for future pandemics, which we know will come.

Our target for the seventh replenishment is to raise at least \$18 billion. This is an almost 30% increase from the previous cycle because of the enormous setback the world has experienced over the last two years. With at least \$18 billion, our technical partners, the WHO and others estimate that we would be able to save an additional 20 million lives over the next three years and avert approximately 450 million new infections across the three diseases. The stakes could not be higher. If we do not provide the resources that are necessary, then we must acknowledge that we are essentially abandoning the 2030 commitments. This would be a tragedy that would cost millions of lives and harm economies in many low- and middle-income countries.

President Biden, who is generously hosting the seventh replenishment in New York in September, has already included a \$6-billion pledge commitment for the seventh replenishment in his budget. U.S. law requires that every dollar the U.S. commits must be matched by two dollars from other donors. Without a similar 30% increase from other major donors like Canada, for example, it will be difficult to raise the remaining \$12 billion needed to unlock the full U.S. pledge. Therefore, we are here today to seek your help to secure a Canadian pledge commitment that meets this target as we do not want to leave money on the table.

The Global Fund has proven to be an effective and agile partner in development, as well as in times of crisis, whether by supporting low and middle-income countries in their responses to COVID-19, or by ensuring the continuity of life-saving treatment for conflict-affected populations in Ukraine—or, indeed, in many other places.

It also a powerful tool to advance human rights and gender equity, which are at the very core of our strategy. We have, for example, significantly increased our investments for adolescent girls and young women to prevent HIV in 13 priority countries where HIV burdens are highest. In these countries, the number of new infections has dropped by 41% over the past 12 years. Also, in Global Fund-supported countries, the percentage of mothers receiving treatment to prevent transmission of HIV to their babies reached 85% in 2020 compared with 44% in 2010.

By focusing on breaking down human rights or gender-related barriers to health, the Global Fund ensures that no one is left behind.

Thank you again for this opportunity today, and I would be very happy to answer all of your questions.

Thank you so much.

• (1110)

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Thank you very much for your opening statement, Ms. Vanni.

We will now begin our first round of questions. Each questioner will have six minutes.

[*English*]

We will go to Mr. Genuis, please, to lead us off for six minutes.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis (Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan, CPC):** Thank you very much, Chair.

Thank you for being here, Ms. Vanni. I appreciate the opportunity.

My questions will focus on issues of maximizing fund effectiveness and understanding some of your internal processes along that line.

To start with, there was a report out last month from your inspector general raising concerns about fund allocations in Liberia. I wonder if you could just update the committee on what is happening in Liberia and what the response has been.

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** We have, first of all, no tolerance for any sort of fraud or any misbehaviour across our programs. We fund programs in more than 120 countries, subject to three lines of defence. We have, obviously, our financial controls first. We have our risk department, which also oversees the allocation of the funds in countries. Then we have the inspector general, who is entirely independent, and when they investigate they we provide public reports. We publish all of their reports, and then obviously we take relevant actions and also publish the progress in those actions that we take in response to any misconduct that may have been identified.

You can find all of those reports from the OIG, as well as all of the responses made by the Global Fund, on the website. At the moment, I'm not on top of the details of the Liberia investigation, but this is the general process that we follow.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you.

I think it's certainly much to your credit that the inspector general identified these issues in Liberia, so I don't mean this to be a criticism at all of your overall work, but I wanted to raise the question. Maybe if there are further details, we would welcome them in writing.

You spoke about efforts to advance human rights and gender equality. My understanding of your model is that it's not based on country selectivity. You provide funding essentially to all countries regardless of their policies. How does not having a country-selectivity approach mesh with pushing on issues of human rights and gender equality, or at least how do the mechanics of advancing those things work?

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** The way the Global Fund allocates the resources that our donors are providing us is through an allocation methodology that looks at the disease burden. Then obviously the countries that have the largest burden of HIV, TB and malaria get the most resources. Also, there's the economic capacity of the countries themselves to respond to the three diseases. This is the basic methodology through which we allocate our resources.

Then we have a strategy that guides the way we operate, and the strategy includes the understanding that in order to effectively fight against and end HIV, TB and malaria, we need to tackle human rights and gender barriers. Otherwise, we won't be able to end those diseases. That's part of the analysis of the determinants behind those diseases. In that sense, we push the boundaries, if you wish.

We work with local partners. The Global Fund doesn't have country teams or offices. We work with global partners, including communities, civil societies and other partners on the ground, to assess what are those human rights and gender-related barriers to accessing health care. We work with them to push the boundaries and ensure that if laws are impeding access, those laws need to be changed, or if the practice needs to be changed, then we work again with in-country partners to make sure that those are gradually removed.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you.

Just to clarify that point, it sounds like you engage in policy advocacy. You try to inform countries regarding a policy or other changes that are linked to combatting these diseases. If a country refuses to go along with you on some of those issues, will that impact their eligibility or availability for funding, or is it purely based on the earlier criteria? You mentioned that capacity and need determine which countries get which resources.

• (1115)

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** We do have a performance-based funding model by which, indeed, a country that wouldn't be investing enough.... We ask countries to also invest in the fight against the three diseases. It's co-funding, so we have a performance-based funding mechanism.

When it comes to human rights and gender-related barriers, it's not a straightforward response, obviously, because, if we did have those as criteria, then we would leave a lot of people who need life-saving treatment behind and put their lives on the line. It's more of a progressive approach, if you wish, trying to convince them and change, as I said, the policies and practice on the ground step by step.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** With respect to corruption, is a possible consequence for countries that misallocate funding that you might direct funds towards other countries, as opposed to them? Is that something that happens? Is that a potential risk for Liberia, for example, or are the funding determinations made purely based on

whether those countries are prepared to make contributions financially and their capacity and need?

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** We track funding requirements, and we push hard for that. We have a very good return performance in terms of differing requirements from countries.

When it comes to corruption cases, we have a series of instruments that we can use. One of them is that we can change the recipients of the grants, because we have multiple recipients. We usually have a principal recipient for, say, the malaria grants. In most scenarios, it would be the ministry of health. Then you would have sub-recipients, which could be civil society organizations, specific branches of the ministry of health or others.

Normally we take remedial action, but, depending on the gravity of the facts and whether no remedial actions are being taken by the recipients, we can change the recipients, but still with the idea of ensuring continuity of treatment for the people we serve. We try to find alternative routes.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you very much.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Genuis.

Thank you, Madame Vanni.

We will now go to Mr. Ehsassi, please, for six minutes.

**Mr. Ali Ehsassi (Willowdale, Lib.):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Ms. Vanni, for appearing before our committee. We're very grateful for the explanations you have provided.

I should say right off the bat that the results have been quite impressive. Since 2010, I understand that fatalities and mortality are down 47%, and we are the sixth biggest donor overall and the second biggest when it comes to tuberculosis, if I'm not mistaken. Most recently, there was a 16% increase in our replenishment, so thank you for all of the hard work you're doing.

I do understand, however, that, because of COVID, there has been a bit of a setback and you had to come up with a new strategy, a new strategy that incorporates greater considerations for equity, sustainability and innovation.

Even though I understand those terms in the abstract, I was wondering how that plays out on the ground insofar as introducing these programs is concerned.

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** Thank you very much for the remarks. Indeed we are quite proud that together over the past 20 years we have saved 44 million lives. It's quite remarkable and humbling.

You're right that COVID-19 has been a shock for everybody—for countries, rich and poor alike, and for organizations and partners like the Global Fund. There are a lot of lessons to be learned. In a way, we were challenged but also lucky enough to be developing our new strategy for the next six years in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. We were learning literally by the day and feeding the new strategy through all of those lessons that we were learning.

The new strategy reflects all of that, including the importance of community and people-centred health services. We've learned that very much through COVID-19. Without the communities on the front line and the community health workers on the front line, it's very difficult to fight a pandemic, whether this is an old pandemic like tuberculosis or a new pandemic like COVID-19. Communities and people are much more at the centre of the new strategy.

It's similar with equity. We've learned that no one is safe until everyone is safe. The most efficient way to respond to COVID was actually also the most equitable way to respond to COVID globally. We couldn't fix it somewhere and let it go somewhere else. Equity was very much at the centre of what we learned through the COVID-19 response and at the heart of the strategy.

In terms of innovation, we have also the ambition of being much faster at developing and scaling up the introduction of new products in the fight against HIV, TB and malaria. We've seen how transformative that can be and how fast that can be. When there is the political commitment, when there are various investments, and when there is a "burning platform", as has been the case for COVID, innovation can be extremely fast and extremely transformative and just save lives. We will be investing much more in that space to accelerate progress on HIV, TB and malaria.

• (1120)

**Mr. Ali Ehsassi:** Thank you.

It's your estimation that the 2030 target that was set by the United Nations will be met, correct?

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** At this stage, we are off track. If we continue at the same pace, rate and way in which we are currently going in the fight against the three diseases, we are off track. We were already slightly off track before COVID, but COVID-19 pushed us far, far off track.

There is the possibility of getting back on track if we take action now. If we don't scale up the investment and the innovation and the co-operation now and in the coming two or three years, then we will be off track. But if we do, we can reach the target, absolutely.

**Mr. Ali Ehsassi:** Excellent. That's great to hear.

In which region would you say progress has been most pronounced so far?

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** Well, it depends; 75% of our investment is in sub-Saharan Africa, because this is where the highest burdens are and the lowest economic capacities can be found. We have seen progress across the three diseases and across the regions, but perhaps I would flag that the disease that was mostly left behind before COVID, and that most suffered from COVID as well, is tuberculosis. The innovations have not been as active as they could have been. The treatments are still the old treatments, etc. Innovation has not been sufficient in that space. There are a lot of challenges in the tuberculosis space. We saw that in the context of COVID as well. The two have been very much combined and have created more vulnerability for the countries with a high prevalence of tuberculosis, such as India, for example.

I wouldn't say that a region is doing particularly better than another one, but we do have perhaps more entrenched challenges in the tuberculosis space that we need to tackle.

**Mr. Ali Ehsassi:** Speaking of entrenched challenges, when it comes to HIV infections, just so you can elevate our appreciation of the many challenges you're contending with, could you tell us what some of those specific challenges are for HIV infections?

**The Chair:** In the interest of time, please give a brief answer.

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** Yes.

Very quickly, with HIV the challenge is mostly on the prevention side. We've made a lot of progress on the treatment side. We are able to save people's lives and allow them to lead healthy lives with antiretroviral treatment. On prevention we need to scale up our efforts, mostly in two areas, one being adolescent girls and young women. This is where most new infections take place in Africa, at an additional almost 900 a week. It's massive. Then there are the key populations of people who are most particularly vulnerable to HIV, such as sex workers, men who have sex with men, and drug users in particular. This is where we absolutely need to focus our efforts.

Thank you.

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Vanni and Mr. Ehsassi.

We now go to Mr. Bergeron for six minutes.

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron (Montarville, BQ):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Ms. Vanni, thank you for being with us today and for educating us on the importance of these three ongoing pandemics. Although they took a back seat to the COVID-19 pandemic, they are no less deadly.

I listened carefully to your opening statement, and I was surprised that you gave the whole thing in only one of Canada's official languages. Feel free to answer in the language of Molière, if you so wish.

Mr. Ehsassi referred to the negative effects of COVID-19 on the fight against AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria. I just mentioned it as well. Nevertheless, there is a positive side to the COVID-19 pandemic, especially the development of mRNA vaccine technology.

In early 2022, Moderna announced that it would be conducting clinical trials of an mRNA vaccine for AIDS. We also learned that BioNTech planned to conduct a clinical trial of an mRNA vaccine against malaria this year.

Are you able to give us an update on how those clinical trials are going? Are any results available yet?

• (1125)

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** Thank you.

I would, of course, be very glad to answer your questions in French.

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** I'm delighted to hear it.

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** You're right. The devastating effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria have been well-documented. In fact, we have lost ground in the fight against the three diseases, which we have invested so heavily in over the past two decades.

It is true, however, that some positive things came of the COVID-19 pandemic. As just mentioned, the investments required led to innovation, so the momentum generated by the pandemic sped up the development of vaccine technologies and other breakthroughs. Obviously, that gives us tremendous hope, since vaccines have yet to be found for all three of the diseases we target, even though they have been around for decades.

The potential for new technologies to be deployed—like mRNA vaccines, as you mentioned—and the fact that a number of labs are now exploring those possibilities are very positive developments. As you know, clinical trials are complex undertakings that often take many years, so we will have to wait and see, but we are cautiously optimistic.

One piece of positive news, however, is the World Health Organization's recent recommendation of the first-ever malaria vaccine. That is one more tool in our malaria toolkit. Of course, it has to be used in conjunction with other tools because it doesn't have a high enough efficacy rate to allow for indiscriminate use. In any case, there is progress in the fight against malaria, and it could help us step up efforts in the next few years.

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Speaking of drugs and vaccines, in the late 1990s and early 2000s, Canada adopted Canada's access to medicines regime with the intent of making HIV/AIDS drugs available to developing countries.

I'm not sure whether you've heard of the regime, but since its creation, only one country has tried submitting a request through the regime—Rwanda, in 2007. It says a lot that only one country has sought to use the regime. Recently, an initiative involving Bolivia and COVID-19 also proved unsuccessful.

Is that an effective way for Canada to make drugs available to countries in need?

Should we instead focus on waiving the patents for AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria drugs to pave the way for new medicines and expanded distribution?

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** Thank you for your question.

I don't know enough about the regime you mentioned.

Nevertheless, generally speaking, the Global Fund partnership is an excellent tool, because we can sit down with the board and talk about which tools are working and which ones aren't as effective in relation to implementing countries. Those partners can also help us adjust our mechanisms.

I don't know the situation with the specific regime you brought up, but on our end, we have set up something I think is very useful, the pooled procurement mechanism. Through the mechanism, we

are able to provide high-quality medicines to the countries we invest in and support, to prevent the use of counterfeit drugs or products that do not meet the necessary quality standards. Of course, the mechanism also gives us the ability to negotiate prices. The Global Fund's scope of activity gives us some influence so that we can bring down prices, whether for AIDS, tuberculosis or malaria drugs, or COVID-19 antigen tests.

Our pooled procurement mechanism makes it easier to access quality-assured medicines at lower prices. As mentioned earlier, it also helps mitigate corruption risks in the supply chain.

• (1130)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Vanni and Mr. Bergeron.

[English]

It's to Ms. McPherson, please, for six minutes.

**Ms. Heather McPherson (Edmonton Strathcona, NDP):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Ms. Vanni, I would also like to thank you for joining us today. It's such a pleasure to have you here. I want to thank you and your whole team for the incredible work you do around the world.

I think what I'll start with is just that we're, of course, very happy that the Canadian government did have the replenishment of \$930 million for the 2020-22 period. Of course, that period is ending now. We are looking at the replenishment of the fund. What do you require from Canada? What is the timeline that you would like to see that happen within?

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** Thank you very much for your kind words.

We are at the moment implementing the funds that we raised in the sixth replenishment. It's not over, and thank you, Canada, again, for your very robust pledge. Implementation is ongoing. Indeed, we have never deployed as many resources in the past. It's really been a scale-up of the Global Fund supports for low and medium-income countries in the fight against these three diseases, let alone COVID.

That being said, this year we aim to raise at least \$18 billion ahead of and at the pledging conference, which is being scheduled by President Biden for September in New York, the date still to be seen. This money would be made available to countries. We will be negotiating the grants next year, 2023. Then they will be implementing such grants in the period from 2024 to 2026. This is how it works. We raise money in one year; we negotiate for one year; and we implement in the following three years, more or less.

With regard to the mobilization on the Canadian side, we thought it would be really interesting to explore the IAS conference as a potential platform for Canada to express its commitment and potentially announce its pledge. That would set up the momentum and show the commitment ahead of the New York pledging conference later in September.

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** What amount would be needed from us? This is an opportunity for you to speak to the Parliament of Canada. What would you like us to pledge? What would that number be?

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** Thank you.

In fact, what I tried to explain at the beginning is that the \$18 billion target represents an increase of 30%, roughly, compared with the sixth replenishment. That 30% is not because we have suddenly become more expensive. In fact, we have very low operating costs. For your information, 5.2% is our level of operating costs; so it's very, very low. The increased target is because of the COVID-19 knock-on impact on these three diseases. This 30% increase is what our funding needs are. This is what we expect our major donors to consider as a potential pledge this time.

As I said, what is happening is that the U.S., as the host, but also as our largest donor, has already committed that 30% increase, with a commitment of \$6 billion. If we want to unlock the \$6 billion from the U.S., we need to find the other \$12 billion. This is why it's so important that all of our major donors step up. If they don't, we won't be able to find the \$12 billion and therefore will leave the U.S. money unavailable on the table.

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** I think we can all agree at this point in time, coming out of COVID-19, that this is not a situation we want to be in. Realistically, the quicker Canada can make that pledge of 30% more than the 2020–22 pledge, it would be really really extremely helpful to the organization and to saving the lives of countless people around the world.

I have a concern, as somebody who has worked in international development for some time. We have heard that the countries will be allowed to use their vaccines as part of the calculation for official development assistance. This would mean that there could be less money within that pot for actual development work going forward. Knowing where we are and knowing the gains we've lost over the past two to three years, it would be devastating for development around the world, particularly with the food shortages we're seeing out of Ukraine and many other contributing factors.

Can you talk a bit about what that would look like if ODA was reduced because vaccines were included in the calculation?

• (1135)

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** That's a very daunting question, because what we are facing at the moment is a false dilemma. On one hand, we're going to stick to our 2030 targets, the long-term sustainable development goals, for which we need sustained funding from donor countries, and also sustained commitments from implementing countries. On the other hand, we have crises that we need to urgently respond to: COVID-19, Ukraine, Afghanistan and many others. This is a false dilemma, because if we jump into responding to one crisis after the other—you could add the climate crisis to that list—at the expense of sustaining of the long-term investment that

is needed to reach the targets, what we will be doing is laying the groundwork for future crises.

If we think about the 2030 targets as our compass, we really need to make sure that this ODA funding or other funding mechanisms—I don't know which ones at this stage—are at the right level to address both challenges at the same time. Otherwise, we will go backward. Indeed, we already are going backward. Going backward is much more costly. It costs more in lives, but also in dollars.

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** Yes.

Mr. Beasley from the World Health Organization said that we will pay a thousand times more if we don't deal with this appropriately now.

Thank you so much.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Ms. McPherson.

Thank you, Ms. Vanni.

Colleagues, we have time, because everyone adhered to the time limits very closely today. Thank you. We have time for a full second round.

The first allotment is for five minutes to Mr. Chong. Please go ahead.

**Hon. Michael Chong (Wellington—Halton Hills, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Madame Vanni, for appearing in front of our committee.

The Global Fund is looking for \$1.2 billion over three years from the Canadian government for its replenishment. Is that correct?

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** Yes.

**Hon. Michael Chong:** Have you had discussions with Canadian government officials about this replenishment, the \$1.2 billion request?

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** Not only have we had discussions with the Canadian government, but the Canadian government sits on our board. We are always discussing it with the board member and others, including through our governance.

We have basically discussed in depth the strategy of the Global Fund. The strategy was designed and approved by our board. The strategy says we stick to our 2030 targets and to our commitments—to our mandate, if you wish—to end AIDS, TB and malaria by 2030. Based on that, we've calculated the funding needs over the next three years in order to be back on track to reach those targets. Those calculations were made by technical partners, not by us, based on their global plans.

That gives us the \$18 billion target for the Global Fund, which represents a 30% increase. This was discussed with the Canadian board member and the Canadian government as the basic requirement in order to get back on track.



To give you an idea, that \$18 billion still leaves \$28 billion unfunded in the global plans to end HIV, TB and malaria by 2030. It's not a very ambitious target. It leaves a lot of funding needs still unmet if we are to meet the 2030 targets.

Yes, we have discussed that, but we have, obviously, not come to a conclusion when it comes to the Canadian commitment.

**Hon. Michael Chong:** You indicated that Canada's board member is supportive of the overall strategy, including the \$1.2-billion request from the Canadian government. Is that correct?

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** Canada adopted the strategy alongside the other board members. We haven't had a formal discussion yet when it comes to the target.

**Hon. Michael Chong:** Okay, so we don't know if they're going to support this request.

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** We don't know yet. We will need all of your support for that.

**Hon. Michael Chong:** Yes. Thank you.

You mentioned that while there's been a significant decline in HIV/AIDS mortality in recent years, there hasn't been a commensurate decline in HIV/AIDS infections.

Can you tell us what challenges there are in trying to reduce infections?

• (1140)

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** That's a very good question.

That's the beauty of innovations, right? When we found the antiretroviral treatments and were able to make them available equitably to all people who needed them, we made a huge step forward in the fight against the disease. Where we are struggling is indeed in stopping new infections from happening. Obviously that means we will always have a large population of people who would need ARV treatment for life going forward, and this is not a good prospect.

The key challenges are discrimination, criminalization, gender inequity, poverty and vulnerability. These are all factors that drive new HIV infections, very clearly. This is why I was referring at the beginning to our investment in breaking down barriers to health and our focus on gender.

**Hon. Michael Chong:** Could you elaborate a bit more on something you mentioned earlier? There seems to be a disproportionate number of adolescent girls in sub-Saharan Africa who are being infected with HIV/AIDS. Could you tell us why that is?

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** Yes. Actually, the majority of new infections in Africa come from adolescent girls and young women. Between 15 and 24 years old, they are twice as likely to get HIV compared with their male peers. As I said, vulnerability factors include gender-based violence, early marriage, not going to school and things like that.

This is why we have focused our investment in the 13 countries where new infection rates for HIV are the highest in Africa. It's essentially the southern part of Africa, if you wish, where we have multiplied our investments and very much focused on that area of work. We are keeping girls in school and making sure we give them

the possibility to have their own businesses and be more empowered economically so they can exercise more and more control over their lives. We also support organizations that provide peer-to-peer counselling among adolescent girls and young women. These sorts of activities go very much beyond the biomedical interventions, if you wish. We are very much working across health, education, economic development and youth engagement to reduce the new infection rates. We've managed to decrease those rates by 41% over the past 10 years in those 13 countries.

**The Chair:** Ms. Vanni, my apologies, but I'll stop you there, if I may, in the interest of time.

Thank you, Mr. Chong and Ms. Vanni.

We'll go to Mr. Sarai for five minutes.

Please go ahead.

**Mr. Randeep Sarai (Surrey Centre, Lib.):** Thank you, Chair.

Ms. Vanni, I want to commend you and your organization. It has a very impressive record given the number of lives that are saved with the small amount of investment for the prevention of tuberculosis and malaria. You save millions and millions of lives in the long run, so I really commend you and your organization. I'm very proud of Canada's contribution towards that. It's something we're all very proud of.

You mentioned that COVID had an effect that changed things, perhaps in your reach and delivery or in other factors. Can you elaborate on how COVID-19 affected your programming?

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** Thank you very much for your kind words and for the question.

COVID-19 has impacted the programs in many ways. First of all on the offer side, health workers and community health workers were completely overwhelmed and under stress by the COVID-19 pandemic. Some of them were sick—we've lost many health workers—and/or couldn't access the health facility and/or could not cope with the level of demand.

That applies obviously to frontline health workers, but also labs were completely overwhelmed. That means that health workers or the labs that were usually used to fight tuberculosis, malaria or HIV were busy dealing with COVID-19 and could not cope with everything at the same time.

The other aspect is more on the demand side. For example, you had a lot of people who had a fever, let's say, in Burkina Faso. Having fever, they understood that they shouldn't go out from their houses and that they should not go to the health centre because it could be COVID and therefore they could contaminate others. There are contradictory instructions. For TB, similarly, if you cough you should immediately get tested and get treated, but if you cough and you have COVID you should stay home. It was very difficult for people to actually know what to do. Also lockdown orders prevented people from getting access to treatment or prevention services.

We've seen indicators go backwards very significantly in HIV testing, which was very badly affected. TB testing and treatment were very badly affected as well. Malaria resisted a bit more because programs and actors on the ground managed to adapt, for example, the way they distributed mosquito nets. They went door-to-door and therefore such programs were more resilient to COVID-19, but TB and HIV were very badly affected because of those different factors.

• (1145)

**Mr. Randeep Sarai:** Are there broader ramifications for malaria infections that happened as a result of the increased malaria outbreaks?

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** Malaria also got worse. I mentioned the increased deaths, which means basically a child dies from malaria every minute as we speak, which is not acceptable really. We've gone backwards on malaria as well.

The countries where malaria incidents are the highest were not hardest hit by COVID. Also the map of COVID-19 has impacted some countries more than others. Malaria may suffer from a couple of things. One is the ODA risk where money goes to other priorities, including COVID-19, but perhaps forgets other priorities that still kill millions of people, including children around the world.

The other one would be an illusion that because there is now a new vaccine, it's fixed. It's not because, as I said, the vaccine has an efficacy rate that is still modest. It needs to be deployed alongside other tools like bed nets, prevention programs and so on in order for us to be able to drive numbers down.

**Mr. Randeep Sarai:** Were you able to assist with COVID vaccinations at the same places just because of your experience in giving vaccinations? Was there any coordination between the COVID vaccinations and your own organization with tuberculosis and malaria vaccinations?

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** That's interesting because we did work very much in coordination and indeed we were one of the founders of the ACT-Accelerator, which is the coalition that brought together all the global health agencies like Gavi, the Global Fund, WHO and others. They really came together to mount an entire end-to-end response to COVID-19, including all the different tools.

The Global Fund has taken a leadership role in everything but vaccines because Gavi is taking care of that part, including through the COVAX mechanism that you know about. We haven't been involved in vaccines ourselves, but we've been focusing very much on tests, diagnostics, treatments, oxygen, protective equipment, laboratory strengthening and all of those things. The coordination was there, but it's not that the Global Fund itself was involved in COVID vaccination campaigns per se.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mr. Sarai and Ms. Vanni.

[*Translation*]

Go ahead, Mr. Bergeron. You have two and a half minutes.

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Ms. Vanni, you said that Canada was the sixth-top donor to the Global Fund and had a seat on the board. It's quite telling and troublesome, then, that the Global Fund isn't really aware of Canada's

access to medicines regime. The regime was the centrepiece of Canada's strategy to help developing countries combat the AIDS epidemic by providing them with access to medicines.

You talked about a pool of medicines provided by the fund's donor countries. Does Canada contribute to the pool?

If so, what medicines does Canada contribute to help combat the three diseases globally?

• (1150)

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** Thank you.

I will look into Canada's regime and get back to the committee with an answer.

What I was talking about was a pooled procurement mechanism, not a pool of medicines contributed by donor or non-donor countries. Through the mechanism, the Global Fund is able to proactively negotiate with labs and suppliers of the various health products we need. Those products are then made available to countries in accordance with their requests. Countries determine their own needs. The Global Fund uses a funding mechanism based on each country's own priorities in combatting the three diseases. Countries seek out use of the mechanism, and we provide them with the medicines requested. It's not a pool of donated medicines. Rather, it's a pooled procurement framework to negotiate better prices for high-quality drugs.

I hope that answers your question, Mr. Bergeron.

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Yes, definitely, Ms. Vanni. Thank you. Also—

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mr. Bergeron. Sorry, but you're out of time.

[*English*]

Madam McPherson, please go ahead for two and a half minutes.

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This has been so fascinating. Thank you.

I have a quick question.

Knowing that COVID-19 is a new pandemic, which we have heard many times is going to be with us for the long term, is there any discussion about the Global Fund looking at including COVID-19 in the HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria bucket?

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** That is an excellent question.

At the moment, we continue to deliver our COVID-19 response. Thanks to Canada's support, and other donors, we have been able to deploy an additional \$4.3 billion to countries to help them fight COVID-19. That is ongoing.

Funding needs, by the way, are not covered for the COVID-19 response coordinated by the ACT-Accelerator coalition, as I mentioned.

When it comes to the Global Fund's long-term intent, the common strategy remains to focus on AIDS, TB and malaria, because that is our mandate. That is why we were created, and we really need to meet our commitment there.

However, it also includes the recognition of the Global Fund's role in pandemic preparedness. It's beyond COVID, in a way, recognizing that during the COVID-19 pandemic, the very same infrastructure and systems and networks that the Global Fund has been able to support in countries to fight AIDS, TB and malaria were the ones that countries used to respond to COVID—exactly the same community of workers, labs, supply chains, data systems and so on.

In that sense, the decision made by our board was not so much, let's continue with COVID, because it isn't something that we can foresee. We will, if needed, but it is isn't something that we can foresee scientifically.

However, the board has agreed that we should play a more deliberate role in helping the world get better prepared for future pandemics—leveraging our investments in health systems. In that sense, the \$18 billion target that I mentioned includes an investment of an estimated \$6 billion in health system strengthening, which means essentially helping those countries get better prepared for pandemics. That is what health systems do: respond to the current pandemic battles and prepare better for what may come.

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** We've heard that from so many experts on how to deal with COVID-19, so thank you very much.

I think that's all the time I have.

**The Chair:** Ms. McPherson, thank you very much.

Mr. Duncan, welcome to the committee. Five minutes go to you, please. Go ahead, sir.

**Mr. Eric Duncan (Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry, CPC):** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. It's good to be joining the committee today on an interesting and important topic.

I want to ask some of my questions pertaining to the financing model. I have a couple of questions on that.

In the replenishment, as it's noted, over 90% of the funding that helps the fund comes from governments, but there is an amount there from private sector foundations. In your replenishment, can you speak to the role that those private aspects have? Is that something you're looking to increase as well? I look at that from a synergy perspective of the performance-based model that you have and transparency in terms of the inspector general in the system you have. Are you seeing more of an uptake or interest in that when it comes to funding opportunities as part of this replenishment? Is the private sector done at the same conference as well?

Perhaps you can address those first.

• (1155)

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** Indeed, in terms of the funding model, we do have more than 90% of our resources coming from governments or sovereign donors—93% exactly at this point in time. The rest does come from private sources. In that space, we have a long-standing partnerships, and we also have very high ambitions for this replenishment.

We are ambitious because COVID-19 has demonstrated to everyone, including the private sector, how important it is to invest in health systems and prevent outbreaks from becoming pandemics, as we've seen with COVID-19 and the COVID-19 crisis.

To respond to your question, there is indeed more momentum. We are very ambitious with two or three things with the private sector. One is targeting and mobilizing philanthropists, high-net worth individuals, and asking them to step up and to fight against the three diseases. We already have a few engaged with us, including the Gates Foundation and others. We want and expect more contributions from that angle.

We are also mobilizing the private sector and particular corporations for their know-how and bringing them onboard to bring particular innovations, tools and capacities they have to help us accelerate our work and drive innovation in particular areas where we are finding bottlenecks and we are not as impactful as we would like. For example, data management is one area where we have a number of partnerships with the private sector to help us leverage change. In that space also, the supply chain space, bringing private sector experience is very, very helpful.

**Mr. Eric Duncan:** Can I ask if that is part of the replenishment conference then? I'm assuming that the private sector foundations are invited there, and that's where they make their pledges. I would assume from your answer that there would be a mix of cash contributions, commitments or pledges, but also in-kind contributions as well. Could you speak a little bit about that?

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** Indeed. There are two ways in which private sector partners can contribute. They can contribute directly in cash towards the \$18 billion, and we very much hope to get such commitments, not only at the conference itself but before that, and the team is already working on securing early pledges in the coming weeks, hopefully. There are also pledges of what we call “innovation partnerships”, namely, bringing know-how to the table. That can also be announced at the replenishment conference. Those are very, very welcome. They do not contribute to the \$18 billion, though, because they do not bring cash; they bring something else, but it's very, very valuable and can be announced there as well.

**Mr. Eric Duncan:** I didn't start my timer, so I apologize, Mr. Chair. Cut me off when you—

**The Chair:** You have about a minute, Mr. Duncan.

Please go ahead.

**Mr. Eric Duncan:** Thank you.

We raised the issues of where some of the demographic concerns are with regard to HIV infections. One thing you talked about and a few colleagues have alluded to in their questions is focusing more on preventive measures, as you've acknowledged.

Could you break down perhaps where this should be done? Is it with education? You've talked about raising awareness via education, but also perhaps maybe more on the medical side. Here I am thinking of prep and medications and different things along those lines. What type of balance or direction do you see the majority of that preventative funding or effort going towards to reduce the number of new infections? Is it mostly via education to raise awareness, or is it purchasing medications that could help prevent infection rates from rising?

**The Chair:** Please give a brief answer in the interest of time, Ms. Vanni. Thank you.

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** That's a fascinating question. The mix will differ from country to country. Essentially, prevention takes education, and awareness in particular, in highly vulnerable populations. This is where you need community leaders and you need peer-to-peer education. You don't need a formal doctor going into those populations. You need a particular approach, in that sense.

You also need tools. You need tests, tests, tests, and in that sense, you need self-tests, for example. We need to scale up self-testing. This is one of the lessons we learned from COVID as well. These tools are really important, as is all the treatment, obviously, including prep.. There is still a lot to be done in that space.

• (1200)

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Ms. Vanni and Mr. Duncan.

Our final series of questions this morning goes to Ms. Fry for five minutes, please.

**Hon. Hedy Fry (Vancouver Centre, Lib.):** Thank you very much, everyone.

Ms. Vanni, you are doing a yeoman's job here, answering all of the questions thrown at you. I want to thank you for your knowledge and for spending the time to talk to us about this.

I have only five minutes and I need to ask you a couple of questions. First, what about the old vaccine for tuberculosis? Does that work? Are we still giving them out? I don't know if we're doing that. Now that we have the drug-resistant tuberculosis, why is it we have it in only certain countries? Is there work being done on new drugs? This is a moving target. As we well know, the tubercle bacillus is able to evolve as new drugs come in. What is your hope for tuberculosis?

I also need to ask you about malaria and HIV, so perhaps you could make that short and quick. Thank you.

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** I'll try. Thank you very much for your question.

Let me start by saying that tuberculosis is underfunded. We are not following the high-level summit on tuberculosis that was held in New York three years ago. It's underfunded. Across the three diseases, it's the one that kills the most people—1.6 million a year.

Multidrug-resistant TB is a high risk for global health security. MDR-related deaths already represent a third of the deaths in the world related to antimicrobial resistance. That is very, very critical. There is indeed a lot of effort being put into the search for new drugs for MDR-TB. Indeed, this absolutely is one of our key areas of work.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** Malaria is still a difficult problem. I remember back in the fifties and sixties that the eradication of the mosquito was very important. In many countries, removing standing water and all of those kinds of preventative measures were very successful, but then so was the drug DDT, which is gone now. What do we have in order to actually kill the mosquito that carries malaria?

The final question, which you can perhaps answer at the same time, is about HIV. As you said, for AIDS we have the treatment and are bringing down deaths from AIDS, but for the actual HIV infections, I find it astounding that it is twice as high amongst 15- to 24-year-old girls. You gave the reasons, but what are we going to be able to do to change some of those things? I know that a lot of these girls don't even have access to contraception. If it's early marriage, what do they do when it's their husbands who actually bring the virus into them? What do they do? How can you change that? Those are cultural practices. Those are economic practices. This is a very difficult thing to try to prevent.

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** Those are massive questions, and I can see the chair in front of me telling me not to take too long.

On malaria, the interventions vary greatly between, for example, a high-burden setting like the Sahel or an area where the incidents are not too high but you want to eliminate malaria. Let's remember that our goal is to eliminate malaria. Sometimes this last mile, such as in the Mekong area where the rates are not very high, to reach elimination requires very focused interventions so that we can eliminate it. Then it's done. We don't need to go back to that.

So it varies, but one thing we've been investing in a lot is a new generation of bed nets that can be much more effective against the vector. We're investing a lot in that area. On HIV...

The chair is asking to me wrap up.

It's a mix of interventions. We find ourselves investing in areas that are very far from biomedical inventions—giving money to girls so that they stay in school, strengthening girls' empowerment groups, running programs to prevent gender-based violence, supporting adolescent-friendly prevention programs and sexual education programs.

We're investing in all of that, but the only way we can do that is through partners. It's not the Global Fund that does that. It's working with communities through societal organizations, youth organizations and women's organizations on the ground. Through doing that, we can address the high level of prevalence in adolescent girls and young women, and similarly with key populations. That's the model we need to fight—

• (1205)

**The Chair:** Dr. Fry, thank you very much. We'll have to leave it there in the interest of time. I apologize.

[*Translation*]

Ms. Vanni, on behalf of the committee, I want to thank you for being with us today. We appreciate your expertise and, above all, the important work you are doing.

[*English*]

Again, Ms. Vanni, our deepest thanks for your appearance today.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Françoise Vanni:** Thank you very much.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Colleagues, we have a few points of business to discuss. The first portion of the next hour is intended to be in public. It's the half-hour session to discuss a number of motions, including one by Mr. Chong. Then there is an in camera portion, where we have a number of housekeeping items as well. Hopefully, we will get to that in about half an hour.

I would like to give the floor to Mr. Chong for the introduction of his motion, please.

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

I move the following:

That the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development supports the full participation of Taiwan in the International Civil Aviation Organization and its 41st Triennial Assembly to be held on September 27, 2022–October 14, 2022, and that this be reported to the House as soon as possible, and that the committee request a government response.

Mr. Chair, I am moving this motion because I think it's important that the committee voice its support for Taiwan's inclusion in the upcoming assembly of ICAO. I believe the health committee is moving a similar motion with respect to Taiwan's participation at the World Health Assembly.

I think Taiwan has much to contribute in the area of international aviation as well as in the area of global health. I think it would be useful for the committee to adopt this motion. That's why I asked you to set some time aside for deliberation on this.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Mr. Chong, thank you very much.

With the support of the clerk, we will work on achieving an integrated speakers list from colleagues who are connected virtually and in person.

Who wishes to intervene?

I see Mr. Oliphant.

If you're online and you wish to speak, just signal to the clerk by raising your hand virtually.

Monsieur Bergeron; okay.

It will be Mr. Oliphant and then Monsieur Bergeron.

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

It's nice to be back. I've missed you. I hope you missed me while I was away doing government business.

I very much appreciate and support the intent of the motion. I think that there is unanimity around this table about the importance of finding ways for Taiwan to participate, not only for the benefit of Taiwan, but for the benefit of the world. There are meaningful ways that Taiwan can participate in international organizations. We have not only seen that through the pandemic, but previously as well. There have been many options and opportunities for Taiwan's wisdom, expertise and contribution, which is not unique from the Asia-Pacific countries. It is significant, interesting and important for us to be in constant communication with Taiwan on their opinions, attitudes and insights. I'm absolutely supportive of the intent of the motion.

I have one concern with the motion. That concern relates to our engagement multilaterally and our respect for the organizations of which we are a part. They have set their own rules for membership and concerns about how members become members, participate, etc. I want to be somewhat sensitive to our responsibility as one partner in a multilateral organization, despite the fact that we have a particular interest. Maybe it is unique in this one, as an international organization housed in Canada. I think that we still want to add something to this motion that respects the right of that body in its own way of engaging in memberships.

I am going to propose an amendment. The first amendment would be inserting after “participation of Taiwan in the International Civil Aviation Organization” the phrase “while respecting the membership requirements of the organization”.

I think that we, as a multilateral country, are a middle-sized power, and this is the way Canada operates best. We find ways to engage through UN organizations and other organizations and bodies that come together, whether it's on trade, health or anything else. This one's civil aviation. I think that we should at least acknowledge that.

The insert then would be the words “while respecting the membership requirements of the organization”. That would be my suggestion.

• (1210)

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mr. Oliphant.

It is moved as an amendment, to be clear.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bergeron, you're on the speaking list. Would you like to speak to the amendment, or would you prefer to speak to the main motion after?

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** I can definitely speak to the amendment, Mr. Chair. If that's what we need to do to make sure Mr. Chong's motion passes unanimously—and I have no doubt it will—I'm willing to support Mr. Oliphant's amendment.

I believe it's important to support Taiwan's participation in international organizations where it can make a valuable and relevant contribution. That is the case with the International Civil Aviation Organization given how many millions of passengers transit through Taiwan every year. Despite not being a member, Taiwan adheres to most, if not all, of ICAO's regulations. As you can imagine, if Taiwan remains outside the organization, it could eventually decide to stop adhering to ICAO regulations, and that could have huge consequences on air traffic in the oh-so-important Asia-Pacific region.

I think there is unanimous agreement on the need to admit Taiwan to the organization. By the way, I fully recognize that each of the international organizations in question has its own set of rules for membership.

Although I support Mr. Oliphant's amendment, I do have a comment. We are being extremely cautious in the case of ICAO, but the Canadian government was not nearly as concerned about Taiwan's potential membership in the World Health Organization and World Health Assembly. It did not express the same desire to specifically recognize the membership rules of those organizations. Nevertheless, I do appreciate that an organization's membership rules take precedence, of course. For that reason, I support both Mr. Oliphant's amendment and Mr. Chong's motion.

• (1215)

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mr. Bergeron.

On the list, I have Mr. Chong and Ms. McPherson.

Mr. Chong, over to you.

[*English*]

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

I support Mr. Oliphant's amendment. Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chong.

Ms. McPherson.

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would also like to reiterate that Taiwan has an awful lot to offer, and so I support both the amendment and the motion.

**The Chair:** I'm just looking at the room and virtually. Are there any other interventions on Mr. Oliphant's amendment. Seeing none, can we pass the amendment unanimously?

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

**The Chair:** We're back to the main motion. Is there any discussion on the main motion as amended, either in the room or virtually?

(Motion as amended agreed to [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

We are still in the public portion of committee business. Are there any other items that members wish to bring forward?

Dr. Fry.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** Thank you, Chair.

I would like to bring forward a motion. I think you all have it in front of you. It is:

That, pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), given recent reports of international backsliding related to women's sexual and reproductive health and rights, the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs undertake a comprehensive study on the global access to the full range

—and I underscore “full range”—

of health services, including family planning and modern contraception; comprehensive sexuality education; safe and legal abortion and post-abortion care; laws restricting or prohibiting women's rights to abortion, the medical and socioeconomic importance of maintaining the right to access safe abortion; and prevention and treatment of HIV/AIDS and sexually transmitted infections and what actions Canada can undertake to support women's sexual and reproductive health and rights globally; that the committee hold no fewer than (5) five meetings; and that the committee report its findings to the House.

**The Chair:** Dr. Fry.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** Chair? Sorry, did want me to elaborate on the motion?

**The Chair:** If you wish to, you can. Members have heard the motion as you read it.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** Yes, I'd like to elaborate on the reason for the motion.

**The Chair:** Let me pause you for one second, Dr. Fry.

**Hon. Michael Chong:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair. Is Madam Fry moving the motion right now or is she giving notice of motion?

**The Chair:** No, I understood Dr. Fry said that she is moving it. It had been put on notice.

Dr. Fry, let me just confirm with you. Are you actually moving the motion?

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** I am moving the motion.

**The Chair:** Yes, she is moving it. It had been put on notice before. If you wish to elaborate, you still have the floor on that, Dr. Fry.

• (1220)

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** Thank you.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** One second. I'm sorry to interrupt. We have another point of order.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Mr. Chair, I see that we received three motions from Liberal members, and at first glance, they all look acceptable to me. I don't object to any of them, but it seems to me that the members are forcing the committee's proverbial hand regarding future business and scheduling. I have to tell you that makes me uneasy.

Usually, our practice is to meet, to share potential study topics and to discuss them. Now, we have three motions before us solely from the Liberal Party. We weren't told that we had to provide topic ideas for future studies. This makes me uneasy.

Unless we come to a friendly agreement on how to proceed going forward, Mr. Chair, I have to tell you that I will be forced to vote against all of these motions. The way Ms. Fry is foisting this on the committee is not in keeping with our usual procedure for determining future business.

I repeat, the three motions that the Liberal Party has put forward strike me as most relevant, but I don't think forcing the committee's hand on future business is the way to do things. In the circumstances, short of a friendly agreement, I fear we will wind up in a drawn-out debate that won't end well.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you for your comments, Mr. Bergeron.

[*English*]

That's not quite a point of order because members are free to move motions as they see fit, but it does go to how the committee will tackle its work plan in the future.

[*Translation*]

Your comments are duly noted, however. Thank you very much.

[*English*]

Dr. Fry, we'll go back to you if you wish to elaborate briefly on the motion, and then we will open it up for discussion by members of the committee.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** Chair, I wanted to say that this motion was sent to everyone on the committee on May 6 in both official languages, so this is not new. The committee should have had an opportunity to look at it. However, I moved it because we need to discuss this motion at some point in time, as it has been duly presented. If there is no time to do it today, I will listen to the Chair's ruling on this, but I wanted to present this motion because it is extremely important.

Chair, there are 121 million unintended pregnancies every single year. Sixty percent of these unintended pregnancies end in abortion and 45% of abortions are unsafe and result in 7 million women a year either being hospitalized or dying from unsafe abortions. Two hundred and fifty-seven million women in the world are unable to get contraception, and the complications of pregnancy and childbirth are the leading cause of death among girls 15 to 19, and we see among girls aged 15 to 24, high incidence of HIV.

The whole issue of the full spectrum of sexual and reproductive health and rights is almost an emergency. It's getting worse.

COVID has made it worse. I think when we realize that only 55% of women and girls worldwide are able to take and make decisions about their own sexual and reproductive health and rights, I don't think we can let this get any worse than it is now.

I just wanted to lay that on the table, Chair, so that we can discuss this motion at a date that you deem appropriate, but I need to make sure that we take it seriously.

**The Chair:** Dr. Fry, thank you very much. You are free to move it, and you moved it in a committee business session. It's completely in the hands of the committee as to how they wish to deal with it. We will make space if the committee agrees that it should be discussed. We still have some minutes in the allotted time, which was for half an hour of public committee business.

I have a speakers list right now that includes Mr. Chong, Madame Bendayan, Mr. Oliphant, Ms. McPherson and Mr. Genuis, as well.

I think it would be opportune given the time that we have to hear from those colleagues and to see where that takes us in the course of the time that we have allotted.

Mr. Chong, please.

[*Translation*]

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

I agree with what Mr. Bergeron said about Ms. Fry's motion. The committee's schedule until Parliament rises at the beginning of the summer has already been planned. I think the committee members should all discuss the committee's schedule. We should consider not only this motion, but also motions that deal with other issues affecting the country.

[*English*]

I agree with Mr. Bergeron on this. I think this motion relates to the business of the committee, that is, what we're going to be studying over the next number of months. I think it should be part of a much bigger discussion about other issues that are facing the country.

The second point I'd like to make with respect to the substance of the motion is that this motion clearly is in reference to the recently leaked potential decision by the Supreme Court of the United States of the America. Clearly, that's what this motion is in reference to.

It says, "given recent reports of international backsliding related to women's sexual and reproductive health rights". Clearly that's a reference to the leaked decision that made the news both in the United States and in Canada. If we are going to be undertaking a comprehensive study on global access to abortion, and that's being triggered by this wording of "international backsliding", then we should invite the ambassador of the United States to Canada to appear in front of our committee to talk about this, if this motion were to be adopted.

Personally, I think there are issues of much greater import than abortion when it concerns Canada-U.S. relations. Issues concerning trade and investment, a range of issues, I think should be a much higher priority in the bilateral relationship than the issue of abortion.

I don't think we should be calling a U.S. ambassador to committee to discuss the matter of abortion as it relates to Canada-U.S. relations. On the substance of the issue, I don't think this is a matter that committee should be focused on. I think there are much higher priorities than the issue of abortion between the United States and Canada. But if the committee goes down the path of adopting this motion, which I don't think we should, then I will insist that the U.S. ambassador to Canada, Mr. David Cohen, appear in front of our committee to discuss the recent leaked potential decision by the U.S. Supreme Court, because that's what the motion is referring to.

Those are my two views on this. I think we should incorporate this discussion as part of a much bigger discussion about the future of this committee's business, rather than dealing with it as a one-off issue in the form of this motion.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (1225)

**The Chair:** Mr. Chong, thank you very much.

I have on the list at the moment, Madame Bendayan, Mr. Oliphant, Ms. McPherson, Mr. Genuis and Mr. Bergeron.

Madame Bendayan, please.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan (Outremont, Lib.):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

First, I'd like to respond to Mr. Bergeron's comments.

Ms. Fry's motion was sent out on May 6, and this part of the meeting was set aside to discuss committee business. It is entirely appropriate and within the rules to put forward motions. I don't see how this could have caught anyone by surprise. What's more, the motion doesn't specify when the study would be conducted. Obviously, it's up to the committee to decide when it could undertake the study, if the members find the motion to be relevant.

[*English*]

On the issue of relevance, I would like to address Mr. Chong's comments. Clearly he does not feel that women's sexual and reproductive health is of great importance, if I understand what he's just expressed.

There is no reference to the United States in this motion. I'm reading it very carefully for the fourth time now. We have heard testimony and it is, in fact, a fact that at the moment women are being sterilized in China. The Uighur population is facing forced sterilization. Italy is also heavily investing in anti-abortion organizations. This is not a subject unique to the United States.

If Mr. Chong wishes to politicize the issue by bringing in an ambassador as a threat, that's fine. I do not think that we should dismiss the importance of women's health internationally because of any suggestion that our relationship with the United States is much

greater than this one issue. Of course it is, but so too is the responsibility of our committee to address important international issues. This is the committee of foreign affairs and international development. This is a matter of grave concern internationally, which absolutely must be addressed by our committee.

What I would hope is that we would at least be able to vote on this motion before the end of this session and leave it to the Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure to decide when exactly this study would be appropriate for discussion.

• (1230)

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Madam Bendayan.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** Mr. Chair, I would like to clarify this motion. I think Mr. Chong may not have read it. If he had read it he would realize that it is not all about abortion. The data that shows the rise—

**The Chair:** I'm going to cut you off.

One moment, Dr. Fry. If it's a point of order, fine.

You're on the list to intervene. You can make that point in a couple of minutes once we've gone through the list, but it's a point of order I'll take the point of order, but it doesn't seem to be.

Let me go—

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** Mr. Chong set up a straw man here [*Inaudible—Editor*], with misinformation.

**The Chair:** You can debate that with him in future interventions. That will be on the speakers list. Thank you.

I have Mr. Oliphant, Ms. McPherson, Mr. Genuis, Monsieur Bergeron and then Dr. Fry.

Colleagues, I have to leave you a little bit early. What I will do is after a couple of interventions I will go to Monsieur Bergeron to make that he has a chance to intervene. He has agreed to take the chair for the remainder of the meeting, but I would like to give him the chance to make his intervention.

Mr. Oliphant please, and then Ms. McPherson.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Thank you, Chair.

On the process part, I just want to affirm what you said. What we are doing is debating a motion. We're not setting an agenda. It is very appropriate that notice of motion was given. It didn't even need to be, because we're in a business meeting. I guess it's not on topic, so it did need to be.

We are debating that motion appropriately, but we are not saying that this is bumping other work that is currently on our agenda. This should still go to the Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure. They can look at all of the work that we're doing, set priorities and come back to us with an agenda.

What we're doing today is saying that overwhelmingly the majority of Canadians support women's reproductive rights in this country. We want to bring it to this committee to look at reproductive rights of women around the world, as is appropriate given the mandate of this committee.



I can't imagine we're going to get this work done unless we have a special two days of meetings or something, which is always possible, but I don't see that happening. What I see happening is our passing motions on work that we think is important. That tells Parliament what we think is important and therefore tells Canadians what we think is important. When we get to scheduling it, that will be another discussion that we will have, in which we will look at all of the priorities of the committee.

The last point I would make is that I don't know what was in Dr. Fry's mind on this. I'm not going to pretend that I always know what's in Dr. Fry's mind. What I do know is in Dr. Fry's mind is the well-being of people. I don't know whether it's related only to a leaked memo from the U.S. Supreme Court. Also, when I travel in the world as I did last week, I see threats to women's reproductive rights everywhere—not just in the United States.

I think that this is a big question that goes well beyond the American issue. I hope we can study it at some point. I'll be voting in favour of it, but also recognizing that it will go to an agenda discussion.

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Oliphant.

Mr. Bergeron, before I give you the floor, I'd like to thank you for agreeing to chair the rest of the meeting.

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** You don't have to thank me, Mr. Chair. I am merely doing my duty as vice-chair. That's my job.

I would like Ms. Bendayan to know that I never claimed that we were caught off guard, far from it. That wasn't at all what I was saying. Ms. Bendayan will even be surprised to hear that Ms. Fry was very consistent and persistent on this issue. We discussed it for the first time back in December, when we began considering future business. We discussed it again in January. All that to say, I don't think Ms. Fry's motion has anything to do with the U.S. Supreme Court's rumoured decision. Ms. Fry has consistently maintained her position, asking the committee months ago to examine the issue. In no way was I implying that Ms. Fry's motion took us by surprise. It didn't. I was merely pointing out that this wasn't how the committee usually did things.

If a friendly agreement could be reached, and Ms. Fry were to agree to put her motion on hold, I would be entirely willing to revisit it later and support it. That is my formal pledge, because I believe that what she is proposing is worthy of our consideration.

My concerns have to do with the form of the motion, not the substance. My concerns don't have anything to do with notice of the motion not being given. On the contrary, Ms. Fry put her motion on notice months ago, so we were very much aware that she wanted the committee to examine the matter. However, I would like us to do things in a co-operative fashion, as has always been the committee's habit. That is why I am respectfully asking her to hold off on having the committee consider her motion today. I am willing to discuss it before the end of the session, though, and let it be known that I will probably support the motion.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (1235)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Bergeron.

Could you clarify something, please? Are you moving that debate on the motion be adjourned?

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** No, it wasn't a motion to adjourn debate. I was simply asking Ms. Fry if she would be so kind as to hold off on having the committee consider her motion today.

With that, Mr. Chair, I can take over now, if you like.

**The Chair:** Yes, please. Thank you very much, Mr. Bergeron.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** We will now go to Ms. McPherson.

[*English*]

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** Thank you to our new chair. Well done. I like to be the first person called.

First of all, I want to say that I commend Ms. Fry for bringing this forward. Of course I will support this. I'm going to try not to be emotional here, but I am utterly filled with rage when I hear things like trade trumping reproductive health.

I brought forward this motion last week in SDIR, the international human rights subcommittee, because women's health and access to women's rights is vital. It is vital around the world. We are seeing backsliding, not just in the United States, not just at the federal level, but certainly at state level. We are seeing a lack of access in our own country. We are seeing that reproductive health for women around the world is backsliding in countries around the world.

Frankly, Mr. Chair, the fact that this is deemed not important enough to study is absolutely appalling. It is terrifying—absolutely terrifying—to be a woman of reproductive age in this world right now.

I want to talk about ensuring access around the world. I want to talk about ensuring that the rights of women are available around the world. It should be happening at the international human rights subcommittee. The Conservative party has deemed that not appropriate to do at the international human rights committee. I respect Mr. Chong very much for the work that he does on this committee, but I am appalled by his language.

I will be supporting this motion.

[*Translation*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Thank you, Ms. McPherson.

Go ahead, Mr. Genuis.

[*English*]

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I think there's the question of process and then there's the question of substance. I want to comment initially on the question of process.

We're discussing what the committee's agenda should be going forward. I think, as it has been rightly pointed out, the rules of committee permit somebody to put forward a motion during committee business and this motion has notice. That doesn't change the fact that, as you've pointed out, Mr. Chair, the typical procedure for this committee to consider matters of any level of importance is for those to be considered by the subcommittee on agenda and procedure, which is the vehicle that we have set up. The subcommittee on agenda and procedure reviews the items that come forward to consider how we prioritize those studies, and then to weigh up the different issues that may be on the agenda. At the foreign affairs committee, we deal with so many issues that are of such consequence all the time. I think the best way to adjudicate that prioritization is through the subcommittee.

This particular motion doesn't just seek to introduce a general topic, it also has some very prescriptive direction in terms of the scheduling and study. For instance, it says "no fewer than five meetings". Is five the right number, or is it three or seven? These are the questions that I think are most appropriately dealt with at the subcommittee on agenda and procedure, which is set up precisely for that purpose.

The other point I would make is that I think colleagues should be aware of the fact that we have a responsibility as a committee to prioritize legislation. Again, that's not with reference to people's views on particular topics; it's the fact that as a standing committee of the House of Commons, the House of Commons at times directs us to study legislation, and we have to prioritize that study of legislation.

There is a scheduled vote on Wednesday on the organ harvesting bill, and I was hoping to have some discussion of that a bit later, but I want to flag that unless the vote goes very differently from how I expect it to go, that piece of legislation will be coming to the committee after Wednesday. In addition to the existing studies we have on COVAX, Ukraine and Taiwan, we will need to adjust our agenda to put that on the list.

Also, there is Mr. McKay's bill. Originally, it's Senator Dechêne's bill on supply chains and human rights. After that is adopted by the House at second reading, it will come to this committee as well.

In addition to any discussion of the existing priorities we have as a committee—the studies we're already doing—we will first need to study both of those pieces of legislation. On the subject of agenda again, I suspect and I hope that the study on the organ harvesting bill will be fairly quick. I suspect that we will need a bit more time with the supply chain slavery bill, because it is a bill that, at least in our committee, hasn't been studied before. I think there will be some stakeholders that will want to be heard on it, and some potential amendments that people will want to bring forward.

Very respectfully, as a matter of process, there are other things we could talk about. It's already been mentioned here and I know from others that there are multiple committees that are bringing forward the same discussion. We can talk, as well, about that, but I would prefer to say let's let the subcommittee deal with this. On our side, out of respect for our caucus, I'd like our vice-chair to be able to be part of those discussions as well.

Mr. Chair, what I'll do is move that this matter be referred to the subcommittee and that the subcommittee can report back to the main committee.

• (1240)

[*Translation*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Madam Clerk, I need some guidance regarding Mr. Genuis's motion. Does it take precedence over Ms. Fry's?

It would seem so.

Do the honourable members wish to vote on Mr. Genuis's motion, which seeks to send Ms. Fry's motion to the Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure?

I'm taking down names for the speaking list.

Ms. Fry, go ahead.

**The Clerk of the Committee (Ms. Erica Pereira):** Mr. Chair, the motion cannot be debated. It must be put to a vote immediately.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Sorry, Ms. Fry, but we can't debate the motion. We have to proceed with the vote immediately.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** I'd like a recorded division, please, Mr. Chair.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** I will now let the clerk proceed with the recorded division.

(Motion negatived: nays 6; yeas 4 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** We are now back on Ms. Fry's motion.

Ms. Fry, you have the floor.

[*English*]

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** Thank you very much, Chair.

I really need to speak to this. I don't get furious; it's not something I do very much, but I am emotional about the very idea that Mr. Chong, for whom I have a great deal of respect given his integrity, ethics, etc.—

• (1245)

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

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** I'm shocked that Mr. Chong—

[*Translation*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Just a moment, Ms. Fry. We have a point of order.

Mr. Chong, go ahead.

[*English*]

**Hon. Michael Chong:** Mr. Chair, I have always spoken to the substance of issues at this committee. I have sat through a number of interventions now where my reputation and my intentions are being impugned by members of this committee, and that is out of order.

I don't mind if members speak to the substance of what is at hand and whether they agree or disagree with my position on a particular issue. However, I don't particularly feel that it is in order for members to impugn my motives or interpret my position on various issues.

Mr. Chair, I ask, through you, that members stick to the substance of the issues instead of attacking me on this committee.

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Thank you, Mr. Chong.

[English]

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** Mr. Chair, I would like—

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Just a moment, Ms. Fry. We have another point of order.

[English]

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** Every time I try to speak, I am being railroaded out of speaking and that's annoying me.

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Just a moment, Ms. Fry.

Who had the point of order, Madam Clerk?

**The Clerk:** It was Ms. McPherson.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Ms. McPherson, you may speak to your point of order.

[English]

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** Mr. Chair, I just want to point out that it is entirely appropriate to respond to somebody's intervention in committee.

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** I fully understand your concerns, Mr. Chong, but I'm going to let Ms. Fry finish explaining her rationale, if you don't mind. You're next on the list, so you'll get the opportunity to respond to her comments, if you so choose.

Go ahead, Ms. Fry.

[English]

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** I did not insult Mr. Chong. I said I have the greatest respect for him.

What I think he just argued is that people should not impugn his motives or, in fact, assume or interpret his intention. Well, that is precisely what he did on this motion to my intention. Mr. Chong assumed that this was about abortion. Well, I want to tell Mr. Chong that I brought this forward in December. It was shoved under a table or a rug somewhere. Nobody ever talked about it again.

I am a physician. I have to tell you, I chair the Canadian Association of Parliamentarians for Population Development. I also work

on this at the G7 and G20 levels. This is one of the most important issues. This is an SDG issue, Mr. Chair.

I want to say that this has nothing to do with abortion, but it has. If you are going to talk about the range of sexual and reproductive health, it starts with contraception. It starts with education to young people about their sexuality and taking chances, etc., without knowledge of contraception and sexually transmitted diseases. It moves into prenatal care, pregnancy and delivery, postpartum care and neonatal care.

This didn't start; this has been going on and escalating. Since COVID started, this has moved forward exponentially around the world. I am reading from the UNFPA statistics that started in 2019 about the rise in deaths from postpartum hemorrhage, which is the biggest and the largest cause of death in Africa today in young women between the ages of 15 and 19. This is a preventable problem we're talking about here. Women make up 51% of this world, 51% of this global population. If we don't care about their dying in childbirth, we don't care about their dying because of postpartum hemorrhage, we don't care about their having access to a safe delivery if they want to....

Abortion is one of the issues; it is not the only issue. I think the idea that we should jump to conclusions over something that is clear....

The UNFPA and the World Health Organization deem this to be a crisis right now. When a woman dies from postpartum hemorrhage, the majority of her children under the age of five do not survive. We're talking about a real problem with people's lives, with people's ability to do something that we think is simple: to have or not have a child, to choose if we get pregnant or not and to have a safe delivery. This is not happening around the world.

We hear about critical infrastructure needs for clinical care around the world. We hear about it with COVID. We hear about it with TB. We hear about it with malaria. We hear about it with HIV/AIDS. We hear about it in everything. Now that we have rape being used as a tactic of war in Ukraine and around the world, and we hear of about 85 million people being displaced, women and children are at great risk of sexual assault and sexual violence. It's getting worse. I cannot believe that we would think....

As I said, I brought this up before. I waited patiently. It was not accepted. It was pushed under the table. I am bringing it up again because this is a crisis. This is a critical issue for women, children and infants around the world. This is about sexually transmitted diseases, one of which we just listened about from the Global Fund, which is called HIV. We hear that girls from 15 to 24 are getting HIV. They may not be dying of AIDS, but they're getting HIV, which can ruin their ability to have children later on in their lives. This is something that, as a physician, I feel really strongly about.

Every single year we take this issue of sexual and reproductive health to the G7 and the G20. International organizations are dealing with this. This is an urgent issue, and I am told that it should be put aside. For what? Don't women matter? Don't 51% of the people in this world and their children matter? Do we not care? Am I hearing this from this committee?

We can wrap ourselves around process. You know, Mr. Bergeron brought up an important point, and I heard him. I think he may have had a point, but that's not the point. The substance of this issue is so urgent that the World Health Organization calls it a crisis. I guess we don't even know what a crisis is anymore because we face so many of them.

• (1250)

The lives of women and children around this world are in jeopardy. I'm bringing up an issue to deal with it. In December it was kicked somewhere out of the room. I will not stand down on this issue because it is so important to the lives of people everywhere. Even the bare access to contraception is denied because of costs and for the fact that there are many reasons why young people don't get an opportunity to look at this.

Sexually transmitted diseases like HIV, chlamydia, gonorrhoea and syphilis are all still abounding in the world. We thought we had gotten rid of them about 25 years ago. They're still there. This is something we need to deal with.

I don't know if any of you know that when a woman has more than five children, her uterus becomes like a piece of cardboard. The uterus is a muscle. It clamps together to stop bleeding after a baby is born. When a woman is having her tenth child because she has no choice and her uterus is like a piece of cardboard and cannot close down to stop the bleeding she dies. She dies. There's no infrastructure to help her in some of these countries.

I'm sorry. I am very emotional about this. I delivered 800 babies in my lifetime. I don't want this to be something that we think is not good enough for us but is good enough for people in Africa, Latin America and in many countries where they have no access to this kind of care. I will not stand down.

I am sorry, Chair. I don't usually get emotional. It's not my way of doing things. I have to be calm when I'm a physician. I can't get emotional. I am being emotional at the callousness of what was said about this motion. It's the callousness, the lack of humanity, the lack of compassion and the lack of caring because what are women? Are we to be thrown away?

I think that time went by when we were chattel and possessions. We have rights. We all sit on this committee and talk about gender equality and about women's rights are human rights. When we talk about their human rights I am getting this kind of attitude from colleagues of mine. For shame.

Thank you, Chair.

[*Translation*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Thank you, Ms. Fry.

Go ahead, Mr. Chong.

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

• (1255)

[*English*]

First off, I did not read into the motion "abortion". It's explicitly mentioned in the motion four times.

Look, I appreciate that Madam Fry introduced this motion. Part of the motion I'm concerned about is the part that says "given recent reports of international backsliding related to women's sexual and reproductive health and rights". Taken in the context of overall parliamentary business, it's a clear reference to the leaked draft by the Supreme Court of the United States and I think, Mr. Chair, that's the problem in the motion. I think we do not want Canada-U.S. relations to be consumed by the issue of abortion.

I agree with Dr. Fry about the issue of abortion in many other countries around the world. I agree with her on reports of gender-based violence against women in Ukraine and elsewhere. I agree with her on all of those issues. I think it's important that women have access to reproductive practices. Mr. Chair, I want to emphasize that I fully support women's reproductive and health rights. I do not support any change to Canada's existing legislative framework, both statutory and non-statutory. I have heard loud and clear over many years that Canadians do not want the issue of abortion to be reopened. They do not want this debate to be reopened in this country.

The framing of this motion is the issue. It is in the context of the recent leaked draft by the Supreme Court of the United States.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** No, it isn't.

**Hon. Michael Chong:** Mr. Chair, that's how I read the motion.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** And you're wrong.

**Hon. Michael Chong:** That's what it's clearly a reference to. There's no mistaking the fact that the Prime Minister and other ministers of the Crown used the reports of that leaked draft to introduce initiatives and discussion here in this country about domestic abortion policy. That's clearly what happened in the executive branch of government. That was followed up by discussions that took place in other aspects in Parliament. That's how I read this motion. It's done in reference to the recent leaked draft out of the Supreme Court of the United States. I don't believe that should be the focus of Canada-U.S. relations.

I support Dr. Fry's view that the broader issue of access to reproductive practices is an issue for Parliament. It's an issue for the committee, but I don't think it should be in respect of the United States. That is the whole issue here.

If the committee were to agree to undertake a study of women's access to reproductive measures in the developing world, in the developed world, where it's not available for women and girls then I think that is a matter the committee could take up. But if it's being done in the context of "recent reports of international backsliding", which I take to be a reference to the leaked draft by the Supreme Court of the United States—a decision, by the way, that has yet to be released by the court—I don't support a study like that. I don't think that should be the focus of the committee. If the committee decides to study women's reproductive rights in places around the world as a matter of general import, and it's not a study focused on what's going on domestically in the United States, what's going on at the Supreme Court of the United States or what's going on with the potential decision by the Supreme Court of the United States, then that's a whole other matter.

However, that isn't the context of this motion, and not the context in which this motion was introduced, in light of the Prime Minister's comments, in light of the comments of other ministers of the Crown, in light of what is going on in other parliamentary committees and what is in the black-letter text of the motion.

It's a very different motion from what Dr. Fry introduced last December. That is my first concern, among others. That is my first concern.

I do not believe that we should be meddling in a potential decision of the highest judicial body of the United States. While it's not entirely captured by the *sub judice* convention, it's not appropriate for us to be focused on that potential decision. We should respect the court's independence and let that court make up its mind.

Further, we should not be interfering in a domestic matter that has no impact on access to abortion services here in Canada. If we want to undertake—

• (1300)

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** I have a point of order, Chair.

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Go ahead, Ms. Fry.

[English]

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** Mr. Chair, nowhere in my motion...

This point is out of order.

This motion says nothing about the United States. It speaks to "the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs undertake a comprehensive study on the global access to a full range"—

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

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** —of health services".

Mr. Chong is filibustering, Chair. He is not speaking to my motion. Nowhere does my motion speak to the Supreme Court or to the United States.

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** I think that's a point of debate, and you'll get the chance to have your say. You're next on the list, after Mr. Genuis.

Do you still wish to raise a point of order, Mr. Genuis?

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** No. Mr. Chong can continue. Thank you.

[English]

**Hon. Michael Chong:** Mr. Chair, I'm not filibustering. I was impugned at this committee on a number of occasions, so I am just responding to make clear what my position is.

My position is that I fully support women's reproductive and health rights, but I also know that my constituents and Canadians generally do not want the debate on abortion reopened in this country.

My second broad point is that I do not believe that this committee should be studying the issue of a potential leaked draft out of the Supreme Court of the United States. I think there are matters of much greater importance in bilateral relations between Canada and the United States than that issue.

The third broad point is that, broadly speaking, I think it is well within the remit of the committee to study women's reproductive and health rights around the world, particularly in war zones and in conflict zones and particularly in developing countries where those services may not be available.

Those were the three broad clear points I was trying to make, Mr. Chair.

First, I fully support women's reproductive and health rights and, in that, I support the current legislative framework here in Canada. I support both the common law decisions that have been promulgated over many decades and I support the current legislative framework. I know first-hand from constituents and Canadians that they do not want this debate reopened.

Secondly, I do not believe it is within the responsibility of this committee to be looking at U.S. domestic abortion policy or to be studying this issue in the context of the leaked Supreme Court decision.

Lastly, I think it is within the remit of the committee to take a broader look at women's rights globally, but I think that should be done as a broader discussion about where the committee will be going in the future.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Thank you, Mr. Chong.

I want to let everyone know that we have now gone over our meeting time.

Mr. Genuis, you have the floor, followed by Ms. Fry.

[English]

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, because Dr. Fry wanted to respond, maybe I'll strike for now. If you could put me on the list at the bottom, I'll have some things to say, but I'm happy for her to go first.

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Thank you, Mr. Genuis.

Ms. Fry, go ahead.

[English]

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** I have nothing further to say. I made my points.

Thank you, Chair.

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Does anyone else wish to comment on the motion?

[English]

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'll go, then. I did want to comment on this. I thought Dr. Fry had responses.

I think we have to be honest about what's happening here. Dr. Fry spoke very passionately and said many things that I agree with, but she also said this is not about abortion. Maybe it would be helpful to reread the motion we're debating so that those listening can decide if this is about abortion or not. The motion says:

That, pursuant to Standing Order 108(2), given recent reports of international backsliding related to women's sexual and reproductive health and rights, the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs undertake a comprehensive study on the global access to the full range of health services, including family planning and modern contraception; comprehensive sexuality education; safe and legal abortion and post-abortion care; laws restricting or prohibiting women's rights to abortion, the medical and socioeconomic importance of maintaining the right to access safe abortion; and prevention and treatment of HIV/AIDS and sexually transmitted infections and what actions Canada can undertake to support women's sexual and reproductive health and rights globally; that the committee hold no fewer than (5) five meetings; and that the committee report its findings to the House.

That is the motion put forward today, for which notice was given after a Supreme Court leak in the United States, and it mentions abortion four times. For context, as members know, many motions are being put forward at various committees by members of the Liberal caucus with respect to the issue of abortion.

I recently read the book written by the former justice minister and attorney general, Jody Wilson-Raybould, who says in the 10th chapter, "I remember decisions being made in an effort to trigger a debate over abortion, which no one had any desire to reopen, for no other reason but to try to make other parties squirm or fuel fundraising efforts." Again, those are not my words. Those are the words of Jody Wilson-Raybould, the former minister of justice and attorney general, who was speaking to the motivations of her own party. I, of course, am not privy to those internal discussions, but that is a direct quotation from her book.

I think it is very legitimate for this committee to have discussions about process, but the frame we're being given by Dr. Fry is that to raise questions about this in the midst of the broad range of issues that are going on, and ask what order we should study them in and say these things should be considered by the subcommittee, is somehow dehumanizing. We're simply raising the issue that there's a process for these things to be discussed at the subcommittee, in a context where, as my colleague said, we repeatedly see efforts by members of the Liberal caucus to try to reopen the abortion debate for reasons that I suppose they know.

I think it's important to underline that I agree with many of the comments Dr. Fry made with respect to the importance of looking at access to certain kinds of services. On the issue of the health of women during pregnancy and health afterwards, and the health of women and children, this committee should be committed to the principle of defending the immutable dignity of the human person, regardless of gender and at all ages and all stages. I think this is consistent with a belief in human rights. It is a commitment to the dignity of the human person and to upholding that dignity in whatever country people live in and whatever other aspects of a person's circumstances are present.

As I said previously, we have the issue of other legislation that this committee is supposed to be looking at. We have a subcommittee that's supposed to be dealing with these kinds of issues. We also had housekeeping issues that the chair indicated we have to deal with as a committee. Instead, here we are with a motion that we're told is not about abortion but that says abortion four times. It just reflects the fact that the government wants to move the discussion to these particular issues.

● (1305)

I think we could take a step back from this. We could frame a study that looks at some of the issues that Dr. Fry raised around access to health and do so in a way that reflects the choices of people and nations in the developing world.

I don't know if this is a fruitless endeavour, Mr. Chair, but I want to move that we table consideration of this until our existing studies are complete.

● (1310)

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Thank you, Mr. Genuis.

Madam Clerk, I assume this situation is the same as the one earlier.

**The Clerk:** Not exactly, Mr. Chair. Once the committee has finished its consideration, the motion becomes debatable.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Does it take precedence over the one currently before the committee?

**The Clerk:** Yes.

You would have to ask Mr. Genuis whether his intention was to move another motion for debate.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Thank you, Madam Clerk.

Mr. Genuis, would you be so kind as to clarify what your intentions were regarding debate on your motion?

[English]

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, I think we should adjourn debate on the motion until we're finished the work that we've already programmed out to do.

Whether that's a debatable motion or not, I suppose, depends on the rules. My intention was to say, precisely, that we should finish the work we're doing.

[*Translation*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** What you just said isn't exactly what you said earlier.

You are moving a motion to adjourn. Did you want to move such a motion, or did you prefer to continue debating the motion you moved earlier?

[*English*]

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, the motion I want to put forward is to table consideration of this until after our existing studies are complete. Does that entail a condition or not? Okay.

[*Translation*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** All right. We will begin debate on Mr. Genuis's motion.

Does anyone wish to comment?

I have Ms. Bendayan on my list.

Ms. Bendayan, did you want to comment on Mr. Genuis's motion?

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Mr. Chair, in the few minutes we had left, I would have liked us to vote on Ms. Fry's motion. That's what I was going to propose, but I see that certain individuals would rather play political games.

The issue before us today is important for both Quebeckers and Canadians. I really wanted the committee to vote on the matter.

We've already talked about the motion to table the discussion. We could refer the motion to the subcommittee to block off time once our current studies are finished.

Since committee members see this as worthwhile, I don't understand why we can't vote on the motion before us and leave it to the subcommittee to schedule the dates for the fall. That's precisely what Mr. Genuis asked for.

The opposition members are trying to prevent us from voting on the motion. That is sorely disappointing.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Genuis has his hand up, Mr. Chair.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Thank you, Madam Clerk.

Mr. Genuis, go ahead.

[*English*]

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

With respect to Ms. Bendayan's comments, I think it's legitimate for the subcommittee to discuss this issue. If this motion is adopted by the committee, then it is being highly prescriptive about certain aspects of the approach that the subcommittee will take.

I suggest that the subcommittee consider this, along with the very interesting motion by Ms. Bendayan about the Wagner Group.

Frankly, I didn't even know we were at the stage of proposing new ideas. There are obviously lots of other possibilities.

We have an obligation as a standing committee of the House of Commons to prioritize legislation, period. I know we don't have legislation in front of us—

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** On a point of order, that's the second time, theoretically, it has been—

[*Translation*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Mr. Oliphant, you have the floor.

[*English*]

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** —suggested that we have a piece of legislation. We have to respect the members of the House of Commons who will need to vote on that piece of legislation. It is not in order to bring it up at this meeting. I let it go the last time.

We'll deal with any piece of legislation when it comes to this committee at the will of the House of Commons and we will do our work on that, not what has been done at the other place. That is its own work. We will do our work as a committee if and when we get a piece of legislation that could pass or may not.

• (1315)

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** On the same point of order, very briefly, we're talking about the forward—

[*Translation*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Pardon me, Mr. Genuis, but Ms. Pereira wants to say something.

Ms. Pereira, did you want to jump in?

**The Clerk:** I just wanted to tell you that Mr. Chong wished to speak.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Very good. Thank you.

Go ahead, Mr. Genuis.

[*English*]

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, I wanted to comment on the point of order that we're having a discussion about the forward agenda of the committee. It's fairly reasonable to talk about the fact that it seems likely, to me, based on the positions of the parties, that we are going to have two items of legislation before this committee.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** It could change. It might change.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I don't dispute that it might change. Lots of things might change. The government could call an election. It's happened before. There are things that could happen that we don't expect to see happen.

If Mr. Oliphant wishes to vote against my bill to criminalize forced organ harvesting and trafficking, that's his prerogative, I suppose.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** On a point of order, it is just as important for us to talk about things like organ harvesting in other countries as it is to talk about reproductive rights in the United States. There's no "get out of jail free" card for any country in this committee.

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Mr. Oliphant, that's a point of debate.

Mr. Genuis, are you finished with your point of order, or did you want to come back to your—

[English]

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Can I respond to Mr. Oliphant's point? If there were piece of legislation dealing with the matters of this motion, I would be the first to say we should prioritize it. We can't ignore questions of the process obligations of the committee. If we're going to talk about the agenda of the committee going forward....

Mr. Chair, that's enough on the point of order. I think I had the floor, in any event, didn't I?

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Please go ahead.

[English]

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** If there's consensus, we can proceed in whatever manner we like by unanimous consent.

My suggestion would be that we adjourn the debate, send this to the subcommittee to consider, among other ideas, and we get a report back from the subcommittee that says, recognizing—

[Translation]

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Mr. Chair, I have a point of order. We already voted on referring the motion to the subcommittee. We can't vote on the same motion twice.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Ms. Bendayan, Mr. Genuis's motion was found to be in order.

That said, once again, there does seem to be some confusion since he referred to a motion to adjourn again.

Is the committee continuing to debate the motion, or has Mr. Genuis put forward a motion to adjourn?

[English]

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'm sorry. Mr. Chair, we are debating the adjournment motion. Is that correct?

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** What you put forward is not an adjournment motion strictly speaking. You seem to be confusing it with a motion to adjourn debate. Madam Clerk, could you provide some clarification, please?

[English]

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'm sorry. Are you asking me or the clerk to clarify? My understanding is that we are debating an adjournment motion with a condition that I have put forward. Is that correct?

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Is that correct, Madam Clerk?

**The Clerk:** Yes, that's correct, Mr. Chair.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** The debate carries on, then.

Go ahead, Mr. Genuis.

[English]

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I think I've made my points with respect to the adjournment. I suggest we accept that adjournment. That will allow us to have the subcommittee do its work and then make a reasonable plan going forward.

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Before I move on to the next speaker, I'd like the clerk to clarify something.

My understanding is that an adjournment motion can't be debated and has to be put to a vote right away.

Was it an adjournment motion, yes or no?

• (1320)

**The Clerk:** When an adjournment motion is accompanied by a condition, it becomes debatable. The debate took place, and I don't see any hands up in the room. You can proceed to the vote if there are no further comments.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Very well.

I thought Mr. Chong was on the speaking list. If not, we can vote on Mr. Genuis's motion.

Over to you, Madam Clerk.

**The Clerk:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Chong has let me know that he doesn't wish to speak right now. He'd like to speak after the committee votes on the motion. With your permission, I'll proceed with the vote.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Please go ahead, Madam Clerk.

[English]

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Could I clarify?

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Do you have a point of order, Mr. Oliphant?



[English]

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** I'm just trying to understand this because with regarding to adjourning the debate, there are really two motions, I think, as opposed to a conditional motion. There's a motion to adjourn debate and there's a motion to refer this to the agenda subcommittee. My problem with that is that I would like the committee to inform the subcommittee what its opinion is of this motion, as opposed to having this debate happen again at that agenda subcommittee. I would vote against this because we would then be referring something to a subcommittee that would simply go through this debate again. I think we should have the opportunity to express our opinion, as a committee, to inform the work of the agenda subcommittee.

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Mr. Oliphant, I'm going to stop you there. Once we've dealt with Mr. Genuis's motion, we will resume debate on Ms. Fry's motion.

We will proceed with the vote now, Madam Clerk.

**The Clerk:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[English]

The vote is on the motion of Mr. Genuis that the debate be now adjourned until such time as the committee has completed its other work.

(Motion negatived: nays 6; yeas 4)

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Mr. Chong, I believe you wanted to comment on Ms. Fry's motion. The floor is yours.

[English]

**Hon. Michael Chong:** Mr. Chair, I'm going to suggest a constructive way out of this impasse.

The way I read the motion is that it's a clear reference to the leaked draft from the Supreme Court of the United States. I do not believe that this committee should be studying access to abortion in the United States. I don't think that's constructive for the committee to be doing. I don't think it is the top of mind concern in bilateral relations between Canada and the United States.

But I do believe studying reproductive rights for women globally is within the remit of the committee and is something the committee could take a look at. In order to square that circle, what I'm going to suggest is that we strike part of the motion.

I'll move an amendment that doesn't change the substance of the motion but does change its context. I move that we strike the following words, "given recent reports of international backsliding related to women's sexual and reproductive health and rights".

Mr. Chair, I move that amendment to the motion so that it's clear it's not in reference to recent events that have taken place in the United States. It still preserves the rest of the motion for the subcommittee to consider. I hope that my suggestion here and my intervention that we not study access to abortion rights in the United

States will be taken to consideration when the subcommittee meets to talk about planning our future business.

I think it's well within our rights to study access to reproductive rights globally, but I do not believe we should be studying access to abortion in the United States. I think the committee should focus on countries around the world, but not the current debate that's raging in the United States because of the recently leaked draft decision from the Supreme Court. I don't think it's conducive to Canada-U.S. relations. I don't think it's something that we should be seized with as a committee.

I move that amendment in the hope that we can get it adopted and can then adopt this motion so that the subcommittee can put this into its consideration for future committee business. I hope that's constructive. That will allow us to move forward and deal with the motion at hand.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (1325)

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Mr. Chair, could I ask for a recess of two minutes?

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

We're at 1:25 p.m. We have debate going on in the House.

How long will this go on for?

If members want a recess to have conversations about this motion, how about we adjourn as we are scheduled to adjourn and then bring this motion back at the next meeting?

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Since we don't seem to have consent to suspend the meeting—

[English]

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** I don't need a recess. Thank you. Fine.

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** —we will now debate Mr. Chong's amendment.

Ms. Fry had her hand up.

Ms. Fry, do you wish to comment on Mr. Chong's amendment?

[English]

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** No, thank you.

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Ms. McPherson, the floor is yours.

[English]

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** Mr. Chair, I will not be supporting this amendment because you don't get to decide which women have access to reproductive health. We should be able to look at what's happening in the U.S. They are part of foreign affairs. They are part of our purview as this committee, and excluding that is insulting.

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Does anyone else wish to comment on Mr. Chong's amendment?

If not, we will proceed with the vote, Madam Clerk.

We are voting on Mr. Chong's amendment.

(Amendment negatived: nays 6; yeas 4 [See Minutes of Proceedings])

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** We are now back on Ms. Fry's motion.

Are there any comments?

Go ahead, Mr. Genuis.

[English]

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

This is a bit frustrating, clearly, because members of our party have done our best to try to work and engage in good faith here. The government has—

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'm getting heckled, Mr. Chair, which is something I admittedly have done at certain points in the past, as members are pointing out, so that's fair enough. I've been chastised when I've done it, though.

Mr. Chair, the objective we're trying to pursue here is to have a good-faith approach to the work of this committee by being able to establish what the work we're going to undertake is, and to do so in a way that respects all parties and gives due process of time. Instead we have Liberals putting forward multiple motions on different topics, saying that we're going to try to program by motion the work of the committee.

We're over time. I don't know what the timeline here is, Mr. Chair. I would appreciate it if we had an opportunity to have the subcommittee on agenda and procedure review this and have our vice-chair be a part of that discussion.

In the absence of that, let me try again with an amendment that will maybe help us be less prescriptive in our engagement with the subcommittee. It is to remove the words "that the committee hold no fewer than (5) five meetings".

Removing those words would not be to prescribe a specific number of meetings. We might go on to hold five meetings. We might go on to not hold five meetings. We might go on to do something else entirely. It would to remove that prescriptive requirement around the number of meetings, so as to give the greatest possible flexibility to the subcommittee in its consideration of the matter. I would move that amendment.

• (1330)

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Thank you, Mr. Genuis.

Is the amendment in order, Madam Clerk?

**The Clerk:** Yes

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** We will now debate Mr. Genuis's amendment.

Do we have any comments on the amendment?

[English]

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, I wasn't finished speaking. There may be others who wish to comment on it, but I have....

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Please continue, Mr. Genuis. No one has their hand up as of yet.

[English]

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

On the agenda of the committee right now, we currently have three studies ongoing. We have a study with respect to the situation in Ukraine. We have not thus far made a decision around completing a report on that study. On that study, in the context of the work of this committee, we probably should do a detailed report on the situation in Ukraine.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Mr. Oliphant has a point of order.

[English]

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** It's with respect to relevance. It is in the standing order that it needs to be relevant. There is no statement in this motion about when this study would take place. It is to simply affirm the fact that we will do a study.

Mr. Genuis is arguing about work that we have to do or not do. That will go into a study, but it is not relevant to this particular motion. There's nothing in this about when the study will happen.

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Thank you, Mr. Oliphant.

[English]

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** I have a point of order as well.

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** When considering the standing order on relevance, I note that the chair's interpretation has traditionally been as wide as possible, so I will allow the debate to carry on.

That said, I see that Ms. McPherson would like to comment on the point of order.

The floor is yours, Ms. McPherson.

[English]

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** I would just like to point out that I have heard the same things repeated three times from this member.

I'd like to call a vote.

[*Translation*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Unfortunately, Ms. McPherson, the debate must continue.

You can finish what you were saying, Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

With all due respect to the committee members, we have tried to work together. We have been reasonable and proposed accommodations so that the committee could find a path to move forward with its work.

[*English*]

We had plans today to look over a draft statement with respect to the situation in Ukraine. Regarding the question of whether this is impacting our agenda in other respects, it's clear that it's already impacting our agenda. The fact that Liberals wanted to talk about abortion today, instead of being able to move forward with the study on Ukraine, is already informing the conversation that we were intending to have.

For Mr. Oliphant to say, well okay, this could happen at any time and that we have to set a minimum of five meetings to do it clearly can't help but impact the structure of this committee's agenda.

The committee is currently is studying the situation in Ukraine and my understanding was that today, we were supposed to have a discussion about that statement on Ukraine. I think it's a missed opportunity. There are some members in other parties who have said very emphatically that we need to be talking about the fact that there's a land war in Europe right now and that it has huge consequences for our strategic situation and our interests, as well as for human life and well-being. Instead, Liberals wanted to bounce that off the agenda, apparently, and have a discussion about reopening the abortion debate.

There was the Ukraine study. There's the COVAX study. We've given drafting instructions with respect to the report. We have a report coming back on the very important issue of vaccine equity, and that is something that I think the committee needs to look at and move forward on.

Recognizing the importance of all the topics we're working on, it's important that we work toward completing the things we start as a committee, and that we don't simply throw out a bunch of ideas and leave them half incomplete while we're throwing out a whole bunch of other ideas. The obligation of a standing committee is to be intentional about working through the study it's done when it has heard from witnesses, and that it should take what it has heard from those witnesses and turn those things into reports.

Frankly, I think there's a lot more we could be hearing on the issue of Ukraine, given that there are constant, ongoing developments. There's the situation in Taiwan—

I'm sorry. Ms. Bendayan, did you have a point of order or something?

• (1335)

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Mr. Chair, the member has asked whether I have a point of order.

How is our study on Ukraine relevant to the altogether different motion we are in the process of debating?

I want to point out that the member is actually jeopardizing the importance of our study on Ukraine, because he is choosing to speak for no real reason other than to prevent the committee from voting on the motion before it.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Thank you, Ms. Bendayan.

I told the committee my view on relevance a moment ago.

Mr. Genuis, you have the floor to wrap up your comments.

Mr. Chong and Ms. Fry are next on the speaking list.

[*English*]

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

With respect, it seems to be the position of the government, though, that if we only sort of resolutely rubber-stamp the motions they put forward, we'll be able to get back to other things. That seems to be an unreasonable request for members of the government to make of the committee.

Generally, if members want their ideas adopted quickly, there's an opportunity for discussion in advance of the meeting and broader programming around the committee's agenda. There is limited time we have.

I mentioned the issues of legislation. We have the COVAX study, we have the Ukraine study and the Taiwan study, which I think members have all said are important. Everything's important, but the fact that the Liberals are in multiple committees trying to displace all of the other items of business before this parliament—it seems—to push for a conversation about abortion is just very telling about their political approach to this. That's their choice, but it's our conviction that we could try to work together to try to identify some things that we can study in the framework that we normally do, which is through the subcommittee. That's why I proposed the framework that I have.

I'll leave it there for now.

[*Translation*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Thank you, Mr. Genuis.

I'm being told that we have to suspend the meeting for a half-hour for a staff change. We will suspend until further notice, as determined by the discussions currently happening among the whips. I have Mr. Chong and Ms. Fry on the speaking list. We will resume the meeting as soon as possible.

The meeting is suspended.

• (1340) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (1545)

[English]

**The Chair:** Colleagues, good afternoon. We are resuming our session.

Just to reorient ourselves, before we suspended we were discussing the amendment by Mr. Genuis to delete a phrase in the motion, namely “that the committee hold no fewer than (5) five meetings”. Is that the understanding of members?

I don't see any objections.

With that, we have a speakers list right now that includes Mr. Chong and then Mr. Genuis. If colleagues are interested in being added to the speakers list, please raise your hand either virtually or in person, and we will give you the floor—

**Hon. Michael Chong:** Mr. Chair, I wanted to speak to the main motion after the amendment.

**The Chair:** After the amendment? Okay. You're going to go into standby mode for that. I'll going to mark that down. Thank you.

Mr. Genuis and Ms. Lantsman as well: On the amendment or on the main motion?

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I want to speak to the main motion.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** On a point of order, Mr. Chair, I'm sorry to interrupt the proceedings. I've realized you asked a question just a moment ago and I just wanted to clarify.

We did in fact vote on the proposed amendment, I believe, and we have voted that down. We are now back on the main motion.

**The Chair:** I'm advised that the committee had not voted on the amendment. If that's incorrect, let's please clarify that.

I was not there for the last portion of the meeting. The advice I got is that the committee had in fact not yet voted on the amendment by Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I don't think we had—

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Can the clerk clarify—

**The Chair:** This is an important question, so let's clarify.

We will suspend for a moment just to make sure that we're getting in the right starting blocks before we start the discussion.

• (1545) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (1545)

**The Chair:** Colleagues, thank you.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Thank you so much for clarifying.

**The Chair:** Again, Mr. Chong, we'll stand by for a resumption of discussion on the main motion.

We have Mr. Genuis on the amendment and Ms. Lantsman on the amendment.

Does anybody else wish to intervene at this point? If not, just keep raising your hands when you do wish to intervene, and I'll keep an eye on the virtual list as well.

We'll go over to you, Mr. Genuis, please.

• (1550)

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, and welcome back.

I've been thinking a lot about just the nature of the committee and the work we have to do in the context of some of the things going on around the world. I would like to propose a very specific adjournment motion right now.

That motion is: That the debate be adjourned on this motion until the committee has completed its work on Ukraine.

If that's understood, I will proceed to speak on that adjournment motion.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Genuis.

Just to clarify, that's a non-dilatory motion because it has a condition attached to it.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** That's correct.

**The Chair:** Please go ahead.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I know there have been different levels of passion by different members, and people asserting that there is no politics, allegedly, behind the sudden proposal that we prioritize, in the work of this committee, the question of abortion. However, I think the public will be well-advised to note what is going on around the precinct more broadly, and members of this committee probably know—they may not, but certainly the people behind the table probably know well—the fact that many motions are being moved on the subject of abortion at many different committees across the precinct.

It seems to have been the conclusion of the strategic minds of our friends across the way that having as much discussion about abortion at as many parliamentary committees as possible is a good idea. To pretend that that is not framed with politics in mind is a bit rich.

It's not for me to say what other committees should study. Of course, other committees also have competing considerations. Perhaps there is a case to say that there is a particular need at a committee. I can only speak to the issue in front of us, which is the question of the agenda of the foreign affairs committee.

My goal with this specific adjournment motion is to put into focus the question of whether we want this committee to prioritize a discussion of the issue of abortion, or whether we want this committee to prioritize a discussion of the Russian invasion of Ukraine. That is the choice. In a context where we have one foreign affairs committee, as well as many other committees in this place, there is the status of women committee, the justice committee, the public safety committee.... There is the international human rights subcommittee, and, in fact, one member already spoke about the fact that she had brought a motion to that other committee. In the past, when we have had issues specifically around human rights, the argument has been made by some members that that is what we have the subcommittee for, that is the goal of the subcommittee.

I think about the breadth of issues that we are dealing with in the world. There is, of course, the question of Taiwan; there is, of course, the question of vaccine equity. However, there is, in particular, the invasion of Ukraine that, I think it is fair to say, has really seized the attention and concern of Canadians from all walks of life. I know I'm hearing it significantly within my constituency. My riding is home to a large Ukrainian diaspora. People have, up to now, been following the very serious, the very non-partisan, and the very engaging work that had been done by this committee up till then.

On Ukraine, there have been some differences in terms of the recommended approach of the parties, that is, there have been times when we've been critical of the government, and there have been things back and forth, but, generally, our tone has been in the context of the foreign invasion to try to keep the discussion focused on the issues, and substantive. That is befitting the dignity and seriousness that we would expect from the Canadian foreign affairs committee

I'll say, as we contemplate this choice about what we prioritize, and whether we prioritize the Russian invasion of Ukraine as being a central issue of importance, that we shouldn't sell ourselves short as a foreign affairs committee either. Sometimes there is the tendency for members of Parliament to fail to fully appreciate just how important our role is.

• (1555)

We have the potential, as the Canadian foreign affairs committee, to drive discussion at this critical time in global affairs, when, I believe for the first time since the Second World War, we have one sovereign state invading another in Europe, and there are implications of that for global security and for our own security. This has been re-emphasized regularly by government ministers, and of course by members of this committee and members of all parties.

The context of the study on Ukraine is one in which we said we'd begin looking at the issue of Ukraine, but in an open-ended way, without prescribing a certain number of meetings. We said we'd be open to scheduling additional meetings as new information comes online. I believe it was Ms. Bhandari who had initially proposed that. This was, I think, a very good idea. I shouldn't say it was prior to the invasion, because, of course, the invasion really started in 2014. It was prior to the escalation of the invasion that began in February of this year. We started holding hearings on this. We began hearing very compelling testimony from various officials who

highlighted what we needed to do and the challenges in front of us. They spoke about Minister Joly's recent travel to Europe prior to the invasion, about issues around Operation Unifier—the commitment in January for the renewal of Operation Unifier—and significant investments that were being considered around humanitarian assistance.

I recall that prior to the invasion, our focus really had been on making the case for tougher sanctions and that targeted sanctions would play a critically important deterrent role. Also, we were making the case for energy security even then. Of course, the discussion around energy security has increased more. Again, I think this committee should take that up as part of its consideration around the issue of Ukraine.

The proposals around sanctions, lethal weapons support, ongoing training and other forms of assistance to Ukraine needed to be focused on this question of deterrence. The best way to defeat an invader is to deter them in the first place, obviously. It's to establish the conditions where the Putin regime would have made the calculation that it was better off not interfering. We need to take very serious stock of the fact that this was a failure of deterrence.

If you look at the times, historically, when we've been drawn into major wars, generally it has often been tied into some kind of failure of deterrence, when aggressors perceive that they will not be resisted in their gradual efforts to occupy more and more territory. Why did we allow the conditions to be established such that there was this failure of deterrence in the context of the invasion of Ukraine?

I think we have to look right back to 2015. Maybe we should have been studying the issue of Ukraine in this committee even then. I was not a permanent member of this committee as of 2015-16. I think there were some of the same members. I was subbing quite a bit at the time. We raised the issue around cutting off access to RADARSAT image sharing. Following the 2014 invasion, the government of Stephen Harper had put in place a system of image and information sharing coming out of RADARSAT. This provided important strategic resources to Ukraine, but it also provided an important expression of solidarity and of our commitment to doing all we could to support and enable Ukrainians.

• (1600)

I travelled to Ukraine in 2016. I saw the sense of hope that came out of the fact that they were getting weapons and acquiring resources. They felt that their army was much better prepared than it was two years before, and I know that that preparation, readiness and fighting continued and, of course, continues to this day. The RADARSAT technology played an important role, and it was never really explained why the new government, led by Prime Minister Trudeau, made the choice of no longer sharing that critical information.

It was also around that time when there was a context of obvious internal debate within the government caucus over the issue of the Magnitsky sanctions. The Magnitsky sanctions really are a top ask. They were and continue to be a top area of focus for the Ukrainian community and for the Russian dissident community, who are pushing this message of the need to have Magnitsky sanctions to be able to target those who are involved in gross violations of human rights. This was an important measure that was proposed.

At the time, then-foreign minister Stéphane Dion and the Liberal government gave every indication of not being keen on the Magnitsky sanctions regime, but in the end, the House of Commons unanimously adopted the Magnitsky act, which was an important step forward, but it was not used. There have been plenty of cases, I think right up to the end of February, when the further invasion took place, when Conservatives were asking about specific individuals who were involved in human rights abuses in Russia and who were involved in acts of aggression against Ukraine. Those individuals were not being sanctioned.

I think it underlines the importance of the Ukraine study and the importance of the work of this committee that in the context of the Ukraine issue, we were able to put forward specific names of individuals. One way that we framed it was around Navalny's list. Alexei Navalny, the important Russian opposition figure, had put forward a list of individuals who he thought should be sanctioned. We raised some of those names at this committee. Eventually, some of those individuals were sanctioned. In fact, when he sanctioned them, the Prime Minister specifically cited the fact that they were on Navalny's list. He didn't specifically cite the work of the foreign affairs committee, but it underlines how important it is that we put these things onto the agenda and put out there the fact that we have opinions as legislators who work on this committee and that, often-times, when we put those issues forward, they shape the response of government and the response of ministers.

Notwithstanding the fact that we were pleased to see some of that movement on some of the sanctioning of individuals who were brought up in this committee, that movement didn't happen until after February 23. I believe it was the 23rd. I might be off by a day or two, but it didn't happen until after February 23rd. The advice we received from Marcus Kolga, Bill Browder and others who appeared before this committee was about the importance of sanctions and, in particular, to help us understand the deterrent effect that could come about as a result of those sanctions.

We were given this sense that... This is where Navalny's list comes in as well. There were people around Vladimir Putin who are responsible for taking and investing the regime's money. In particular, Mr. Putin is focused on his own interests, his own financial interests, and his own preservation and enhancement of power. Striking hard in advance, not militarily of course, but with sanctioning, would have been totally justified on the basis of past acts of aggression and human rights abuses. Striking in advance would have, I think, played that important role in sending a deterrent message.

• (1605)

We can look back at some of these actions ahead of February of last year: the cutting off of the sharing of RADARSAT images; the failure to make better use of the Magnitsky act; and the failure to

sanction individuals who were responsible for investing in the regime's personal wealth. Had we taken those steps, I think we could have played a stronger role in deterrence.

We can be proud of the role Canada played in the immediate aftermath of the initial invasion of Crimea in 2014. As a key player and member of various international organizations, Canada was able to pull countries towards a stronger position. That was when Russia was expelled from the G8. That was really the first time Russia felt consequences of that significance. We'd seen human rights abuses in Chechnya, of course, and aggressive action in Georgia.

We've seen other instances of this, but it was really Canadian leadership that played a big role in pushing for that strengthened, sharpened global response that followed the initial invasion of Ukraine in 2014. That was the point at which we have to understand the violation of Russia's commitments under the Budapest memorandum, a clear promise on committing to Ukraine's territorial integrity.

I think part of the value of studying this and of going back to look at it, looking at the present and looking forward but also looking back at where we've been since Ukrainian independence, is to counter some of that misinformation that we often see out there in the context of this invasion. It is important to acknowledge right out of the gate that whatever some people may try to say—i.e., “whose territory, and what and when”—the Russian Federation had committed to defending the territorial integrity of Ukraine based on its boundaries prior to 2014, which are still its internationally recognized boundaries.

I think Canada after 2015, certainly in the initial phase at least, was not as aggressive or as pointed. There are certain obvious instances, such as the ones I've mentioned, where we eased off the kind of pressure that had been there. I think that informed the failure of deterrence that got us to the point where we are now, where the trajectory post-2014 was a strong response from the rest of the world and then a gradual easing off.

That happened differently in some countries as opposed to others, but there is a sense that even though the conflict was ongoing, and even though Russia continued to be occupying sovereign Ukrainian territory and continued during that period to be committing gross violations of human rights against the Ukrainian people, there was in some countries this kind of easing off of the pressure, this kind of forgetting that things were actually continuing to go on.

In the few months leading up to this invasion itself, I think it was very clear to members of Parliament that this was coming. I believe that obviously the government was aware of the risks. They spoke directly about it when we had officials come before the committee. Officials told us the following:

The mobilization of Russian military forces in and around Ukraine continues, with no sign of de-escalation. The situation remains unpredictable and President Putin's military intentions remain unclear.

We're working closely with our allies and partners to find a diplomatic solution to the military conflict, by developing multiple strong deterrents.

This was the stated policy commitment from Global Affairs Canada. That was the testimony we heard at this committee prior to the invasion.

Many of the questions were specifically building off that commitment around deterrence. How do we strengthen our deterrence? How do we strengthen our position in relation to the need for deterring that aggression?

• (1610)

That was where we were at that time. We heard from other witnesses, again calling for sanctions specifically targeting those around the regime.

I should note as well that one issue we've dealt with at the committee is misinformation in the form of RT and some of the efforts of the Russian Federation to project disinformation here about what was happening before, what was happening in the context of the invasion and since.

This is notable in that there are inconsistencies in the approach we've taken—

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Mr. Genuis, let me pause you for one moment. We have a point of order.

Mr. Oliphant, please.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** I'm just wondering if there is a speakers list, which would be a point of order. If there is, it might alleviate the member's gymnastics of trying to extend this conversation to what some might consider to be a filibuster, going on to issues of RT when we are talking about another "r", which is reproductive technologies and our capacity in that regard. If there is a speakers list, it might give him a little break and he won't have to keep going through that list.

**The Chair:** Mr. Oliphant, thank you. We'll treat that as a point of order. Just to refresh the committee as to who's currently on that list, it is Mr. Genuis who has the floor. Then it is you, and Madame Bhandari and Mr. Duncan at the moment. If anybody else wishes to be added—Ms. Lantsman I see—use the "raise hand" feature on-line or signal the clerk or me if you're in the room.

With that, it's back to Mr. Genuis, please.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I think we need to be clear about the topic that's in front of us. We're debating the agenda of the committee.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** On a point of order, Mr. Chair, we are actually not debating the agenda of the committee. That is not what we're doing. We're actually debating a motion with respect to an amendment of another motion. We are not in any way debating the agenda of this committee. That is work that should be done in the future, once some of the intentions are known. It is simply not a debate about the agenda of the committee. That seems to be the fundamental misunderstanding.

**The Chair:** I'll treat that as a point. That straddles a point of order and point of debate because it's partially about what the committee will do, but it isn't about the plenary set of issues before the committee.

Mr. Genuis, if you could, just stick to what is relevant as much as you can.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I thank Mr. Oliphant for his suggestions, but I do maintain the view that this is a motion. It's an adjournment motion in the context of an amendment to a motion, but the purpose of moving the original motion was very much about setting the agenda of the committee. It did so with some level of specificity. It didn't prescribe which dates those meetings would take place on, but it said that the committee should proceed with a study on a particular issue. That issue substantially was about abortion, as well as some other things. The context is that the Liberals are wanting to make the focus of discussion at the foreign affairs committee of Canada abortion, when we have the invasion of Ukraine and threats to Taiwan. We have various other challenges around the world. The Liberals' desire to reopen the debate on abortion in the context of the Foreign Affairs committee specifically, and let's acknowledge, in a whole bunch of other committees as well, is a question fundamentally of the agenda of the committee.

So what I'm doing is I'm putting forward an adjournment motion that says, let's focus our attention for the time being on the earth shattering events taking place in Ukraine, the implications for women and men there and around the world.

I do think it's important to acknowledge that perhaps before the direction from PMO came in saying, "Drop everything, because we want to be talking about abortion at every committee we can", Liberal members were very pointed in talking about just how urgently it was to attend to the issue in Ukraine.

I might even quote remarks by Dr. Fry, who said on February 14, with the prescience of doing so prior to the further invasion, in I believe this committee:

We are seeing a global movement to get rid of democracy. We know that Taiwan and Ukraine are democratic. We see Russia doing what it's doing in Ukraine and we see China taking steps against Hong Kong and Taiwan. They're invading air space, moving very close to naval lines, etc. Is your sense that this is part of a joint action to get rid of democracy in the two major regions, Europe and the Asia-Pacific.

And then she said again:

We are concerned about the big picture and that long-range plan to rid of world of democratic institutions and democratic nations?

If members agree that this is part of a strategic effort to make the world less safe for democracy, and I am inclined to generally agree with Dr. Fry's perspective, then, my goodness, folks, we are the foreign affairs committee. This is very much what we should be seized with. We should be seized with the urgency of what's going on.

The parliamentary secretary, Mr. Oliphant, said the following on April 5:

It has been more than a month since President Putin chose to unleash war on Ukraine. With every day that passes, the number of civilians, including children, killed and wounded continues to climb. We have witnessed Russian attacks on apartment buildings, public squares, theatres and maternity hospitals. In addition, recent reports and images of what Russian forces carried out in Bucha are horrifying and they are deeply shameful. Let me be clear. We believe that this amounts to war crimes and crimes against humanity, and we are committed to holding President Putin and those supporting him accountable for their actions.

Mr. Oliphant said at the time that we were witnessing war crimes and crimes against humanity, and since then—I can't remember the exact date on which Ms. McPherson's motion came forward—the House has recognized that Russian forces are committing genocide in Ukraine.

• (1615)

I think Conservatives were saying some of these things a little bit earlier in the process, but if you just take what we've heard from Liberal members in recent days, they're saying there have been war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide as part of an effort to eradicate democracy and democratic institutions. That is the account being given by Liberal members in terms of where we are and where we might be going.

There are other committees in this place, but I would say, as the House's one foreign affairs committee, we have a responsibility to say, "Let's take this issue on in a serious way. Let's be engaged with the continuing emergence of events and let's be engaged with continuing developments as things go forward."

I made the point, and I think many members have as well, that there is what is happening in Ukraine, and also what those events in Ukraine mean for the rest of the world and the kind of precedent-setting issues from this happening. Russia and China are very different states in many respects, but they are both governed by revisionist leaders who do not support the idea of an international rules-based order. They believe that nations should be able to exercise dominance and power, if they have that power to exercise, within their self-determined sphere of influence.

The position of Canada and its allies has been to assert that the relations among nations should be governed by rules and a set of principles and mechanisms of arbitration so that when nations have disputes, they don't need to resort to violence as the only way of mediating those disputes. That is the core idea of a rules-based international order, and it's one that makes everybody everywhere better off.

Hence, in invading Ukraine, the Putin regime is trying to upend that international rules-based order, and that order only exists if it is defended and protected and if there are consequences for those that violate it. Otherwise, nations will seize on this precedent and try to go further.

We have a separate study in the committee on the issue of Taiwan, but I think we always sort of understood that there was a notional linkage or implications between these issues and what has happened, and happens, in Ukraine and Taiwan. These have implications for other nations that might be a victim of subsequent aggression. If we allow the disregard of the principles of law and order in international affairs and the substitution of the rule of force in their place, then the consequences will be extremely dire.

Nonetheless, the invasion happened, and I think some people were very much surprised by the nature and scale of it—although I think there was still a significant expectation that there would be some kind of aggression by Russian forces against Ukraine.

I think one core goal we have to identify, and I think this has come out very well in some of the testimony we've heard already, is

Putin's desire too boost his popularity at home, given his concerns about his declining popularity prior to the invasion and his desire to try to energize his image. We saw similar efforts by this regime before, going back to early horrific violence that Vladimir Putin was responsible for in Chechnya. These acts of violence appear to have created a kind of short-time "rally around the flag" impression, and there was not, in some of these early instances, a significance response from the rest of the world.

• (1620)

I think it looks like the Putin regime in a certain sense has miscalculated the level of strength and severity of the response from Ukraine and the effectiveness of the response from the rest of the world. The situation has been the initial stated war aim of effectively demilitarizing the entire country. What a lot of people expected and what our witnesses talked about was the desire of the Putin regime to install a puppet government of some sort. That doesn't look like it has any chance of succeeding.

I just remember in the first week of the war regularly checking the Kyiv hashtag to see if the capital was going to fall and what the situation was looking like. Ukrainians heroically resisted, and what was I think planned to be quick is obviously continuing. The Ukrainians deserve a huge amount of credit for their heroic resistance.

The international community has stepped up in various ways, and the Conservative position in response to that initial invasion was to say that we are supportive of the steps the government has taken to date. We continue to be supportive of the steps that have been taken, and we've also continued to put ideas forward for additional steps. Also, we've continued to say that we need to, in the appropriate way and at the appropriate time, certainly take note of how not strong enough or not forceful enough action prior to the invasion likely put us in a position of greater vulnerability.

Going forward, there's an issue that we need to look at in terms of how we support Ukraine, and I think we could find witnesses who support our efforts on all of these fronts. There was an urgent need for more weapons, for more lethal weapons that will effectively protect Ukrainians and try to support the ongoing heroic resistance. Again, "more weapons earlier, but better late than never", and this continues to be a key ask. We had the pleasure of hearing from Ambassador Deshchysia from Ukraine talk about the urgent need for more weapons. I think what we could do as a committee is that we could hear that testimony. We could hear specifically from those with expertise in weaponry and hardware and be able to then come back and make concrete recommendations to the government around the steps that we should take.



I'm always in favour of parliamentary committees grabbing their role and being very substantive and specific in recommendations. I think that sometimes the temptation for committees is to take the easy way out and say that the government should study such-and-such an issue. A committee has just been through a detailed study of an issue and says, "Well, it looks like we should do such-and-such, but we're not going to actually recommend that the government do such-and-such a thing, and we're going to recommend that the government do a further study on that particular point." My view is that it's usually a missed opportunity for the committee members to take their collective knowledge and expertise, build on that and go from a recommendation for further study to actually providing those specifics.

When it comes to this vital need for lethal weaponry, we can go further in hearing more testimony and being specific. The issue I am hearing about over and over again in my riding with respect to how we can support Ukraine is the issue of energy security and recognizing the role that Canadian energy can play in displacing Russian gas and Russian energy products that are going into Europe. The Russian economy is heavily dependent on the export of natural resources. Europe is number one: Europe receives the majority of Russian gas and Russian oil products. Russia is also a significant exporter of coal, some of which goes to our democratic partners in the Indo-Pacific region, such as South Korea.

• (1625)

As nation with a very different economy in many ways from that of Russia, but also one that is a natural resource-producing country, Canada has an immense amount of potential to see the critical role we can play in the context of supporting Ukraine in its fight. It's to enable our democratic partners to impose tougher energy-related sanctions against the Putin regime. We can enable them to do that by exporting more of our oil and gas products to Europe and to the Asia-Pacific.

We have these long debates about pipelines and process in this country. I think those are important conversations, but we have to proceed with a recognition of the urgency here. The factors that we weigh out when we're making these decisions.... Yes, we have to take into consideration the economic effects, the effects on jobs and opportunity and issues of engaging indigenous communities that are affected by natural resource projects, many of which are supportive of those projects as well as environmental impacts. However, this global security dimension has not been a sufficient part of the discussion up until now. It needs to be part of the discussion to a much greater extent going forward. Recognizing the crisis that we're in, how do we move quickly?

The interesting thing is to see the government's response and how it's shifted over time. Initially, when we were raising these energy security issues, my colleague Mr. Chong had a motion before the House right after the invasion that flagged energy security as being a key piece of this. The government, sadly, didn't support that motion. Initially, the government was saying that the alternative was renewables.

I guess my response to that would be to just say that the alternative is everything. When Europe is continuing to effectively allow the Russian economy to function because of its own need for ener-

gy products and when we can displace those energy products through our own exports, we have a crucial role to play. It has a significant impact. It's one that just requires a recognition of the urgency, such that we can't wait for the development of new technology. No one is against new renewable technologies, but the urgency of the situation requires us to take an all-of-the-above approach.

It's good for the environment for Canada to produce and export more of its relatively cleanly produced energy products as an alternative to Russian exports. If we're able, in particular, for example, to provide alternatives to Russian coal in the Indo-Pacific region through the export of Canadian natural gas, that's a win-win-win. It's a win for the economy. It's a win for the environment. Most importantly, it's a win for the preservation of a democratic, free and rules-based world that I think all of us are so deeply concerned about passing on to our children and grandchildren. This is why the conversations we have around what our response should be, particularly in the case of Ukraine, are so important.

I've certainly met with a number of ambassadors who have highlighted the energy security issue as well. It's an issue throughout Europe. It's different for different countries. For instance, Poland produces a lot of coal. Providing Canadian natural gas as an alternative and providing Canadian technology around carbon capture and storage—the technologies we're developing as well as energy export.... It doesn't have to be security versus environment. We can think about both at the same time, but we need to move quickly on this energy security dimension. I would like us to be able to hear witnesses speak about that to this committee as well.

• (1630)

Another issue with respect to Ukraine that I think we need to think about and hopefully propose recommendations around is this proposal for a no-fly zone. In this connection, it was great that President Zelenskyy was able to come and speak to Parliament. His primary ask was for us to close the sky. I believe it was Ms. May from the Green Party who said "I do not support that". Conservatives presented an alternative proposal that was a modified version of a no-fly zone. Basically, other parties, despite declaring solidarity and a commitment to stand with the people of Ukraine, didn't engage on the question of that specific proposal. It left a bit of a dissident impression, where there was an ask that was made of the government and there still hasn't been—at least in that moment, in the context of that debate—a clear response.

What Conservative leader Candice Bergen proposed was that we work to establish enforced humanitarian corridors. A reasonable step that we could take that would entail a much reduced risk of further escalation would be to say we are going to enforce and defend humanitarian corridors as an avenue for civilians to be safe and move to safety.

We have seen the horrific toll that this war has taken on Ukrainian civilians. Is there a role that NATO could play? Is there a role for Canada in putting ideas forward and leading within NATO to say that we should have that established no-fly-zone-type defence of limited areas of humanitarian corridors?

In the context of some of the negotiations that have been happening, Russian authorities have talked about this, but there hasn't really been a follow-through. This is a major challenge that I think this committee needs to hear recommendations on and make recommendations back to Parliament. This is the role...this is the potential of the foreign affairs committee to engage with the immense seriousness of what is in front of us with the Russian invasion of Ukraine. This is the potential to say, rather than play the PMO-directed political strategy of trying to make every single parliamentary committee, it seems, talk about abortion, let's actually talk about the fact that we have this war happening and let's zero in on the specific recommendations we could make in response to that war. Let's zero in on the specific recommendations we can make on lethal weapons, energy security, establishing a no-fly zone and/or having the enforcement of these sorts of humanitarian corridors.

These are the kinds of recommendations that we could bring forward if, as a committee, we say we want to work together, we want to do this seriously and we want to set an agenda in a collaborative way, but we want to focus on this critical issue confronting the world, rather than focus on some effort to stir up a domestic controversy.

I think we also need, as a committee, to really dig into the shifts in the Putin regime's rhetoric round its strategic positioning. In a sense, we should be careful to not put too much into what we hear from the Kremlin. We know that there is an effort to push misinformation and disinformation to try to throw us off track of what their intentions are. Nonetheless, it's important for us to be aware of and take note of the things that are being said and to then study what the implications of those things might be.

• (1635)

The initial stated reason for the invasion—and I'm reluctant to even repeat it, because it's so absurd—was the so-called denazification of Ukraine. These were totally ridiculous allegations that were made by the Putin regime. And then there was demilitarization. I think what's important to understand about the initial stated aspiration of the regime was that it was related to the entire country. It was expressed in terms of what was happening in all of Ukraine; it was not the articulation of specific regional objectives.

It started with, as everybody knows, an invasion from all sides, but an effort to strike across the Belarusian border and hit Kyiv. That failed, and we've seen a shift in some of the rhetoric towards more discussion of a more regional agenda. What does that mean? I don't think it means that in any sense we should weaken our resolve or our recognition that the threat is to the entire country, but we should also take note of how there is this apparent shifting in position. It responds, I think, to the intensity that Ukrainians have shown in defending their own sovereignty, the solidarity and strength that they've brought to the table and also the ability of the rest of the international community to step forward to speak about what's going on and to apply pressure in various ways.

I also think we need to be prepared for this to continue because the conflict isn't going to melt away. We need a longer term strategy, and I think that strategy needs to facilitate the maintenance and further escalation of economic sanctions, as well as sanctions targeting individuals who are involved in these acts of aggression. I

think we need to recognize that and really escalate the pressure that's on. I'm taking note of that.

Mr. Chair, in making the case for the importance of the work that we need to do on Ukraine, I wanted to highlight a number of instances of the horrific atrocities we've seen in Ukraine. Members talked earlier in this debate about gender equality, the importance of combatting violence against women, and what we are seeing in the context of the Russian invasion of Ukraine is the horrific victimization of women, the use of sexual violence as a weapon of war.

It's unfathomable the horror of what we're seeing going on. As members have all agreed, there are war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide being committed, and I want to highlight a number of these stories that I think should bring into sharp focus the work we need to do and only we can do as the foreign affairs committee in responding to this. There was a recent story from the BBC of woman talking about how Russian soldiers raped her and killed her husband. She details the story. She's 50 years old, her name is Anna, she lives in a rural neighbourhood outside of Kyiv, and when the Russian soldiers came through, she was raped at gunpoint and her husband was killed. This is just one story of the violence. There's a picture here that basically they have a wooden cross in the yard where they buried her husband, after the Russians have pulled out of the area.

That's one story among many of the unrelenting violence that we've seen.

• (1640)

Another story I was able to find, entitled “U.N. told 'credible' claims of sexual violence against children as Russia's war drives a third of Ukrainians from their homes”, reads as follows:

Britain's ambassador to the United Nations said Thursday that there were “credible” claims Russian forces have committed sexual violence against children in Ukraine, as U.N. agencies said Vladimir Putin's invasion had driven more than 6 million people to flee the country. The U.N. refugee agency reported the grim statistic, which, combined with the roughly 8 million Ukrainians who have been displaced within their country, means a third of Ukraine's people have been forced from their homes.

The war's effect on Ukraine's youth has been particularly devastating, and Britain's U.N. ambassador said that appeared to extend to sexual violence committed against children by the invading forces.

British Ambassador Barbara Woodward, citing the U.N. humanitarian agency, said at least 238 children were believed to be among the thousands of civilians killed since Russia launched its war, with 347 more injured.

“There are credible allegations of sexual violence against children by Russian forces,” Woodward added. “As others have said, mass displacement has left children exposed to human trafficking and sexual exploitation.”

Last month, Ukrainian lawmaker Kira Rudyk told CBS News that sexual violence was being used systematically “in all the areas that were occupied by the Russians.”

“Rape is used as a tool of war in Ukraine to break our spirits, to humiliate us and to show us that we can be helpless to protect our women and children and their bodies,” Kira Rudyk, a member of Ukraine's Parliament, told CBS News. “It is happening systematically in the occupied territories.”

It's just horrifying to hear about these things happening. It's important for us to recognize the role we have as a committee in trying to combat this. I think the way we do it is by specifically focusing on how we can support Ukraine to win the ongoing war.

Recognizing this use of sexual violence as a tool by occupying forces in all of parts of Ukraine that are, according to this testimony, occupied by Russia should underline for us just how much of a role we need to play in preventing the further advance of that Russian aggression and in preventing the further occupation of Ukraine, and how we need to prioritize our engagement with this issue ahead of the political agendas that we may be being told should be pushed. This is the work we need to do: How can Ukraine win and ensure that more Ukrainian women and children don't have to live with the lifetime trauma that comes with these kinds of horrible events?

I'll continue reading from this article:

At the Security Council on Thursday, U.N. children's agency...Deputy Executive Director Omar said "children and parents tell us of their 'living hell,' where they were forced to go hungry, drink from muddy puddles, and shelter from constant shelling and bombardments, dodging bombs, bullets and landmines as they fled." He called the war "a child protection and child rights crisis."

"Children in Ukraine have been displaced, hurt, orphaned, or killed," U.S. Deputy U.N. Ambassador Richard Mills told diplomats. "Of the nearly 14 million people forced to flee their homes since the conflict escalated, approximately half are innocent children; children who deserve a chance to live, grow, and thrive, but instead, are struggling every day to survive in horrific circumstances."

Briefing diplomats at the Security Council, U.N. Assistant Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Deputy Emergency Relief Coordinator Joyce Msuya said "civilians — particularly women and children — are paying the heaviest price" in the war.

- (1645)

Msuya said the situation was deeply worrying in the Luhansk region, in eastern Ukraine's industrial heartland of Donbas, where Russia is currently focusing its assault. She said there were an estimated 40,000 people cut off from electricity, water and gas supplies there alone.

The U.N. Human Rights Council met in a special session in Geneva on Thursday, meanwhile, where High Commissioner for Human Rights Michelle Bachelet said "1,000 civilian bodies had been found in the Kyiv region alone...some had been killed in hostilities, but others appeared to have been summarily executed."

"These killings of civilians often appeared to be intentional, carried out by snipers and soldiers. Civilians were killed when crossing the road or leaving their shelters to seek food and water. Others were killed as they fled in their vehicles," Bachelet said.

CBS News partner network BBC News documented one such alleged killing on Thursday. The network obtained video from multiple security cameras around a business outside of Kyiv that appear to show several Russian soldiers shooting an unarmed civilian security guard in the back, and then looting the business.

One of the soldiers is seen breaking a security camera with the butt of his rifle, apparently upon realizing that he and his colleagues' actions were being recorded.

That's really hard information to share and to think about, but the kinds of atrocities that we are seeing in Ukraine are horrifying and unfathomable. They require the committee to urgently grab hold of this issue and, as part of its broader agenda, look at the issues of the atrocities that are going on.

I want to share from this story in The New York Times, called "Clear patterns' of Russian rights abuses found in Ukraine, a report says". It states:

Investigators from almost a dozen countries combed bombed-out towns and freshly dug graves in Ukraine on Wednesday for evidence of war crimes, and a wide-ranging investigation by an international security organization detailed what it said were "clear patterns" of human rights violations by Russian forces.

Some of the atrocities may constitute war crimes, said investigators from the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, who examined myriad reports of rapes, abductions and attacks on civilian targets, as well as the use of banned munitions.

On Wednesday, civilians were still bearing much of the brunt of the seven-week-old invasion as Russian forces, massing for an assault in the east, bombarded Ukraine's second-largest city, Kharkiv, striking an apartment building.

In an hourlong phone call with Volodymyr Zelensky, Ukraine's leader, President Biden said the United States, already a major provider of defensive armaments to Ukraine, would send an additional \$800 million in military and other security aid. The package will include "new capabilities tailored to the wider assault we expect Russia to launch in eastern Ukraine"...

I'll just skip down a bit in the article to where it say this:

An International Criminal Court investigation into possible war crimes has been underway since last month, and a number of countries have been looking at ways for the United Nations to help create a special court that could prosecute Russia for what is known as the crime of aggression. Other possibilities include trying Russians in the courts of other nations under the principle of universal jurisdiction, the legal concept that some crimes are so egregious they can be prosecuted anywhere.

I note as well, and the members may be interested to know this, that the Subcommittee on International Human Rights is doing a study specifically on the issue of violations of international law and mechanisms by which there could be prosecution for those violations. I know some members of this committee are members of that committee. I think that's an important study as well.

Ironically, the same thing is happening at SDIR that is happening here, it seems, which is—I'm not sure what deliberations have happened in public or not, but I'm jumping off of what was said publicly here by Ms. McPherson—that in the midst of its study on human rights violations and atrocities being committed in Ukraine, there's an attempt to shift the agenda to a discussion about abortion. We have similar things happening here as in SDIR where—

- (1650)

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** I'll pause you for one moment, Mr. Genuis.

Go ahead Ms. McPherson.

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** That is actually not accurate, so I would just like to correct—

**The Chair:** For the purposes, I'll take—

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** The motion that was brought forward in the House of Commons Subcommittee on International Human Rights was to look at reproductive rights around the world and, in fact, Mr. Genuis's colleague asked for a study on the preborn rather than one on looking at the rights of women around the world.

**The Chair:** I'll allow that clarification. Thank you very much.

Mr. Genuis, it's back to you.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'll let my colleague speak for himself on his proposals around that.

My understanding was that the Subcommittee on International Human Rights was doing a study specifically on the situation in Ukraine and on international human rights as they relate to that, but I can at least, it's fair to say, speak with the most authority on what's happening here at the foreign affairs committee, which is that we are in the process of doing a study on the issue of Ukraine, and there are many issues that need to be I think further discussed and further considered.

We are in the midst of that study that's happening here, and we could be pursuing that study. There are many issues that I've mentioned around lethal weapons, energy security, humanitarian corridors and no-fly zones and the issues around the shifting Russian strategic position. A different issue for the foreign affairs committee as well is the engagement that we do around questions of refugees. This is another issue that I think has not been sufficiently discussed in this committee. It has been taken up to some extent at the immigration committee; I suspect there will be an abortion motion there, too, without delay, but....

The issue of refugees coming out of Ukraine and how Canada engages and collaborates with other countries in the region in supporting them is I think a very important one. On this point, all of the opposition parties actually have been united in saying that there should be visa-free travel for those who are coming out of Ukraine, recognizing that visa-free travel is part of the framework that exists in other countries in the vicinity.

The Government of Canada says they couldn't do it and have kind of vacillated in terms of their explanations. On some days, they say, well, it would be a potential security issue, but then at other times, they say, well, it would take too long to put in place or it's too complicated or onerous to make that kind of change in our immigration rules.

Well, it seems that these things take far longer than they should. Other countries are able to lift their visa requirements. Think of how much is being done by Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Romania and all of the countries in the region that are accepting refugees without requiring a visa. Given the vastness of Canada and the way that I think Canadians feel about this conflict and their desire to play an important role in helping to support those who are suffering as a result of this conflict, I think there would be just an immense desire for Canadians to be able to play more of that role, yet we see the government, through their immigration policies, saying no to visa-free travel.

Another issue that I think we need to take up in our engagement with this conflict is what we are doing to help those who are impacted by it. Of course, there's the refugee side of it, and there's also the humanitarian support, and we have called for that humanitarian support. As we've said, on a number of issues we've been supportive of the steps the government has taken to date, but we've also called on the government to make improvements in certain respects.

There was one issue I raised in the House that I think would merit further attention here at this committee, and that is the question of how the government approaches matching programs. Right out of the gate, the government announced that they were going to do a matching program and that matching program would apply only to

the Red Cross. Canadians were so generous that the allotment the federal government was prepared to match filled up right away—

• (1655)

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** I apologize, Mr. Genuis. We have a point of order.

Let's go to Ms. McPherson.

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** Mr. Chair, I'm a relatively new parliamentarian, so perhaps this isn't a point of order, but I did just want to check if there is any need for gender parity as we discuss women's rights, or will we be listening to a man speak about the rights of women for the next several hours? I'm wondering as well if we would be interested in hearing from some of the female members of this committee on the reproductive rights of women.

**The Chair:** Ms. McPherson, I don't believe that's a point of order.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Can I speak to the point of order? I don't think I've ever disclosed my gender to this committee.

**The Chair:** Mr. Genuis, thank you for that, but irrespective of that, I don't believe it is a point of order. It may be part of the emerging dynamic this afternoon and members are certainly welcome to challenge that in subsequent interventions.

It's back to you, Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I think that was an interesting intervention by my colleague. With all due respect, when an issue is brought to a committee that I happen to be a member of—

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Mr. Chair, I have a point of order. I hear a bell ringing. Do we have a vote happening?

**The Chair:** Let's see what we have. Is it a 30-minute—

• (1700)

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** And you will need unanimous consent to consider it? I don't believe you will find unanimous consent at this time.

**The Chair:** It's a 30-minute bell and, as you say, Mr. Oliphant, we need unanimous consent. We have a practice of going 15 minutes in, but we need UC from the point of the bell. Is there unanimous consent to continue for an additional 15 minutes?

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, just on a point of order. Is there a will for the committee to adjourn or to suspend?

**The Chair:** There's no point of order on that.

Just a second: there are two interventions at the same time.

There's no unanimous consent. Let's hold that thought, Mr. Genuis.

Your question—

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** The meeting is adjourned at that point.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Is the meeting adjourned then? I'm just looking for clarity.

**The Chair:** There's no unanimous consent that it would be suspended until—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** We are over the allotted time, so is there a will to adjourn, or...

**The Chair:** My understanding is that we have until 5:50. It's going to be a half-hour bell, plus a 10-minute vote, plus 10 minutes of confirmation, so we will be more or less at 5:50, which would be our full two-hour allotment. There's no UC, so what is the default conclusion if—

**Hon. Michael Chong:** Mr. Chair, I have a point of order. If the committee is agreeable, I would suggest that we adjourn, which would allow us to continue our regular meeting on Thursday—on Taiwan—which I believe is what we have scheduled. Is that not correct?

**The Chair:** That is correct.

**Hon. Michael Chong:** I say this because if we suspend, the meeting with respect to Taiwan will be cancelled, I assume—

**The Chair:** It will be superseded in the short term.

**Hon. Michael Chong:** In lieu of that meeting, we will have a meeting on this motion that we are currently presently debating. My suggestion is that we adjourn so that we can actually get back to the Taiwan issue.

**The Chair:** We have to make sure that we are procedurally on solid ground because we did not get UC to continue, which really technically means that we are suspended after the time of Mr. Oliphant's having—

**Hon. Michael Chong:** Yes, that's true, unless you seek agreement from the committee to adjourn, in which case we could do the Taiwan meeting on Thursday.

**The Chair:** There does not seem to be unanimous agreement, so we are suspended until we are advised by email.

Thank you colleagues.

• (1700) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (1755)

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

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

On another note, I understand that there is some competition for House resources this evening and there's a risk to the Afghanistan committee, so I would propose, and I'd like to move, Mr. Chair, that we adjourn this meeting so as to allow resources to be available for the Afghanistan committee.

I would note that if we don't do that, then there is a question of whether the Afghan interpreters who have come to be heard will be heard. I don't know all the machinations behind the scenes, but my understanding is that if we don't adjourn, this has the potential of overriding the Afghanistan committee and missing the opportunity to hear from those Afghan interpreters.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Genuis. Let me seek some procedural advice because we have a motion on the floor that was brought

by you that we adjourn the debate while the Ukraine study is going on. This is now an additional motion to adjourn, but to adjourn immediately.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** It's to adjourn the meeting, and this motion is—

**The Chair:** A dilatory motion.

So you're moving that. It's in order.

We have a dilatory motion to adjourn that's in order. There's no debate allowed.

(Motion negated: nays 7; yeas 3)

**The Chair:** Let me check briefly. Is it six o'clock sharp, or are we going to be advised when to suspend?

It's back to you for four minutes, Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'll cede the floor for now, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Mr. Oliphant.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Thank you.

I want to clarify a few things about this. My sense during the early part of the previous member's remarks was that there had been a strategy meeting at high levels of the Conservative party to find every way not to have this come to a vote. I'm disappointed in that because I think it's very clear that we should bring this to a vote quickly, because if we don't, it will stop other pieces of work from happening.

I want to be really clear that despite what Mr. Genuis said, there is no priority attached to this motion. It is a motion to study. He has already revealed in a public meeting other motions that have been brought by Liberals, which I believe are confidential, so I won't reveal them. There are other motions that have been suggested for discussion, which I would also like to make sure that we have time at some point to discuss, because there are several important issues going on in the world right now. This is one of them. This is a critical issue, and we want this discussed by committee.

However, we also respect the process of a committee to set its own agenda, so once we get these motions passed, we'll be able to look at them all. As Mr. Bergeron said earlier, we want a good and fair process to look at everything we have on the table that's been moved. Therefore, we can pick what we want to do most urgently as we continue.

This motion is putting a stake in the ground and signalling that women's rights, including women's reproductive rights, are important to this committee.

• (1800)

**The Chair:** Mr. Oliphant, I apologize. I'll stop you there at the end of that sentence and suspend for half an hour. I'm told that we have to do that for resource reasons. We will then give you back the floor in that same speaking order that we had.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** I sense there is an appetite for a vote.

**The Chair:** Is there an emerging consensus that the committee is....

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** We had moved to adjourn with precisely that objective in mind.

**Hon. Michael Chong:** If debate has collapsed, we can have the vote so we can adjourn.

**The Chair:** I'm not sure that debate has collapsed.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** I thought we were still on the conditional non-dilatory motion.

**The Chair:** We are.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** I didn't think we were on it.

**Hon. Michael Chong:** If everybody stops talking, we can have the vote.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** But we would like a vote on the main motion, not on one of the adjournment motions, because we're in no way prepared to adjourn this meeting. We have an important issue and if that's—

**The Chair:** My sense is that debate has not extinguished, and we're being advised that we need to suspend to get resources in line for 6:30 to 8:30.

With that, we'll suspend for 30 minutes and then resume in the same speaking order.

• (1800) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (1945)

**The Chair:** Colleagues, let's try to continue.

Before giving the floor back to Mr. Oliphant, for the benefit of all members here tonight, I want to give a bit of a recap of where we are.

We have before us a motion that the debate be adjourned until the completion of the work on Ukraine. The debate that's being referenced is on the original motion by Dr. Fry, which was amended by Mr. Genuis to delete in English, "that the committee hold no fewer than (5) five meetings".

We are still on the adjournment motion—it's conditional and therefore debatable—that the matter be adjourned until the completion of the committee's work on Ukraine.

The speaking order we have on this motion at the moment is Mr. Oliphant, Madame Bendayan, Mr. Duncan, Mr. Chong and Mr. Genuis.

With that, I will pass the floor back to Mr. Oliphant for resumption of debate.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** I would continue simply to say that I would be against this motion to delay voting on this as a potential study to be scheduled. I think it's a topic that deserves studying.

We have shown in this committee how we are able to walk and chew gum at the same time. We have interspersed a variety of studies, starting one and continuing with other studies. I think it's suspicious to say that we should delay a vote on this until after another study is finished, when we don't even have a firm date on that

study. I think we're mixing apples and oranges in this. That's my fourth metaphor; I apologize.

What I like about the motion by Dr. Fry is that it puts a stake in the ground for this committee to say that this is an important issue to study. And it's not the only issue we'll study. There will be other motions. We have a number of notices of motion on the books right now. Once we get a number of motions, then we'll have a meeting. We'll look at what the priorities of the committee are—to do what, when.

However, because this does not have a time limit—it does not have a deadline set on when the study would begin or would end—I think it's appropriate for us to dispose of it quickly. So I would not be supportive of a motion to delay a vote on it. It's an unusual motion to adjourn until after an unknown date. I'm not even sure I would have agreed to that kind of a motion. Also, adding a substantive part to that motion, with respect to the number of committee meetings, I don't think is appropriate at this time within that context. So I will be voting against this motion.

There were many comments in the lengthy speech that Mr. Genuis made that I could comment on, but I'll refrain, hoping we can quickly dispose of the motion to adjourn conditionally, so we can get to the main motion quickly and get it done, and put it into our ideas for a potential work plan and leave it until the future.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mr. Oliphant.

Madame Bendayan, please.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Thank you. I'll keep it short.

As Mr. Bergeron pointed out earlier today, Ms. Fry brought forward the issue and proposed a study back in December—long before the events the Conservative members are claiming prompted the motion. That is not at all the case.

Ms. Fry put forward her motion months ago. I think we're ready to vote on it.

[*English*]

I would also like to very briefly respond to the lengthy intervention by my colleague on the Conservative side, simply by saying that it was, indeed, my motion on Ukraine that was presented in January of this year. It is absolutely an important study. I would hazard to say it's one of the most important studies the government is undertaking at the moment. Obviously, that's my personal opinion.

I also agree with my colleague Mr. Oliphant's comments. There have been many other members of this committee, including my Conservative friends, who have argued quite the opposite, that we should be hearing witnesses on matters relating to Tibet, on matters relating to Taiwan and many other issues that we all agree to. Now, strangely, on this particular issue, they seem to suggest that we are not able to study Ukraine and any other subject at the same time, which is, of course, untrue. We are doing it at the moment, and we can do it again.

Once again, as many have said, the motion before us does not include dates, and these will be up to the subcommittee to decide.

For those reasons, I will also be voting against my colleague's amendment.

• (1950)

[*Translation*]

**The Chair:** Thank you for your comments, Ms. Bendayan.

[*English*]

Next I have Mr. Duncan, please.

Go ahead.

**Mr. Eric Duncan:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Can you hear me okay?

**The Chair:** Mr. Duncan, I am advised that the microphone is not selected. As such, could you just double-check the connection?

**Mr. Eric Duncan:** You'd think I'd have this down pat two years in. I apologize.

Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you to the clerk for that advice.

**The Chair:** That's good now. Thank you very much.

**Mr. Eric Duncan:** I am, as you are all aware, subbing in today in participating in a committee, and it has been informative. We started off several hours ago with what I thought was an informative briefing, and we had committee business—a couple of motions—to deal with. We're still on that. It was unfortunate that I was not able to participate in camera, as we were to deal with I believe the statement on the important issue of Ukraine. Public Accounts is my main committee, but I of course have been watching with interest the work that all our committees do.

I want to give credit to my colleague Mr. Genuis from Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan for his comments on this. I will agree with his premise on the need to prioritize and his amendment on it, which I believe is reasonable. I believe it is fair and accurate and resembles when I try to do a pulse of our community. I think of my riding of Stormont—Dundas—South Glengarry in eastern Ontario. As we get back to normalcy, we have events back in our community, and we're getting a pulse for what we're hearing from our constituents on issues they believe that we as parliamentarians should be tackling and focusing on. I agree with him wholeheartedly in his amendment that this committee needs to continue its important work on the topic of Ukraine, and I believe that is something that is front of mind for many Canadians.

As was alluded to, I believe this motion is meant to be divisive. As Mr. Genuis and other colleagues of mine have noted, this is not the only committee that is seeking to reopen the abortion debate here in Canada. There are several committees that are attempting similar motions like this. Canadians do not want to see the debate reopened.

It would be incumbent, I believe, on this committee that is dealing with foreign affairs and international development, that we look at and survey our country on what is front of mind. When it comes to what this committee's work should be, I think it's finishing the work on Ukraine, hearing from witnesses, working on the draft

statement, which I believe was being dealt with in camera today, and also, again, coming up with a final report of ways where, frankly, on many issues, when you look at the Conservative Party's perspective, the Liberal Party's perspective, the NDP's and that of the Bloc Québécois, there's been actually a strong consensus on the need to focus on this important issue, not just to the benefit of the Ukrainian people, but I believe in the bigger geopolitical situation that our country faces.

Mr. Chair, one of the things that I commented on, and the importance of this, is that I believe the illegal invasion of Ukraine and the horrific war crimes that are happening under Putin's regime and actions are one of the things that has made this front of mind for more Canadians. This been able to stay, rightfully, in the front of our public debate and discourse in this country, which is why I believe this committee needs to focus on it.

I can perhaps compare, as I know that unfortunately, sadly, the Afghanistan committee that was supposed to be hearing tonight from the interpreters was cancelled as a result of this. It is unfortunate, but it speaks to where I believe that in this situation what we're seeing in Ukraine, with the evolution of technology, the evolution of social media and our smart phones, is that we have Canadians in real time, whether it be on Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, TikTok or other forms of social media, who have now seen firsthand in near live time the atrocities that have been happening, the unjustifiable horrific actions by the Russian regime.

I'm amazed. Just as an example, as I was saying, we're getting out into our communities more, and I was in Morrisburg at the South Dundas trade show. It was a great way to take the pulse of the community. I was there for two days and got unfiltered feedback—good, bad or indifferent—from constituents on issues or topics that are important to them. It gives you a chance to understand what's resonating. In terms of the number of people I spoke to over the course of a day and a half at that event, it was incredible in terms of the number of people who were more knowledgeable about the geography of Ukraine, perhaps, but again, about the geopolitical aspects there, the humanitarian aid that Canada needs to provide and to continue to provide lethal weapons as well. I'll get into that a little bit, as well as why this issue continues to be and should be front of mind.

It's the first illegal invasion.... It's a war. It's an illegal invasion. It has gotten so much attention because people have seen it in live time. They've seen the videos. They've seen the bravery and the determination of the Ukrainian people in fighting back against these horrific acts.

• (1955)

As was mentioned, and again, I know that with numerous colleagues from all parties there's been consensus on the urgency and importance of this. War crimes are being committed, and there are numerous unacceptable actions by Mr. Putin. When we look at the issue of Ukraine and the topics we need to cover, they're very multifaceted and are why this committee should be prioritizing that work, ensuring that this is dealt with. We're hearing from witnesses. We're making recommendations. Again, I say it from a constructive perspective, in the sense that I believe parliamentarians are pretty well united in terms of a lot of the topics and the approaches they need to take.

When we talk about humanitarian assistance and our foreign aid and being able to provide that, and the access to providing and equipping the Ukrainian military with lethal weapons, I think it is absolutely essential in making recommendations in this timely manner for how we can do that better as an international community and how we can best do it as Canadians.

As well, one of the things that I think is especially important, too, Mr. Chair, is the compassionate grounds. Canadians, as always, have stepped up to offer help. Again, I'm amazed. When we talk locally, I have to admit that very often foreign affairs topics and international jurisdiction may not always be the front of mind to all Canadians, but with what has been happening in Ukraine and, again, the manner in which we're able to communicate it, and just the atrocities of it, the unbelievability and the evil that we've seen in these actions, more Canadians are versed in this.

I've been amazed over the course of the last while as I see a growing interest from Canadians when we talk about this topic of how they can help support refugees and humanitarian efforts, particularly for women and children who are attempting to relocate to Canada. There are a few things when we deal with that in terms of what the committee can do to better resettle them. Again, we have a few Ukrainian families that have arrived in my community in rural eastern Ontario. One of the things we've heard on that is about the disorganization and the frustration around paperwork processes and access to flights, and the confusion and some of the chaos, frankly, around that. We saw that last year during the Afghanistan crisis with the evacuation of numerous Afghanistan citizens, those who helped us in our time of need in Afghanistan. We saw absolute chaos and disorganization.

Mr. Chair, again, I think the one reason why this needs to be front of mind and continues to need to be a conversation for our committee is that there is more work to be done there, and certainly recommendations. There are witnesses we need to hear from in the NGO community and, from a governmental perspective, departmental officials, as well as international organizations and those that are on the ground in terms of how our response as Canadians can be improved.

I certainly think that one of the things we could agree on is that the more timely we make that, the more we hear those voices at the committee, the more we get to that testimony and make recommendations I think to positively pressure the government, the bureaucracy, NGOs, and I think, frankly, even beyond in the international community, there's the opportunity to be constructive and to be

united as a Canadian Parliament regardless of which political party. There's been a lot of support for this. I think the committee needs to be focusing on that and addressing that.

One of the things as well, Mr. Chair, is another angle. We talk about the economic aspects, and that's one of the things that I believe the committee needs to continue to tackle, and why I support and will continue to support the amendment, the principle of it and the importance of it, because that's what I'm hearing. I know that many of my colleague are hearing about the need for this—and I think that frankly around the country we are hearing about it in terms of the energy policy and the energy dependence that far too many countries in Europe have in an alliance with Russia.

We've had motions and we are trying to get on record and pressure the government to be more aggressive on this. I will say, as constructive as my comments have been on unity, Mr. Chair, on many of the aspects I mentioned before, that when it comes to the role that Canadian energy can play in I think destabilizing the war machine in Russia, there unfortunately has not been much agreement on that topic.

• (2000)

I think it's important to have the time at committee to really study and look at that aspect of the relationship and how our Canadian energy, whether it be on our east coast or in the west, can be used in the short term to destabilize—and rightly so—Putin's economy, his regime and his oligarchs. In the longer run, we can look at how to support our Canadian economy, which helps to support causes not just in Ukraine, but in the international community. We could also take a look at some of the economic aspects. This could help, in the long run, what we do and how we do it, while sending a message to other regimes that have undertaken horrific actions similar to those Russia has taken. The world is watching and Canada is watching. Canada can step up, and this is a way that we can do more.

We need to have attention on how our actions and our resolve could actually improve the situation and resolve the situation better, particularly in Ukraine, in terms of destabilizing the Russian economy and government revenues. We need to have more of those debates and more of those understandings, and I think it would be a benefit to our committee and a benefit for Canadians to understand our role, not just with a verbal commitment, but with tangible actions economically that can benefit Canadians and, frankly, can benefit the environment.



We have an energy sector in this country that is second to no other around the world. I will put up the workers, I will put up the companies and I will put up the trajectories and plans of our Canadian energy sector, any day of the week and any month of the year, against those of any other country in the world. There's a commitment to human rights and a commitment to the environment, and I think you would see both of those issues better addressed if we saw more support domestically for our sector. As opposed to phasing it out, with all the negatives that you see, let's embrace the technological advances while helping not only ourselves domestically and environmentally, but those around the world. I believe, from a human rights perspective, we should stop sending dollars to countries that do not deserve revenue, growth and support through those means and that are turning around and doing devastating actions. We're seeing this unfold day after day, week after week and now, unfortunately, month after month with what is happening in the situation in Ukraine.

One other thing that I think is important—and why this amendment is important—is to ensure that the focus and attention continues to be on this, not only for ourselves as the committee and as Parliament through the committee's work, but for the message it sends to the international community, and particularly the business community.

This is timely today. As I was participating in the meeting earlier—I will acknowledge that I was paying attention, as I always do—I was getting caught up on news. It's timely because we are talking about the economic impacts of how numerous businesses, international corporations and businesses of all types are receding from and closing their relationships with Russia. Many have done so on a pause basis, a short-term basis, to see exactly what's going to happen, but I've been impressed by the number of businesses.

There is far more that needs to happen in the coming weeks, months and, frankly, years to make sure we don't go back. There need to be serious long-term consequences. This is a topical issue, and with the actions we have seen from Vladimir Putin and his thugs over the course of the last couple of months particularly, we need to make sure the message we're sending, not only in this instance but for future acts of inappropriate and unacceptable aggression, does not go unanswered.

There's a reason I say that. There was an article just published this afternoon, probably around midday, by BBC News with the headline “McDonald's to leave Russia for good after 30 years”. The article, which was published by Becky Morton, said, “McDonald's has said it will permanently leave Russia after more than 30 years and has started to sell its restaurants.” As these temporary measures were taken by several in the business community internationally, it is going to have a significant continued ripple effect and a continued consequence, which I think is positive. It comes “after it temporarily closed 850 outlets in March”. As stated:

The fast food giant said it made the decision because of “the humanitarian crisis” and “unpredictable operating environment” caused by the Ukraine war.

• (2005)

Now, it's noted that McDonald's has had operations in Russia since 1990, and that was meant to symbolize “a thaw in Cold War tensions”. As stated:

A year later, the Soviet Union collapsed and Russia opened...its economy to companies from the West. More than three decades later...it is one of a growing number of corporations—

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Mr. Duncan, let me pause you for a moment here. We have a point of order.

Please go ahead, Madam Bendayan.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** As much as I'm enjoying this lengthy filibuster, I would like to make a point of order based on relevance. I understand that the amendment on the floor is with respect to Ukraine, and as much as I congratulate the member for having read the news today about McDonald's, I think we are veering way off topic.

The motion and the amendment that we are discussing are about pushing off a women's reproductive rights study, and not McDonald's, so I have on a point of order on relevance, sir.

**The Chair:** I'll take the point under advisement.

Mr. Duncan, it's on the margins of relevance. I think it is still tangentially relevant because it is about the dynamics in Russia, but if you can keep your arguments as focused as you could on the motion itself, that would be appreciated.

Thank you very much.

**Mr. Eric Duncan:** Perfect, and again, to relevance on this, I'm happy to provide a refresher to the member on how this is connecting to relevance. I'm happy to do so in the sense, as I've mentioned, of the importance of the amendment introduced by my colleague, which I believe is a valid one, because I'm trying to demonstrate the wide variety of topics on the subject of Ukraine that I believe this committee needs to continue its work on.

Mr. Chair, I've mentioned before the humanitarian aid that the Canadian government has provided and needing to provide lethal weapons and needing to improve our refugee and immigration process for those who are fleeing Ukraine and are looking for safe haven in Canada. I'm talking about the Canadian energy sector and its importance on this topic and, as I was alluding to, the article here—and I'll get to it again—is showing some relevance of the economic factors here and the importance of where I'm going.

Again, as we've been in committee meeting here for several hours, I don't mean to talk about food or McDonald's as such, but the seriousness of it, in getting to this, is that a corporation today—just as an example in their case—is making news on a significant commitment to remove itself from its operations in Russia. We're seeing numerous corporations, numerous businesses, do that. They're looking for continued leadership or direction from countries like Canada. Just with the example today, the corporation said that they were going to “write off” charges of up to \$1.4 billion that they are going to absorb themselves and write off—

• (2010)

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Mr. Chair, on a point of order again, I'm going to interrupt because this is no longer relevant to the amendment, and the fact that this member is now preventing our committee from voting on this motion is getting a bit ridiculous—

**Mr. Eric Duncan:** On a point of order, I think you've already ruled on that, Mr. Chair, but I'm happy for you to do so again.

**The Chair:** I think what you are trying to do, Mr. Duncan, is to establish why your initial comments that were challenged were being relevant. I would encourage you to finish that point and then return to the thrust of the motion, if you could. I will sustain your comments as they are given to us.

**Mr. Eric Duncan:** As I was saying, the economic context here is that there are numerous corporations around the world that have tentatively, and at different levels, suspended their economic relationships with Russia. That needs to continue over the course of the next couple of months. They're looking for continued leadership in the long term. The point I'm trying to raise, which is relevant to the amendment, is ensuring that this committee continues to put a focus on an issue and a topic that is important to many Canadians, that is, the illegal, horrific, unfair invasion of by Vladimir Putin and his regime.

It's important to go back to the economic aspect of this. There are billions of dollars left up in the air that I believe need to permanently leave, as we saw in the news article today. The article does reference numerous other corporations that are waiting to see not only what the short-term aspect has been, but what the medium-term and long-term aspect has been.

I think from the committee's perspective, when we go back and look at the larger aspect and mandate here, the geopolitics of the region have implications for the two countries right now, and we're all aware of the ripple effect of not confronting this issue with the emphasis that we've seen. We've seen a solid response from the international community, but the committee's work needs to continue on this aspect because it's not just Ukraine that is in Russia's sights. You can look at Poland, you can look at the Baltic states and you can look at the news.

The relevant news, which I believe the committee would be interested in as an evolving topic, was the announcement this weekend from Finland and Sweden of their request to urgently join NATO and become partners there. We're seeing a snowball effect moving here, and there have been conversations, doubt and perhaps a lack of political will from different factors for several years about those two specific countries joining NATO. I've been following that with interest and making sure that is timely and that the information is there. As we talk about the importance of the amendment to have the committee focus on concluding its work on the topic of Ukraine, I think what happened this past weekend has provided relevance to the committee and relevance to the importance of focusing on and hearing from witnesses on the subject of Ukraine.

There are other countries around the world, unfortunately, with perhaps similar negative intentions. They are watching to see how the international community responds or, in many cases, does not respond to the challenges and horrible actions we're seeing by Russia. I think of China. We've talked—and I believe will again later

this week—about its relationship with Taiwan and the connections there.

Maybe not every Canadian is watching the House of Commons committee on foreign affairs, but I know there are a lot of like-minded countries around the world that are not seeking to reopen the abortion debate and are not looking to create division. We see that. I say this because there have been numerous attempts by members to implement and institute several different aspects of that here by trying to raise these types of motions at a wide variety of committees and cause a change in the direction of all this.

I believe it's incumbent on this committee.... I appreciate that, yes, I'm not a regular member, but having been here for several hours today listening to discussions from members of all parties, I wanted to make sure that I was on record for the amendment and its emphasis and focus. I am bringing the views of my constituents and I believe of millions of Canada. If they had the opportunity to understand what this committee should be tackling and discussing, it would be concluding the meetings, testimony, recommendations and next steps on how Canada can improve its response to the very real challenges facing the brave and wonderful people of Ukraine.

With that, I believe my colleague Mr. Chong is next, but I appreciate taking a few minutes while here at committee today, which has turned into tonight, to get on the record. I believe it's very important that the amendment be considered, as this issue has relevance and should be the focus of the committee as the work of the committee continues in the last five or six sitting weeks we have here in Ottawa.

• (2015)

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Mr. Duncan, thank you very much.

We have on the speakers list at the moment Mr. Chong, Mr. Genus and then Mr. Davidson.

Mr. Chong, please go ahead.

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

I'll be voting for Mr. Genus's motion because I think the main motion introduced by Dr. Fry concerns me. I think we need to have some off-line discussions about what the nature of that five-meeting study would be before we agree to it.

The way I read the original motion introduced by Dr. Fry is that it says that if it is adopted we are going to study, amongst other things, access to abortion in the United States of America, which I do not think that we as a committee should do.

Clearly, I'm not alone in my interpretation of the motion introduced by Dr. Fry, because I've listened to the debate on that motion very carefully throughout today, and clearly, others on the committee have interpreted the motion in the same way, which is that if the motion is adopted, it would include a study on access to abortion in the United States. I do not think that is a matter that this committee should be seized with.

It's why earlier in our debate today I moved an amendment to strike the reference in the motion to the recently leaked draft ruling from the Supreme Court of the United States, an amendment that did not pass.

As I've said, I don't support this committee studying access to abortion services in the United States. I think there are many matters of more urgent concern in the bilateral relationship between Canada and the United States.

I want to be clear: I fully support women's reproductive and health rights here in Canada and I support the current common law and legislative frameworks that have long been in place. I know with a great deal of certainty that Canadians do not want the debate on abortion here reopened. We don't want to import into this country the kind of fractiousness that we have seen south of the border on issues like abortion, which is another reason why I don't think we should be studying the issue of access to abortion in the United States in this committee.

Look, I support this committee studying access to abortion services and access to women's health and reproductive services in the global south. I think that's well within our remit to study. I think it's well within our remit to study the list of health issues that Dr. Fry has put into her motion. I think it's worth studying a full range of health services, including family planning and modern contraception; comprehensive sexuality education; safe and legal abortion and post-abortion care; laws restricting or prohibiting women's rights to abortion, the medical and socio-economic importance of maintaining the right of access to safe abortion; and prevention and treatment of HIV/AIDS and sexually transmitted infections. I think that's all within the committee's remit, provided that it focuses on countries that Canada has traditionally provided aid to in respect of those services.

That does not include the United States of America, our largest trading partner and ally, and I don't think the study should include that, which is why I moved the amendment earlier to strike the words "given recent reports of international backsliding related to women's sexual and reproductive health and rights". Clearly, that was a reference to the recently leaked draft of the Supreme Court of the United States, and I don't think we should be importing that kind of divisive politics into Canada. For those reasons, I don't support this committee studying that issue as it relates to the United States.

There are so many other issues of concern to Canada-U.S. relations that are more important than access in the United States to abortion services. Line 5 is one example. It supplies half of Ontario and Quebec's gasoline, diesel, propane and jet fuel—half—and it is now being—

● (2020)

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, now we seem to be discussing Line 5, and what we are supposed to be discussing is a motion on the reproductive rights of women and the amendment that has been put forward by our Conservative colleague.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Madam Bendayan.

Mr. Chong I think is—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** On that point of order, Mr. Chair, respectfully, we're hearing a lot of points of order from that member when people are making comments that are relevant to the motion. I do notice that there's a lot of discussion happening on the Liberal side concurrently while people are talking, so I do want to respect the fact that maybe it does create some issues in terms of people being able to hear what speakers are saying. Mr. Chong's comments and Mr. Duncan's comments were highly relevant to the question of whether the adjournment should proceed. I hope that members will listen to your rulings rather than continually repeatedly bringing up the same issue.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Mr. Chair, in response to that colleague's intervention, I was speaking to absolutely nobody. I was listening to the intervention of Mr. Chong.

This is my third point of order on relevance after hours of filibuster on a very important motion. The two points of order on relevance in relation to McDonald's were valid and the point of order in relation to Line 5, in my opinion, is valid.

Of course, Mr. Chair, you're free to rule as you see fit, but neither of my points of order earlier nor this one right now are in any way out of line.

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, both of you, for the comments.

I think the members are free to raise points of order and to question relevance in the context of a discussion, any discussion. I think Mr. Chong had a point that was tangentially relevant. He was maybe trying to establish how it is relevant; that motion before members, as you all know, is that debate be adjourned until completion of Ukraine. I think he was trying to make a point with respect to the original motion that dealt with the U.S. If he can show how that's relevant directly to the motion before the committee, I will allow it.

Just in terms of the dynamics generally, I think it's healthy for members to raise a point of order now and then just to make sure the direction of the committee and the discussion really stay focused on the motion that's before the committee. I don't want to necessarily have that discussion be too truncated by points of order that are just there to change the flow, but it's completely within members' discretion to raise a point of order as they see fit, as it is for members who are speaking to defend how their points are relevant.

My own ruling in any particular case could go either way and could be challenged. I see my role more as guiding the general discussion onto the subject of the motion.

I have Mr. Oliphant.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** On that point of order—and I may have forgotten now—it seems to me that we dealt with an attempt to change the motion. There was an amendment to cut out the whereas clause per se. Did we not vote on that already? There was a motion—an amendment—made to strike the first clause with the argument made that it was inferring the United States, and Mr. Chong wanted it out. He is now trying to raise an issue that has been dealt with by this committee. Therefore, I would ask the chair to absolutely rule it out of order as something that the committee has dealt with not in the recent past but in the last several hours.

That's the point. It's not relevance. It's actually against the rules of the committee to try to relitigate an issue that has been dealt with in the very recent past. You might want to check with the clerk, but I think I'm right on that.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** On the same point of order—

**The Chair:** I appreciate that point of order, Mr. Oliphant. It is a different point of order. It is more focused.

I wasn't part of the discussion when that vote took place, but we can certainly verify whether or not that point was effectively extinguished by the committee having pronounced itself on that very issue.

I'll take a comment on that same point of order from Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, just as a matter of procedure, I'm not aware of any rule by which the fact that the committee has previously voted on an amendment to the main motion somehow renders arguments in relation to the main motion that are derived from that same point as no longer acceptable. I'm not familiar with any precedent—and again, I'm happy to hear from the clerk on this—that would say because the committee voted against an amendment from Mr. Chong previously that dealt with one section of the main motion somehow he's not able to discuss that section of the main motion.

What we're discussing right now is a motion to adjourn debate around the motion, so the question of whether or not to adjourn the debate means that questions of the adjournment motion itself, as well as the original motion, which the motion seeks to adjourn debate on, are all relevant.

The implication that you can't reflect on a matter that has previously been voted on by the committee...that's just not a rule. It just isn't.

Thanks.

● (2025)

**The Chair:** Mr. Genuis, thank you very much.

I think one of the points would be to argue that this goes to repetitiveness, in the sense that if we're within the same line of discussion, the same arguments should not be made. You raise a good point, because that was procedurally done under a different motion at a different time at the committee.

I'm going to do two things. I'm going to check, first of all, if the committee did in fact vote to settle that point, and then what the implications of that decision would be with respect to the motion that's currently under discussion.

Please stand by for a moment....

Thank you very much, Madam Clerk.

I hope I'm able to provide some clarification. The committee did vote on this point that was brought by Mr. Chong earlier, and voted against the amendment. That took care of the issue. What that would do is foreclose the opportunity for a member subsequently to resurrect that same amendment or same argument in the form of a new motion to try to do again what the committee has already pronounced itself on.

The repetitiveness point is one that members generally should keep an eye on in the conversation, but it generally extends only to the line of discussion that is under the motion before the committee. If Mr. Genuis, Mr. Chong, Mr. Oliphant or anybody else were to make arguments under that same motion repeatedly, that could be challenged by members on a point of order, because repetition in that case would be against the rules.

I hope that's helpful—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, I have a follow-up point of order.

I respect your position, so I don't want to come across as questioning it, but I'm more seeking clarification. What I understood you to say, and this is consistent with my understanding of procedure, was that the fact that the amendment was defeated means that the same amendment cannot be moved again.

Mr. Chong is, of course, free to point out the fact that his amendment not passing is a primary reason for him continuing to have concerns about the motion, and therefore not wanting to support it in general. Of course, it's fine to make that argument; it's just that he cannot move an amendment identical to his previous amendment. Is that correct?

**The Chair:** That is correct.

Again, members are free to raise points of order that challenge the speaker. We're free to review and assess them. I would just encourage all members to stay focused on the motion under discussion.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Yes. Thank you. That's consistent with my understanding of the rules. I appreciate that.

**The Chair:** With all of that said, it's back to you, Mr. Chong. Go ahead, please.

**Hon. Michael Chong:** Mr. Chair, just to clarify, were my remarks, or were they not, in order?

**The Chair:** Yes, Mr. Chong, they were in order. I would just encourage you, as you're in the threshold of tangential relevance, to just stay focused as much as you can on—

**Hon. Michael Chong:** Thank you. I just wanted to clarify that. Thank you.

As I was saying, I don't support this committee studying access to abortion in the United States, which is why I support Mr. Genuis's motion to adjourn debate on this motion so that we can, hopefully on the sidelines outside of this committee, sort this out.

As I was saying, there are many more issues more important in the Canada-U.S. relationship than abortion. I mentioned Line 5, which supplies half of the energy to Ontario and Quebec for some 24 million consumers in these two provinces. It's at risk of being shut down at any point in time because of what's going on in the U.S. federal court. We have the issue of dairy imports. That continues to be an ongoing issue for many, many dairy farmers in both Ontario in Quebec. We have "buy American" issues. We have the entire modernization of NORAD, which could cost upwards of \$10 billion U.S.

So I don't support this committee looking at access to abortion in the United States. I don't think that's within this committee's remit. I support us taking a look at women's reproductive and health rights, including access to reproductive services in the global south, because that is within the remit of this committee. Canada funds a lot of foreign aid, much of it in the global south. I think it's well within our committee's responsibility to take a look at that, which is why I tried to move that earlier amendment that was not passed.

To finish, Mr. Chair, the reason we should adjourn debate on the motion introduced by Dr. Fry is that I don't believe this committee should be studying access to abortion in the United States. For that reason, I support the motion in front of us. For that reason, I do not support the motion introduced by Dr. Fry.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

● (2030)

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Chong.

Mr. Genuis, go ahead, please.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I appreciate the opportunity to join the debate again and to make some follow-up remarks with respect to some of the things colleagues have said. I will start by reflecting on that.

The main thrust of my remarks was to say, look, this committee has a finite amount of time. The House of Commons has a finite amount of resources. We deal with scarcity in all areas of life, and one of them is the work of parliamentary committees. That means we have to make choices about priorities. We can't just say we're going to do all of it and there's no such thing as scarcity.

I'll share with members that I sometimes have questions about the way in which the scarcity of House resources seems to be selectively used in certain situations. I think members of Parliament should have access in the form of committees to be able to sit when and for however long they want to be able to deal with issues, and to be able to add extra meetings and so forth. But that is just not the reality of how this place is operated. We do have to make choices in the face of these scarce resources between different topics that are up for consideration. That's not even about constraints that exist on our schedule. That's about constraints that we are told are just a function of the structure and the way in which the House of Commons is operating right now.

Over the course of this debate, we have therefore made the argument that the priority of the Canadian foreign affairs committee should be the Russian invasion of Ukraine, and that we should not replace the possibility of further discussion of the invasion of

Ukraine with discussion that reflects the desire of some interest in the PMO to reopen the abortion debate in every parliamentary committee, or at least in most.

We are already seeing the impact of that scarcity. Even today our position was that we should adjourn debate and that we should have discussion in the subcommittee about how this and other priorities of the committee should be scheduled to proceed. The government consistently refused to support that. The consequence was the whips of other parties deciding that the Afghanistan committee that was supposed to meet tonight and hear from interpreters would be cancelled.

That is a mighty shame, given that interpreters who served Canada were going to be here to have their voices heard. We repeatedly tried—

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** One second, Mr. Genuis.

Madam Bendayan, please go ahead.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** I too find it extremely unfortunate that the Afghanistan committee was cancelled this evening—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** That's not a point of order.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** —but it was due to the filibuster engaged in by that colleague. I would argue that the lack of relevance to the motion and the amendment that we are now debating—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** If you would like to argue it, get on the speakers list.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** —is flagrant at this point, Mr. Chair.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** This isn't a matter of order. You're welcome to argue it.

**The Chair:** I think we're getting into a question of debate. I'm sure Mr. Genuis will establish the relevance, so we'll let him go, with the message generally being to stick as closely as he can to the thrust of the motion.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you.

I do think it's revealing when a member says they have a point of order and they use the words "I would argue" in the context of a point of order. That should maybe indicate that it's not a point of order.

● (2035)

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** I apologize. The point of order was on relevance. Please stick to the motion. That's the point of order.

**The Chair:** Let's keep order, colleagues. Instead of talking over top of each other, let's keep order, please.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We have sought to adjourn this meeting and to proceed to allow the Afghanistan committee to do its work. In fact, this is why we said, prior to six o'clock, that we would be prepared to let the debate collapse on this entirely, and it was Liberal members.... The record will show that at six o'clock it was Liberal members that talked this through past that time and therefore ensured that the Afghanistan committee would not proceed

Regardless, the important point is to respond to the arguments made directly by Ms. Bendayan and by Mr. Oliphant, who said, essentially, hey, this committee can do lots of things at once, that we can “walk and chew gum at the same time”.

Let's just reflect on that metaphor a little bit, because the reason people say that you can walk and chew gum at the same time is that you can. Those are activities that don't involve the same organs. Chewing gum involves your teeth and walking involves your legs, right?

But a committee cannot simultaneously study two different issues in the same meeting. It cannot. Of course, it can study one issue at one meeting, one issue at another meeting and go back to the other meeting, but it very clearly can't do those things simultaneously. We have to weigh out....

Some colleagues are speaking to me. I invite them to get on the list or raise points of order, or we can suspend and have a side conversation about this, but otherwise, I'll just continue. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Oliphant.

If members of the government believe that there isn't such a thing as scarcity of resources, well, I'm sorry, that's just missing out on the reality of how this place has worked. The fact is that, today, if this motion hadn't been moved, or if there had been agreement to take a step back from it and have discussion on the side about it, we could have in fact been having the conversation that we should have had on the statement with respect to Ukraine. We might well have adopted that statement, we might have released that statement and we might have tabled a statement in the House.

I would have been in favour of us giving analysts some direction on developing a report on Ukraine, because we're in the middle of a study on Ukraine, and what I'm saying is, let's get back to the vital work that we need to do on Ukraine.

For members across the way to say, well, we can do all these things simultaneously and we can be on this half of the room doing Ukraine and on this half of the room doing something else.... Well, no: That's just not how it works. We need to set priorities. We need to say what we are going to prioritize as a committee. If we're going to prioritize the issue of Ukraine, then we need to set aside a time to hear from witnesses; to renew our information, as there are new developments on the ground; to discuss the many other emerging issues that we have not discussed; and then to move from there to the question of releasing statements and of writing reports—interim report, final report. We can make that decision as a committee about how we move forward.

On the other issue, there were some other statements that were made by government members in response to our conversation on this that I think are—I don't know if I can say “misleading”—inaccurate: I'm sure well intentioned, but inaccurate. This motion was characterized as an idea for a future “work plan”. This isn't an idea for a further work plan. This is a highly prescriptive motion that says we are going to study a particular thing. That is the nature of the way the world works. Parliamentary committees study one thing at a particular meeting at a particular time. This says that in the midst of Ukraine and everything else that is going on, we

should study, they are saying, abortion, and we're saying, and saying in the context of this adjournment motion in particular—

**The Chair:** Mr. Genuis, there is a point of order.

Once again, colleagues, we have bells. It's a 30-minute bell that would take us on this clock until about 9:10 to even get to the vote. We have resources until 9:30 with an absolute hard stop, so that would leave us at best 10 minutes after we come back from this vote.

If colleagues agree.... It's clear that there is going to be more discussion on this. If colleagues agree, I would suggest that we suspend for the evening until our next session, whenever it is, and maybe as early as tomorrow—it may be on Thursday—and that we resume with the speakers list that we have now, which is Mr. Genuis, Mr. Davidson, Mr. Duncan and Ms. McPherson. Is that agreeable?

• (2040)

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, I would suggest that we adjourn as opposed to suspending.

**The Chair:** No, I don't think we have consent for an adjournment.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'm happy to suspend for the night, as well.

**The Chair:** We will suspend until our next session.

Colleagues, the meeting is suspended until the next session.

*[The meeting was suspended at 8:41 p.m., Monday, May 16]*

*[The meeting resumed at 3:37 p.m., Thursday, May 19]*

• (8735)

*[Translation]*

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Good afternoon, honourable members.

I am back as committee chair in these unusual—to say the least—circumstances. Please be kind and indulgent.

Welcome back to meeting number 21 of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development.

Today we will be continuing the discussion that began on Monday.

As always, interpretation is available through the globe icon at the bottom of your screen, and members participating in person should keep in mind the Board of Internal Economy's guidelines for mask use and health protocols.

I would like to take this opportunity to remind all meeting participants that screenshots or taking photos of your screen is not permitted.

Before speaking, please wait until I recognize you by name. When speaking, please speak slowly and clearly. When you are not speaking, your mike should be on mute. A reminder that all comments by members should be addressed through the chair.

We were debating Ms. Fry's motion, and we had an amendment from Mr. Genuis.

We are still debating Mr. Genuis's motion, which I will recap for you.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Mr. Chair—

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** I assume you have a point of order, Ms. Bendayan.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** No. I wanted to say something before we hear from Mr. Genuis, if I may.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** In the spirit of co-operation, you may go ahead.

[English]

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'm sorry. The member wants the floor but not on a point of order. Is that what I understood?

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** You understand correctly, Mr. Genuis.

[English]

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Then, no. That's not consistent with the rules. If the member wants, she can raise a point of order to suggest some aspect of process, but if the member has the floor without a point of order, the member has—

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** I will ask you again, Ms. Bendayan. Do you have a point of order?

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** I just wanted to acknowledge the work of our former chair, Sven Spengemann, who obviously isn't here today. The role of chair certainly suits you, Mr. Chair, but as members of the committee, we can recognize the hard work of our former chair.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** I think every member of the committee would agree that Mr. Spengemann is to be thanked and commended for his hard work, both as the member for his riding and, especially, as chair of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development.

Thank you, Ms. Bendayan.

The floor is yours, Mr. Genuis.

• (8740)

[English]

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Okay.

[Translation]

Thank you, Mr. Chair. Congratulations on your role as chair today.

[English]

If I may, I want to briefly add my own thoughts to what Ms. Bendayan said.

After Monday's meeting and on seeing the resignation of the chair, I thought, "Oh, wow", but he was clear that it had nothing to do with what took place at this committee. I know he's very committed to the work we've done and to continuing work that he cares deeply about. It's been a pleasure to work with him. We won't have a chance formally to see him at the committee before he leaves if he's not able to be here today, but who knows? Maybe we'll call him as a witness one day and get him to report on whatever his new role is. I want to join my voice to those thanking Mr. Spengemann for his work here.

We're having a discussion about an adjournment motion that we put forward. The context of that was very simply that this committee has multiple studies going on that respond to emergent, urgent, time-sensitive issues going on in the world right now. We're concurrently working on a study on vaccine equity and COVAX, a study on Taiwan and, of course, a study with respect to the invasion of Ukraine by the Putin regime. In the midst of that ongoing work, a motion was put forward by a Liberal member that said we should prescribe a certain number of meetings to a new study on the issue of abortion abroad, with a clear implication that this study would include a discussion of what's happening in the United States as well as other countries.

This is in a context that I think members know. There seems to be a strategy among Liberal members and some NDP members, across a broad range of committees, to try to reopen the abortion debate and have a discussion about abortion. This is not just at one committee, but at many committees. There have been motions with respect to it at three or four committees, and I think it's likely that there's a political strategy here whereby the government wants to reopen the abortion debate in as many committees as possible because it has decided that it's in its political interest to do so.

As part of that context, as we know, I read a quotation from the former minister of justice and attorney general, Jody Wilson-Raybould. She was explicit about saying that there was a tactic on the part of the government to try to look for opportunities to reopen the abortion debate because it believes this is in its political interest. My humble encouragement to this committee is—

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Sorry, Mr. Genuis, but I believe Ms. McPherson has a point of order.

[English]

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** I would like to point out that the member has assumed or made the accusation, veiled as it may be, that the NDP has been working to bring this forward as a political thing. I brought a similar motion forward at the international human rights subcommittee because it is vitally important for women and because I'm a mother, I have a daughter and I am a daughter. It has nothing to do with any political machinations, so I'd like the member to withdraw—

[*Translation*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** I hate to have to interrupt you, Ms. McPherson, but I don't think that's a point of order. It's actually a point of debate, and since you're the next person on the speaking list, you'll get the chance to have your say. Thank you.

Please continue, Mr. Genuis.

[*English*]

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you for your ruling. If it's not out of order, I want to take the opportunity to wish the member a happy anniversary. I saw that on social media.

The member is up next, of course, and she is welcome to—and I suspect she will—disagree with a number of the points I've made, but I've presented my perspective on the issue respectfully, as I see it, and welcome the opportunity to hear the views of other members as well.

As I was saying, other committees can do what other committees wish, of course, but in the particular global context we're dealing with in terms of foreign affairs, we have said that we'd have a discussion at a future date about the future agenda of this committee. At the very least, let's make sure we complete the work required on all of the studies that are in front of us. That was our first proposal.

We proposed a number of motions to refer this to the subcommittee on agenda and procedure. The normal process is that the subcommittee on agenda and procedure receives various recommendations from members, and then there's a discussion in the spirit of co-operation about how to manage the committee's agenda in a way that makes sense, given the different ideas that come forward from members. We initially proposed to refer this issue to the subcommittee on agenda and procedure. Our friends in the other parties, through their votes, expressed that they didn't want to do that, so we asked if we could adjourn debate until we had completed all of the existing studies and return to this question of the agenda once we had completed our existing studies. Again, that was opposed.

We're back to a very precise and a very reasonable appeal through the motion that I moved, which is to simply adjourn debate on this question until we've completed our work on Ukraine.

Given what's going on in Ukraine.... Frankly, just given my observations about the public comments, the social media comments and comments in the House of many members on this committee, it seemed that, up until this motion was moved, there was a clear consensus that Ukraine was and is the urgent foreign policy priority in front of us. I understand that members on the committee may agree, yet there may be a PMO-driven strategy that says it wants the foreign affairs committee to be talking about something it decides is in its political interest to talk about rather than what's urgently before the committee.

As it happens, I'm a former PMO staffer myself, so maybe at another time I can make some confessions with respect to that—

● (8745)

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Chair, on a point of order, I'm not sure what the Prime Minister's Office or any supposed strategy has to do

with the amendment that is being proposed, so my point of order would be on lack of relevance. I do not understand where the member is going, and as many of us have said many times, we're happy to complete the study on Ukraine, the study that I brought forward as a matter of priority.

We simply want to vote on this motion.

[*Translation*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Thank you, Ms. Bendayan.

I have previously pointed out that the chair has always given a wide interpretation to the relevance criterion. I don't want to put words in the member's mouth, but I think he was referring to his personal experience. If you don't mind, I'm going to ask Mr. Genuis to continue with his remarks while sticking as closely as possible to the substance of his motion.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, for the great work.

[*English*]

Respectfully, to the member who raised the objection, what I think I'm very clearly talking about is what is before us, the choice that is embodied in the motion that I put forward, and that choice is the question of whether we should consider this motion to have the foreign affairs committee of Canada study abortion along with various other parliamentary committees, or whether we should complete the work that needs to be done on the issue of Ukraine.

There have been various interruptions, and I want to just make a few comments on an issue that I know is very important with respect to Ukraine and speaks to the urgency of the study we have to do on Ukraine, which is the issue of food security.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Mr. Oliphant has a point of order.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** We may need clarification from the clerk on this, but does the motion as presented and then amended have a date on it that requires the study to happen before the Ukraine study? I'm now unclear.

Mr. Genuis is very clear in his argument that there is a date that supersedes the Ukraine study, but is that in the motion? I'm having a—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** On—

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** I have the floor right now for a point of order, Mr. Genuis. You're very aware of that.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** That's not a point of order.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** I'm misunderstanding the motion, I think, so I may need clarification from the clerk as to whether indeed it has a date that requires a suspension of our current study to take us to the next study.

● (8750)

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** This seems like a point of debate, Mr. Chair.



[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Madam Clerk, can you shed light on Mr. Oliphant's question about the motion?

[English]

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, on a point of order, if I may, the member has a factual question.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** There's a point of order on the floor and the chair hasn't ruled on it, Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'd like to speak to the same point of order, Mr. Chair.

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** If you don't mind, Mr. Genuis, I'm going to ask the clerk for some clarification, and then, you can have the floor to speak to the same point of order.

[English]

**The Clerk:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. The motion as it's currently formulated does not have any dates listed in it.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** That helps me understand a little better. Thank you.

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Thank you.

Mr. Genuis, you wanted to comment on the same point of order.

[English]

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, as I think you'll find, the idea that this was raised as a matter of order and not as a matter of debate is a bit farcical. The member wished to make a point in response to a point I was making. I'm happy for him to make it at the appropriate time by getting on the speakers list, and I'll respond to his point momentarily, but to suggest that seeking clarification about the text of the motion we're debating is somehow a question of order as opposed to a question of debate is, frankly, beneath the member.

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Go ahead, Ms. Fry.

[English]

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** On point of order, Mr. Chair, is Mr. Genuis challenging the chair on accepting Mr. Oliphant's point of order, which was a question of clarification for the clerk?

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** No, I'm not.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** It sounds as if you are, Mr. Genuis, and I raise that as a point of order because if you're challenging the chair, we have to call a vote on your challenge of the chair.

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Mr. Genuis just made clear that he wasn't, so I'm going to ask him to continue now.

[English]

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I think I've made my point with respect to the matters of order, and I'll get back to the issue of food security, briefly.

I know many members have raised, in the context of how urgent the discussion of Ukraine is and the need for this committee to get to its work on Ukraine, that what is happening in Ukraine has global implications with respect to food security and access to food. I want to note a few things from an article on this.

Actually, I should start, with respect to food security, by just reading out a tweet from my colleague in the NDP. It's something I agree with. She said, "We need to talk about catastrophic food shortages around the world right now! Food security is an urgent issue! This is a threat to human life and a serious security risk everywhere. We can deal with this crisis appropriately and timely now or we will 1000x in the future." I think that's prescient in that it relates very much to the work we need to do on Ukraine.

I'll quote from a news article:

Russia's invasion of Ukraine has sent food commodity prices soaring in March to the highest levels ever recorded, bringing to the forefront the global implications of its military offensive on the former breadbasket of the Soviet Union.

As Moscow refocuses its military efforts on Ukraine's east, readying massive forces for part two of its offensive, analysts have warned a Russian takeover of Ukraine's ports and most fertile stretch of land will have repercussions on Ukraine's food exports to be felt the world over.

I think that's an important part of the context.

Mr. Chair, at this point I'll yield the floor and happily listen to the comments of other members. Thank you very much.

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Thank you, Mr. Genuis.

I must apologize, Ms. McPherson, for not taking into account your anniversary when I made my decision earlier. I do, however, want to wish you a happy anniversary, and I have no doubt the committee members join me in wishing you a wonderful end of the day.

Now, over to you, Ms. McPherson.

[English]

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** Why, thank you, Mr. Chair.

I will say that it would perhaps not be my preference to spend my anniversary with all of you, as much as I enjoy you all very much. Hopefully, I will get an opportunity to see my husband of 21 years very soon.

**Some hon. members:** Hear, hear!

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** I'm not going to take up very much time. I'm not interested in filibustering this committee, but I want to say a few things that are very important that I want on the record.

This motion that came forward from Dr. Fry is not time-bound. We can study this in the fall. We don't have to do it right now. We have the opportunity to look at this. This committee has very clearly used this way of bringing forward studies. In fact, it was my study in December on Ukraine that I brought forward to this committee that started the study on Ukraine. Ms. Bendayan brought forward a study on Ukraine to make sure we were looking at this.

Nobody in this room thinks a study on Ukraine is not vital, which is why we have been undertaking it. If you look around this room at the number of people who are celebrating Ukrainian culture and Ukrainian history and honouring Ukrainians today, it is very apparent, so nobody is saying that.

In fact, what we could do is vote, in probably less than one minute, on this motion that is before us to look at this issue going forward, to look at reproductive health for women around the world, something that is vitally important. The member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan seems to think it's a ploy. The member for Halton Hills seems to think that trade is more important and that it is not important, but I have to say that, realistically, on the attacks on women's reproductive rights in the United States, the Supreme Court leak is one aspect of it. There are multiple states where women's rights are being undermined; there are multiple places around the world, including Ukraine. There are problems with reproductive access in this country, for people in this country. People sitting at this table have constituents who have no access to reproductive health. It is a vitally important issue.

It is offensive to me as a mother of a 17-year-old daughter. I want to make sure I do everything I can to fight for her to always have access to the full range of reproductive services. How could I come to this place and fight for the reproductive rights of my daughter without fighting for the reproductive rights of every 17-year-old girl in this world? How could I do that? My daughter has a right to get an abortion if she needs one. Everyone's daughter decides how they choose to use their body and how they choose to act, because you know what? Do you know what we call an animal that doesn't have control over their reproduction? Livestock. We call them livestock.

The member for Sherwood Park—Fort Saskatchewan did one other thing the other day that deeply disturbed me. I would urge him to ask himself whether or not it would be worthy for him to apologize. He mocked gender identity. He chose a political opportunity to mock people who do not identify in cisnormative ways according to his description.

• (8755)

[*Translation*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** You have a point of order, Mr. Genuis.

[*English*]

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** On a point of order, Mr. Chair, the member is attacking my character and saying things that are simply not true. I'm happy to comment further on the context of what I think she's referring to, but the allegation she's making is totally baseless. Respectfully, it's just wrong.

I don't know if the committee will allow me to comment on that or if they'll see it as a point of debate—

[*Translation*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** With all due respect, Mr. Genuis, that's more a point of debate, and you've asked to be on the speaking list.

[*English*]

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** It's not a point of order.

[*Translation*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** You'll get the chance to share your views on the member's arguments.

Carry on, Ms. McPherson.

[*English*]

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, I respect your ruling, but I would ask if you could clarify: Are there no limits to what a member can say about another member and to a member's insulting another member—falsely?

[*Translation*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** There are limits, and you know them. If you feel your privileges as a member have been breached, you know what has to happen next. At this point, I consider it to be simply a point of debate, a point of disagreement between two members of Parliament.

I encourage you to express your opinion when you have the floor again.

We are listening, Ms. McPherson.

[*English*]

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

To summarize and to finish, I just want to say one thing: We could pass this immediately. This is an important motion for us to bring forward. This is an important thing for this committee to look at, and I am prepared to listen to hours upon hours of Conservative men telling me what I should think about reproductive health in this world so that it comes to a vote.

I would point out that it is in fact Mr. Chong's motion about Taiwan that we can't get to today because of the Conservative filibuster. I would point out that it is Mr. Genuis's private member's legislation that we will not be talking about today because of Mr. Genuis's filibustering this committee.

We could get to our work on Ukraine. We could get to our work on vaccine equity. We could get to our work on Taiwan. We could do so many things that need to happen in this committee, and we're not doing that because the Conservatives refuse to vote.

If they actually believe that this is not a study we should undertake, vote that way. Let's get it done.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

• (8800)

[*Translation*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Thank you, Ms. McPherson.

Go ahead, Mrs. Stubbs.

[*English*]

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs (Lakeland, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Not being a permanent member, I just want to say that it's my pleasure to be able to join all of you here in this committee. It's nice to see all of you.

It is, I guess, exactly for the reason that it is Vyshyvanka Day that we should be having this debate and showing Ukrainian Canadians in every corner of this country that it's not just an empty gesture of people wearing cultural clothes and it's not that all the permanent members of this committee are prepared to do is to do that instead of taking seriously their influence, the impact and their responsibility to address this crucial and urgent issue of the attack on Ukraine.

It has been almost three months since Putin first attacked. Of course, for years before that, he was building up troops and Conservatives were calling for government action. It was earlier in the new year that Conservatives called for exactly what the president of Ukraine asked for, which was the provision of lethal weapons so that Ukrainians could defend themselves.

I believe—I think it's true—that the solidarity and sincerity among all members of Parliament in the Canadian House of Commons across all parties are legitimate. I want to believe everybody who says they want to protect Ukrainians against the unjust and illegal attack by Putin, not just because of the role that Canada can play in securing peace and freedom for our allies—Canada being the country that was the first to recognize the independence of Ukraine and to carry that legacy and our own national heritage—but also, obviously, in support and in defence of the very real impact of the attack on Ukraine to Canadians themselves, to Ukrainian Canadians in every corner of this country.

I happen to represent a riding that is in the top five of where Ukrainian Canadians live. I grew up in the county of Lamont, just south of a tiny village in what is known as the cradle of Ukrainian settlement in Canada, the home of the first 125 Ukrainian families to settle in our country. I'm not Ukrainian, but I married into a Ukrainian family, and you will all know that you become one by osmosis because of the tight-knit relationships, the self-reliance and carrying on the traditions of providing for each other and caring for each other among Ukrainian Canadians.

This is a debate that is obviously crucial and urgent, and it's an emergency in terms of foreign affairs policy overall, but it's also deeply important, personal and urgent for Canadians, so it seems to me that it's exactly why the members of this committee should prioritize finishing the work you initiated in regard to the attack on Ukraine. Frankly, I think that if you don't pursue this work as the urgent priority that it is, then in terms of our gestures, our words and the solidarity that we pledge, it's really very empty, isn't it?

I would implore all of the members across all of the parties in this committee to continue to do the vital and urgent work on Putin's attack on Ukraine. I urge you to take seriously all of the very impactful roles that you can each have to make concrete and constructive solutions and recommendations for how Canada can assist Ukrainians fleeing Ukraine under attack and, also, of course, in the service of the Ukrainian Canadians whom so many of us represent. It is very obvious to me that this should be the top priority for the foreign affairs committee right now.

• (8805)

I want to recognize the efforts and the work undertaken by the Canadian government so far. We've supported the imposition of sanctions and a number of other measures, but there is no denying that there are still major challenges in terms of Canada's response to aid the people of Ukraine and particularly to aid the people and families who want to come to Canada for peace, freedom and security. A couple of those areas really require your dedicated work and co-operation and the redoubling of your efforts, your hearts and your minds to this issue that is so necessary, because there continue to be major projects despite the efforts the government has made so far.

I would just point out the issues around the promised expedited visa program. Of course, Conservatives called for visa-free travel, but the reality is that this so-called expedited visa program is taking months. It is extremely bureaucratic. In many cases, it is just absolutely impossible for Ukrainians to access the program and to meet the requirements. It requires your work to make the recommendations to improve that program.

There are a number of other promises related to the three-year work or study program for Ukrainians, as well as extended visa stays and open work permits for Ukrainians who are already in Canada and can't go home. For example, there are still no details related to the April 9 announcement about this financial support for hotel accommodations and income support. That announcement was made in April, and there are no details on that program or real funding for Ukrainian refugees who have been here for months. That's an urgent issue that your committee ought to study and make recommendations on to improve.

Again, we take this at face value. I think all the members of the party believe this to be true, but the government and Liberal members of Parliament have said they want to ensure that there's urgent processing of travel documents. The reality is, that hasn't materialized. There are no realistic and concrete improvements that work for the people of Ukraine fleeing the terror and the attacks from Putin. That's a major problem that I think deserves your attention and your recommendation.

**Mr. Randeep Sarai:** Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** Not to put too fine a point on it, the truth is that the Samaritan's Purse has successfully airlifted more Ukrainians.

[*Translation*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** I'd like to hear what Mr. Sarai has to say, Mrs. Stubbs.

Go ahead, Mr. Sarai.

[English]

**Mr. Randeep Sarai:** I'm trying to understand the relevance of this. We're not talking about the motion at hand. We're talking about a study we have already done and perhaps another one that could be done. I fail to understand how talking about what's happening in Russia or Ukraine has any relevance to the motion request by Dr. Fry or any amendment to it. We can talk about anything at any time, but it has to have some relevance to what we're dealing with.

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Thank you for your comments, Mr. Sarai, but as you know, tradition holds that the chair interpret the rule of relevance quite broadly.

Mrs. Stubbs, I would be especially grateful if you would focus your remarks on the substance of the motion as much as possible.

Thank you, Mrs. Stubbs. You may carry on with your comments.

• (8810)

[English]

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** I think all of this context is extremely relevant and important to the question about finishing the work on the escalating situation in Ukraine.

As I mentioned, the reality is that the Samaritan's Purse has successfully airlifted Ukrainians under attack into Canada more in the last three months than the Government of Canada has done. That, given no end in sight to the attacks that have already been going on for the last three months, again merits your urgent attention to and prioritization of this issue.

I just want to close by telling you a little about the experience of a teenager in Vegreville. Members in this committee would note, of course, that the Liberals closed the highest-performing and most effective citizenship and immigration processing centre in that very community of Vegreville, which is also a community of long-time Ukrainian families and settlement. I guess it is ironic in the worst possible way, and tragic, really, that there continue to be these visa processing holdups, lags and backlogs in the system.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Mr. Chair, on a point of order, I know you've ruled a few times on relevance. This one is now way off anything to do with the adjournment motion, the amendment, the motion, or the foreign affairs committee as it stands. I can't see any relevance whatsoever.

I would hope that you would rule on that.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'd be happy to speak to the same point of order.

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Go ahead, Mr. Genuis.

[English]

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, these points really are not consistent with long-standing practice. Members know that. If a member is talking about something else for a period of 30 to 60 seconds, to interrupt that member before they've had any opportunity.... If somebody is speaking for five minutes and none of it has any relation to the motion....

The convention in the House of Commons is that we've had cases of people telling lengthy background stories—and that's not what the member is doing here—going on for five, six or seven minutes without reference to the bill, and then concluding by creating a connection to the bill. That's a long-established practice. Members across the way know that. I see what they're trying to do.

Chair, I think you've repeatedly ruled that their points are off. I hope they will just stop the interruptions in light of your repeated rulings.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Mr. Chair, further to that, I would argue that relevance is relevance. It is a concept that is not hard to understand.

I would say that an IRCC processing plant in Vegreville or anywhere has absolutely nothing to do with the future agenda of this committee, which is not being set but is being proposed as something for us to do in the fall.

Thank you.

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Thank you, Mr. Oliphant.

I have no doubt that Mrs. Stubbs will explain to us the connection between her comments and the motion, especially since she was getting ready to let someone else have the floor, if I'm not mistaken.

Please wrap up your comments, Mrs. Stubbs.

[English]

**Mrs. Shannon Stubbs:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I find it somewhat surprising that the Liberal members don't seem to think that talking about the real experiences—which I was just about to get to—of refugees from war-torn Ukraine are relevant to this motion and also to the committee. I'm quite certain that it's exactly the kind of experience that we should be talking about, given the motion's comments about the escalating situation at the Russia-Ukraine border, which has, of course, created 13 million refugees. Over six million of those are fleeing from Ukraine.

Let me tell you about the experiences of one of the Ukrainians who are now in Vegreville, in Lakeland. He's a guy named Makita. He is 19 years old. He came to Canada to play hockey. He billets in Vegreville, in Lakeland. It's no surprise that the community has taken him under their wing.

When war broke out and Putin attacked, he frantically tried to keep in touch with his family—his mother, Natalia, and his sister, Anna, who is 16. He wanted to try to get them here to Canada. He knew his father couldn't come, and his mother considered trying to send his sister to Canada to safety, because she's only 16. It was hard, of course, to send a minor alone.

Makita has worked at a tire shop. The community has fundraised intensely to get them money to come. They auctioned off his hockey jersey to show support. He wanted to go get them, but the community begged him not to, because he wouldn't be able to get back out.

His family barely speaks English, and their only option was the Canada-Ukraine authorization for emergency travel, so Makita went to a friend for help on their laptop to apply. Of course, as I know all of your offices are probably hearing right across the country, it was really confusing and took weeks, even after approval for his family. Then they had to make their way to provide biometrics, which aren't available in Ukraine. His mother and sister finally arrived on April 19, but with no financial support except for the goodwill, kindness and charity of the people of Vegreville. Of course, they'd like to plan their lives and find jobs, since there is no funding available to them from the government, but you can imagine it's not easy, as it wouldn't be for any new Canadian or refugee here with a language barrier. Right now they are just in total limbo.

The problem comes down to immigration issues, challenges and delays that Canada so far doesn't seem equipped to deal with, which are exactly the barriers and challenges your committee should be looking at when you continue this priority study, which I hope you'll decide to do so that you can make concrete recommendations to make a real difference in the lives of all these innocent people.

I think that Makita's story is important to understanding the real human aspect of what we're talking about, which often can be theoretical, conceptual or mainly systemic.

Makita's family had to go on the website, which, being Canadian, was in only English and French. His mother and sister could not understand, and they did not have regular computer services. They tried to get on through their phones. Long hold times caused them to give up, which was when Makita went to a friend's house to try to apply. For just his mother and sister, it took almost four hours, as they asked questions about where his mother worked and his sister went to school, with addresses and dates. He stayed on hold on a very poor phone line, losing her multiple times. After applying, Makita still had to check the government account to try to tell her when he got a message. Then his mother was told to get biometrics and had to get to a place to do that in Poland and wait for an appointment. They have no car, and nothing was provided for them. They had to go, not only for biometrics, but again to submit the passport. It took two separate visits for these refugees to get their application done in a foreign country.

Now they are in Canada. Makita's mother, who barely speaks English, does not have a job. The federal government announced that there would be—as they had mentioned before—some short-term income support to ensure their basic needs are met, but of course there are no details.

• (8815)

Those who entered under the emergency travel authorization don't know if that will include them or if it will be only for those who are brought over on charter flights by the Canadian government. Of course, the first round of chartered flights from the Canadian government won't show up in Ukraine until next week.

People are calling in—I'm sure it's the same in your offices—saying that their applications are sitting...because they had an application in prior, to visit, and now agents are not completing them for ridiculous reasons, such as not knowing if you should give a one-time entry or a multi-entry to refugees coming from a war zone under attack.

In another case, my constituent, Darren, called for his father-in-law, who had originally applied to come and see his daughter's new baby. The agent said they hadn't been approved because they were not sure what type of entry visa to give, single or multi. The system is broken overall, I think, but particularly in this case. I think it is up to the members of Parliament here, who obviously could have an impact, to put pressure on the minister to provide adequate direction to make these changes that are important in people's real lives.

I would just say that if departmental officials in our own Canadian government don't know the answers, I don't know how in heck vulnerable Ukrainians fleeing for their lives are supposed to figure all of this out. That's why it's so important that in your committee you continue your work and redouble your efforts and commitment to study the situation in Ukraine, and that you really fulfill your role as MPs on this important committee, beyond gestures and displays and words, to make concrete recommendations to make a difference for the people of Ukraine. It's important that you make a difference for Ukrainian Canadians everywhere and help find ways for Canada to help Ukraine, which is under attack, and bring Ukrainians to safety. Of course, that's something that all of us from all parties keep saying repeatedly that we want to do.

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate being able to be here.

• (8820)

[*Translation*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** On the speaking list, I have Ms. Dancho, Mr. Brock, Ms. Gladu, Mr. Genuis again, Ms. Bendayan and Ms. Fry, in that order.

Over to you, Ms. Dancho.

[*English*]

**Ms. Raquel Dancho (Kildonan—St. Paul, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I want to recognize, first off, as we debate this motion to adjourn, the motion on women's health. I want to say and recognize how very sensitive this issue is. Women particularly, as I'm seeing on this committee for sure, and that includes me, have very strong feelings about this. It's very deeply personal. My objective today is to ensure that those feelings are respected.

That being said, Mr. Chair, I feel very obligated to address something that the member for Edmonton Strathcona said. I took great offence to her generalizing Conservative men in the way she did. I have served with the Conservative federal caucus for two and a half years. I know my male colleagues to be good men, compassionate men, and hard-working, principled and patriotic men. I'm also married to a Conservative man. Many of my dearest friends are Conservative men.

For anyone to generalize in the way she did about Conservative men, I take great, deep and personal offence to that.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** I have Mr. Oliphant on a point of order.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** My concern is that the issue of being male was not the issue. The issue was Mr. Genuis's saying, "Can I speak to the point of order? I don't think I've ever disclosed my gender to this committee."

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** That's not a point of order.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** It had nothing to do with being "male". It had to do with the fact that he was making fun of people whose gender identity is not determined.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I was not making fun, Mr. Chair. If he can address this on a point of order, then I should have been able to as well.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** That is the issue that Ms. McPherson was raising.

I'm happy to quote from the debate—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'm happy to address it, but he should address this by raising his hand, not by interrupting someone else.

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** If I may address that, Mr. Chair—

[*Translation*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** I realize this debate has roused everyone's passions, but so far, it's a matter of interpretation.

[*English*]

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** Order.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

[*Translation*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Ms. Fry, please put your mike on mute.

[*English*]

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** Order indeed: We have four people speaking at once. They are speaking over each other. That's my point of order.

[*Translation*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Ms. Fry, I—

[*English*]

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** I'm making a point of order, Chair. I have a right to do so.

[*Translation*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Please go ahead.

What is your point of order, Ms. Fry?

[*English*]

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** My point of order is this. I am listening to this debate and I heard four people speaking over each other. I was asking for there to be order and precedence [*Technical difficulty—Editor*] people's names are up for speaking.

If a member raises their hand, as the chair well knows, on a point of order, that takes precedence. Mr. Oliphant was speaking to a point of order. He was interrupted not only by Mr. Genuis but by two other people. I would really like to see some order occurring in this forum.

Thank you.

[*Translation*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Thank you for your support, Ms. Fry.

Mr. Oliphant and Mr. Genuis, those are very relevant points of debate. I can add you to the speaking list, if you wish, Mr. Oliphant.

Now, please continue, Ms. Dancho.

[*English*]

**Ms. Raquel Dancho:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I apologize to Mr. Oliphant for not calling him by his riding name—I'm not familiar with it—but I do not appreciate, Mr. Chair, being told how to feel when I feel deeply personally offended by a comment from the member from Edmonton—Strathcona.

Mr. Chair, again, I don't feel that there is any place for any man or woman on this committee to tell me how I've interpreted something said by another member when from my perspective she has deeply insulted Conservative men generally. I just want to put on the record how very proud I am of the Conservative men in my caucus and, frankly, how very proud I am of Mr. Genuis. There is no one in Parliament who has stood up for religious minorities across the world with the relentlessness and dedication of Mr. Genuis, and I'm very proud to call him my colleague.

On the motion to adjourn, Mr. Chair, I very much agree that Ukraine needs to be the focus—very much. I represent a riding in which at least one in four constituents, if not more, is of Ukrainian descent, and some are very first-generation Ukrainian. I also have in my riding the most folks of Polish descent out of any riding in Canada.

Also, the nephew of a very dear friend of mine was killed within the first couple of weeks of the war on Ukraine. He was 26. As well, a number of family members with relations in my riding have been killed in the war on Ukraine. I represent them when I am in Parliament.

I cannot see anything more important for the foreign affairs committee to be studying or to be focused on than the war on Ukraine right now, how Canada can play a greater role in supporting Ukraine, and further, how we can ensure that we can be reaching out to our allies so that they also provide more resources and more support to Ukraine.

I have to say that I receive a considerable number of comments from my Ukrainian constituents with concerns that the Liberal government is not providing enough defence supplies to Ukraine and that they were very late to the game. I think something that this committee—and the defence committee as well—should clearly be reviewing why it took so long to send military defence. That is consistently a piece of information and feedback that I have received from my Ukrainian constituents. Perhaps the committee would wish to discuss that in its study, or in a future study, so that this mistake is not made in the future and perhaps lives could be saved.

Something I found very personally alarming when the war on Ukraine broke out was from a young member of parliament there. She's my age and she is an opposition MP as well. Her name is Kira Rudik. She shared something on Twitter to the effect that "a few days ago I was a legislator and now I'm fighting for the freedom of my country". She was photographed with a firearm, a very large firearm. I will never in my life, as long as I live, get that image from her tweet out of my head. It was the most relatable moment that I had felt concerning a war in a country that we call an ally, that we call a friend. To see a woman just like me, who is at her job just like we are right now, and to think that in just a few days you're taking up arms to defend your homeland, I think is possibly one of the most shocking, disturbing and scary things I could think of.

I very much support her and the efforts of women there to stand their ground and to defend their homeland and their sovereignty against an aggressor. Obviously President Zelenskyy and many male leaders in Ukraine are involved in this as well, but I would say that their women are really shining as well.

If we look to the Prime Minister of Finland, Sanna Marin, who was 34 years old when she was first elected as the Prime Minister of Finland and is now 37 or 38—very young—and one of the youngest world leaders in the world right now, she is very boldly and very bravely following many decades of neutrality with NATO by putting her country forward to join NATO. They share an extremely long border with Russia.

As a woman politician, to see a young woman who's similar in age to me with that sort of gumption and that bravery to stand up to one of the most intimidating authoritarian figures in modern times is also incredibly inspiring. I very much applaud the Prime Minister of Finland, as well as the Prime Minister of Sweden, for standing up to bullies, so to speak, and pursuing NATO membership.

I very much support the Canadian government in supporting those initiatives from the prime ministers of Finland and Sweden. Also, on our leader, I think she's been very eloquent in putting on the record in the House of Commons, in the chamber, how important it is that Canadians and members of Parliament understand the severity of what's going on.

• (8825)

She said something that I thought.... I remember that when she said it, it gave me goosebumps. She was talking to President Zelenskyy when he came virtually to the chamber. She said to him in her speech, "The kind of leadership that you are showing, sir, is very rare, and it serves as an inspiration to all of us who are elected. You are the leader of Ukraine for such a time as this, and we remain indebted to you."

I just mentioned Prime Minister Marin and the Swedish prime minister, whose name escapes me at the moment. In looking at many of these leaders, including MP Rudyk, the opposition MP in Ukraine, I continue to think of Canada. Should Canada—God help us—ever face something like this, would I be brave enough to do what the Ukrainians are doing? Would you be brave enough, Mr. Chair? Would our Prime Minister or the leader of the Conservative Party be? I hope so. I think we all hope we would be, but as our leader said, it is extremely rare to see this. I think President Zelenskyy's leadership and bravery will stand the test of time, as he is one of the bravest leaders in the western world in the 21st century.

On the issue of Ukraine and the importance of this committee's ensuring that it focuses on Ukraine, everyone has seen the images. It's so strange to think that one day my constituents are visiting their families in Ukraine—their families are coming here to visit us and they are breaking bread—and then we see what's on Instagram. There are so many videos, and I actually had to stop watching them because of how alarming they were. You see families huddled in bomb shelters, ruined children's hospitals and maternity wards, dead bodies in the streets, women who were raped and people who were shot in the back of the head—absolutely barbaric war practices that I don't think any of us ever anticipated we would be seeing. To think the individuals in Ukraine are related to the constituents I represent.... When I was asked to join the foreign affairs committee today to talk about the importance of this committee's focusing on Ukraine, I willingly took up the opportunity, given how close to home this is for the people I represent.

Again, I think we're seeing the global order shift. That's why foreign affairs, more than almost any other committee, should be extensively studying Ukraine. I would hope to see it study Canada's position in the international order and how it has changed relative to the Russian aggression and that posture, as well as what we're seeing with Finland and Sweden. I think that would likely warrant a committee study, as would how Canada is looking at its Arctic.

At the national security and public safety committee, I put forward a motion of study, which we're addressing right now, to review Canada's ability to defend itself against Russian aggression should the worst happen. Of course, it's highly unlikely, but I think that regardless, our duty as legislators is to ensure that—

• (8830)

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Once again, Mr. Chair, my point of order has to do with relevance.

We are listening to Ms. Dancho describe her very worthwhile work on another committee. I understand that Canada has to be ready for any eventuality, and I certainly agree with her, but that has nothing at all to do with the motion before us. The motion before the committee has to do with the reproductive rights of 51% of the population—women. The member's comments are not germane to the Conservatives' amendment either. The comments are off topic and irrelevant.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** My sense is that Ms. Dancho is trying to stick to the topic of Ukraine, which is one of the central elements of Mr. Genuis's adjournment motion.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Yes, I was with her on that, but then she started talking about the Arctic.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Your argument has more to do with viewpoints, and you will certainly have the chance to share yours, since you are on the speaking list.

Ms. Dancho, it would be greatly appreciated if you would concentrate on the substance of your fellow member's motion as much as possible.

[English]

**Ms. Raquel Dancho:** Mr. Chair, correct me I'm wrong, but I believe we are debating whether we should be adjourning because we should be focusing on Ukraine. I think it would be very odd not to be talking about the Canadian foreign affairs context and our ability to defend ourselves, given the war on Ukraine. I can't really think of anything more relevant, given that with the Russian aggression, all countries in the world, I would think, have had to review their own national security abilities.

The eye-roll I just saw from the members opposite is a bit disrespectful, and I would ask that if you don't agree—

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** I have a point of order.

What is disrespectful is coming to this committee as a substitute and insisting that what we are doing is talking about the agenda of the committee. We are not talking about the agenda of the committee. We are talking about a motion to be considered for the agenda of the committee. That is what is disrespectful.

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** With all due respect, Mr. Oliphant, that isn't a point of order.

Go ahead, Ms. Dancho.

• (8835)

[English]

**Ms. Raquel Dancho:** Again, on the national security and public safety committee, the reason we began the study to review the security posture concerning Russian aggression is that Canada shares a very long Arctic border with the Arctic Ocean and Russia, and they have numerous military bases, 19. They have over 40 icebreakers, most of them nuclear powered.

To think that any member of Parliament doesn't believe that what is happening in Ukraine does not impact the security posture of Canada.... The member is perhaps not fully aware of the magnitude of the situation going on in Ukraine, how it impacts Canadians and

the conversations parliamentarians should be having to ensure that we are not only supporting our Ukrainian allies, but also doing everything we can at home.

We can even talk about cybersecurity. Ukraine has experienced significant cybersecurity attacks and threats from Russia. Canada, which overall does quite well with cybersecurity compared to others, is lending support to Ukraine. That may be an issue that this committee would like to review as well, considering that the cybersecurity field is growing in importance in terms of its threat to critical infrastructure, hospitals and Canada's contacts to CRA and to Global Affairs. We're seeing considerable security threats to cybersecurity. I'm very glad and proud that Canada was able to provide expertise to Ukraine in this regard.

I would also say that the study at SECU, the national security and public safety committee, is relevant to this discussion to underline the importance of staying on the study of Ukraine because of the infrastructure we're looking at in the Canadian context if we want to talk about the threat that Russia poses to the rest of the Western world. We're also looking at our surveillance technology in Canada. We can talk about NORAD, which is four decades old and has not been updated in quite some time.

Again, when we're talking about the invasion of Ukraine, we also have to be reviewing, as parliamentarians, our ability to defend ourselves should the worst happen, however unlikely that may be.

We've had numerous leading academic and national security experts underline this position so clearly that it would be foolish for parliamentarians not to take this seriously in the Canadian context of what's happening in Ukraine. Not only do we need to focus, Mr. Chair, on supporting our Ukrainian allies, but also we need to focus on ensuring that Canada is prepared for a cyber-attack, for an attack on our critical infrastructure.

In fact, when I was briefed by the cybersecurity officials of Public Safety, they said that the worst, like the Pearl Harbor event.... I asked what would be the worst thing that could happen, and they said it was an attack on our critical pipeline infrastructure. These are the types of conversations we need to be having at both the foreign affairs and the national security and public safety committees. I've been very pleased but alarmed to hear the testimony from leading national security advisers. Again, I think that everyone recognizes that it is very important that we have these discussions.

I think what we're seeing as well, when we talk about Ukraine, is that a lot of our allies are leading the way in providing arms and support. The Americans, of course, have provided billions and billions of dollars. I heard one statistic that the amount—I want to say it's 21 billion dollars' worth—of arms they've committed and various defence technologies and tools is more than the entire Ukrainian federal budget, so it's considerable.

Perhaps it's something this committee would also like to look at, or perhaps the defence committee. What kinds of arms are being provided, why is Canada providing what it is, and are we providing everything that we can? Unfortunately, I don't have the expertise to go into all the technology that Canada has in its arsenal and which ones should be provided that have not yet been.



I think that, overall, this committee should be focusing on Ukraine. I very much appreciate the efforts of my fellow Conservative committee members for making this point very clear, and I look forward to their testimony and what they have to say.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[*Translation*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Thank you, Ms. Dancho.

We now go to Mr. Brock.

[*English*]

**Mr. Larry Brock (Brantford—Brant, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

It is indeed a pleasure to be here on a Thursday afternoon at the foreign affairs committee.

I'd like to start off by making an observation. Again, I am not familiar with Mr. Oliphant's riding, but I was a bit concerned about his commentary that we're nothing but substitutes, seat fillers. Quite frankly, given the international importance of the Russian aggression against this country, this is a humanitarian issue. This is a parliamentary issue and we, as proud Conservatives, believe that this is serious business that this committee is undertaking.

• (8840)

When I was asked by Mr. Genuis to assist, I took it as a badge of honour. I took it as an opportunity on a grander scale to express my concerns as a proud parliamentarian in the 44th Parliament, a new parliamentarian, I might add. My riding is Brantford—Brant. It is the home of a significant Ukrainian population. I grew up with many Ukrainians in grade school and high school and have many Ukrainian friends to this day. I felt the impact on the local stage as to how this war has impacted.

When asked for the opportunity to come here and talk about my feelings, I didn't view it as simply a seat warmer or as a substitute. It gives me an opportunity beyond the restrictions of a 30-second QP question or an S.O. 31 to truly express my views. I wanted to put that on record, because I was offended by that.

I also want to thank my colleague, Ms. Dancho, who stood up for her Conservative male colleagues in relation to the statement of the member for Edmonton Strathcona, because I viewed it in much the same light that Ms. Dancho did. It was offensive. It was uncalled for. I see a few members who know my background, but for many members who may not know my background, I left a 30-year law career to pursue politics, and in the last 18 years of those 30 years, Mr. Chair, I was a Crown attorney who took great pride as a specialist in dealing with the most serious, extreme, violent matters in my community, particularly in the realm of spousal abuse, sexual assault and children exploitation offences. I took great pride in being a strong advocate and a champion for women's issues.

I'm a proud, married individual. I too am going to be celebrating an important milestone this October—20 years with my spouse—and I'm raising two teenage daughters who turned 13 not too long ago. I don't call myself a feminist, but I certainly respect women's views, and I'm a champion of women's rights.

I say that because it's important to distinguish the importance of this study that you've already embarked on. I don't know how many meetings you've had prior to this intervention, but I know that it had been started some several weeks ago.

My point, Mr. Chair, is to Ms. Fry's motion: The most pressing issue that this world is facing right now is happening in Ukraine. It's not just impacting Ukrainians. It's not just impacting the citizens who are actually there fighting the resistance. It's not just impacting the residents who have been displaced and have fled the country looking for safe passage and refuge. It's quite frankly affecting all of Europe, and it's affecting the entire world.

Quite frankly, there isn't a day that goes by in the House—and even if I refer to some of my observations of politics down south there isn't a day that goes by—that you don't either read about it or hear about it or watch it on television, and where the leaders, leaders of this country and leaders of the United States, are all blaming inflation and the rise in everything—gas prices, housing issues...it's all Putin's fault.

To say that we should be looking at standing down, adjourning or deferring—whatever nomenclature you want to use—this important study to then embark on another study... I'm not saying that it's not important. I'm talking about timing, Mr. Chair. The only reason this is being brought up.... I'll deal with the elephant in the room. The only reason this is being brought up is because of what's happening south of the border: the leak from the Supreme Court and the backlash and the fear and the worry.

• (8845)

It's not happening here in Canada. We have settled law. It's been settled law in this country for several decades. There's no urgency, Mr. Chair. There is no rush to suspend this most critical, important study, quite frankly, of my lifetime and the lifetime of my wife and my children, because we are on the brink of a third world war. We are on the brink; we're within a hair's breadth of Putin's invading a NATO country. We all know what article 5 says, so this is extremely important and ought not, in my view as a guest of this committee, to be derailed by another study.

I'd like to spend some time now talking about my personal connections to the Ukrainian people. I talked about my ties in my hometown. I was a very proud MP, Mr. Chair, when a constituent of mine reached out to me for the first time, introduced himself and came up with an idea, an idea that I believe I was the first member of Parliament to advance and speak about very proudly in the House on an S.O. 31.

He asked what I thought about the idea of having a twinning agreement between my hometown and a town in Ukraine. I said that I'd not thought about it, but what a wonderful gesture, what a wonderful idea. We talked about it. Literally within two weeks, with the able and most important assistance of my legislative assistant, Vladimir, who's also known as Walter and about whom I'll talk in a little more detail, we were able to consult with the mayor in Kamianets-Podilskyi in the Ukraine, and we were able, with the mayor of my hometown of Brantford, to sign a twinning agreement.

The town of Kamianets-Podilskyi, Mr. Chair, is located in south-west Ukraine near the borders with Moldova and Romania. Like Brantford, Kamianets-Podilskyi has a population of 100,000 people and centres on manufacturing and tourism, which are two key sectors of my riding of Brantford—Brant.

Now we are taking active steps with social agencies and Ukrainian churches, again with the assistance of both mayors and my legislative assistant, Walter, to welcome thousands of Ukrainian refugees into my community. We are looking at various homes and billeting. We are looking at cultural centres. We are looking at places that ordinarily would be open only for spring, summer and fall camping. We're looking at opportunities to make the lives of Ukrainians fleeing the persecution that much better.

I'd like to provide a bit of a historical account, because I don't know if it's ever been shared with this committee, but I was able in the time that I was asked to consider my participation today to do a little research. I've always been fond of history. I majored in political science and history in university. I found an article called "The 20th-Century History Behind Russia's Invasion of Ukraine", which I'd love to share with the committee at this time.

Before Russian forces fired rockets at the Ukrainian capital of Kyiv; seized Chernobyl, site of the world's worst nuclear accident; and attacked Ukraine's second-largest city, Kharkiv, Russian President Vladimir Putin shared some choice words.

● (8850)

In an essay published on the Kremlin's website in Russian, Ukrainian and English last July, Putin credited Soviet leaders with inventing a Ukrainian republic within the Soviet Union in 1922, forging a fictitious state unworthy of sovereignty out of historically Russian territory. After Ukraine declared its independence in 1991, the president argued, Ukrainian leaders "began to mythologize and rewrite history, edit out everything that united [Russia and Ukraine], and refer to the period when Ukraine was part of the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union as an occupation."

The "historical reality" of modern-day Ukraine is more complex than Putin's version of events, encompassing "a thousand-year history of changing religions, borders and peoples," according to the New York Times. "[M]any conquests by warring factions and Ukraine's diverse geography...created a complex fabric of multiethnic states."

Over the centuries, the Russian and Austro-Hungarian Empires, Poland, and Lithuania have all wielded jurisdiction over Ukraine, which first asserted its modern independence in 1917, with the formation of the Ukrainian People's Republic. Russia soon wrested back control of Ukraine, making it part of the newly established Soviet Union and retaining power in the region until World War II, when Germany invaded. The debate over how to remember this wartime history, as well as its implications for Ukrainian nationalism and independence, is key to understanding the current conflict.

In Putin's telling, the modern Ukrainian independence movement began not in 1917 but during World War II. Under the German occupation of Ukraine, between 1941 and 1944, some Ukrainian independence fighters aligned themselves with the Nazis, whom they viewed as saviors from Soviet oppression. Putin has drawn on this period in history to portray any Ukrainian push for sovereignty as a Nazi endeavor, says Markian Dobezensky, a historian at Harvard University's Ukrainian Research Institute. "It's really just a stunningly cynical attempt to fight an information war and influence people's opinions," he adds.

Dobezensky is among a group of scholars who have publicly challenged Putin's version of the Nazi occupation of Ukraine and the years of Soviet rule it's sandwiched between. Almost all of these experts begin their accounts with the fall of the Russian Empire, when tens of thousands of Ukrainians fought against the Bolshevik Red Army to establish the Ukrainian People's Republic. Ukrainians continued to fight for independence until 1922, when they were defeated by the Soviets and became the Ukrainian Soviet Republic of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (U.S.S.R.).

[Translation]

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** I'd like some clarification, please, Mr. Chair.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Go ahead, Ms. Bendayan.

[English]

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Thank you.

As much as I'm enjoying this history lesson, it is now almost five o'clock. I wonder if I could ask the clerk for a clarification. I'm actually quite concerned that there may be witnesses on the Taiwan study who are somehow waiting for us to get to their testimony. It was my understanding that we were supposed to be studying the issue of Taiwan today.

Madam Clerk, do we have our witnesses on the Taiwan study waiting to hear from our committee?

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Over to you, Madam Clerk.

**The Clerk:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[English]

No, there are no witnesses waiting today.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Were they cancelled for this filibuster?

**The Clerk:** They were rescheduled.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Thank you.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** On that point of order, I wonder if there might be unanimous consent to adjourn debate on this matter so we can proceed to those witnesses.

Is there unanimous consent to do that?

**Some hon. members:** No.

**An hon. member:** The witnesses aren't here.

● (8855)

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Mr. Brock, please continue.

I see you are reading from a document to back up your argument, and it's fascinating, but do you plan to tell us how the information you're reading to us relates to your view on the matter in hand?

Please carry on, Mr. Brock.

[English]

**Mr. Larry Brock:** Thank you for the intervention, Mr. Chair.

I thought the title of the article was self-explanatory. It's "The 20th-Century History Behind Russia's Invasion of Ukraine". I thought it prudent, because I am a history buff, to share the historical conflict that Russia has had with Ukraine. In fact, I did further research on the history of Ukraine—I don't think you want me to talk about before-Christ days, but I was prepared to do that—as there is such a wonderful, fascinating history behind the country of Ukraine.

To the point of what we're talking about, it's important to talk and learn about the previous historical conflict in relation to the current conflict. This particular article starts off by talking about the historical end of things and then moves to the modern day. There is a connection and there is relevancy.

May I continue?

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Yes, but I would ask that you stick to the content of Mr. Genuis's motion to adjourn debate on Ms. Fry's motion until the committee has finished its work on Ukraine.

Although I appreciate that the history behind the current conflict in Ukraine is important to understand the reasons for getting back to that work, please keep in mind that we need to hear your position on why the debate should be adjourned to get back to the Ukraine study.

Please continue, Mr. Brock.

[English]

**Mr. Larry Brock:** The reasons were stated at the outset of my intervention that I am here to share my personal thoughts on the matter, as a parliamentarian, where I felt that I was impeded in my ability to do so in the House, because of time constraints. I wanted to highlight the passion that I have on this issue and the critical urgency that this current study not be adjourned to allow another study, which, quite frankly—

**An hon. member:** It doesn't call for adjournment.

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Mr. Brock, carry on.

[English]

**Mr. Larry Brock:** Thank you.

With your permission, I'll skip ahead various paragraphs, because I think there is relevancy in this document.

A couple of pages talk about Russia's involvement in Ukraine in World War II. I will not comment on that. I will move on to current, 21st-century issues, as follows:

Putin has referenced Ukrainian nationalists in service of his own political agenda of portraying modern Ukrainians as Nazis.

I've referenced that. The article continues:

Prior to Russia's 2014 invasion of Crimea, many Ukrainians viewed Bandera and other freedom fighters in a less favorable light, says [Ms.] Shevel. After, however, she noticed a shift, with these individuals, some of whom fought alongside the Nazis, being called heroes. The Soviets, once held up as liberators from the Nazis, were now the bad guys again.

Bandera may no longer be [the] official hero of Ukraine, but his memory and that of other 20th-century independence fighters endure. In 2015, Ukraine passed a series of decommunization laws calling for the removal of communist monuments and the renaming of public spaces in honor of Ukrainian nationalists and nationalist organizations, including those known to have participated in the Holocaust. The legislation has received pushback from scholars who see it as whitewashing, or ignoring the dark sides of these movements and their activities.

Shevel agrees that a complete reversal in framing is "probably not the best outcome." Although the previous Soviet narrative was very one-sided, she cautions against replacing it with an equally one-sided narrative that labels Ukrainian nationalists unconditional good guys. Either way, Shevel says, the issue is one that should be debated internally, not by a foreign invader: "It's problematic, but it's a domestic debate."

Dobczansky, for his part, believes Ukraine is entitled to its own version of history and that Ukrainians should be allowed to choose how to present their own experiences. He praises local researchers' efforts to study the Holocaust and open their archives and notes that Ukraine's current president, [Mr.] Zelenskyy, is Jewish.

"Ukraine has begun the process of confronting the darkest pages of its past," he says.

In today's charged atmosphere, saying anything critical about Ukrainian nationalism or calling attention to Ukrainian nationalists' involvement with the Nazis can be seen as supporting Russia's depiction of Ukraine as a Nazi nation, Belsky notes.

This Russian narrative is nothing new.... [I]t's part of a long-term Russian information war—

I would call it a misinformation war.

—on Ukraine. Putin's ahistorical justification of the invasion doesn't surprise [scholars]. What does surprise [scholars] is the outpouring of support [they've] seen for Ukraine, with even [the very popular American skit comedy] "Saturday Night Live" paying tribute to the beleaguered nation.

[Scholars theorize] that the outraged response to the invasion is tied to society's relatively recent reexamination of colonialism. Because Ukraine was successfully integrated into the Soviet Union after World War II, Dobczansky doesn't see the period leading up to Ukrainian independence in 1991 as an occupation so much as a relationship between a colony and a colonizer. By waging war on Ukraine, Putin is, in essence, trying to hold on to a colony.

"[Russian leaders] basically don't recognize any Ukrainian historical agency except the agency that they imagined for them," says Dobczansky.

Ukraine—and the world—seem to be imagining something different.

I think the takeaway there is the false narrative that Putin is sharing with the world as his illegal justification for invading this country. It may appease and it may pacify his nationalists in Russia because of its state-controlled media, but the rest of the world does not buy into this misinformation rhetoric.

● (8900)

The issue regarding colonization is troubling, because we all know that Putin is a relic of the U.S.S.R. We all know about his pursuit of power at all costs. His international war crime legacy and history are not lost on me. This begs the question: What country is next? Is he going to be satisfied with just Ukraine? Is he looking at some of the other Baltic nations?

Right now, we have what could be described as a ground operation in Ukraine. We have ground and air strikes. We have missile strikes. However, what about the cyberwar? There is a cyberwar currently happening with respect to this conflict, and I want to share my thoughts and concerns on that issue at this time, with this quote:

It has widely been assumed that the Western world saw the last of its hot conventional wars with the end of the Second World War, as the world grew increasingly integrated economically, making this type of conflict inefficient. The liberal international order assumed rationality would prevail and countries would choose the economic benefits of these relationships over conflict. Economics became a new tool to replace traditional military means of force if peaceful relations deteriorated; sanctions, preferential trade and exclusion from financial institutions all became methods of punishment and retaliation. With the rise of the internet, the world became further interconnected, but also more vulnerable to attack through cyber-space, as critical infrastructure, finance and access to information all have come to depend on online systems. Warfare came to be regarded differently, with cyber-warfare expected to be the future of conflict. Yet, Russia invaded Ukraine on February 24, 2022, launching a full-on conventional war. Western countries rushed to apply economic pressure, applying sanctions—

I will, after this article, start talking about the history of the Magnitsky sanctions, the origin of those sanctions and the man himself, because it's important to put everything in context.

—excluding Russia from the SWIFT system, payment systems and banks, cutting access to the country, banning travel and a host of other harsh conditions.

Meanwhile, the internet has been flooded with real-time information on the invasion. However, disinformation and censoring are rampant, with civilians, combatants, world leaders, governments and journalists competing to post the latest updates. Cyber-attacks are playing a role in the conflict, though have not been the sole or even most important aspect of the hostilities; furthermore, they are coming not just from state-sponsored organizations, but non-state hacker groups and even volunteer hackers on both sides. Private sector organizations were drawn into the conflict as some chose to suspend services to Russia or support cyber-resiliency in Ukraine. In recent years, Russia has employed many devastating cyber-attacks against Ukraine, including on the country's electricity grid in 2015, with the virus NotPetya on the Ukrainian financial system which spread globally, and other Eastern European countries. Considering Russia's extensive history of hacking and policy of information warfare, this raises the question: Why are we not seeing a cyber-war, and will we?

• (8905)

To fully answer that question, it's important to get context on the record as to what really is a cyberwar:

Cyber-war is a fairly contested term, and not all believe that cyber-war actually exists. For the most part, nation states look to international law and the rules on use of force and self-defence regarding the legality of cyber-operations. The Tallinn Manual and Tallinn Manual 2.0 both analyze extensively—

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

About 20 or so minutes ago, you mentioned the importance of relevance and the need to connect the passages the member is reading to the amendment before the committee and the motion dealing with women's sexual and reproductive rights.

I wonder whether there is such a connection and whether the member's comments are relevant.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Thank you for that reminder, Ms. Bendayan.

I would remind Mr. Brock that it is entirely acceptable to refer to supporting documents in committee debate, but obviously, the member has to state his opinion on the content of Mr. Genuis's motion. Mr. Brock, please finish what you're reading and explain how it relates to the motion.

[*English*]

**Mr. Larry Brock:** I will conclude my reading and I will put my own personal thoughts on that and why it has relevancy. For the

benefit of Ms. Bendayan, there is relevancy to this, Mr. Chair, so I will continue:

...The popular vision of cyber-war is one in which critical infrastructure, telecommunications, the internet and all connected systems are completely shut down, effectively crippling society. We have seen this to varying degrees in the aforementioned case of Russia's attacks on countries in its neighbourhood, as well as on infrastructure in other countries such as the Colonial pipeline attack in the United States, but nothing to such a complete extent.

However, despite the increasing predictions of this sort of cyber-war—of which there is no broadly accepted definition—it has not made an appearance thus far. There could be many reasons for this, one of which of course is that we simply don't know it's happening; after all, it is often strategically useful in a cyber-attack to remain undetected for as long as possible. It could also be that this simply would not meet the strategic goals of the invasion. In this case, Russia has long considered Ukraine as key to its plans for many strategic reasons, including territory and warm water ports. Ironically, Western sanctions in the wake of the 2014 annexation made Ukraine even more important to Russia's geoeconomic ambitions as part of a land route for energy exports. Based on its goals, this type of complete cyber-war seems unlikely to be useful. This is not to say that cyber has not been used in this conflict; however, these activities have been used in different ways, as a supporting activity of the war aiming to accomplish the two main goals that cyber-activities usually attempt to achieve: propaganda and disruption. ...Cyber-attacks cannot gain territory, but they can disrupt the other side's operations, target infrastructure and civilians and affect public opinion during the process of gaining physical territory. ...These operations are simply better suited to spreading disinformation and confusion and attempting to cause distrust and chaos, bolstering the conventional forces.

Many on this committee may be asking, "When is Mr. Brock going to get to the point?" I will eventually, but there's more to add, Mr. Chair. The next question I want to put to the committee and provide some explanation for is this question: What cyber-activities have we seen so far in the Russian-Ukrainian conflict? As stated in the same article:

Propaganda and disinformation have been widely employed in this conflict, and the reach of these activities has been global. Social media has played a role in conflicts before, though this truly global scale is unprecedented, especially among youth. Young Russian TikTok influencers posted videos with a justification of the invasion—all apparently following the same script. Young Ukrainians also took to TikTok, as well as other platforms such as Instagram, to post their own videos of updates. While many sincerely try to ensure their information is as accurate as possible, this is not always easy—especially with just as many people deliberately spreading disinformation. Some examples include attempts to cause fear and panic; Russians found local Telegram chats and posted false warnings about upcoming bombings to scare citizens away. People created Discord servers for updating and commenting and livestreamed battles online in addition to news footage. Social media was not only used to spread information—whether it was true or not—but to boost morale and push narratives, and much of the information circulating on social media is in favour of Ukraine. Videos and photos of President...Zelensky went viral, from his impassioned speeches—

• (8910)

including his impassioned speech to our Parliament

—about defending the country to the end to posing with his dogs. There were photos of Ukrainian couples getting married on the front lines and citizens crowding the streets wanting to get weapons and join the fight. In Russia as well, videos of Russians protesting the war and getting detained started to circulate, and Ukrainians posted videos of Russian soldiers surrendering or being captured.

Disruption and espionage have been used by both sides, with Russia hacking government ministries and defacing Ukrainian websites even before the invasion. The most substantial cyber-attack so far, which has not officially been attributed to Russia at this time, is the hack [at] Viasat, a satellite communications provider, which impacted other European countries as well as Ukraine. The American company is still working to bring users back online and recently stated that they are still actively defending the service from malicious activities. Russia has also actively blocked Western social media—

including Canada

—and created what is being called a “fake news” law to control the narrative at home. It’s also threatened steep fines for Wikipedia if it does not remove certain information about the war that it considers inaccurate. Meanwhile, Ukraine’s volunteer hackers and other hacking groups, including the group called Anonymous, have also made progress in disrupting Russian government websites and services. So far, however, there have been no largely debilitating cyber-attacks on infrastructure, with the extensive damage done coming from conventional attacks and weapons.

That begs the question, Mr. Chair: If we haven't seen it so far, will we?

Let me continue:

For the foreseeable future, cyber-activities will likely remain in the realm of propaganda and disruptions of communications and services. In this conflict, complete cyber-war does not appear to be strategically useful, though cyber-activities including disinformation will continue. Disinformation will remain a powerful tool, especially as digital propaganda techniques using artificial intelligence become increasingly sophisticated. The environment for cyber-operations and disinformation is increasingly complicated, which has been demonstrated in this conflict; the involvement of new actors, ranging from youth on social media to private companies both large and small, to any civilians engaging with online content, makes for an environment impossible to control and potentially creating a variety of new targets in conflict other than states.

Experts also warn that civilian infrastructure will increasingly be a target of cyber-operations. Sensitive infrastructure, including nuclear weapons, is a serious concern that is especially difficult to discuss considering its highly classified nature. While our interconnected systems are convenient, there is always a risk of compromise.

The risk of cyber-attacks in retaliation for sanctions remains high....

We as a country have sanctioned Russia, as have many other countries in this world. Our chair is probably on the list of several politicians in the 44th Parliament who have been banned. The threat to Canada is real.

● (8915)

The risk of cyber-attacks in retaliation for sanctions remains high, but being the first country to launch a complete cyber-offensive would probably be costly in many ways, and some experts believe it could even lead to the cyber equivalent of mutually assured destruction. It seems unlikely in the current circumstances that cyber-war will come to the West, but it is vital to have cyber-defences on high alert to prepare for any possibility.

I hope that this committee spends some time hearing from experts and witnesses on this very real risk to this country.

Canada's intelligence agencies are preparing for an increase in cyber-threats and warning Canadians to be vigilant in their online activities.

If our security experts are giving us that warning, Mr. Chair, it's incumbent upon this committee to heed those warnings.

The last part of this article that I will read various portions of, Mr. Chair, is titled “How to be Strong, Secure and Engaged in Cyberspace”.

In 2017, the Department of National Defence (DND) released its *Strong, Secure and Engaged* defence policy, which envisions Canada's armed forces as agile—

● (8920)

**Mr. Randeep Sarai:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

[*Translation*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Go ahead, Mr. Sarai.

[*English*]

**Mr. Randeep Sarai:** Mr. Brock is a very esteemed colleague of mine and steers in my other committee, too.

Mr. Genuis last time said that the definition of a filibuster is when you start reading articles and you read articles over and over. That's the definition of a filibuster.

Mr. Brock said the same thing in our other committee, and I have a lot of regard for him. His judicial mind is very astute. I'm just wondering how this is not a filibuster when we're reading articles from national security or cyber-security things and how it's relevant to this.

I would like him to enlighten me, or perhaps the chair can enlighten me whether that contradicts the definition of a filibuster or if it stays relevant.

[*Translation*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Mr. Sarai, Mr. Genuis is allowed to have his own take on what constitutes a filibuster.

I have already said that it's not unusual to cite passages from documents during parliamentary debate, but it is unusual to read one document after another. Some may perceive that as a stalling tactic.

A few times, I have asked Mr. Brock to explain how the passages he is reading are germane to his personal position on Mr. Genuis's motion. I will ask him again to please tell us where he stands on the motion in question.

Back to you, Mr. Brock.

[*English*]

**Mr. Larry Brock:** I have been doing that, with all due respect, Mr. Chair. I have absolutely been doing that. I read out, probably about five or 10 minutes ago, the warnings of Canada's security intelligence. We need to be aware of the risks of a cyber-attack founded by Putin and his misinformation agenda.

My suggestion is that it's important to put that into context as an item for further consideration at this committee. I provided my personal opinion. Maybe you didn't hear me correctly, Mr. Chair. I invited this committee to perhaps look at calling in some experts from Canada's security intelligence and other experts in this particular area. Canada needs to secure not only its borders, but its international cyber domain, so it's important for these warnings to be shared with this committee.

I'm almost done. I'm sure the committee will be very happy to hear that. I have two paragraphs to read. I think it's important for the whole article to be on the record as an invitation for further witnesses whom this committee can hear from.

The warning is on how to be strong. How does Canada remain strong against cyber-attacks?

The article says, "Canada must reaffirm its commitments to security alliances including NATO and NORAD. To maintain a peaceful international system, staying secure means upholding its relationships and contributing its fair share." I could probably go on for another hour about whether or not Canada is living up to the obligation to contribute its fair share, but I'm sure I would receive several points of order on that, so maybe I'll defer it to another day.

The article goes on:

NATO recognizes cyber-space as a domain it must be able to defend as effectively as land, air or space, and is committed to cyber-space being peaceful and secure; Canada also believes that a peaceful and secure cyber-sphere is necessary to its security, economy and democratic values, and that collaborating with allies is necessary to achieve this. In order to realize its vision of security and resilience, innovation and leadership and collaboration in the National Cyber Security Strategy, contributing to NATO's efforts, especially the Cooperative Cyber Defence Centre of Excellence, is imperative. If Canada seeks to support NORAD modernization, particularly in detecting and deterring threats in all domains, including cyber, and promoting research, development and innovation, it will require significant investment and commitment.

The last paragraph is on how Canada can remain secure:

[S]trong emphasis on digital literacy in schools and workplaces, and free independent journalism can help foster trust, establish reliable channels of information and spread awareness. Canada should use its advanced position in cyber-security and artificial intelligence to reinforce defensive strategies and detection abilities for sophisticated disinformation techniques. Finally, our digital infrastructure and communications are dependent on technology such as satellites in space, which is a dangerously contested and crowded environment with virtually no norms and outdated international law. Canada has historically been an important contributor to space technologies and was the third country in the world with its own satellite in space. Space has been identified as a strategic asset that is essential for security and sovereignty; Canada needs to work with its allies to establish better governance in space, building off the extensive work done to write a Manual on International Law Applicable to Military Uses of Outer Space....

On that note, I've completed my intervention, Mr. Chair. Thank you for the opportunity.

• (8925)

[Translation]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Thank you, Mr. Brock.

I see that we have just a few minutes left. My understanding is that we can't go much later than scheduled for technical reasons.

Now, I will turn the floor over to Ms. Gladu.

[English]

**Ms. Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton, CPC):** Thank you, Chair. I want to say that you're doing an excellent job of moving things along, but I'd be remiss if I didn't also say that I've been to this committee several times, and I wanted to recognize the work of the former chair as well and to wish him well in his new responsibilities at the UN.

I'm very glad to be here and speaking about this today, because I have five main themes to cover on why I really think that this committee needs to use the precious committee time that's left to focus on Ukraine.

Everyone is aware of the war that's happening between Russia and Ukraine, but I want you to know that in my riding of Sarnia—Lambton we have people who have actually gone over to Ukraine and are on the ground in Ukraine, as well as in the surrounding countries. They're at Medica, and I know my colleague across the way, Mr. Ehsassi, was there with another one of my colleagues.

There are folks from my riding who are there and who have set up stations to help the Ukrainians who are fleeing the country. The various churches in my area have missions; they actually created churches and orphanages and all kinds of things in Ukraine years ago, so there are still people there who are giving us a daily update on what's happening. Our entire community—many organizations—has reached out. We're trying to bring about 100 families to Sarnia—Lambton.

I'm certainly seeing on a daily basis the urgency of the situation. It has been three months. The war is not getting better. It's getting worse. We're seeing a number of things that are not going well and a number of areas where there are gaps that need to be addressed. Also, then, we see an escalation. Those are the things I really want to talk about today.

Now, in terms of the efforts in my riding, I could tell you many stories, but really, let's talk first of all about the people who are on the ground in Ukraine and the situation there. People are without electricity, and some are without water. We've all heard and seen the various social media tapings of people who are in the subway stations underground and of the constant bombings and everything else, so you know it's urgent.

I think that is one of the main reasons this committee needs to focus on the situation and address it.

At the same time, there are six million people who have left the country in the hopes of going somewhere. The problem is, it's really taking way too long to get them out of there.

There's this one lady, Tanya, with two kids. She was in Ukraine. We have a place for her in my riding, so she had to leave with her two kids on a Saturday to go to Warsaw to get her biometrics. It ended up that the embassy wasn't open on Sunday, and then on Monday the system went down because of the overload from everybody applying. It was the same thing on Tuesday. On Wednesday, she gets told that she can have a biometrics appointment in a month. Well, what is she supposed to do with two kids in Warsaw with no money for a month?

That is certainly something that the government needs to address. They exempted children from the biometrics requirement, which is great, but I don't know any mother who is going to send her children off to Canada, where they don't speak the language, without having—

• (8930)

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** On a point of order, Mr. Chair, it is reaching the end of our scheduled time for this committee meeting. I thought that before you suspended the meeting it would be important for us to see whether or not we could continue the meeting, because we would very much like to bring this to a vote. We could do three pretty quick votes before that. I don't know what the situation is with respect to House resources, but I would like us to vote on this fairly quickly so that other committees could do their work and we could then continue with our Ukraine study.

The Conservatives don't seem to be aware that, actually, their filibuster is stopping us from doing the work they're asking us to do in their filibuster. There's a problem with the logic of that, because—

[*Translation*]

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** I gather, then, Mr. Oliphant, that you are looking for unanimous consent to vote immediately.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Yes.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Do I have unanimous consent?

**Ms. Marilyn Gladu:** No.

**The Vice-Chair (Mr. Stéphane Bergeron):** Seeing as there isn't unanimous consent, Ms. Gladu, I'm going to have to suspend the meeting, and you'll have to finish what you were saying next time.

The meeting is suspended.

[*The meeting was suspended at 5:33 p.m., Monday, May 16*]

[*The meeting resumed at 3:49 p.m., Thursday, June 2*]

[*English*]

**The Clerk:** Welcome, members. I see that we have a quorum, so I will get started.

Due to a vacancy in the position of chair, the committee must proceed directly to the election.

[*Translation*]

I must inform members that the clerk of the committee can only receive motions for the election of the chair.

[*English*]

The clerk cannot receive any other types of motions, cannot entertain points of order and cannot participate in debate.

We can now proceed to the election of the chair. Pursuant to Standing Order 106(2), the chair must be a member of the government party.

Ms. Bendayan, you have the floor.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Thank you, Madam Clerk, and it is a great pleasure and an honour to be able to nominate my colleague Ali Ehsassi.

**The Clerk:** It has been moved by Rachel Bendayan that Ali Ehsassi be elected chair of the committee.

Are there any further motions?

Is it the pleasure of the committee to adopt the motion?

(Motion agreed to)

**The Clerk:** I declare the motion carried and Mr. Ehsassi duly elected as chair of the committee.

**The Chair (Mr. Ali Ehsassi (Willowdale, Lib.)):** Allow me to start off by thanking all of you for the confidence you have placed in me.

I can assure you that I will endeavour to the best of my ability to ensure that this committee continues to work in a collaborative and co-operative manner. I'm very, very grateful and very humbled.

I can also assure you that I will rely heavily on the wisdom of the clerk.

[*Translation*]

Welcome back to meeting number 21 of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development.

We are continuing the discussion that began on Monday.

[*English*]

As always, interpretation is available through the globe icon at the bottom of your screen. For members participating in person, please bear in mind the Board of Internal Economy's guidelines for mask use and health protocols.

I'd like to take this opportunity to remind all participants in this meeting that screenshots or taking photos of your screen are not permitted.

Before speaking, please wait until I recognize you by name. When speaking, please speak slowly and clearly. When you are not speaking, your mike should be on mute. I remind you that all comments by members should be addressed through the chair. Thank you.

Go ahead, Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, my understanding of where we are in the process is that, having completed the election of the chair, we're now back into the committee business rubric.

With that in mind, I'd like to suggest to the committee, perhaps move, that we establish a calendar for the remaining meetings in June. That would allow us to make progress on and complete our existing studies in the areas of vaccine equity, Ukraine and Taiwan.

I'd like to move that, and we can proceed to discussion on it.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

I'm not sure that you can move another motion while there is a motion on the floor. I would further seek direction from the clerk as to what motion is currently on the floor, because in reviewing the blues last week, I noticed that there may, in fact, be two motions on the floor at the moment.

Perhaps we could get some direction from the clerk as to what is possible at this time. I'm certainly very interested in getting to the scheduling of witnesses and to proceeding with the important work of our committee.

**The Chair:** I will consult with the clerk.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Maybe I could join in on the same point of order.

We just completed the election of a chair. I don't understand how the election of the chair could occur without our not being on another item of business.

Members may want to propose the resumption of some other matter, but our view is that we should get on with the studies that we have on the table, and insofar as we've just completed the election of the chair, there aren't any motions before the committee right now. I've just moved a proposal in terms of how we move forward.

**The Chair:** Yes, Mr. Oliphant.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** On that, I think we're on a point of order. I'd like the chair to actually advise the committee as to what motion....

This was not an adjourned meeting; it was a suspended meeting. I think the opposition is clearly aware of what the difference is between a suspended meeting.... Maybe they're not. Maybe you'll need to explain that to them. Experienced parliamentarians should know what a suspended meeting is. When a meeting is suspended, we will have work on the floor. The resignation of a chair and the election of a new chair is simply not related to the suspension of the meeting. The meeting continues.

We have a motion. I believe it might have been amended and it might have been subamended. We would like to have clarity about that and then perhaps a discussion on where we are with those. Thank you.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Could I just respond quickly to Mr. Oliphant?

I'm fully aware—

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** On a point of order, if you allow him to respond, he may allow it.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Is he allowing you now?

**The Chair:** Yes, I did allow Mr. Oliphant.

Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I apologize on behalf of all of us for making your job challenging on your first day here with these procedural questions.

I understand the difference between an adjourned meeting and a suspended meeting. I also understand the long-established precedent of the committee that if we're debating an item of business and then we are debating another item of business, we cannot also be debating the original item of business.

Insofar as we are obliged by the rules of the House of Commons to have moved immediately to the selection of a chair, having done that, it is illogical—there may be precedents that can be cited, but it seems illogical to me—to say that something else is still on the floor when we have just completed the election of the chair, which is clearly a distinct item.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

I must say, as you have rightly pointed out, that I face a unique dilemma. I think it's only fair that I consult with the clerk and defer to her better judgment as to the point of order that Ms. Bendayan has raised.

**Mr. Marty Morantz (Charleswood—St. James—Assiniboia—Headingley, CPC):** Mr. Chair, may I make a point on this point of order?

**The Chair:** Mr. Morantz.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** I had my hand up as well, Mr. Chair.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Mr. Morantz.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** Mr. Chair, I just want to point out that under Bosc and Gagnon, chapter 20, essentially when the chair resigned, the committee became unconstituted. Under chapter 20 it says very specifically, “Before a committee can begin to consider its work at the beginning of a parliamentary session, it must be properly constituted; that is, its members must be appointed and a Chair designated.”

I think the argument here is that because the chair resigned, the committee became unconstituted. It has now been reconstituted with the election of a chair and new motions can be entertained.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Morantz.

Mr. Bergeron.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I have two things to say.

The first has to do with Mr. Oliphant's comment. He suggested that the opposition didn't know the difference between a suspended meeting and an adjourned meeting. I would appreciate it if he could make clear that he was referring to the official opposition. I am a member of the opposition, and I was the one chairing the meeting when it was suspended, so I know full well the difference between a meeting that is suspended and one that is adjourned.

The second is in response to Mr. Morantz's remarks. I must point out that the committee cannot be considered to have been unconstituted because there was no election of a vice-chair. He and I remained the vice-chairs of the committee. For that reason, I think it was just a mandatory motion, something that had to be dealt with immediately—electing a chair—so that the committee could carry on. We are definitely resuming the meeting that was suspended the last time.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Bergeron.

I will suspend to consult with the clerk.



• (1555) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (1600)

**The Chair:** My having had the benefit of speaking to the clerk, we will now resume.

There are a number of different issues that I had an opportunity to speak to the clerk about.

The first one is the issue that was raised by Mr. Bergeron. The reality is, as was pointed out, that the meeting was previously suspended, so the manner in which we have been proceeding is actually correct.

Insofar as Mr. Morantz's issue is concerned, I did have an opportunity to look at the third edition of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*. I did find the passage that you referenced, Mr. Morantz, and it reads as follows:

In the event of a vacancy in the office of Chair, the committee cannot conduct any other business until a new Chair is chosen. This is similar to procedure in the House, where a vacancy in the office of Speaker must be filled before any other matter can be considered.

A reading of this particular passage does confirm that we did proceed in the appropriate fashion. That would have been the first order of business: to come up with a chair.

Moving to the point of order raised by Ms. Bendayan, I think it's fair to say that the practice of this committee under the previous chair has been to make sure that we are masters of our own proceedings. The practice that was previously developed and followed was that we could deal with various issues that did arise concurrently if that was the will of the members.

Now, we have a point of order from a procedural standpoint that the practice is that if there are two substantive motions, that should not be allowed.

In fact, if members look at page 1068 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, they'll see that it says, "If a dilatory motion is accompanied by a condition, it becomes a substantive motion."

Ms. Bendayan's read and interpretation of the rules is quite correct. We have two substantive motions before us.

I should emphasize that, as always, the chair is guided by the will of the committee. Until now, members have seen fit to embark on the original practice, and the previous chair allowed members to intervene and make their positions known with what I imagine to be the ultimate goal of concluding debate in a way that could be meaningful for all.

Now that a point of order has been raised, I find myself in the position of having to rule in line with the procedures outlined previously, as I pointed out, that you cannot concurrently have two substantive motions.

Currently, the committee has these two substantive motions on the floor simultaneously. I will rule accordingly in reference to the procedures that the second motion is to be deemed out of order.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Point of order, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** I guide the committee back to the original motion and amendment that is currently before it.

As always, I should emphasize that should any member of this committee not agree with this particular ruling, they may challenge this decision.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** On a point of order, Mr. Chair, I want to make a number of points with respect to the point you made.

First of all, a point of order was raised with respect to the question of whether or not we are currently debating motions. You ruled that there cannot be multiple substantive motions on the table, and I will get to the issue of the adjournment piece of that in a moment.

My point was we had been dealing previously with the substantive matter of the election of the chair, which is clearly a substantive matter.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** Yes, Mr. Oliphant?

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** It's a point of order in that I believe we're now engaging in debate. If one of the members wants to challenge your ruling—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'm making an argument with respect to order.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:**—which has been made, we do not debate in committee, Mr. Chair.... I would just caution us as a committee: We do not debate the ruling of a chair unless it has been challenged.

You have made a ruling. You have said that there was an original motion on the floor. A second substantive motion you have ruled out of order. If one of the members would like to challenge you, that is their privilege; however, that needs to be voted on immediately. If the honourable member across would like to challenge you, it is his right, but it is not his right or our need in this committee to entertain that debate.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Could I just finish my point of order? I was in the middle of a point of order when another point of order interrupted me.

**The Chair:** Mr. Genuis, I didn't recognize you.

Mr. Oliphant has spoken as to what the proper procedure is. You cannot challenge—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** [*Inaudible—Editor*] point of order about that. I was in the middle of a point of order. Mr. Oliphant interrupted me and you gave him the floor in the middle of my point of order. I think it's important for you, as chair, to think about engaging with all parties in a constructive way and I'm—

**Mr. Sameer Zuberi (Pierrefonds—Dollard, Lib.):** I have a point of order.

I'd like to know who has the floor right now, Mr. Chair. Can you tell us who has the floor?

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Again another member of the government is interrupting me on a point of order—

**Mr. Sameer Zuberi:** I have a point of order. Hold on a second. I have a point of order. I'd like to know who has the floor right now.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** You can't interrupt a point of order with a point of order and claim the floor.

I waited until Mr. Oliphant was finished even though he had been interrupting my point of order.

**Mr. Sameer Zuberi:** Again, I'd like to know who has the floor right now.

**The Chair:** Mr. Genuis, that is not the point. The point is that before you're allowed to proceed, you have to be recognized by the chair.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** You recognized me first, Mr. Chair, and then Mr. Oliphant interrupted me and now Mr. Zuberi is interrupting me.

Can I have the floor to make the point that I was originally making? That's what I'm asking.

**The Chair:** Yes, but this is not a debate. Do you appreciate that? If you do have a point of order—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I am making arguments with respect to procedure under the rubric of a point of order. It is legitimate for a point of order to include arguments in the context of matters of order.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Mr. Chair, can I ask if you have indeed made a ruling—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Here we go again.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** —which is then debatable or is it not debatable? I think that is very important. I think the members need to know the procedure right now. If it is debatable, if the decision is made, we had an opportunity to have points of order—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I haven't been able to get a sentence in.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** —and debate before you made your ruling. You've made your ruling. That is the way Parliament works.

**The Chair:** That is correct, Mr. Oliphant.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** May I finish my point of order, Mr. Chair?

**The Chair:** It's not debatable, Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, with respect, Mr. Oliphant had an opportunity to run for chair and he chose not to.

I would like to be able to make my point of order, to make the argument with respect to the matter of procedure, and then I invite you to make a ruling on those arguments, because what seems to be happening here is that, following the ruling of a previous chair, a new chair is making a different ruling to negate the ruling of the previous chair and to throw out a motion that was on the floor and to do so without allowing arguments from members of Parliament with respect to the appropriateness of that matter.

That is incredible, so I'm asking at a minimum for the opportunity to make arguments with respect to the matter of order for your consideration, Mr. Chair. Surely, you'd like to hear the views of members with respect to matters of order before we proceed.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Genuis, but I believe you are engaging in debate.

Is it your intention to challenge the ruling?

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, it is my intention to assert the privileges of members of Parliament in this committee; that is, it is my intention to make arguments to you, the chair, with respect to a matter of order. That is to make the point that at multiple committees in this House, at the citizenship and immigration committee, at the status of women committee and previously on multiple occasions at this committee—those are the cases that I know of in the last few months—members have proposed motions for adjournment.

Mr. Chair, who is the staff member you're consulting with? I hope you're listening to the arguments that are being made.

Mr. Chair, there have been multiple instances in this Parliament in multiple committees where members have moved motions to adjourn with conditions, and those motions have been deemed debatable. Ms. Zahid, the chair of the immigration committee, Ms. Vecchio, the chair of the status of women committee, and your predecessor, Mr. Spengemann, have all ruled those motions to be in order.

Now we have a new chair, after the resignation of Mr. Spengemann, who all of a sudden wants to overrule the precedent on this matter. Parliament should be guided by precedent. Precedent is the basis on which we understand the interpretations of these rulings. That precedent has consistently been, at multiple committees in various committees of this House, that when there is a substantive motion on the table, it is considered legitimate to move an amendment motion with a condition. While it is not acceptable to move a different substantive motion on a different matter, when it is an adjournment motion with a condition then it is legitimate to do so.

Now, insofar as that is a grey area in the rules, because the rules don't specify with respect to an amendment motion with a condition, we should be guided by the precedent, by the precedent of multiple committees, including by this committee.

What you're saying is to try to overrule the precedent and the ruling of the previous chair without even giving opportunities for other members to hear arguments.

That is outrageous, Mr. Chair, and we're not going to function very well as a committee if you show such flagrant disregard for the rights of members.

**The Chair:** Mr. Genuis, one more time I will repeat the question that I have posed to you previously. Is it your intention to challenge my ruling?

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, I would like you to consider the arguments that have been made about precedent in previous committees.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Chair, making a point of order on that, I would read from the rules of procedure:

Disorder and misconduct in a committee may arise as a result of the failure to abide by the rules and practices of a committee or to respect the authority of the Chair.

In the event of disorder, the Chair may suspend the meeting until order can be restored....

I would remind the committee that you have that authority. If your ruling is being disrespected by one of the members of the committee, it is disorder. There are precedents for that.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Oliphant.

I presume that you are referring to chapter 21, which relates to disorderly conduct. However, just to clarify further, I would like to draw everyone's attention to page 1059 of the rules of procedure. The third paragraph reads as follows:

Decisions by the Chair are not debatable.

I understand that Mr. Chong has a point of order.

**Hon. Michael Chong:** Mr. Chair, my point of order is that I'm unclear exactly what your ruling was, so I'd like you to clarify.

I think you ruled the motion out of order. You made reference to two motions. I believe you ruled the second motion out of order, and I am not certain what that second motion was. Are we referring to the motion that I believe Mr. Genuis introduced regarding adjourning debate?

Is it the motion Mr. Genuis introduced referring to Ukraine that we were debating previously before the previous meeting was suspended that you ruled out of order?

**The Chair:** That is correct. The ruling was that you cannot concurrently have two substantive motions before a committee. The basis for that decision, if you'd like to know, is on page 1068 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*. It states:

If a dilatory motion is accompanied by a condition, it becomes a substantive motion.

Therefore, it's debatable and amendable.

It's also true according to—

**Hon. Michael Chong:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to clarify that.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Chong.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, I have another point of order.

The original question raised by the point of order, as I understood it, pertained to the election of the chair as if that was a substantive matter before the committee.

Could you clarify in your ruling whether the election of the chair was considered a substantive matter before the committee?

**The Chair:** Mr. Genuis, I can assure you that was not what was decided. That is an issue that is separate and apart. At no point was it suggested that the election of a chair would constitute a second substantive motion.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, I'm seeking further clarification.

Your ruling seems to me to be that the election of the chair is not a substantive matter, but a motion to adjourn is a substantive matter if it is attached to a condition.

Could you maybe explain a little more to the committee to help our understanding about why you would deem that the election of the chair is not a substantive matter but that the adjournment mo-

tion is a substantive matter? I think it might be helpful for those who are trying to reconcile the conflicting precedents in the future.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

I do believe this is disorder and disrespect of the chair's ruling. You have made a ruling, and you do not—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** You were not recognized, Mr. Oliphant. That's disorder. You started speaking before you were recognized.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Could I?

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Oliphant.

**Mr. Sameer Zuberi:** On a point of order, Mr. Chair, can I be recognized?

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** You decide.

**The Chair:** I will allow Mr. Oliphant to proceed, and then, if you have a point of order, Mr. Zuberi, we will—

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Mr. Chair, this is the third attempt by Mr. Genuis to disrupt the meeting and disrespect your ruling as the chair. He has parliamentary privilege to challenge the ruling. That challenge may be made, and there's a process for it to be made. It will be voted on immediately and then we can proceed to the business.

My understanding is that there was a motion on the floor to do a future study. There's an amendment, which was not challenged. Mr. Spengemann, as chair, did not rule on it. He allowed it, so it wasn't a case of procedure that you are changing. It's the first time a point of order has been raised on whether that was a substantive or dilatory motion. The point of order has been raised. You have ruled on it.

I would ask us now that we either proceed to the original motion that was raised or have the chair's ruling challenged.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** On the same point of order, I see that—

**Mr. Sameer Zuberi:** I'm sorry, but I had the floor.

**The Chair:** Mr. Genuis, you have not been recognized.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'd like to be recognized.

**The Chair:** Mr. Zuberi, please proceed.

**Mr. Sameer Zuberi:** Thank you for recognizing me, Mr. Chair.

I'd ask all colleagues to allow the chair to recognize them before they enter into any form of debate or intervention in the committee, if that's possible, so that we can move ahead with our business, as we all want to do. Our colleague Mr. Genuis also expressed in his initial remarks that he wants to move into studies and whatnot, for us to be productive and do the work we need to do.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Zuberi.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** May I have the floor?

**The Chair:** Is it a point of order?

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Yes.

I think it's interesting that Mr. Oliphant is providing rationale for the chair's decision. I think the chair is perfectly capable of providing that rationale himself.

To respond to Mr. Oliphant, who made substantive arguments with respect to this, the chair was presented with a motion, which the chair allowed. The previous chair allowed it. The same thing happened at the status of women committee. The same thing happened at the immigration committee. Those are three different committees that I know of where three different chairs, in two out of three cases.... Those were members elected within the government party—

**The Chair:** Mr. Genuis, I believe you're engaging in debate once again.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Respectfully, Chair, I'm responding to Mr. Oliphant. Continuously, he is allowed to finish his remarks, and I'm being told I'm engaging in debate when I'm offering a more limited response to Mr. Oliphant's argument.

It's a new day with a new chair. There are some things that are happening here and I want to make sure that I'm afforded the same opportunities as Mr. Oliphant to be able to make arguments with respect to procedure. I think all members from all parties should be treated fairly and given those same opportunities, regardless of whatever different staffers are hoping to see.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Genuis.

I have to say that I very much agree with you that all members should be treated fairly. However, as it was noted, the previous chair did not render a ruling on this issue, so no ruling was made by the previous chair.

In this particular instance, having had an opportunity to refer to the rules, I have made a ruling.

Is it your intention to challenge my ruling?

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, before I make a decision on that, I'd like to get some advice from the clerk, if that's acceptable.

Is it acceptable for a member to ask the clerk for advice on a matter?

**The Chair:** For me to ask—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** No, for a member to ask the clerk for advice on the record.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Ask for a suspension.

**The Chair:** Do you want to ask for a suspension?

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Would you grant a suspension to consult on this?

**The Chair:** Yes—

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Mr. Chair, I'm happy to listen to the question and to the clerk's response, so that we can perhaps get on with it.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'm not agnostic in general, but I'm agnostic on this matter, whether you want to suspend or I can pose my question.

**The Chair:** Do you want to pose the question to the chair, and I will undertake to consult with the clerk?

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'm sorry. Is the clerk going to be able to respond to the committee, or are you going to consult with her and then tell us your interpretation of the response?

**The Chair:** We will ensure that the clerk can speak to every member of the committee.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Okay, wonderful. Thank you.

I wonder if the clerk can highlight any precedents that she's aware of with respect to the issue of suspension with a condition. In particular, can the clerk share information about how committees are typically guided by historic practice, as well as by the interpretation of written rules?

**The Chair:** Madam Clerk.

**The Clerk:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I can speak to this a little bit.

In this committee in particular, the adjournment motion with a condition has been used in the past. One of the recent examples I can think of is during the meeting of May 5, when there was a motion on the floor and our Tibetan delegation was here. You moved to adjourn debate on the motion until the questioning of the witnesses was completed. That would be another such example of what we had before us.

Now, it is up to the committee to decide which way they would like to run their own proceedings. They do that within the framework that is provided to them by the Standing Orders of the House and *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*. If a committee finds a practice that it likes and it is able to continue with that practice within that same framework, then it's completely up to the committee to decide whether or not they will continue with that practice.

If there is a question as to whether or not that practice is contrary to the rules of procedure set out by the House of Commons, which is a higher procedural authority, it is then raised in a point of order. It's up to the chair to determine whether or not that practice should continue.

I can address a little bit about precedents from one committee to the other, if you like.

Precedents within the House of Commons chamber are very important because there is only one chamber. While there are multiple committees, precedents from one committee to the next generally do not transfer because the committees are masters of their own proceedings. You cannot say, on the one hand, that you're the master of your own proceeding, but you're also tied down to the precedents that happened in not your own committee, if that makes sense.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Madam Clerk, just to make sure I understand—

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Now we have had the benefit of that clarification, I fear that what is happening here is we are wasting the time of the committee intentionally. It is regrettable that the official opposition is doing this. There is work to be done in this committee. I would ask you to indicate what motion is currently on the floor, so we may debate that motion, rather than engage in these procedural shenanigans in order to push the work of the foreign affairs committee to...never.

We have three more weeks, sir, and I believe we all have work in front of us, including a study on Ukraine. May I remind all members of this committee that the war in Ukraine continues to rage while we debate in this committee procedural nonsense as a result of Mr. Garnett's desire to avoid substantive work.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** On the same point of order, Mr. Chair—

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Bendayan.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** May I be recognized?

**The Chair:** I think we've had ample opportunity today, over the course of the past hour almost, to clarify these rules of procedure, Mr. Genuis.

I believe this is the sixth time I am asking you this. I have made a ruling. Is it your intention to challenge it?

I would be grateful if you could keep your comments strictly focused on whether you intend to challenge that ruling or not.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, this is quite incredible. Ms. Bendayan just launched an attack on me and my motivations. You let her finish, while you nodded along and then you tell me what I can and cannot say or do.

Let me make this very simple. I'd like to seek the unanimous consent of this committee to adjourn debate on the matters before it and proceed to consideration of our calendar, so we can program the next three weeks to get back to our business.

If members refuse unanimous consent to adjourn debate on this motion on a completely other subject, then I think it would be hard for them to play this game of pretending that it's somebody else's fault that we're not talking about the issues we should be talking about.

I'm seeking the unanimous consent of the committee to adjourn debate on whatever motions are or aren't before us. I'll start with that.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Unanimous consent will not be given to stifle a debate on a potential motion to discuss women's reproductive rights. Very clearly, on this side of the House, we will not adjourn debate on that issue—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, was the member recognized?

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** —as it is only to get it on our agenda. It's an important issue, so no.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Are you enforcing rules on that member, Mr. Chair?

**The Chair:** Mr. Oliphant, can I ask that you wait until you are recognized?

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** My apologies, Chair.

**The Chair:** I've made every effort to ensure we are proceeding in an orderly fashion. I have attempted to canvass the opinion of the member as to whether or not he wishes to challenge. I have not heard any answer after asking, I believe, on seven occasions, so the ruling—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I've been repeatedly interrupted, but I'm happy to challenge your ruling, Mr. Chair.

I was seeking the opportunity to make arguments and get clarification on your ruling before doing so. I was repeatedly interrupted by other members, and you did not address that matter—

**The Chair:** Mr. Genuis, I did not recognize you to speak.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Okay, well, I'm challenging your ruling.

**The Chair:** On numerous occasions, I pointed you to authority—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** May I challenge your ruling?

**The Chair:** Yes, you may do so, but that doesn't get in the way.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'm glad Mr. Oliphant clarified that. Thank you.

**The Chair:** We will take a vote as to whether the ruling stands.

(Ruling of the chair sustained: yeas 7; nays 4)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

That being the decision of the committee, the ruling does stand.

We will revert to debate regarding the amendment to the motion.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Could we have the amendment to the motion read?

**The Chair:** Yes.

Please read it, Madam Clerk.

**The Clerk:** Currently, the amendment is to delete the words “that the committee hold no fewer than five (5) meetings”.

**The Chair:** That is correct.

Go ahead, Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, do I have the floor?

**The Chair:** You do have the floor. That's correct.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Okay. Thank you very much.

This is great. I can speak to the motion without other members speaking at the same time, maybe. We'll see what other practices of the committee are evolving in light of the change in leadership.

Notwithstanding some points of disagreement, I do want to congratulate you, Mr. Chair, on the position that you have ascended to.

Returning to debate on the question of the committee's forward agenda, the circumstances that have led us to debate the committee's foregoing agenda are that we are in the midst of three different studies on clearly pressing global issues. In the midst of a study on the horrific ongoing further invasion of Ukraine; in the midst of a study on vaccine equity, on COVAX and intellectual property issues related to that and other issues around health systems in the developing world; and in the midst of a study on Taiwan and potential security threats to Taiwan, a member of the government decided to go outside the normal process for setting the agenda of the committee. That member chose to try to move a substantive motion, effectively resetting the agenda of the committee to move that substantive motion at committee.

Members on our side did our best to be reasonable and to say, look, instead of trying to insert another item of business in the midst of these three ongoing studies, it would make more sense for us to refer this matter to the subcommittee on agenda and procedure. As members know, the subcommittee on agenda and procedure is specifically set up for the purposes of reviewing the agenda of the committee. It has a mandate to operate in a collaborative manner.

The usual way that this committee sets its agenda is that questions of the way a debate is unfolding and questions of the committee's agenda are discussed among parties in the context of the committee on agenda and procedure. The committee on agenda and procedure considers those matters, reviews those matters, and therefore proceeds with a recommendation that is generally adopted by all members.

That is a very effective way to proceed. It prevents the need for lengthy debates about agenda on the floor of the committee, and it presents a kind of perverse majoritarianism. You could imagine a situation in which a majority of members of the committee sets the entire agenda of the committee and decides all of the studies that happen at that committee. That has generally not been the way this committee has worked. It's made more sense for us to bring ideas to the subcommittee on agenda and procedure and then to be able to define an agenda that is respectful of the different issues that different parties are raising. Certainly, there are many important issues.

This was how we set our initial agenda. It was to say that we would focus on these three urgent issues—the situation in Ukraine, threats to Taiwan and COVAX. I think the ability to have all parties engaged in that process led to a consensus around an agenda that would be substantive and non-partisan and avoid the kind of politicized aspects that happen sometimes at other committees but that generally we wanted to avoid at the foreign affairs committee. We wanted to see this as being an effective multi-party forum for proposing collaborative work on important global issues that Canada has to respond to.

In the midst of that, we had a motion that was put forward on abortion. I think it's in a context where we see many motions on abortion being put forward at many different committees. Different aspects of that motion implied that—

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Ms. McPherson has a point of order.

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** I'm looking for some clarity.

The motion that I believe we are talking about is not a motion on abortion. It is a motion on the reproductive health of women and their rights around the world. I'm wondering if you could read the initial motion, because I don't believe that's what it is solely about. I know there has been a lot brought forward in this committee where we've heard testimony from the Conservatives saying that it is something that it very clearly is not.

Perhaps you could clarify what the motion is, because I don't believe that's accurate.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** On the same point of order, Mr. Chair, I wonder if you could clarify if questions of accuracy are matters of order or matters of debate.

**The Chair:** Ms. McPherson, you're absolutely correct. We should all attempt to the best of our abilities to ensure that the debate is relevant to the issue at hand.

Insofar as the amendment is concerned, it relates to one issue and one issue alone. The scope of the issue before our committee currently is whether, and this is in accordance with the amendment, several words in the original motion should be deleted or not. The words I am referring to are "that the committee hold no fewer than five (5) meetings". That is what we are currently debating. I would ask all members to ensure that to the extent they are engaging in this debate, they keep their remarks relevant to that very limited scope.

Ms. Bendayan.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I had the floor still, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** You did. My apologies.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you for returning the floor to me, Mr. Chair.

I had actually raised another point of order, which you didn't respond to. That's your prerogative and that's fine. I won't make a big issue of it.

The issue was, of course, I was debating aspects of this motion and Ms. McPherson raised a point of order in the context of that saying that she thought I was describing the motion in an inaccurate way. She was allowed to complete an alleged point of order that was not in fact about order at all. It was about her interpretation of the substantive qualities and merits of the motion. I think in the interests of consistency, it's important to say that matters of order are about the rules of the committee and they are not about whether you think somebody is characterizing the motion in an accurate way or not.

Having said that, I think respectfully that Ms. McPherson is incorrect in her comments. Again, it's not a matter of order that she's incorrect; it's simply a matter of debate that she's incorrect.

The motion uses the word “abortion” four or five times, so it would be odd to contend that the motion is not about abortion. That’s fine, but just suffice it to say that this is the foreign affairs committee and motions respecting the same issue have been brought forward at many other committees. We know how much our friends in the Prime Minister’s Office want to bring in debates that are happening in the context of American politics. In fact, in the case of the foreign affairs committee, it seems that this motion directs this committee to study developments in American politics, which is quite interesting. However, our view is that there are certain matters before the committee. This is why this amendment is important, because at the very least, a reasonable step—

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** I have a point of order.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Here we go again.

**The Chair:** Yes, Ms. McPherson.

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** It seems incorrect, but the member has suggested that the PMO wrote this motion. I would just like to ask whether or not that would be accurate and whether or not he would be suggesting that the PMO wrote the motion that I brought forward at the human rights subcommittee on a very similar topic, because, of course, I’m not part of the government and I have a very big interest in the rights of women. I’m just wondering whether or not he would like to retract that.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** If we’re doing points of order for inaccuracy, I don’t know if I agree with the member’s statement that she’s not part of the government at this point.

Can I proceed with my comments, Mr. Chair?

**The Chair:** Yes, Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you.

Would you be prepared to rule that the member’s point of order was not, in fact, a point of order?

**The Chair:** Yes, my understanding is that was not a point of order.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. That is my favourite ruling you’ve made so far in this committee, and I think it will go entirely unchallenged. Thank you for your display of wisdom on that point. I appreciate it very much.

This brings us to why the amendment that is before the committee is important. The amendment deals specifically with the question of how much time is going to be allocated to this study. Transparently, my goal with this amendment is to be consistent with the general belief that most, if not all, of the matters of the agenda of the committee should be evaluated by the subcommittee on agenda and procedure. That is the proper and appropriate place for these conversations to take place. We should generally be reluctant to pass motions at all on programming the committee’s agenda without first allowing the matter to be considered by the subcommittee on agenda and procedure, but at the very least, we should seek to be minimally prescriptive. Being minimally prescriptive creates that opportunity for the subcommittee on agenda and procedure to at least weigh in to some extent, and for us to be able to be a little more nimble and a little more responsive to the emerging circumstances that are in front of us.

It’s my belief that the problem with prescribing the five meetings as proposed in this motion is that there are other urgent matters of ongoing study before the committee. One of those matters is, of course, the war in Ukraine. Notably, this committee began its work at the time.... Well, the Russian invasion had started. There was the occupation of Crimea and other areas, but it was, in fact, prior to the further invasion that began at the end of February that this committee began its work on Ukraine.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** I have a point of order on relevance, Mr. Chair.

I believe the amendment is quite clear. You read it into the record. I would argue that this is not relevant to the amendment. I look to you for a ruling on that.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I’m happy to respond on that point of order, Mr. Chair, if you would like to hear my perspective before making a ruling.

**Mr. Randeep Sarai:** Further to that point of order, I would like to add as well that I think the member opposite has mentioned more of the—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Can I speak first, Mr. Chair? Is there an order for speaking to the points of order?

**Mr. Randeep Sarai:** Mr. Genuis, I will offer you the floor in terms of this point of order.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Maybe you could be the chair now.

**Mr. Randeep Sarai:** No, there’s one too many.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Bendayan. As you know, it is important that members bear in mind that their remarks should be relevant. As you have pointed out, the scope of the issue before us is very limited and narrow. It is as to whether this committee should commit a minimum of five days to this study. I think it is incumbent on all the members to bear that in mind, to keep their comments focused on that issue and to refrain from debating the main motion. At this juncture, it should be limited to the temporal limitation that was contained in the amendment to the motion.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Mr. Chair, given the amendment scope, I don’t believe there’s any indication of when those five days could be. It could be next year. It’s certainly not indicated in the motion as to when that would be.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** On a point of order, was she given the floor, Mr. Chair?

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Is this diatribe and argument regarding these other issues relevant to this point of order?

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, was she given the floor?

**The Chair:** It’s a point of order.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** I have the floor.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I’m seeking clarity from the chair, because the chair spoke and then you started speaking again, so did you continue to have the floor while he spoke?

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** You can ask the chair.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** That is what I just did.

**The Chair:** I would ask all members to ensure that they are recognized before they proceed with their points of order.

Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you.

Just to clarify, do I have the floor on the point of order or are we back to my having the floor on the substantive matter?

**The Chair:** I believe you have the floor on the substantive matter, on the amendment to the motion.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** That's excellent. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I think it's important, just before I go back to what I was saying, to clarify the link, because I think it's important since it's been contested.

The amendment pertains to the number of meetings that should take place on some prospective study that has been proposed by Dr. Fry and perhaps in collaboration with others.

The question of whether we should set a minimum number of meetings is of course a question about the committee's agenda. It would seem to me difficult to consider the question of how many meetings should be set aside for a particular item without also, in relation to that, considering the question of what other possible matters could be considered in those same meetings.

Top of mind in terms of what other matters should be considered, it seems to me, should be the existing work of this committee.

Respectfully, I make no apologies for making the case for the importance of other matters that could be discussed at the committee. I think that is central to the question of how many meetings we should—

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** Mr. Chair, could I have a point of information?

**The Chair:** Yes, Ms. McPherson.

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** This is a point of information, and forgive me if I have this wrong. I'm learning this mostly in this committee.

I'm just wondering whether or not this member will have unlimited time to debate this amendment. I'm wondering whether we'll be getting to any business today or if it will just be this for the next 45 minutes.

It's just a point of information on whether the debate can be limited.

**The Chair:** Thank you for that, Ms. McPherson.

I think it's important to highlight that the members do have as much time as is needed to debate a motion or an amendment to a motion.

That being said, it is important that members actually ensure that the points they are arguing are relevant.

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** It wasn't a point of order.

**The Chair:** Ms. Bendayan.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** On that point of clarification, could the clerk clarify until what time we have this room? I'm certainly pre-

pared to listen to this until midnight. I just want to be able to schedule things accordingly.

**The Chair:** I did consult with the clerk, and at this particular point, it is unverified. We have no response on that specific issue.

Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

We're deleting old practices and creating new ones at the same time.

We're having points of information, which is a previously unknown practice. I don't want to be too much of a stickler, but if members want information—

**Mr. Sameer Zuberi:** Point of order, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Mr. Zuberi.

**Mr. Sameer Zuberi:** Thank you for recognizing me.

I'm wondering if people's interventions on this amendment to the motion have to remain fixed and focused on the amendment to the motion in question. If that's the case, I'd ask that anybody who is intervening be succinct so that we can grasp the essence of what they're trying to say.

Thank you for recognizing me again, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Mr. Zuberi, you are correct. All members are required to keep their remarks focused on the substance of the amendment to the motion.

**Mr. Sameer Zuberi:** Again, may I, Mr. Chair?

**The Chair:** Yes, Mr. Zuberi.

**Mr. Sameer Zuberi:** I myself am paying attention, but I'm not grasping the essence of what's being said. I'm not sure if other members of the committee are feeling similarly.

I would just put this forward. Would you be willing to intervene to make sure that these comments are succinct so we can move on with our business and anybody who's intervening can be effective and not waste words?

**The Chair:** Mr. Zuberi, I will do so by emphasizing and underscoring how important it is that all members keep their remarks relevant to the issue at hand. Thank you.

Go ahead, Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, I have a great deal of respect for Mr. Zuberi. We work together quite a bit, and I think one of the.... He's being very friendly, but I don't know that the public can see.

I think the challenge may be that I am so frequently being interrupted with points of order, points of information, points of practice, points of debate and points of general grumpiness that it is difficult to proceed with any line of reasoning.

Sometimes in the House the Speaker calls upon ministers to begin from the beginning again, and I won't do that fully, but perhaps I can try to directly answer Mr. Zuberi's question. To Ms. Bendayan's comment, I don't plan to talk until midnight. I plan to be wrapping up my intervention on this topic well before then.



To try to respond to Monsieur Zuberi's request for us to grasp the essence of the topic before us, the amendment that we're discussing is an amendment to remove.... The point isn't really five meetings; it is to amend out the prescriptive reference to a minimum number of meetings from the motion. It is based on the belief that the work of this committee should be shaped by the subcommittee on agenda and procedure meeting together with a mandate to work in a collaborative way.

What I would like to see in an ideal world is for this committee not to adopt motions programming the agenda of the committee going forward without first receiving a report and a series of recommendations from the subcommittee on agenda and procedure. That would be my preference.

In fact, early on in this conversation, we moved a motion to refer this matter to the subcommittee on agenda and procedure, which wasn't about tricks or anything. It was a very straightforward way of trying to move the conversation along by saying that we have this idea, and I can't speak to motions that are on notice, of course, because they're not public, but, prospectively, we might have motions on notice. Prospectively, we might have many motions that have been put on notice by other members as well. This one was moved, but there might prospectively be other motions that have been put on notice on various other topics that we could study.

Let's refer all of that to the subcommittee on agenda and procedure to allow those matters—

**Mr. Randeep Sarai:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Zuberi's not going to be happy with you, Mr. Sarai, because you've now interrupted this explanation of the essence of the topic.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Sarai.

**Mr. Randeep Sarai:** Mr. Chair, I've been trying to listen. The amendment is a very simple one. It's to have five meetings. I've heard nothing about why we should have five meetings. I've heard how many times the word "abortion" is in the original motion. I've heard why it wasn't referred or was referred or an amendment was made to refer it to subcommittee.

I have yet to hear one word on why it should be five meetings. Therefore, there is absolutely zero relevance to one word the member has said in the last hour and a half that he's been speaking to the amendment.

I implore you to please rule on this; otherwise, this will continue. This makes no sense. If he wants to speak to the actual motion itself after the amendment is passed or defeated, he has all liberty to do so, but every single word that has been said by the member on his own amendment has had absolutely nothing to do with the amendment itself—zero, nothing.

I ask you to make a—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** This seems like debate, Mr. Chair.

**Mr. Randeep Sarai:** —directive, and please rule this out of order.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Sarai.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Can I respond to the point of order or not?

**The Chair:** Yes, Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate that.

Mr. Chair, I think the member characterizes the unfolding of events thus far in this committee very inaccurately. What has allegedly been going on for an hour and a half... This committee didn't even start until closer to four o'clock than 3:30 and it began with the election of chair. It proceeded with discussion about matters of procedure and I am now discussing the amendment. The arguments I am making are fundamental to that amendment, which is around the question of the agenda of the committee and how the agenda of the committee is being set.

The reason for my amendment is the fact that I don't think this committee should be prescriptive on the subcommittee on agenda and procedure about the number of meetings that are involved. As I said, it's not fundamentally about the numbers—

**Mr. Randeep Sarai:** That should be your amendment.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Do you have the floor, Mr. Sarai, or do I? Okay.

These are highly relevant and well within the traditions of this committee to make substantive arguments about these matters. They are entirely consistent with what has always been permitted in the rules of the committee—

**The Chair:** Mr. Genuis, could I ask that you not debate the point of order.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I defer to you.

**The Chair:** You may resume, Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Resume what?

**The Chair:** You may resume your point of order.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I think my point was made.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

The point having been made, now it goes to—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I still have more to say on the substantive matter.

**The Chair:** Yes, that's what I said. I said you may resume.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Okay, I see. We're done the point of order and now we're resuming on the substantive matter. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I will do my best to continue with where I was before I was again interrupted. I hope to be able to wrap up my remarks uninterrupted, so that I can complete the point that I was trying to make and respond to the very reasonable encouragement from Mr. Zuberi to really distill the essence of the argument.

**Mr. Randeep Sarai:** On a point of order, I didn't get a ruling on the point of order I had, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Mr. Sarai, I understand the point that you have raised, but I'm confident that Mr. Genuis will bear the issue of relevance in mind and he will keep his remarks focused on the 10 words that are in the amendment to the motion.

Mr. Genuis, you can resume.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I can't tell you how much it means to me to have your esteem and confidence as I proceed in this matter. It makes me greatly reassured about the future of this committee, that it is in good hands. I certainly voted for you to be the chair, lest there be any doubt.

**Mr. Randeep Sarai:** He just lied.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** That's not allowed. You can't accuse me of that, Mr. Sarai, but I'll let it go. Maybe that, too, will become a practice of the committee.

Mr. Chair, on the point, it is my belief that we initially proposed to refer this and other motions to the subcommittee on agenda and procedure, to be evaluated. After it was referred to the subcommittee on agenda and procedure, the subcommittee could have come back with specific recommendations.

The majority of the committee opposed that proposal to refer the matter to the subcommittee on agenda and procedure. As a result, we put forward an amendment which said, at the very least, let's not be too prescriptive with respect to the committee's foregoing agenda, because there are many emerging issues internationally.

If we proceed and say we must spend five meetings on this matter, we're handcuffing ourselves to scheduling a particular number of meetings on that matter. It may be more, but it would certainly be no fewer than five. Given where we are in June, we're likely looking at that going into the fall and displacing other matters that could be on the agenda. We don't know what the fall is going to bring in global events.

There is, of course, the ongoing invasion of Ukraine. We certainly hope for an end to that violence before the fall, but I think, realistically, the committee will need to prepare itself to be seized with whatever the situation is at that time, when it comes to the fall. It will be important for us to be ready to continue to study that issue.

It's my belief that in light of the circumstances that we're seeing globally, we should be having many meetings specifically on the issue of Ukraine, perhaps scheduling extra meetings on the issue of Ukraine to hear from more witnesses. Specific recommendations should come out of that, which we can make to the government on the issue of Ukraine.

That's why we moved a motion that was debated for a long time and was then retroactively ruled out of order. It was a motion that said, let's adjourn debate on this issue—

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Here we go again.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Ms. Bendayan.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** I believe now we're engaging in debate over a ruling not only that you made on a previous motion, but that was also contested and voted on, which is entirely irrelevant to the debate.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I say something for 10 seconds and immediately that's the basis for calling something irrelevant. It's—

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** There has been a filibuster of over 16 hours that you have engaged in, sir.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** There was no filibuster. There were constant efforts to adjourn debate.

I'll move a motion now, Mr. Chair.

I move that the committee proceed to scheduling future meetings with respect to its study on Ukraine.

That motion is specifically given as an example on page 1068 of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*, third edition.

I share the member's alleged eagerness—I hope it's genuine—to get back to the work on Ukraine, so I would move that the committee proceed to scheduling future meetings with respect to its study on Ukraine.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Genuis, would you say your motion one more time, please?

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you.

I am being asked to read the motion one more time. The motion is “That the committee proceed to scheduling future meetings with respect to its study on Ukraine.”

**The Chair:** Having had an opportunity to reflect on Mr. Genuis' motion, it appears to me that it is a dilatory motion. We can now proceed to a vote on his motion.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** That's a great ruling. I agree. Two for two. I mean, two for five.

**The Chair:** Shall we take a vote?

**The Clerk:** Mr. Chair, the motion is to proceed to the other item of business as outlined by Mr. Genuis.

(Motion negated: nays 7; yeas 4 [See *Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** This means that we'll resume debate on the amendment to the motion.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

If Liberal members are trying to claim that we are the ones holding us back from proceeding to the study on the substantive matters before the committee, that vote made the positions of the parties eminently clear. It made it eminently clear.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Here we go.

**The Chair:** Ms. Bendayan, the floor is yours.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Procedurally, is it possible to move to a vote on this amendment at this point, or is that not possible?

**An hon. member:** We'll support your amendment.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** To be clear, we would be willing to support the amendment, so I don't see the point of this endless debate. However, I understand, Mr. Chair, that it might not be a point of order, technically speaking.

**The Chair:** As I understand it, unless the debate has collapsed with respect to the amendment, we will continue to proceed.

That having been said, I—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'm sorry. I have a point of order, Mr. Chair. There might be unanimous consent to suspend the committee for a few minutes for some dialogue.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** We don't need unanimous consent. You can suspend if any one of us asks.

**The Chair:** The committee stands suspended—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you.

**The Chair:** —for five minutes.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Perhaps to the call of the chair.

**The Chair:** What's that?

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** To the call of the chair.

**The Chair:** Yes. Five minutes

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** To the call of the chair means that you can call it in five minutes, or more or less, as you wish.

**The Chair:** No. It will stand suspended for five minutes.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** As you wish.

**The Chair:** It will not be within five minutes, but for five minutes.

• (1710) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (1725)

**The Chair:** The committee will now resume.

Mr. Genuis, the floor is yours.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, given that there's some interest in supporting the amendment, I will cede the floor and hear what others have to say. We'll go from there.

Thanks.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** I guess my question would be this. This is negotiating in public, but if we could, I'll agree to the amendment that takes out the minimum number of weeks and allow that to go into scheduling later with the subcommittee. Would we have unanimous support to simply move on the motion, get it done and send it into our scheduling routine? That would be the goal.

**The Chair:** Yes, Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** If we're just chatting informally, I believe we do want to propose just one more amendment with respect to talking about the need to complete the previous work of the committee first.

I'm happy to say let's allow debate to collapse on the amendment and let's vote on the amendment. I'm hopefully getting some feedback in terms of consultations there, but we should be able to then just propose one more amendment. If it doesn't have support, okay. If it does have support, okay. We'll go from there.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Mr. Chair, we're acting in a slightly committee-of-the-whole fashion right now, which sometimes works, but we have not moved into that. I think it would be helpful if we knew what amendment was going to be proposed, even though that is a little unusual. I don't want to go down a rabbit hole where I don't know where I'm going.

**The Chair:** The clerk reminds me that, much like the issue we faced at the beginning, you cannot have two different amendments before the committee. We will have to vote on this amendment, and then we will proceed to another amendment, should that be the case.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Thank you for that.

It would not be unusual, though, for a member to give an indication of what he or she may be proposing as an amendment in the context of a debate. That could be done. It's not proposing the amendment. It is suggesting what the proposed amendment might possibly be, which would just give us some indication.

However, I would like to work in good faith. We are not wedded to the five meetings. It could be three. It could be two. It could be nine. It depends on what the subcommittee on agenda comes up with. We're very willing to leave it to that. We're also very willing to leave the scheduling of this this work to after we've done the important work that we're already doing.

We do want to finish the study on vaccines. We do want to finish the statement on Ukraine. We do have two pieces of legislation that are coming before the committee. We recognize that. We're not dumb. We know that we have work to do. But we would like this motion passed so that next fall, or whenever we finish with the agenda as it is laid out, we could deal with it. We're not trying to bump any work. What we're trying to do is indicate that this is work that we would like to do in the fall.

I'm looking around at our team. Are we okay to trust them?

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** You might not like the amendment. I'm not guaranteeing that you'll like the amendment.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Oh, I'm sure we won't.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** We might as well vote on the thing we agree on, and then we can—

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Well, frankly, Mr. Chair, we want a long study. We would like a study of five or six weeks, a minimum of five weeks. That's what we would like. However, in good faith we're offering to not do that in order to try to reach a compromise so that we can get out of this filibuster. That's what we're doing. But if we're going to be into a filibuster anyway, we'll keep the five weeks.

That's just what it is. That's what human beings do.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Accepting the amendment doesn't mean less than five meetings, as you pointed out. It means that the matter will be considered by the subcommittee on agenda and procedure at the appropriate time.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Mr. Chair, I would hate to cast aspersions on the mover of that amendment, because that seemed to be what they were suggesting.

You can see why we lose faith. Now we hear that it wasn't even important, that we had an amendment that is now no longer important.

We didn't move that amendment—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I think it's very important. We're having this back and forth, if the chair allows.

The point I made was that, fundamentally, it's not about the numbers. It's about the fact that the parameters of the study should be set by the subcommittee on agenda and procedure. That is the proper forum. That's the role of that committee.

Further, in my view, the focus of the committee right now should be on the invasion of Ukraine and completing our existing work, as well as on the legislation we had from the House. That is a total of five items. There are two pieces of legislation and three studies, which is quite a large amount of work.

Those continue to be my points, and I think I have been consistent on them. I don't want the member to presume he's going to like everything I'm going to say afterwards, but let's try to proceed. Let's adopt the amendment and go from there.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Mr. Chair, I would suggest, with all due respect, that I have read or written a couple hundred motions at committee. Many of them, in fact, most of them, do stipulate a minimum number of meetings. It is not the work of the subcommittee to put that in. Writers of motions do it every day, in all 25 or 26 standing committees of the House of Commons. It is normal procedure to put in a number of meetings.

It's the work of the subcommittee on agenda and procedure to deal with that and honour the work of the committee members, who have tried to do their best, and come up with a schedule and get back to us. If they can't schedule five meetings, and they come back to the committee saying that they can only fit in three because there is other important work, we will listen to that.

We are willing, on the reasonable government side, to say we will let that amendment pass, but we are hoping the official opposition will be reasonable in their suggestions following that understanding on the points we have been making over the last number of meetings.

**The Chair:** Let's move to a vote on the amendment to delete the words "that the committee hold no fewer than five (5) meetings".

(Amendment agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0)

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'm seeking the floor to move my amendment.

The amendment is, in the place where the original line "that the committee hold no fewer than five (5) meetings" was, we add the following line:

and that this study not take place until after the completion of the committee's studies on Ukraine, vaccine equity and Taiwan as well as studies on legislation sent from the House of Commons; and further that it not take place until the subcommittee on agenda and procedure submits a report prescribing the manner in which the study is to proceed.

I'm happy to read it again.

**The Chair:** Yes, could you?

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** It reads:

and that this study not take place until after the completion of the committee's studies on Ukraine, vaccine equity and Taiwan as well as studies on legislation sent from the House of Commons; and further that it not take place until the subcommittee on agenda and procedure submits a report prescribing the manner in which the study is to proceed.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Ms. Bendayan.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Mr. Chair, I'm not sure I quite understand the part of the amendment about the report from the subcommittee being submitted. That is not something I'm personally familiar with, so perhaps the member could clarify what he is looking for in that report.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'd be happy to do that.

The subcommittee at some point will meet and it will discuss what happens next. The way I would envision this happening is that we complete what are essentially five items before the committee: three studies and two pieces of legislation.

Once that is done, the subcommittee will meet. We'll say that we have this motion and we have other possible issues. They will discuss, as the subcommittee does, and then they will submit a report to us as the main committee. That report will be adopted and it will say that we will do this and then this in this order for this many meetings. That's how we'll proceed.

That's how we got the current agenda. The studies we're working on were discussed at the subcommittee. A report came out of the subcommittee. We're simply saying that this proposed study will happen in a manner prescribed by the subcommittee on agenda and procedure and that will be after a report has come from the subcommittee to the main committee prescribing the manner in which it is to proceed. That will take place following the completion of the committee's work on the issues we're currently studying, as well as legislation.

That's our proposal.

**The Chair:** Mr. Bergeron.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

In light of Ms. Bendayan's comments, I'm wondering about the last part of Mr. Genuis's amendment. It says that the report will prescribe the manner in which the study is to proceed. I was thinking that the subcommittee's report would set out a proposed schedule or, at least, a work plan for the fall, since other study suggestions will certainly be made.

One of the issues I'm concerned about is the global food crisis that is emerging because of the conflict in Ukraine, including the challenges developing countries face in accessing grain from Ukraine. I'm also concerned about the inflation crisis caused by rising fuel prices, among other things. Those circumstances have created a perfect storm that calls for the committee's attention.

That is why the last part of Mr. Genuis's amendment worries me. My understanding is that the subcommittee's report would address only how the study on women's reproductive health should proceed, whereas the Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development normally proposes some sort of work plan to the committee for the coming weeks. Unless Mr. Genuis amends his own amendment, I will have no choice but to move a subamendment.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Bergeron.

[English]

Before going to Ms. Bendayan, I should say that we have been advised that, with respect to the allocation of services, we only have access to this room until 5:50.

We will now proceed to Ms. Bendayan.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Mr. Chair, I look forward to getting to a vote on this, but just to explain for the benefit of my colleagues, my current thinking is that I'm quite concerned that accepting a report from the subcommittee would mean we would engage in yet a second filibuster on a vote at that time. I am preoccupied and uncomfortable with that piece of the amendment.

I'm not sure if the member opposite would like to remove that piece from his amendment, but otherwise we're happy to proceed to a vote.

**The Chair:** Ms. McPherson.

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** Mr. Chair, I just want some clarity as well.

What I'm worried about is that, as Mr. Bergeron has brought forward, when things come to this committee that are urgent, we need to have the flexibility to respond to those.

Will this dictate what other things this committee can study? Does it take away our ability to have the mobility to study things that may come forward that are urgent in matter?

**The Chair:** Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, we're trying to work and word-smith a bit on the fly. I'm never strongly wedded to particular words in particular places. I hope we can work to achieve an understanding. I will say that I'm particularly aware that when we're working on the fly it's a challenge in terms of translation and nuance of language, so I apologize for not having the French ready. Ideally, we'll get this done before we have to wrap up, but if not, certainly we can have a tightened-up translated version distributed and maybe have some off-line discussion on just nailing this down.

Since the focus of the discussion has been on part two of the amendment... First of all, maybe it's worth acknowledging, is there agreement on part one of the amendment? If there is, that's good, and if there isn't, maybe we can talk about that.

The second part is that it is the normal process for the subcommittee on agenda and procedure to submit a report to the main committee and that the report would then prescribe the work of the committee across a broad range of topics. At no point in the amendment does it say that particular report would have to be exclusively about the issue of this motion.

What I imagine would happen is that there would be a report from the subcommittee that would come forward and that would prescribe work on this as well as a number of other items. We might have motions on notice on other topics. There are other topics such as issues of access to food, which Mr. Bergeron mentioned. The subcommittee on agenda and procedure would take this motion, as well as those other motions, compile them, propose a plan for how many meetings in what order, build flexibility into that

plan, which is what we always do, and put forward a plan, and then that report would come to the main committee.

I think it's important to proceed in that fashion, which is engaging the subcommittee to prescribe an agenda going forward, and it gives every party, then, the opportunity to say what it is they want to study, and then it all comes together. In terms of the possibility of filibusters at that point, a subcommittee report will define the agenda of the whole committee and, hopefully, will reflect the consensus of the subcommittee, which is in fact core to the mandate of the subcommittee and which is to work on the basis of consensus. Let's try to move forward in good faith and the understanding that it will be the job of the subcommittee to take this and take other items and build an agenda that follows our work on Ukraine, vaccine equity, Taiwan and the legislation.

I think the amendment achieves the things that both Mr. Bergeron and Ms. McPherson are seeking, but if either have a subamendment to propose that further tightens or clarifies the matter, that's fine. We can explore it.

**The Chair:** Mr. Oliphant.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** I've lost track of whether or not a subamendment is possible, because I don't know where we are. We have an amendment, and this is just the first amendment. We have a motion and an amendment, so we could subamend.

My concern about the motion is the second part, because I think we could end in an endless loop, but I also have a concern about the first part, in that when we decided to do—and started—a study on Taiwan, there was not a special committee that the House had set up on Canada-China relations. It seems to me that we need some discussion about whether or not we can get that work over to the Canada-China committee. We can't dictate to another committee what work they do, but we can transfer to them our testimony that we've already done at one meeting with the suggestion that they do that work so that we could do work like food scarcity. Based on Mr. Bergeron's comment, I think there's some important work.

I just don't like the way this is tying things. It feels like our hands are being tied and we can't be nimble and do stuff. We know that we have work to do on two things. We have to finish the COVAX study, the vaccine equity study. We have to finish the Ukraine statement. We know that when those are done, we have 60 days—maybe an extension—to get two pieces of legislation done. That's what we know we have to do. I would like to focus on getting that done and leaving a little flexibility for something like food and energy coming out of the invasion of Ukraine by Russia. I'm just worried that we're tying this down needlessly, because we have a motion to do a future study and that's all we've got.

I guess I'm now thinking against the amendment because it just ties our hands, and I'd sooner like us just to get rid of the motion, pass it and send it off. It will go into our hamper of work that we want to get done and, as we said, our work plans will come back to us.

Also, we may have other things. I mean, we have a notice of motion from Ms. McPherson. I think it's very good, on....it just left my mind—

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** It's on sanctions, a review of the sanctions.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Thank you. I had it in my head earlier.

There are several things I think we're going to have to do. That's all going to come back to us as a committee. I'd just like to get this done, get it out, and move this on so that we can approach our weekend.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Monsieur Bergeron.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** I must admit, I have some doubts, Mr. Chair.

As I saw it, the problem basically had to do with—

[*English*]

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

I'm sorry, Mr. Bergeron, but there's no translation.

[*Translation*]

I speak French, but not fluently.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** I understand that the problem is fixed.

Please continue, Monsieur Bergeron.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** I was saying that I have some doubts given what Mr. Oliphant just said. I thought the problem was only with the last part of the amendment. In light of Mr. Genuis's comments, perhaps it wasn't really a problem. Perhaps a language nuance is to blame for my thinking that the last part of the amendment referred specifically to the study on women's reproductive health.

Mr. Genuis seems to be saying that the last part of his amendment relates to any topic that comes to the committee for consideration or study in the fall. That wasn't how I understood the last part, so it might just come down to a language nuance, as I said.

What Mr. Oliphant just said about the first part, I find a bit unsettling. It's not that I don't think we should finish what we started, but we will need to decide whether to finish our study on Taiwan or recommend that the Special Committee on the Canada–People's Republic of China Relationship continue that work.

I have to tell you, Mr. Chair, that, at this point, I'm not really sure where I stand on Mr. Genuis's amendment.

[*English*]

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Can I make a point of order to propose a unanimous consent motion?

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Is there consent?

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** You have to have unanimous consent to do that.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** We were told that we have until 5:50 p.m. with resources.

There are some questions around the amendment. We all want to get this issue resolved. Let's refer the amendment to the subcommittee. Let's use the next time slot we have to do a meeting of the subcommittee, and then the subcommittee can come back to the main committee.

Mainly what we're trying to do here, in terms of wordsmithing the amendment, is generally something that happens at the subcommittee. That's where we talk about how we want to do this.

I would propose that we refer this to the subcommittee, that the subcommittee meet and that the subcommittee report back to us on this matter.

**The Chair:** Mr. Zuberi.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** It's a request for UC.

**The Chair:** Yes.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** I think I'd like to be part of the discussion after spending hours working on this motion.

**Mr. Sameer Zuberi:** I think I had my hand up before the other member.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** It's denied, so it's over.

**The Chair:** We do not have unanimous consent.

Mr. Zuberi, you have the floor.

**Mr. Sameer Zuberi:** Thank you for recognizing me, Mr. Chair.

Very briefly, I would just suggest that all the parties speak in the interim before the next meeting to please iron this out. Although I do appreciate the procedural learning that's happening for yours truly right here right now—it's very, very useful and informative—I think we can all agree—or almost all of us—that we want to get to the substantive conversation.

I'll leave it at that. I'm pleading that parties speak with each other and iron this out so we can get to the substantive stuff we want to address in this committee.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Zuberi.

There are several more individuals who would like to take the floor. However, having advised everyone that we only have this room available until 5:50, I'm afraid I'm going to have to suspend this meeting because it is now past 5:50.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Mr. Chair, would you grant an intervention unrelated to this particular topic addressed to the analysts for the benefit of all members? I have a question for the analysts.

**The Chair:** Absolutely.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I believe the analysts were tasked with preparing a statement that we have received on Ukraine. I had indicated many meetings ago that I had comments on that statement. Would the chair and members be amenable to my circulating those comments by email to everyone so that we can move our work forward on that statement? Other members are free to respond by email with their own comments.

I'm simply trying to move our work forward, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** I have spoken with the analysts and clerk, and they are advising that if anyone has any comments or would like to make any changes to the statement, they should do so by end of business on Monday.

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** Mr. Chair, could we do that with the vaccine equity draft as well?

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** On the vaccine equity issue, the question is, when are we going to study that report? I don't know that we want to set the same deadline for amendments on both the statement and the study. I guess it comes down to which ones we're planning on studying first and then setting deadlines that are proportionate and appropriate in relation to those dates.

**The Chair:** On that specific issue, Ms. McPherson, I'll have to consult with the vice-chairs and we'll get back to you.

It now being 5:55 p.m., the meeting stands suspended.

Thank you.

*[The meeting was suspended at 5:55 p.m., Thursday, June 2]*

*[The meeting resumed at 11:03 a.m., Monday, June 6]*

**The Chair:** I call the meeting to order.

Welcome back, everyone, to meeting number 21 of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development. Today, we will be continuing the discussion that began on Monday, May 16, 2022.

As always, interpretation is available through the globe icon at the bottom of your screen. For members participating in person, keep in mind the Board of Internal Economy's guidelines for mask use and health protocols.

Before speaking, I would like to remind all members to please wait until they are recognized by name. When speaking, please speak slowly and clearly. When you are not speaking, your mike should be on mute. I would remind members that all comments should be addressed through the chair.

Before we resume debate, I want to apprise all members, given our interest in developments in Ukraine, that we have received notification that two members from the Ukrainian parliament will be visiting Ottawa. They have indicated, should the members agree, that they would like to appear before this committee. That would be on June 13, which is next Monday. It would start at 10 a.m. and would go until 12. The two members who have written to us are Ms. Yevheniya Kravchuk and Mr. Rustem Umerov. Members can decide at some point whether they think it would be a good idea to once again hear from Ukrainian parliamentarians.

Yes, Ms. Bendayan.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** On a point of order, Mr. Chair, would we be deciding that now? Are you going to vote? How would you like the committee to make that decision?

**The Chair:** If there is unanimous consent, we can vote on that.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** We agree.

**The Chair:** Does everyone agree?

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** We certainly agree, yes.

**The Chair:** Okay, great. That's good to hear. We will take note of that.

Thank you, Ms. Bendayan.

If we can resume debate, Ms. Bendayan, the floor is yours.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Mr. Chair, can you clarify what we are resuming debate on?

**The Chair:** We are resuming debate on Mr. Genuis's amendment to the motion.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** I believe that we agreed on an amendment that we had been debating for some time. Are we moving to a new amendment by Mr. Genuis?

**The Chair:** Let's ask the clerk to read the amendment.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Chair, the amendment is:

That the words "and that this study not take place until after the completion of the committee's studies on Ukraine, vaccine equity and Taiwan, as well as studies on legislation sent from the House of Commons; and further that it not take place until the subcommittee on agenda and procedure submits a report prescribing the manner in which the study is to proceed;" be inserted between the words "rights globally;" and the words "and that the committee reports its findings to the House"

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Thank you. It's much appreciated, Madam Clerk.

I would like to begin by saying that in good faith, we agreed to the previous amendment proposed by the same member. At this point, it would seem that there is going to be a litany of new amendments at every turn.

I believe calculations have been made and it is now the 16th hour of debate on this same motion. We have all agreed on many occasions that the important work of this study is being deterred. I would urge all members to move simply to vote on this motion, which has dragged on in debate for far too long.

I would not be supportive of this amendment, as I mentioned on a previous occasion. I believe it was at end of the last meeting. Not only would there only be further amendments should we agree to this amendment—that is obviously quite clear at this point—but moving an amendment that would essentially defer the matter to after a report from the subcommittee is presented to this committee will only engender another endless filibuster on behalf of the Conservatives.

I am not supportive of this particular further amendment.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Bendayan.

Mr. Genuis, the floor is yours.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair. I'm sorry to hear that we're not yet at a point where there is consensus. I had hoped we might be there.

Just to review the context and maybe clarify a few points from what Ms. Bendayan said, I think we were very clear, prior to the vote on the previous amendment, that we would be proposing one more amendment. I said as much. I said as much on the record. The record will show that.

The implication is, "Well, we accepted the amendment in good faith, and now here's another amendment." No. I said, prior to the amendment that I want you guys to be aware that there will be another amendment coming.

The amendment we are putting forward to this motion is actually completely consistent with things that government members have said throughout the course of this conversation on this motion. We had a motion put before the committee, in the middle of three existing studies. At the time, I said that the expectation was that we would see two pieces of legislation come to the committee, in addition to the three studies we were already doing. Effectively, there were five things on the table, which is a very substantial agenda, probably more substantial than most committees deal with in terms of three ongoing studies plus two points of business the House has directed the committee to take up.

We said there were some problems with the motion as it was written. I think Mr. Chong identified those problems when this issue was first up for discussion. Fundamentally, then we said, let's make sure that the study proposed by this motion, if the motion passes, proceeds in a way that is prescribed by the special committee, and that it not proceed until the other work of the committee is finished. That's all the amendment says. The amendment says that we should focus first on completing the work we have to do on the issues of Ukraine, vaccine equity and Taiwan as well as legislation, and that the subcommittee should meet and prescribe the particulars of how the committee is going to undertake that study going forward.

In fact, members of the government have said precisely that this is their intention. "Oh no, we're not saying the study should take place right now. Of course, we think the committee's work on Ukraine should be completed first. We just want to pass this motion anyway to express some aspiration about something that we would study in the future."

Well, we are putting what they have said is their intention with respect to the committee's agenda into the text of the motion. It's always a little bit suspicious when the government says, "This is what we're going to do," but then we put it into the text of the motion and say that we're going to have this language in the motion to make sure this is what we're going to do, and then all of a sudden at that point, we have government members saying that this is somehow unreasonable.

I think the process around the conversation we're having on this amendment is important to clarify. Conservatives have repeatedly moved motions to adjourn debate on this or to proceed to other orders of business.

Our view is that the committee should get back to its work as soon as possible, get back to the important work it was doing prior to this disruptive motion being put forward. We should get back to that work right away. The best way to do that is to adjourn debate on this motion so that we can proceed with that work. There's plenty of time for further discussion on how this type of a study would unfold.

It's fairly obvious that even in the most hawkish scenario, we're not going to get to the content envisioned by the study, let's say, prior to the summer. Members could spend a substantial amount of time talking and figuring out what and if and the particulars of the study. That's why we've said let's adjourn debate on this matter and proceed with the work of the committee as planned.

The government has consistently voted against our proposals to adjourn debate. They've said that the only way they're going to allow this committee to proceed to something else is if we actually complete debate on this matter.

They're professing the same concern. We're saying that we should get back to the regular work of this committee and they're saying we should get back to the regular work of this committee.

On the face of it, you have two sides that are professing a desire for the same thing, which is the committee being able to proceed with its work. I guess the difference is that we've said the way for the committee to proceed with its work is for the committee to adjourn debate on this matter and to return to this matter closer to a time when we might actually proceed with a hypothetical study, when we've actually completed the five points of business that are already on the table for the committee to do.

The government, working with the NDP, have said they're not going to accept those kinds of adjournment proposals we've put forward, so we are left with saying that if the government insists that we have to hash this out now, then we have to hash it out. This means making the arguments and putting the amendments with respect to this motion that we think are appropriate.

We are only in this situation because the government is unwilling to adjourn debate or accept motions that we've put forward for the committee to proceed to other orders of business. That's unfortunate because usually that's the way things are worked out.

Again, we put this amendment forward. We were transparent about the fact that we were going to move one more amendment. We put forward this amendment at Thursday's meeting. At the time, Mr. Zuberi quite rightly asked if we could have some conversations offline and if could we give each other feedback on what we want to do so that we don't have to do all the wordsmithing and the hashing out on the floor here.



I moved the amendment verbally and I sent the text of it to our esteemed clerk, who ensured it was translated and distributed to the committee. My understanding is that members had it Thursday night, and if not Thursday night, certainly by Friday morning. They were able to see the amendment. They were able to look at it and consider it. I would have welcomed feedback and suggestions from members in terms of refinements or at least expressions of support or not going forward. We didn't receive those, unfortunately. Now I'm finding out.... I'm not entirely surprised. Usually when you don't hear from the other side, you kind of get an indication that they're not going to go with you on that.

We had this amendment that I would have thought we could have hashed out. Could we have tried to figure something out on it? That didn't happen and now we're just being told that actually, you're digging our heels in.

I'm going to assume that there's a reluctance to proceed in the way that we thought made sense, which is to adjourn debate. It's unfortunate because what we're saying on this amendment is quite specifically to emphasize the importance of the committee's work on Ukraine, on vaccine equity, on Taiwan, as well as on legislation.

I want to flag the importance of the legislative items and the need to get to those first. Generally, it's the practice of the committees of the House to say that they need to prioritize legislation ahead of other matters. We have two pieces of legislation that have been referred to the foreign affairs committee. Both are pieces of legislation for which debate collapsed after the first hour. Both are pieces of legislation that actually received unanimous consent of the House, so they clearly come with a strong consensus coming out of the House. As this amendment says, we should study that legislation ahead of engaging in other business.

One piece of that legislation is a private member's bill by MP John McKay on the government side. It has broad, all-party support. It's designed to tackle the critical issue of supply chain slavery, forced and child labour in supply chains. It does so through a transparency framework requiring companies of a certain size to be transparent about what's in their supply chains. I know that some folks on the committee want this bill to go further or to contain other measures. I think it's the sort of thing that does require a detailed study. We have to work to make it as effective as possible to realize the results that need to be there.

Personally, I would be supportive of including a targeted regional approach in that bill as well, to recognize that there are certain regions where there are high levels of forced labour coming out. On Parliament Hill today, we have Mr. Enes Kanter Freedom, who is an NBA player, highlighting issues of the Uighur genocide, and as part of that, forced labour issues.

I think we should consider, as part of that legislation, or separate legislation, something like the framework put in place with the Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act in the United States that would actually recognize the significant risk of forced labour in East Turkestan and say that any product coming out of there will be presumed to have forced labour in it, unless there's proof otherwise.

These are things we need look at in the context of the committee's study of Bill S-211. I've also said that I think we should have

an amendment to that bill to add in an entities list, to add in provisions that would say that the government should designate a list of entities that we know are of significant concern with respect to forced labour. Providing that entities list would ease the work that government entities need to do, and also ease the work that the private sector needs to do in terms of just being able to identify what the sources of forced labour are.

Mr. Chair, I'm going to give the floor to Mr. Morantz in a moment. I know he hasn't spoken yet during the debate on this motion. I will perhaps have more things to say later on in the debate, but before I give the floor to him, I just want to highlight the other piece of legislation that's before the committee now. It's a bill that stands in my name, although it comes from the other place—

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** On a point of order, Mr. Chair, I just want to ensure that the chair is in charge. No one gives the floor to another member in a committee of the House of Commons.

I believe you will give the floor to someone. I just want to make sure. We have young people in the room who may not know the rules of procedure. If anybody could be misled, it would be a very dangerous thing.

**The Chair:** That's duly noted. Thank you, Mr. Oliphant.

Mr. Genuis, the floor is yours.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank—

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

I just want to clarify, and I do agree with what—

**The Chair:** Mr. Morantz, could you wait until you've been acknowledged.

Mr. Morantz.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** It's on that point of order, though.

I just take exception to the use of the word "misled". It's a good point of order that you recognize who has the floor, but to say that young people here may somehow be misled by my esteemed colleague here is inappropriate, and I would encourage the member to withdraw his use of that word.

**Mr. Sameer Zuberi:** A point of order, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Mr. Zuberi.

**Mr. Sameer Zuberi:** I'd just like to acknowledge that I'm a younger person, and I'm happy to learn.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Sameer Zuberi:** Perhaps I can add something else while I have been given the floor by you, and thank you so much for that.

I want to ask again that all members focus their interventions in a way that is directly related to the issue at hand. Right now I'm at a loss for exactly what the intervention is specifically about. I'd ask that we stay focused and clear so that we can all follow this debate and conversation, which I believe has been happening for 16 hours, if I'm correct, on this exact same point.

We're all very educated—we should be at least—and able to put forth something in a concise fashion. I'm assuming the same point can be boiled down from 16 hours to about 16 minutes. I'm sure we all have the ability to do that. We're supported by great staff, who are behind us, and who oftentimes support us in writing our words to make them pithy, concise and to have meaning.

I ask that all of us here work with our staff to have pithy and precise interventions so that they do not last for 16 hours.

I didn't get my staff to write that for me either.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Zuberi.

I think we can all agree, having heard several of you, that it is imperative we maintain civility in this committee. Part of that civility, of course, is to ensure that we are adhering to process and that we are going about it in a rigorous fashion.

Just to reiterate, when someone does wish to speak, they first have to be acknowledged by the chair. Also, and this is a good reminder to all of us, we should keep our comments relevant to the amendment at hand.

Mr. Genuis, the floor is yours.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, I'm tempted to tease Mr. Zuberi and say that wasn't a very concise intervention about being concise, but I appreciate his comments.

If Mr. Oliphant will forgive me, I'm a relatively new member to this place in terms of how procedure works. I always need a refresher so I appreciate him taking the time to ensure that I'm fully up to speed. I hope we'll get to hear from him about the risks of using Google Translate. I always find it edifying when he shares that information.

My intention in saying I will cede the floor to Mr. Morantz is, of course, not to imply that I have the power to give the floor to anyone but it's more based on what I thought was the speakers list. The chair is nodding so I assume that means that though I clearly failed in describing the procedures in the most formal way it is in fact Mr. Morantz next.

I'll wrap up my comments for the moment by responding to Mr. Zuberi's point with respect to the question of topicality and the amendment and then making a couple of comments about the piece of legislation that I was going to speak to.

The amendment we're debating is an amendment to the current motion. It says:

and that this study not take place until after the completion of the committee's studies on Ukraine, Vaccine Equity and Taiwan as well as studies on legislation sent from the House of Commons; and further that it not take place until the sub-committee on agenda and procedure submits a report prescribing the manner in which the study is to proceed;

In the context of this amendment it would be fully appropriate to make arguments about the importance of the studies on Ukraine, the importance of the study on vaccine equity, the importance of the study on Taiwan, and the importance of the pieces of legislation, because that is precisely what this amendment says. It says that those three studies, as well as the legislation, should be given priority over the content of this motion. Very clearly, there are five things: Ukraine, vaccine equity, Taiwan, Bill S-211, and Bill S-233,

I believe. There's another bill, S-223, that has some folks very excited so I'm careful not to mix those up. Those are the topics that we're invited to discuss in the form of this amendment.

The other piece of legislation, S-233.... Is it Bill S-223? Okay, it's Bill S-223. It's my bill and I've forgotten the number. Bill S-223 is my bill and Bill S-233 is the controversial one. I'm sorry, it's not my bill. Again, we're being precise on a Monday morning after I've taken a red eye and that's good.

Where was I here? The bill would make it a criminal offence for a person to go abroad and receive an organ taken without consent. This bill is designed to combat the horrific practice of forced organ harvesting and trafficking. It also contains a provision by which a person could be deemed inadmissible to Canada if they have been involved in forced organ harvesting and trafficking. We know that there's organ harvesting and trafficking sadly that happens in other countries and there are limits obviously to what we can do about human rights violations that happen in other countries. But one important step we can take is ensuring that we as Canada and that Canadians individually are not complicit in those violations of human rights that take place overseas.

One of the reasons we see forced organ harvesting and trafficking is demand for those organs. If people are coming from other countries to receive an organ that was taken from someone without consent that creates a demand for organs to be taken without consent. That's where we can try to intervene on the Canadian side and confront the issue of prospective demand.

These are two very important pieces of legislation, Bill S-223, and Bill S-211. I'm hopeful that the committee will be able to get to them and proceed with them as well as the other important items on the floor.

I did have a few other things I was going to say but I will finish my remarks for the moment. I suspect next we'll hear from Mr. Morantz and I'm looking forward to his intervention and the interventions of other members as well.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Morantz, the floor is yours.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

First, I want to congratulate you on becoming the chair of this committee. I look forward to a collaborative relationship with you and with all parties on this very important committee.

I want to bring us all back for a moment to what it is we are actually debating currently. As we know, MP Fry introduced a motion on May 6, 2022. In our last meeting, Mr. Genuis introduced an amendment to that motion. His amendment simply states as follows:

and that this study not take place until after the completion of the committee's studies on Ukraine, vaccine equity and Taiwan as well as studies on legislation sent from the House of Commons; and further that it not take place until the sub-committee on agenda and procedure submits a report prescribing the manner in which the study is to proceed.

Those words would be inserted between “rights globally” and “and that the committee report its findings to the House”.

That is the subject we are currently debating. I must say that I am surprised that this amendment has not sailed through. I recall at the meeting on Thursday the members around the table saying that it's exactly what they wanted to see happen. Everybody wants to see us finish the study on Ukraine, on vaccine equity and on Taiwan. We have an obligation to study Bill S-223 and Bill S-211. Everyone seems to agree on that. So I'm somewhat confounded by the fact that we can't seem to come to an agreement on an amendment that everybody has spoken in favour of, from what I can tell so far.

One of the things that's extremely important about this amendment is Ukraine. I want to spend some time talking about my perspective. I'd appreciate some latitude on this, as I was not here the week Dr. Fry's motion was introduced. This is actually my very first time speaking on this subject.

Having the committee find itself in this unfortunate position, I just want to say that this committee is essentially on the front lines. We shouldn't underestimate our role. We're on the front lines of protecting Canada's foreign interests abroad. What we study here can directly impact decisions that the Government of Canada makes vis-à-vis our interests in Ukraine and around the world.

Now, we know that the world is a dangerous place, and it's even more dangerous now that Mr. Putin has taken the rash decision to invade our friend and ally Ukraine. Canada has over one million citizens of Ukrainian descent. Our ties to Ukraine carry a moral imperative. That imperative is to safeguard our foreign policy interests and to stand up for Ukrainian Canadians who are rightfully distraught over the carnage that their beautiful, peace-loving, democratic state has been subjected to. It's also to stand up for the principles of peace and democracy throughout the world. That's why we're here.

We have met these obligations. Canada has met these obligations over our long history. Former prime minister Lester Pearson stood up for these ideals when he assembled the first large-scale United Nations peacekeeping force to de-escalate the situation in Suez. He was awarded a Nobel Peace Prize for the work he did. Mr. Pearson also played an important role in his career to establish the peaceful and democratic State of Israel, resulting in our most important bilateral relationship in the Middle East.

Former prime minister Brian Mulroney stood up for these ideals when he was alone on the world stage seeking to free Nelson Mandela and bring an end to apartheid in South Africa. Mr. Mulroney spearheaded an aggressive Canadian push within the Commonwealth for sanctions to pressure South Africa to end apartheid and get Mr. Mandela released after 25 years of unjust incarceration.

The day after his release from prison, Mr. Mandela spoke with Mr. Mulroney on the phone. According to the former Canadian prime minister's memoirs, Mandela told him, "We regard you as one of our great friends because of the solid support we have received from you and Canada over the years.... When I was in jail, having friends like you in Canada gave me more joy and support than I can say."

In 2004 Mr. Mandela sent a letter in which he said that Mr. Mulroney had provided strong and principled leadership in the struggle

against apartheid. He also said that this was not a popular position—

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Mr. Chair, I apologize. I have a point of order on relevance.

**The Chair:** Yes, Ms. Bendayan.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Mr. Chair, as the member opposite knows, I am a long-time friend of former prime minister Mr. Mulroney. Nothing pleases me more than hearing stories of the discussions between Mr. Mulroney and Mr. Mandela, but that is not relevant to the amendment before us.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Bendayan.

Yes, I would like to caution all the members to try, to the best of their abilities, to remain focused on the issue at hand. Mr. Morantz asked for some latitude, but we ask that you try to keep it relevant to the topic at hand.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm sure you appreciate as a lawyer, as I am, that it's important when you're formulating an argument to be able to set the stage for that argument, and that is what I'm doing with my comments about many former prime ministers, including Mr. Pearson.

I ask my colleagues to have a little bit of patience, and I'll continue with my argument, if that's okay. I'm sure that they will soon see the relevance of why I am revisiting this important history of our country.

Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you, Ms. Bendayan, for your intervention through the chair.

In 2004 Mr. Mandela sent a letter in which he said that Mulroney had provided strong and principled leadership in the struggle against apartheid. He also said that this was not a popular position in all quarters, but South Africans today acknowledge the importance of his contribution to their eventual liberation and success.

Prime Minister Jean Chrétien stood up for these ideals when he recognized that it would be wrong for Canada to get involved in the conflict in Iraq.

Prime Minister Harper stood up for these ideals when he committed Canada to the defence of Afghanistan.

Now the NDP-Liberal coalition seems to be asking us to abandon our work on Mr. Putin's bloody invasion of Ukraine to study something else entirely.

I'm not saying that other matters aren't important, but the most important foreign policy challenge of today is Ukraine.

I'm sure now my colleagues are starting to see the relevance of the comments I made in the preamble, because I'm making a direct analogy to how those prime ministers behaved and how this committee is now behaving, presumably under the direction of the Prime Minister.

I'm not saying that other matters aren't important, not at all. I think there's merit in the motion that's been proposed by Dr. Fry, in fact, but the most important foreign policy challenge of today is Ukraine. It's Ukraine. Ukraine, Ukraine, Ukraine. That's what it is. This committee must be laser focused on pushing back on Mr. Putin's madness, plain and simple.

The pushing back must include a concerted, sustained and unrelenting focus on Ukraine by this committee. We cannot underestimate the importance of this committee in our machinery of government and how it influences our foreign policy. To try to change the channel in the middle of that is just wrong.

Let me ask this rhetorically. What would our NATO allies say about this committee changing its priorities away from Ukraine? More than that, what would Ukraine Ambassador Kovaliv say about this committee trying to change its priorities away from Ukraine? We all heard her. She just appeared before this committee. I think if we all asked her about Dr. Fry's motion, we know what she would say.

She just appeared before this committee pleading with us to do more, not to study something else, but to do more about Ukraine. She described in detail the horrors Mr. Putin has inflicted on her beloved country. I recall the end of her remarks, and I'm sure all of us here do as well. She spoke of a young mother who the Russians taped together with her living child and a mine that they detonated. This is what we should be studying, not something else.

Frankly, it's upsetting to me that we are even having this debate right now, because I thought all of my colleagues on this committee agreed. I heard what they said in the Thursday meeting. They want to study Ukraine. Mr. Genuis's amendment to the motion says exactly that, that we'll study Ukraine and then we'll get to Dr. Fry's motion, so I'm not sure what the problem is here.

In any event, let me ask this rhetorically. What would President Zelenskyy say about this committee changing its focus away from Ukraine? I think we know what he'd say. He appeared in Parliament begging us to do more. Shame on this committee for trying to change the channel right now. Shame on this committee. We need to get back to studying Ukraine.

I know my Liberal colleagues will argue that's not the case. I heard Mr. Oliphant and Ms. Bendayan trying to make the case that we want to study Ukraine, yet they continue to push a motion on another issue that's completely different.

This is another thing that I want to mention, Mr. Chair. Putting Dr. Fry's motion on notice, that's one thing. We do that all the time. There are many motions in the queue and that's fine, but to move it, to actually activate it, in the middle of the most important foreign policy work, the most important issue and the most important study this committee will likely ever do in this Parliament, and that many of us will do in our political careers, is just wrong. It should be withdrawn and we should get on with our work on Ukraine.

At the very least, we should pass Mr. Genuis's amendment so that we know what the order of business of this committee will be, but that's not what the Liberal members of this committee want. Instead of continuing to study, they want to turn the page. They want to talk about what's going on in the United States. I'm not saying

that this isn't an important issue, but Liberal members apparently don't understand that U.S. jurisprudence is not *stare decisis* in Canada. In fact, there is no decision out of the U.S. Supreme Court. There's a leaked decision—

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair. There is no—

**The Chair:** Yes, Ms. Bendayan.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Mr. Chair, there is no reference to the U.S. Supreme Court or to anything related to the United States in this motion. Dr. Fry's motion, which was initially presented last year, I believe, in December, is—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair—

**The Chair:** Mr. Genuis, do you have a point of order?

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Yes, sir, I do have a point of order. It's just to say that this is not a matter for what Ms. Bendayan is raising. She can get on the speakers list, of course.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Mr. Chair, again, this is a point of order on relevance, because the matter that the member opposite is discussing is not related to the amendment. I would also point out that just today there were further news releases and media reports discussing the plight of Ukrainian women and their reproductive rights, so I fail to see why it is that we cannot vote on the motion discussing the international state of reproductive rights for women.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Bendayan. I understand that was based on the issue of relevance, so again, let me remind all the members to attempt to the best of their abilities to keep their comments focused on the amendment at hand.

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

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, I would suggest that you maybe make a ruling and provide some feedback to the government with respect to these repeated and I think frankly disruptive points of order on relevance, because I think they know, and as you've said previously, that the interpretation of relevance is generally fairly broad in this place.

Frankly, my colleague has been speaking very precisely to the issue of Ukraine, which is directly in the amendment. Our amendment says that we should finish the work on Ukraine before we get to the matter envisioned by the study proposed by Dr. Fry, and my colleague is speaking about the situation in Ukraine and making specific arguments along those lines.

It's obvious that those comments are relevant. I mean, he's not talking about what he had for breakfast or something. I wonder if you could maybe just provide some direction to the government so that we don't have these repeated interruptions, because they're clearly not in any way in line with the history of the way these provisions around relevance have been interpreted.

**The Chair:** Yes, Mr. Genuis.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Mr. Chair, on the point of order—

**The Chair:** Yes, Ms. Bendayan.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:**—simply to respond, my point of order on relevance was based on the invocation of the United States, which is not mentioned at all in the motion that Dr. Fry put forward, nor is it mentioned in the amendment that Mr. Genuis put forward, and therefore it's not relevant to this debate.

I think what my colleague is trying to do is point out the numerous interruptions and seek some clarity from you, Mr. Chair. I'm certainly open to hearing your views on relevance, but after 16 hours of filibustering, the Conservatives have lost the moral high ground to claim that we are interrupting them.

We would like to get on to the business of this committee. We would like to get on to the studies that are before us. I certainly hope that the witnesses on the Taiwan study are not waiting in the wings again for this fourth or fifth meeting where we are being denied our witnesses on the Taiwan study and, certainly, we have a lot of important work to get to on the matter of Ukraine.

Mr. Chair, I'm not sure if you would like to rule on relevance more broadly, but I will continue to interrupt when this filibuster gets out of hand.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'd like to speak on the same point of order, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Bendayan.

Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, effectively, the parliamentary secretary has just conceded the point insofar as she said that she's bringing up regular points of order to interrupt our interventions because she doesn't like aspects of the broader context. Very clearly, these points of order are not about relevance; they're about the fact that Liberal members are—

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** Mr. Chair, can I raise a point of order, please?

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I don't mind, after I'm done. It's up to the chair.

I'll finish my point of order.

In response to Ms. Bendayan, since maybe there is a new appetite to adjourn debate, I'd be happy to seek unanimous consent to adjourn debate on this motion. I can't move a motion because I don't have the floor, but is there unanimous consent to do that? I can seek unanimous consent on a point of order.

It sounds like there isn't unanimous consent to adjourn debate, but we' be happy to adjourn debate on this at any time, for the record.

I apologize that maybe isn't a point of order, but the previous part was.

**The Chair:** I'll now go to Ms. McPherson on a point of order before allowing Mr. Morantz to once again resume debate.

Ms. McPherson.

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** Mr. Chair, thanks for recognizing me.

I want to make the point that Mr. Genuis is claiming that he can determine what is a point of order and what is not. That is actually

the right of the chair. I would like to remind this committee that it is in fact the chair who determines whether something is a point of order.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. McPherson.

Mr. Perkins.

**Mr. Rick Perkins (South Shore—St. Margarets, CPC):** I think the chair probably knows what a point of order is and doesn't need to be told by Ms. McPherson what it is, so I don't think that was actually a point of order. It was trying to give instruction to the chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Perkins.

We had been listening earlier to Mr. Morantz talk about moral leadership, so let me take that as the point of departure here. Let me ask every member here to remain relevant to the issue at hand. At times like this, it behooves us to consider what our responsibilities are here and to attempt to the best of our abilities to remain focused on the issue at hand.

Mr. Morantz, the floor is yours once again.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate your Solomon-esque wisdom when it comes to these types of matters.

I apologize if I misinterpreted the motion to mean the United States when I read the words “given recent reports of international backsliding related to women's sexual and reproductive health and rights”. I presume it was not referring to the leak of the decision in the United States, and that, based on the comments made, it won't be a topic of the debate when the motion actually comes up. That's very reassuring, Mr. Chair.

To go back to my main point, this is not the time to let up the pressure on Mr. Putin. It's not the time to take our foot off the gas. It's not the time to let down Ambassador Kovaliv, President Zelenskyy, Ukrainian Canadians or allies. It's just not the time. This is not the time to abandon principle for political attacks.

I want to remind my colleagues about some of the things they said, on the record, about Ukraine. I'm hoping they still mean what they said. For example, on March 2, the member for Milton said:

Canada is...home to the largest Ukrainian diaspora outside of the region... Ukrainian Canadians have helped build this country that we all love and call home, and Canada stands with Ukraine. Militarily, financially, diplomatically and from a humanitarian perspective, we will continue to heed the call and support Ukraine's right to thrive as a peace-loving and independent sovereign nation. The Russian attack is not only an attack on Ukraine. It is a grave threat to global peace, democracy and all that ensures our collective safety and security. The world is witnessing some of the bravest and most heart-wrenching acts of Ukrainian patriotism, from regular citizens to President...Zelenskyy, fighting for their lives and their nation. They are not only fighting for Ukraine. They fight for all of us.

Those are very profound words from the member for Milton.

On March 25, the member for Willowdale said, “At times like this, we must all resolve to ensure that our country continues to prove steadfast in supporting the Government of Ukraine and that we do all we can to assist individual Ukrainians in their hour of need. Let it never be said that our country shirked from its responsibilities.” He also said, on May 13, “Proud Ukrainians will never relent, and neither should we in our assistance.”

I agree with the member's comments 100%, Mr. Chair.

On February 28, the Minister of National Defence said:

Canada is not alone in this mission to help Ukraine. NATO allies are more united than ever. The world has become a dangerous place, and while these dangers can feel far away to Canadians, these are tumultuous times. We must unite as a country and redouble our efforts to support our allies. We stand with the people of Ukraine. We will continue to support them in the face of unwarranted Russian aggression.

The member for Ottawa West—Nepean and Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Development said on March 21, “Canada's commitment to stand united with those affected by the conflict in Ukraine is clear. We are continuing to work in close collaboration with our allies and our humanitarian partners on the ground to monitor the development of this rapidly evolving crisis.”

I must admit, Mr. Chair, that this quote left me confounded and wondering how the parliamentary secretary can keep that commitment without being timely informed by this committee.

On January 31, the member for Outremont, a member of this committee, said:

I think that it is very important for us to have this meeting today as the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development. We are at a turning point, a crucial moment for rules-based...order. Quite frankly, it is possible that we are on the eve of a new invasion of Ukraine by Russia, a military confrontation that could have vast and devastating consequences not only for Ukraine, but also for Europe and NATO, including Canada. I think that it is important for this committee to study the issue and make it a priority.

On January 31, as well, the member for said, “I think the most pressing issue internationally for foreign affairs is the situation in Ukraine, and I think we must treat it as being of paramount importance and deal with it as quickly and as efficiently as possible.”

This should be the first study that this committee deals with in this Parliament. I could go on and on quoting Liberal members on this issue. I wonder, though, in the recent context of this attempt to limit the study in favour of another, if they still feel this way.

When we first started talking about this issue on January 31, there were roughly 100,000 Russian troops on Ukraine's borders. Three weeks later on February 24, 2022, Russia invaded Ukraine. Thankfully, it appears they have failed in their attempt to unseat President Zelenskyy, but the risk is still very high, and we must keep up the pressure. We must plan for deeper and harsher sanctions. We must plan for more financial and military aid. We simply can't do this if we take our eyes off the ball. We can't be studying something else.

Russia has violated international law, including the Charter of the United Nations. We don't know what Mr. Putin might do next. Article 5 of NATO could force us into a broader European conflict that we need to be discussing. In fact, I just had a meeting with Latvia's ambassador to Canada, Mr. Kaspars Ozoliņš, during his visit to

Winnipeg last week. He was there to wish 500 of our troops well and to thank them before their six-month deployment to Latvia as part of NATO's Operation Reassurance. He told me he grew up during the Cold War and he worries about what might become of his country if Russia were to invade.

These issues are unfolding in real time. That's my point, Mr. Chair. This committee must stay focused.

Ambassador Kovaliv told us that Ukrainian children have been forcibly taken deep into Russian territory. I remember she told us to not rest until they are returned home. We should be helping her. She also told us of Russian soldiers committing sexual violence against women and children.

I recently returned from a trip to Berlin where I was paired with the Minister of International Development. While I was there, I had the opportunity to visit the Sachsenhausen concentration camp where some of the worst atrocities of the Holocaust were perpetrated. I couldn't help but think about the refrain of “never again” as I walked through the gates and saw moulded in iron in the bars of the gates, “Arbeit Macht Frei”, which means “Work sets one free”.

We cannot allow this to go on in this century. The stakes are simply too high. I was honoured to lay a wreath alongside the minister at the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe and tour the Holocaust museum. While I was there, I also had the opportunity to meet with three members of the Bundestag. One of them was my counterpart, the vice-chair of this committee in Germany.

Do you know what their top priority is, Mr. Chair? The top priority is their concern about Russian brutality. They're concerned about helping the 600,000 refugees who have come to their country. They are concerned about energy security. I think if I told them about this motion to study something completely different, they wouldn't understand.

We need to be studying and talking about Ukraine.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Morantz.

We'll now go to Mr. Bergeron.

[Translation]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I listened closely to what the member had to say, and I couldn't help but be shocked at the crocodile tears being shed by the Conservative members supposedly because we are preventing the study on Ukraine from moving forward. I would like to remind members that, in an effort to get past this filibustering, a motion was put forward in the House to allow committees to travel, including to Ukraine. However, the Conservatives, not wanting the filibuster to end until the Liberals withdraw their motion on women's reproductive health, said they would vote against all motions. That includes the motion in the House that would allow this committee to travel to Ukraine and Poland, meet with Ukrainian refugees and see how they were being received in Poland. The committee is also supposed to go to Sweden and Finland to support our allies in their request to join NATO, and travel to Belgium precisely to meet with NATO officials.

It is surprising, then, to hear the members bellyache about the fact that we won't be able to discuss issues relating to Ukraine, when they are the ones who continue to prevent this committee from finalizing its travel plans. Think how much our Ukrainian allies would appreciate seeing the members of this committee come to their country to learn first-hand all about the challenges they are facing. Ukraine's former ambassador to Canada requested that Canadian officials travel to Ukraine, and the Conservatives are the ones stopping it from happening.

It is shocking, to say the least, to sit here and listen as our friends in the Conservative Party shed their crocodile tears, in an attempt to mislead people and make them think that we don't want to move forward with the study on Ukraine. The fact is they are the ones throwing a wrench in the works and preventing us from finalizing the trip.

Mr. Chair, I don't think anyone would believe that the intent of Ms. Fry's motion is to supersede the committee's ongoing studies. From the outset, when Ms. Fry decided to bring her motion to the committee for debate and a vote—a motion that had been put on notice—I voiced my concern because that isn't how the committee usually operates. Normally, decisions about the committee's future business are based on discussions at the steering committee level, and then, the committee decides. While I recognize Ms. Fry has consistently maintained that the committee should examine the issue, I was shocked, to say the least, at the unusual and peculiar way in which it was brought before the committee. For months, she has stressed how important it is that the committee study the reproductive health of women, but we haven't had the opportunity to do so.

Unless I'm mistaken, no one is claiming that the study she is proposing should take priority over those under way. The Conservatives' own filibustering is the very thing preventing the committee from discussing Taiwan, Ukraine, vaccine equity and the bills Mr. Genuis so wants us to discuss. I find that deeply disturbing. I can't seem to find a polite way to express what I'm thinking, but suffice it to say, it's disturbing to watch the Conservative members partake in this filibuster on the pretext that we want to discuss something other than Ukraine.

It is equally disturbing to watch my esteemed colleague Mr. Morantz impute motives and comments to the new Ukrainian ambassador to Canada. I think the new ambassador is perfectly capable of understanding that this isn't about putting the Ukraine

study on hold, even though the Conservatives have already delayed the study by quite a few meetings. I think she understands that this is about making sure the committee examines women's reproductive health at some point. Far be it from me to impute motives to the Ukrainian ambassador or put words in her mouth, but I'm quite sure she would think it quite relevant for the committee to examine the issue, which affects over 50% of the world's population. It's certainly an issue worthy of our attention.

Now I'll come back to Mr. Genuis's amendment, which would put a halt to this filibuster, so that we could get back to the studies and bills that require the committee's attention.

I explained why I have concerns about the second part of the motion. As it currently stands, it refers to the study. The study being referred to in the motion in amendment is the same one mentioned at the very beginning of the motion, where it says “this study”, in other words, the study on women's reproductive health. The amendment deals with the committee's work plan for the coming weeks and months, once we have completed the studies on Ukraine, vaccine equity and Taiwan, as well as studies on legislation sent from the House of Commons.

I already had concerns about that part of the amendment, but Mr. Oliphant said something that troubled me with respect to the first part of the amendment. Talking about our study on Taiwan, he said that the Special Committee on Canada-China relations had been reconstituted at the Conservatives' request. I won't rehash the speech I gave in the House to tell you how strange it is to me that the Conservatives suddenly have a renewed interest in Canada-China relations now that the Afghanistan committee is about to wrap up its work. In any case, since the decision was made to reconstitute the committee, perhaps it's better to let it examine the issue of Taiwan, and we could send the committee everything we've done thus far. We could also opt to continue or finalize our study. Basically, we first need to decide what we want to do about the study on Taiwan.

If I may, Mr. Chair, I'd like to move a subamendment, which I've already sent to the clerk. It reads as follows:

That the words “after the completion of the committee's studies on” and “prescribing the manner in which the study is to proceed” be replaced with “the committee makes a decision on the studies before it on” and “specifying the manner in which the studies be undertaken”, respectively.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you very much, Mr. Bergeron.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** On a point of order, Mr. Chair, I'm sorry, but I didn't fully follow the amendment. Mr. Bergeron suggested he sent it to the clerk. Can it be distributed? Is it ready for distribution?

**The Chair:** We're still waiting for the translation.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Okay. I assume it will be distributed when the translation is in, but if it's acceptable, could Mr. Bergeron just repeat the amendment again so we're clear on what we're debating?

Thanks.

**The Chair:** Mr. Bergeron.

[Translation]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Oh, the joys of virtual proceedings. My apologies, Mr. Chair. The subamendment reads as follows:

That the words "after the completion of the committee's studies on" and "prescribing the manner in which the study is to proceed" be replaced with "the committee makes a decision on the studies before it on" and "specifying the manner in which the studies be undertaken", respectively.

[English]

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'm sorry. I'm having a hard time following that.

**The Chair:** Mr. Bergeron, could I ask you to repeat that one more time, please.

[Translation]

**Mr. Stéphane Bergeron:** Mr. Chair, I would be glad to repeat it. Everyone knows that repetition is edifying.

That the words "after the completion of the committee's studies on" and "prescribing the manner in which the study is to proceed" be replaced with "the committee makes a decision on the studies before it on" and "specifying the manner in which the studies be undertaken", respectively.

Allow me to explain.

The change I'm proposing to the first part of the amendment would ensure that the committee had made a decision on the studies under way on Ukraine, vaccine equity and Taiwan, as well as legislation sent by the House of Commons. By making a decision on the studies under way, I mean that the committee could either complete the studies or decide otherwise in the case of Taiwan.

The reason for the change to the last part of the amendment is simply to refer to "studies", in the plural, rather than "study", the idea being to mention the various studies proposed by the Subcommittee on Agenda and Procedure.

I hope that clarifies things for Mr. Genuis.

[English]

**The Chair:** If we could ask the clerk to provide us with an unofficial translation while we wait for the official translation to come in, I think that would help all members.

Yes, Madam Clerk.

**The Clerk:** Mr. Chair, just give me one second here. I think I have it so that it can at least be understood by all members.

I will read the amendment as it would read if the subamendment were to just replace those words, so that it makes more sense.

What I have is, "and that this study not take place until the committee makes a decision on the studies before it on Ukraine, vaccine equity and Taiwan as well as studies on legislation sent from the House of Commons; and further that it not take place until the sub-

committee on agenda and procedure submits a report specifying the manner in which the studies be undertaken".

That's unofficially what I have.

**The Chair:** How much longer, approximately, before we get the official translation?

**The Clerk:** I'm sorry, Mr. Chair. I don't have a time frame on that.

**The Chair:** Okay.

Is it the wish of the members to actually debate this subamendment?

Yes. Did you want to speak to the subamendment?

**Mr. Ziad Aboultaif (Edmonton Manning, CPC):** I just want to say that it's still very unclear. The reference to this study is very unclear. I would rather wait and see the whole motion written in front of us, so at least we know how to decide on it, if that's okay.

**The Chair:** Is it the wish of the committee to suspend for 10 minutes?

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** We could suspend for a few minutes until we get the translation.

**The Chair:** Okay. We'll suspend for five minutes.

• (1210)

(Pause)

• (1225)

**The Chair:** Members, the clerk has done the translation and shared it with us. She has gone back to the member who moved this subamendment. The member has approved the English translation of the French subamendment.

The clerk has kindly emailed it to all of our emails for your ease of reference. However, for those who may not have access to their email, I will read it out.

The subamendment reads as follows, "That the words 'and that this study not take place until the committee makes a decision on the studies before it on Ukraine, vaccine equity and Taiwan, as well as studies on legislation sent from the House of Commons; and further that it not take place until the subcommittee on agenda and procedure submits a report specifying the manner in which the studies be undertaken' be inserted between the words 'rights globally' and the words 'and that the committee report its findings to the House.'"

That is the official English translation of the subamendment introduced by Mr. Bergeron.

Mr. Oliphant.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** There are two things.

I'd like to get on the speakers list. I don't know how you're handling that.



On a point of order, I didn't really think about this before, but because I'm now studying the amendment more closely, could I get a sense from the chair on the appropriate nature of a negative motion? There is precedent that motions that tell you something you can't do have not been allowed. Maybe the clerk could advise on the appropriateness. It may be okay in a subamendment or an amendment, but to ask a committee not to do something, I think, may be problematic. I hadn't really noticed it until I had the help of Mr. Bergeron's amendment and I really looked at it.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Oliphant.

I've had an opportunity to check with the clerk. That is an interesting issue you have raised, Mr. Oliphant.

My understanding is that you are correct. You cannot have a negative wording that will essentially have the same purpose as the amendment if it gets you to the same place and all you have done is make it negative. However, in this case, this particular rule does not seem to apply. These are simply Mr. Bergeron's instructions. Although the principle is valid, it does not apply to the subamendment before us.

If members would like to discuss this subamendment, please do let me know.

Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Is there a new speakers list, or are we going through the...?

**The Chair:** Now the focus is on the subamendment, unless members would not like to debate it.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Okay, so we have a new speakers list for members who wish to speak to the subamendment.

**The Chair:** Mr. Oliphant is on that list.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Okay.

I will very briefly say that it's our view that the language around "completion of the committee's studies" is important. I don't know if one can sub-sub. I'm happy to discuss it. I'm not wedded to the particular language of the original amendment, but our view is that the completion of the studies on Ukraine, vaccine equity and Taiwan is important.

Insofar as the subamendment removes the requirement that this work be completed.... I understand Mr. Bergeron's points with respect to Taiwan, and maybe there's a case for a subamendment that carves out the Taiwan piece in some particular way. However, insofar as the revised amendments, it now says that the other work would not have to be completed prior to proceeding to this study. That's not consistent with our position.

I'll leave my comments there for now.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Genuis.

We'll now go to Mr. Oliphant.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I will very briefly say that I will be supporting this amendment to the amendment. That's where we are, I think. It's a subamendment. I believe our side finds it helpful, because it doesn't tie the hands of the committee. It allows the committee to continue making deci-

sions as we go. It gives us some flexibility, as opposed to being in a kind of fundamentalist position.

We like the openness of it. We want to thank Mr. Bergeron for a helpful suggestion.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Oliphant.

We'll now go to Mr. Perkins.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Mr. Chair, I think Mr. Genuis said well why we'll be opposing it. Perhaps I could give a little information, since it's my first time in this committee, about my background.

I'd like to comment on Mr. Zuberi's earlier comment. I am young, too, in terms of being an MP, but perhaps not as young in age as Mr. Zuberi, and I have some familiarity with Mr. Oliphant's riding, having been a constituent of Don Valley West for 10 years in Leaside.

More importantly, I served in the Mulroney government as a member of the political staff for the Honourable Barbara McDougall through four different government departments, including the Department of Foreign Affairs. I was their senior policy adviser and executive assistant while she served in that role for three years from 1991 to 1993. It was a very interesting time in the world, obviously with the collapse of the Soviet Union, with the coup in Haiti, negotiating NAFTA, unrest and a coup in Peru, the departure of Pinochet in Chile, Nelson Mandela, who has been mentioned earlier, and obviously Tiananmen Square.

With regard to the collapse of the Soviet Union, this is where it ties to Ukraine and the study on Ukraine quite specifically. Canada, as we all know, was the first country to recognize Ukraine as an independent country from the Soviet Union. While I served in my role for Mrs. McDougall in the then named secretary of state for external affairs as the position was called, I can remember... I don't know how many here remember what they were doing on December 1, 1991. Some in the room might not have even been born, but I recall where I was. I was sitting at my then girlfriend's parents' house in Hawkesbury, Ontario, as we were having a discussion on those old, big Motorola cellphones that we had back then about whether or not to recognize Ukraine, because the Soviet Union formally didn't collapse until between Christmas and New Year's of that year. It was important to us with our long-standing relationship with Ukraine and with the number of Ukrainian Canadians who are very active in Canada, over a million back then and still now, that we recognize Ukraine first and recognize it before the Soviet Union collapsed.

This was a difficult decision. It was not something the department was keen on at the time because the Soviet Union still existed, and recognizing a country within the Soviet Union while it still existed was not the diplomatic thing to do and because Prime Minister Mulroney—as these jobs are when you lead a country—had very close relationships with President Gorbachev. Being the first to acknowledge that a major part of the Soviet Union was no longer part of it was not something that Mr. Gorbachev wanted to see his friend, Prime Minister Mulroney, doing.

We used to take correspondence home for ministers and you know about the many letters ministers get in the big bags. I was sitting there doing that, and I got the call from Privy Council Office saying, “We want to try to work on this.” So I spent the better part of December 1 and December 2, 1991, negotiating back and forth just how and why and what we would say on the recognition of Ukraine.

I say that because at that time we were dealing with a lot of issues around the world that were important, too. We were in the middle of negotiating NAFTA with Mexico and the United States. I had just come back with the minister. We had had a military coup in Haiti against the democratically elected president Jean-Bertrand Aristide, the first democratically elected president of Haiti, where we had passed a resolution through the Organization of American States, led by my boss's speech there to impose western hemispheric sanctions on the illegal coup in Haiti. I can remember because we wrote it on the plane going down.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Mr. Chair, I have a point of order on relevance.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** The relevance—

**The Chair:** Ms. Bendayan, that's it? Did you have anything—

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Mr. Chair, I'm happy to expand further, but I think you see the reason for my intervention. We have happily listened to the resumé of the new member for the Conservative Party, but now we are veering off into discussions of Haiti. It is not relevant to the subamendment, and it's not relevant to the amendment, and I would remind us all that we are dealing with the motion on the reproductive rights of women.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Bendayan.

Yes, I would just implore all the members to actually try to keep their interventions focused on the subamendment before us.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** I appreciate that, Mr. Chair.

I haven't even begun to talk about all the things in my resumé. If you want to hear that, it should barely scratch the surface.

However, the relevance with regard to Haiti is economic sanctions and the way you deal with regimes that have gone rogue in the world.

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

I think your comments are very valid, but we also have bells.

**The Chair:** Yes, we do have bells.

Do we have unanimous consent—

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Chair:** The meeting will be suspended until the next scheduled meeting of the foreign affairs committee.

*[The meeting was suspended at 12:38 p.m., Monday, June 6]*

*[The meeting resumed at 11:32 a.m., Monday, June 13]*

**The Chair:** Welcome back to meeting number 21 of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development. Today, after having heard from parliamentarians from Ukraine, we will continue the discussion that began on Monday, May 16, 2022.

As always, interpretation is available through the globe icon at the bottom of your screen. For members participating in person, bear in mind that the Board of Internal Economy's guidelines for mask use and health protocols are still being followed.

Members, before speaking, I would ask you to please wait until I recognize them by name. When you are speaking, please do speak slowly and clearly. When you're not speaking, your mike should be on mute. I will remind you that all comments made by members should be addressed through the chair.

As you're all aware, we will be resuming debate. More specifically, we are now dealing with a subamendment that was introduced by Mr. Bergeron. As you will recall, there was a speakers list. I will just run down those names. On the current speakers list, we have Mr. Oliphant, Mr. Perkins, Ms. Gray, who is not here with us today, and Mr. Genuis.

We have Mr. Oliphant.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** On a point of order, Mr. Chair, Mr. Perkins had the floor when we adjourned.

**The Chair:** That is not what the clerk has informed me.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** There's a transcript, and it will be very clear that Mr. Perkins had the floor. Could you verify, please?

**The Chair:** Could we suspend for a moment?

**The Chair:** We'll resume.

Thank you, Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Perkins, the floor is yours.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

For those who may be watching on ParlVU, to go over exactly what it is we're debating here, as I understand it, it's a subamendment to Ms. Fry's original motion. It deals with whether or not, at the end of Ms. Fry's motion, we should add a portion that says the committee needs to finish or complete its work on the Ukraine, vaccine equity and Taiwan studies which are already under way before proceeding with Ms. Fry's motion.

When I was speaking for only a few minutes last time, I told members a bit about my personal history. It was just a small piece. It wasn't the full resumé. I was accused of giving my full resumé. I can do that a little later, if you'd like.

I think it's important to step back and understand that the sanctions that we heard a lot of discussion on today in the meeting with officials from Ukraine and the sanctions the government has implemented all come from the Special Economic Measures Act. That act hasn't existed since forever in Canada. It actually was created after the coup in Haiti. I was part of the creation of this act, as I was the senior policy adviser—as I said in the last meeting—to the foreign affairs minister of the day, Barbara McDougall.

The context of 1991-92 is important in understanding the purpose of the act and how governments can and cannot use it. Prior to that time, Canada imposed sanctions a number of times, but it didn't have a standing act of Parliament to do it under. As an example, in the early 1980s, when the government of Prime Minister Trudeau had to impose sanctions on Iran, with the Iran hostage crisis, it had to bring a special act to Parliament and have it pass through the House and the Senate to get authorization to do that. It was the same in 1985-86 when Prime Minister Mulroney decided to try to lead many other nations in imposing economic sanctions on the apartheid regime in South Africa. That required a special act.

Prior to 1991, Canada was not even a member of the Organization of American States. The Organization of American States, which dealt with the issue of Haiti, and the sanctions bill came out of it, because primarily there were a lot of, let's say, despots and dictators. It was not exactly a democratic hemisphere for many years. In 1991, we were in the unusual situation where 34 of the 35 western hemisphere countries were democracies for the first time in the western hemisphere, and for the first time, Canada joined the Organization of American States.

I was with my minister then. It was one of the first international meetings she went to as foreign minister. It was in June 1991, in Santiago, Chile. That was Canada's first meeting with the OAS. They passed something that's become known as the Santiago declaration on June 5, 1991. That declaration said that we were:

To instruct the Secretary General to call for the immediate convocation of a meeting of the Permanent Council in the event of any occurrences giving rise to the sudden or irregular interruption of the democratic political institutional process or of the legitimate exercise of power by the democratically elected government in any of the Organization's member states, in order, within the framework of the Charter, to examine the situation, decide on and convene an ad hoc meeting of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs, or a special session of the General Assembly, all of which must take place within a ten-day period.

That was a revolutionary statement for the Organization of American States in 1991, given the history of the western hemisphere. That was in June.

In the summer of 1991, in August, to be precise, there was a coup in Moscow, with Mikhail Gorbachev. The world took notice. He was trying to implement glasnost and move Russia towards a more open and market-based system. The military took over for a period of about a week. We didn't know where Mikhail Gorbachev was and the military was in charge.

Mr. Chair, the government of the day and former prime minister Mulroney vehemently opposed that and demanded the return of Mr. Gorbachev.

At the end of September—

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** Mr. Oliphant.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** I know that you have been very lax and liberal with respect to relevance. However, we are on a subamendment to the amendment to the motion, which very specifically does two things. It deletes a reference to the completion of a study and it furthers the thing. I have no idea how anyone on this committee, in this room or in this world could possibly find relevance between what the honourable member is saying and the subamendment that is before us at this time.

I know that you give lots of latitude on that. However, I think there is some time when you can rule it out of order and either ask the member to move on and speak to the subamendment or actually end the member's time. It has been done by some chairs at times, notably me, to say it's time to move on. That can be done and I think that's very important because I think we want to show that Parliament is relevant. If Parliament is not relevant because a conversation is completely irrelevant, then we don't have that ability.

I know you have latitude to do that, but I would hope you'd at least remind the member to try to focus on the subamendment, which Mr. Bergeron has presented in good faith, to attempt to move this committee from something that has gone on from May 16 until now.

As you know, we'll be supporting that subamendment if we ever get it to be voted on.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'd like to speak to the same point of order, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Yes, Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, I just want to note that, as you have said in the past, one committee doesn't provide a precedent for another committee. Mr. Oliphant has cited actions he may or may not have taken as chair in a different committee. Those do not provide precedent for the actions of this committee.

I also just note that the amendment removes the language “after the completion of the committee's studies on” and replaces it with the language “the committee makes a decision on the studies before it on”. Discussion around whether the completion of studies related to Ukraine, vaccine equity and Taiwan, as opposed to just decisions being made about those studies and therefore the importance of the matters raised in those studies on Ukraine, vaccine equity and Taiwan are certainly relevant. In fact, they're not only relevant, they're central to the very question of whether the study should be completed first or whether simply a decision should be made about those studies.

Finally, I'll just again mention that the precedent at this committee from the House—the long practice of all committees of this House—is that members are able to speak to the issue at hand while providing context and arguments around it. It is very unusual for people to be interrupted every couple of minutes saying that this sentence and that sentence don't apply. I just make note of those precedents as well.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Genuis.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Yes, Dr. Fry.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** I would like to speak to the issue of relevance.

I think that we are discussing a subamendment to an amendment brought forward by Mr. Genuis, which is an amendment to a motion I brought forward.

I fail to see how discussing South Africa and what went on in a particular government during that time has anything at all to do with Taiwan, Ukraine, vaccine equity and the subamendment. Indeed, it is a rule of committees that relevance and repetition are two issues that can cause a chair to ask a speaker to stand down and move to the next speaker on the list.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Dr. Fry.

Do you have a point of order, Mr. Aboultaif?

**Mr. Ziad Aboultaif:** Yes, if I may.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Aboultaif.

**Mr. Ziad Aboultaif:** I have a couple of things.

First of all, I think the historic background that Mr. Perkins was giving is very relevant to the topics that we're discussing, and I know that Mr. Oliphant knows that. The one concern I have is not just about this but about how it seems like Mr. Oliphant is trying to suggest to the chair to change the way he does things or to do his job, and I don't think that should be the case from any of us as members of this committee. I think the chair knows his job. He knows his options, and he has been doing a good job.

I believe that, if I were Mr. Oliphant, I would avoid making suggestions to the chair about what he should be doing and how he should be running this committee.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Aboultaif.

Mr. Morantz, I understand you have a point of order.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** I'm on the same point of order, Mr. Chair.

I do note that in Mr. Oliphant's intervention, he said that you were being lax in your enforcement of the idea of relevance, and I would just point out that I think that you're the master of this committee, and you will decide what is relevant or what isn't and apply your own standards to that, and Mr. Oliphant shouldn't be telling you whether you're being lax, too strict or just right.

**Mr. Sameer Zuberi:** Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Yes, Mr. Zuberi, go ahead.

**Mr. Sameer Zuberi:** I'm sorry to say this, but clearly, you were given a very rough ride when you assumed the chair and others were trying to tell you what to do.

We need to also note that we are all equal members of this committee. If one of us, whether on the opposition side or the government side, is asking that we remain focused in terms of our interventions, which makes complete sense, so we can move ahead with our work and not continue on for weeks and weeks and weeks on the same exact point of debate and conversation, getting nowhere.... They're just trying to nudge us along and help us to get to where we need to get.

Again, I'm just pleading with all members to be focused and on the issue to help us move along so we can make some decisions, because at this point, that's not what's happening—very far from it. Long speeches are being given along with long interventions, history lessons, personal bios, etc. I'm really interested in that stuff. I'm not going to say I'm not interested in learning about people and colleagues, but I'm just asking that we stay focused so we can make some decisions and get to the actual work here.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Zuberi.

Mr. Oliphant, do you have a point of order?

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Mr. Chair, on my original point of order, I would never presume to tell the chair what to do; however, by definition, a point of order is exactly what Mr. Morantz was arguing it is not. A point of order is exactly suggesting to the chair that we follow the standing orders of the committee. It has been done by Mr. Genuis numerous times when he suggested that the chair should be doing something.

I want to be absolutely clear about that. That doesn't mean I won't contest the chair at some point, because every member can always contest the chair's ruling to see if we have majority support.

At this point, I'm simply reminding the members of the committee that relevance is required. It is in the standing orders, and I would hope that the chair would acknowledge that and either ask the member to move on or to rule the member out of order at some point. That can be done in any committee.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Oliphant.

I would like to remind all the members that relevance is obviously important. I think we can all agree to that; however, that having been said, I think we can all agree that relevance is something of an elastic concept. Context is important, but, as was noted, Mr. Bergeron introduced his subamendment in good faith, so I would ask the members to do their best to bear in mind the subamendment before us and to keep their comments relevant to the subamendment.

Mr. Perkins, the floor is yours.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, members. I thought at the beginning I'd laid out the relevance about what I was about to say. It has to do with the sanctions that have been imposed on Russia and individual Russians as a result of their illegal invasion and war against Ukraine and the method with which the government is doing that, namely, the Special Economic Measures Act.

The context for that Special Economic Measures Act is important. I'm not sure if there are members around here who know how many times it's actually been used. There are 21 cases currently of existing sanctions that Canada has ongoing, and seven previously that have now ended. One of those seven is the reason that the sanction power exists, so that Parliament is not the individual arbiter every time there is a sanction proposed by the Government of Canada. So the debate and discussion.... It is the Governor in Council who gets to set those.

Part of the study, in the motion, is about whether or not we should be getting on with the important things on the study of Ukraine. We've just heard from witnesses from the Ukraine government. While it was in camera, they spent quite a bit of time...and even the government members were asking questions of those witnesses relative to sanctions.

So in terms of the relevance of what I'm saying, it's related to those things that clearly members have—

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

I would ask the chair to be very mindful that with an in camera meeting it is parliamentary privilege.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** My apologies.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Nothing—not anything—about that meeting should ever be said in a public meeting. It is a breach of the rules of Parliament. It is a very, very serious breach of the rules of Parliament to even say “even though” it was in camera.

I would ask the member to withdraw those and make sure they're not put into the record of this meeting.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** I certainly will. I thank you, Mr. Oliphant.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Perkins. The floor is yours.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** The purpose and the way the act came about was that after this situation happened in Haiti, the OAS decided that they wanted to impose sanctions. When the minister of foreign affairs came back to Canada, we discovered that it would require a special piece of legislation related to what the OAS had done.

Our approach was to say that if we have to go back to Parliament, then let's go back to give the Governor in Council the authority to do this quickly. Imposing sanctions in these situations is required quickly, and as we know, even Parliament at its best in terms of speed can take days. Back then money moved fast. It moves in seconds now.

The ability of the Governor in Council to do that without having to seek parliamentary approval was critical, but there were fence posts put around that. A multilateral organization had to have called on the global community to bring in these sanctions. That had been done through the OAS. The OAS imposed their sanctions, but they found them to be leaky after about six months, because it was just

the western hemisphere. We know that if you just do sanctions sporadically and that select countries do them, other countries and other businesses will step into the breach and fill those business relationships.

That certainly happened every time we met with European members back then, after the OAS had passed this and we had passed this piece of legislation in 1991. They said that without the UN's approval, they can't do anything, that they're not members of the OAS, so they will continue to trade with Haiti. We then engaged in a process to get the Security Council of the United Nations, which it did in 1992 and into 1993, to pass a resolution imposing sanctions on Haiti.

Now, that's a slow process, and we're facing some of that now. We have not seen universally the countries around the world implement sanctions as we have done, or as some other countries have done, on the Soviet Union. In fact, we know they are trading with them.

In my own backyard, seafood is a big industry. Snow crab is a big industry in Newfoundland. The price of snow crab a few months ago was \$8 a pound. Now it's \$3 a pound. The reason it's down to \$3 a pound is that the Japanese, who were buying half of it—

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** Yes, Ms. Bendayan.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Now we are listening to stories about the snow crab, Mr. Chair.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** No, it's about the leaky sanctions. It's about the government's leaky sanctions.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** This is disgraceful that the Conservatives would continue to filibuster while we have just heard from Ukrainian parliamentarians about the need to get on with our work.

**An hon. member:** This is not a point of order, Chair.

**Ms. Rachael Bendayan:** We have many witnesses who have been waiting. I believe that Mr. Chen, the representative of Taiwan, is quite upset the Conservatives are continuing this filibuster and denying the ability of witnesses on the Taiwan study. I know the ambassador to Ukraine is similarly disappointed.

Mr. Chair, we need to stick to the topic when we debate the sub-amendment. Listening to stories of sanctions involving Haiti many years ago, and the United Nations' involvement there, or listening to the increased price of the snow crab, is not relevant.

I'm sorry—

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** I was interrupted, sorry.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** —you see, when you get off topic, you lose the interest of members.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** It's right on topic, if you would let me finish the sentence.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Mr. Chair, I would ask that you please rule on the relevance of this, and potentially face an objection to your ruling if you are to continue to rule that these matters are somehow relevant.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, on the same point of order.

**The Chair:** Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** At the point at which my colleague was interrupted, he was speaking precisely about issues of sanctions right now with respect to crab, not a subject I know much about. The particulars of the project—

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** This is debate, Mr. Chair.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'm responding directly to what Ms. Bendayan said.

If I could also say on a matter of order, my colleague has imputed opinions to a number of diplomats with respect to party disagreements in this country. I think, one, those folks are perfectly capable of speaking for themselves, and two, it's quite inappropriate to put them in the awkward situation of claiming they do or don't have a certain position.

**The Chair:** Mr. Genuis, it seems—

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** This is debate, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** —to me you're engaging in debate. Do you have a point of order you want to raise?

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Yes.

I think Mr. Perkins' comments were obviously relevant and I think Ms. Bendayan's comments are out of order with respect to claiming that certain diplomats have certain opinions about party dynamics within Canada.

**The Chair:** Members, I would once again remind every one of you that, out of respect for other members of this committee, we should all strain and we should all attempt to the best of our abilities to remain relevant to the issue at hand.

Mr. Perkins, we'd be grateful if you remained focused on making sure your comments are relevant.

Mr. Perkins, the floor is yours.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe (Lac-Saint-Jean, BQ):** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Yes, Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Alexis Brunelle-Duceppe:** It was a member of my party who proposed the subamendment.

The matter of relevance has been raised over and over again, Mr. Chair, but I'll tell you what's relevant—the committee getting to work.

Everyone already knows how they're going to vote. What is happening here is shameful, quite frankly. I am standing in for my fellow member, and I find this unfortunate. We are all paid to do a job that we aren't doing right now, and we are being paid, still.

This is disgraceful.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Brunelle-Duceppe.

Again, I think it's pretty clear and obvious that all the members are concerned about ensuring our comments do remain relevant.

That having been said, I also wanted to remind all of you this meeting will be over at 12 o'clock. I'm advised by the clerk that resources have not been provided beyond 12 o'clock, since our meeting did start at 10 o'clock.

Mr. Perkins, I would ask again that you try your utmost to remain relevant in your comments.

Thank you.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Just to finish on the snow crab issue, the snow crab issue is that Japan has filled in and is buying snow crab from Russia, a G7 partner, providing them with them with cash—that's the relevance—and has abandoned their contracts in Newfoundland. It relates directly to the leaky sanctions.

With that in mind, given the discussion around the table, I believe a motion to adjourn debate is in order.

**The Chair:** Is there unanimous—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** He doesn't need unanimous consent. He's just moving to adjourn debate.

**The Chair:** Okay.

We're going to vote on that.

(Motion negated: nays 7; yeas 4)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Ms. McPherson.

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

I would like to put on the record that the discussion today is about a study on the reproductive rights of women and, once again, we have five Conservative men—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** This is not a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** —in this room, speaking about why we cannot look at the reproductive rights of women.

I just want that on the record.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** This is a matter of debate, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. McPherson.

The time currently stands at 12 o'clock. I'm sure some will be happy and others not so happy that we're going to have to suspend the meeting.

Thank you.

[*The meeting was suspended at 12:01 p.m., Monday, June 13*]

[*The meeting resumed at 3:38 p.m., Thursday, June 16*]

**The Chair:** I call this meeting to order.

Welcome back, colleagues, to meeting number 21 of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development. Today we'll be continuing the discussion that commenced on Monday, May 16, 2022.

As always, interpretation is available through the globe icon at the bottom of your screen.

For members participating in person, keep in mind the Board of Internal Economy's guidelines for mask use and health protocols.

Before speaking, please wait until you are recognized. When you're not speaking, please ensure that your mikes are turned off.

All comments by members should be addressed through the chair.

As you will recall, we are resuming debate on Mr. Bergeron's subamendment. At the outset, I think it's to be recalled that during our last debate, Mr. Perkins ceded the floor by bringing a motion to adjourn the debate.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** No.

**The Chair:** You did bring a motion to adjourn debate. That motion was defeated, so, as it's clearly stipulated in the rules of procedure, you ceded the floor.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Okay, then just put me on the list.

**The Chair:** Absolutely. You'd like to be back on the list.

As a reminder to all colleagues, the current speakers list consists of Mr. Oliphant, Madam Gray, Mr. Morantz, who is not here today, Mr. Abouttaif, Madam Fry and Mr. Perkins.

Mr. Oliphant, the floor is yours.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I will keep my remarks very short, and I would hope that all members do, because we have important work to do on this committee.

I'll remind the committee that we are very close to finishing an interim statement on Ukraine, which I would like to get finished. We're also in a very important study on Canada's response with respect to vaccine equity and advice for the government on both what happened most recently and for future pandemics. Those are two very important pieces of work, and we had one meeting on Taiwan, which I think we will have to deal with.

I will keep my remarks short and simply say that I am supportive of the subamendment by Mr. Bergeron from the Bloc Québécois. I think it adds some clarity to the amendment. That doesn't mean we would support the amendment; however, we will support the subamendment.

It is clarifying to ensure that we are recognizing that the study proposed by Dr. Fry, following up her request in December to do a similar study on women's reproductive rights globally, is a study that we think is important; however, we are not attempting to jump the queue of our current work. It will go into the regular process of planning work. We would like to finish our work quickly and get it done before the end of this session.

Again, I would just remind members that we are not suggesting that this study takes primacy. It is simply putting it into our work plan to ensure that we will cover a very important issue, which I think has been exacerbated by the war in Ukraine. We have heard testimony, both at this committee and in another committee, with respect to the violation of women and the egregious crimes against humanity, war crimes, committed against women in Ukraine in the current illegal invasion by Russia into Ukraine. God forbid, some of those women may end up pregnant, and they may end up outside of Ukraine in a country that does not provide for legal abortions. They may end up having abortions that are dangerous. We would say this is timely and important, given the war in Ukraine.

I will close by simply saying that we would like to finish our statement on Ukraine, come to a conclusion on vaccine equity and either deal with the Taiwan study or perhaps send it to the new subcommittee that the Conservatives have suggested, now that the House has agreed to have a special committee on Canada-China relations.

Mr. Chair, I hope that brief comments will follow and that we can get to that work.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Oliphant.

Ms. Gray, the floor is yours.

**Mrs. Tracy Gray (Kelowna—Lake Country, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I think this is my first opportunity to say congratulations on your becoming chair of this committee.

I'm here today to speak to what I'll just read out:

That the words "and that this study not take place until the committee makes a decision on the studies before it on Ukraine, vaccine equity and Taiwan, as well as studies on legislation sent from the House of Commons; and further that it not take place until the subcommittee on agenda and procedure submits a report specifying the manner in which these studies be undertaken" be inserted between the words "rights globally" and the words "and that the committee report its findings to the House."

I wanted to speak on the importance of really continuing on discussing Ukraine and the importance of that conversation to highlight some of the examples on why this is so important.

These are some of the comments right through the House of Commons that I'll highlight from June 1 of this year, 2022. I had questioned this with the Prime Minister. I'll just read this:

Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's goal to make everything more expensive is punishing Canadians at the grocery store. My constituency survey on inflationary grocery prices had this response from a resident: "When is it going to stop? How much more do you think people can afford to spend on set incomes!" Another said that with the cost of food now so high, they cannot afford medicine anymore.

When is the Prime Minister going to wake up to how his made-in-Canada inflation is putting basic necessities out of reach for so many people?

That was my question.

As to how the Prime Minister answered that day, which was June 1, he said:

Mr. Speaker, we know the global inflation caused first by the pandemic and second by Vladimir Putin's illegal war in Ukraine is putting pressure on families, including with high gas prices. Canadians deserve support, which is what we are giving, but the Conservatives have opposed policies that put money back into Canadians' pockets. They voted against cutting taxes for the middle class, they voted against cutting child care fees in half this year and they voted against more support for families, seniors and students. They are also opposing our price on pollution, which means they are opposing giving more money to eight out of 10 Canadian families. We will be—

Then he got cut off, but those are the words right from the Prime Minister. You can see how he answered my question, which wasn't about Ukraine. It had to do with inflationary grocery prices, but his answer was, in his view, how Ukraine was affecting that.

There is one example as to how Ukraine could potentially affect what's happening in Canada, or the perception of it, and so why it's important that we have these conversations.

On May 31 of this year, there was another question from the member for Portage—Lisgar. The question was:

Mr. Speaker, it is always good to have you back. Hopefully we give the government, and not you, a hard time today. The Prime Minister is penalizing Canadians at the pumps on purpose.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Ms. Bendayan.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Mr. Chair, we have listened for some time to things that are not relevant. I would ask for a ruling on the relevance of this.

First, I think the member is mistaken, in that we are discussing a subamendment to the motion to discuss reproductive rights. She is citing into the record things that have not only nothing to do with the motion and nothing to do with the amendment, but certainly nothing to do with the subamendment.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Bendayan.

This is an issue that has caused some consternation and expressions of concern throughout our hearing. I think it is imperative that we all endeavour to speak to relevant facts to the issue before us.

For your edification, Ms. Gray, I will read the subamendment that Mr. Bergeron introduced on June 6. It reads that the words “after the completion of the committee's studies on” and “prescribing the manner in which the study is to proceed” be replaced with “the committee make a decision on the studies before it on” and “specifying the manner in which the studies be undertaken”.

As I'm sure we can all agree, that is a very specific subamendment. I would ask that you keep your remarks confined to the issue at hand in this subamendment.

Thank you.

**Mrs. Tracy Gray:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I was setting the table, I guess you could say, on what brought us to this point.

On that note, because we are looking at how important this is, I do want to bring up another issue around Ukraine, which really brings relevance into what we're talking about. This has to do with gas prices.

When we look at gas prices across the country—

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** On a point of order, Mr. Chair, we are further away from relevance at this point. I believe you asked the member to focus her comments on the subamendment.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** On the same point of order—

**The Chair:** Ms. Bendayan, thank you for that.

Again, as you can accept and as we can all agree here, relevance is elastic, but the subamendment before us is a pithy one. I think we can all agree that the scope of the debate is very limited in this instance.

Given the numerous points of order that the members have asked for, in the event that a member does not keep their comments relevant and they continue to repeat the same thing, they will have to cede the floor to the next person on the list.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, can I speak to the point of order?

**The Chair:** Yes, Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, with respect to the rules that are being discussed, I do think it's important to note that the length of the amendment, one way or the other, does not define the scope of the subject. You could add one word. For instance, you could add another country to the list of countries. That would be a one-word amendment that would invite discussion about the particulars of that country.

The other thing is that I do just think it's very unusual that a member would cut off another member after they've spoken for a period of about 15 seconds and say that it's not relevant. It is part of the debates we have here in the committee and the House to make arguments. If a person speaks for 10 minutes and there's no obvious connection, then, okay, fair enough. If a member is speaking for 15 seconds and is offering a quotation—

**The Chair:** Mr. Genuis, are you debating this, or...?

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'm speaking to the matter of order, Mr. Chair.

I hope that in their repeated interruptions around alleged relevance issues, members will take these precedents into consideration.

That's all I wanted to say.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Genuis.

Yes, Mr. Aboultaif.

**Mr. Ziad Aboultaif:** Thank you, Chair. I appreciate your role today. Your role is to set the framework around this motion and the subamendment that was presented by Mr. Bergeron.

On the other side, I heard what Mr. Oliphant said at the very beginning. I think between what he said and what we've been hearing from different members on the government side, the narrative is really unclear on what the parameters of those discussions have to be. That's what is leaving everything in limbo here.



I would appreciate it if you would take the initiative as the chair and try to set clarity over this so that we don't have to run into interruptions here and there after 15 seconds. At the end of the day, we're talking about a very wide subject, a very important subject, that's dominating everything. It's dominating all our lives these days. That's the Ukrainian war. All of that is coming at the same time that we are in the middle of this conversation here.

Chair, the bottom line is that I believe it would be helpful if you could set those parameters in a clear way so that we could all work together. At the end of the day, I believe we need to be very constructive in what we're doing here, and I think we have a responsibility to do so. When I look to request that, I look at you, Chair.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Again, I think it's important, given what you have just said, that, first of all, we try not to substitute our own judgment for the judgment of the person who is speaking. However, the person who is speaking should make every effort to ensure that the points they are raising in debate are relevant and they are not repeating themselves.

Ms. Gray, please do bear those principles in mind.

**Mrs. Tracy Gray:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you for those comments.

Just for clarification, I hadn't repeated myself at this point, but moving forward for maybe other conversations, that's good to know.

Again, with regard to Ukraine, I was going to talk about gas prices, but it was relevant to Ukraine. It wasn't just in general, so again, tying it in to the Prime Minister's comments on how he feels that it's tied to Ukraine, I just wanted to outline a few things here on how this is important and how it could definitely tie into what we're discussing here today.

Some of the numbers that I have here are from June 2. The source was today's gas prices, and it was from the Canadian Automobile Association, the CAA—

**The Chair:** Mr. Zuberi, do you have a point of order?

**Mr. Sameer Zuberi:** I'd like to get on the speakers list.

My apologies, Ms. Gray.

**Mrs. Tracy Gray:** Okay.

On that date, which was a couple of weeks ago—and we know that things are actually even higher in many parts of the country than this—in Toronto, the price was \$2.01.8 per litre. In Montreal, it was \$2.11.1 per litre—

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** On a point of order, Mr. Chair—

**The Chair:** Yes?

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** —you have instructed the member to move on to something that is relevant, and it is now twice that she has continued to read from her prepared filibuster remarks. It is clear that you have made a ruling and that she is not respecting that ruling.

I would also note that Ukraine is not mentioned in the subamendment and would ask for you to direct the member to perhaps switch

pages to something that is actually relevant to the motion on reproductive rights or, more specifically, the subamendment.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Bendayan.

Let me say, Ms. Gray, that you do consistently say that you're setting the table but you have not modified your arguments, and you continue to highlight the very same issues, so even if one can say that they are relevant, you are repeating them. I really do ask you to actually bear in mind what the subamendment is or else I truly will have to ask that you cede the floor.

**Mrs. Tracy Gray:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate those comments.

I talk for about 20 seconds and get interrupted. It's difficult to move forward without being able to get into anything in depth. I think for the amount of time I've been here, I've had three or four interventions and I have not been able to get into what I wanted to. That's made it really difficult. Obviously, that's a strategy here today, and that's fair enough. I think as we're discussing this, one has to be given the opportunity to go into the details of what their rationale is and set the tone, and it's difficult to do that when you talk for 20 or 30 seconds and get interrupted. That makes it much more difficult to be able to carry on the conversation.

Talking about Ukraine and how this fits into the amendment and the subamendment and part of this discussion, if we can't talk about the price of gas and how that all fits in, I'll move on to another topic. I was setting the tone.

What I'd like to bring up is the price of wheat in Ukraine, because that is one of the important topics right now. We're talking about food security and, as we're looking at the study and all of the amendments, how important this topic is.

Again, I'll bring out the example to set the tone here. I'll point to a conversation that happened on March 3 in the House. There was a question in the House of Commons asked by my colleague from Foothills. He asked:

Mr. Speaker, Europe, Asia and Africa all rely on corn and wheat from Ukraine, the region's breadbasket. With Russia's invasion, a global food crisis is emerging. The United Nations has already warned of catastrophic hunger and hundreds of millions are facing famine.

Canada can help. We have a crippled supply chain, punishing carbon taxes, a looming rail strike and PEI farmers are being forced to destroy millions of pounds of potatoes. In a global food crisis, when Canadian farmers want to help, why is this Liberal government neglecting Canadian agriculture?

The response from the member for Vancouver South was:

Mr. Speaker, at a time of crisis like this, I completely agree that Ukraine does supply the developing world with wheat. This crisis is going to be extremely serious. I have been at the UN speaking with the heads of the world food program and other organizations and Canada can play a very important role in this. We will work with our counterparts on how we can provide—

**Mr. Randeep Sarai:** Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** Yes, Mr. Sarai.

**Mr. Randeep Sarai:** Again, I'm trying to find any relevance at all. What does the price of wheat in Ukraine have to do with a subamendment that's proposed by one of our colleagues on an amendment on reproductive facilities? Again, I don't need to know what somebody said in the House with regard to the price of Ukrainian wheat.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** It's in the amendment.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** I have a point of order.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** It's explicit in the amendment.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Continuing to interrupt the speaker when the motion talks about Ukraine and getting back to the studies on Ukraine, the subject of what's going on with the war between Russia and Ukraine is exactly relevant to the subamendment and the amendment.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Mr. Chair, I believe Mr. Sarai had the floor on a point of order, and you did not recognize other people. I want to say that.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** He didn't recognize you, either.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Oliphant.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Sometimes you have to do it when you're dealing with people who have no respect for parliamentary procedure.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Really? You're interrupting every 15 seconds and saying there's no respect for parliamentary procedure.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** There's absolutely no respect for parliamentary procedure and no understanding of the rules of the House of Commons.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Thank you for making our argument for us.

**The Chair:** Members, I'd like to call for order.

Mr. Oliphant, your point is well taken. However, Mr. Sarai had concluded his remarks.

Mr. Perkins, you were not recognized to speak. You jumped into the debate.

Again, to every member here, please do not speak until you've been recognized.

Is this a point of order, Mr. Aboultaif?

**Mr. Ziad Aboultaif:** Yes. Thank you, Chair.

I would ask Mr. Oliphant, given the opportunity, to basically withdraw what he said about disrespect of the procedures. Coming from a parliamentary secretary—and I've travelled with Mr. Oliphant, and I have a lot of respect for him—this would be a great opportunity to do so, please. This is not the way I would like to see this conversation going around this table. I believe we've been working in a constructive way as a group—

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** [*Inaudible—Editor*]

**Mr. Ziad Aboultaif:** Please, Rachel, we're trying to maintain some level of respect among the group.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Aboultaif.

Ms. McPherson, you have the floor.

**Ms. Heather McPherson:** To follow up on Mr. Aboultaif's point of order, I would just like to point out that we have been sitting in this committee listening to Conservatives filibuster since May 16. It is very rich to listen to the members of the Conservative Party say that we need to act in a more parliamentary manner when there is

desperate work this committee needs to do and they're asking members of this committee to act in a more parliamentary manner when they have literally filibustered this committee for weeks, since May 16. It is absurd.

I would like Mr. Aboultaif to take back his comments asking for the rest of the committee to act more professionally. Perhaps he could encourage his colleagues to act in a much, much more professional manner.

Thank you.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'd like to speak to the same point of order, Mr. Chair.

**Mr. Ziad Aboultaif:** Mr. Chair, can I respond to this?

**The Chair:** Yes, Mr. Aboultaif.

**Mr. Ziad Aboultaif:** I've been very respectful. I've always been. I haven't addressed Ms. McPherson with what's going on, especially lately, so I don't think her attack on me at this point is relevant or appropriate. If anyone needs to respond to what I said, it would be Mr. Oliphant.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, I wasn't sure if Ms. McPherson's point was a point of debate or a point of order, but since she was allowed to continue on the matter of order she raised, I think it's important to note that there have been many motions to adjourn debate, motions to proceed to other subject matter and calls for this to be hashed out at the subcommittee.

We are in a situation where she and members of the government have continuously voted against adjourning debate, against adjourning the meeting—

**The Chair:** Mr. Genuis, I think you're engaging in debate.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** —and against proceeding to other matters, so I'm not sure how to interpret her comments.

**The Chair:** Mr. Genuis, I believe you're engaging in debate. Did you have a point of order?

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Well, I said I wasn't sure if her comment was a point of order, but insofar as hers was a point of order, mine is on exactly the same subject as hers. Either they're both not points of order, or they are. If they are, then I appreciate the opportunity to respond and put on the record the fact we have sought adjournment of this and it's been opposed continuously.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Genuis.

Ms. Gray, as you can see, everyone is asking that you kindly keep your remarks relevant.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** She is.

**The Chair:** Mr. Genuis, I would appreciate it if you would not interrupt.

Ms. Gray, as you can see, it's crystal clear that the subamendment has to do with the sequence of events, instructions to be provided to the committee and how studies are to be undertaken. I would ask—and as you know, there is precedence for this, there is ample precedence for this—if a speaker is debating, and they keep repeating themselves and there is absolutely no relevance to the issue at hand, that they cede the floor.

I'm asking you, in the interest of making sure that all members follow this proceeding and follow this debate, please ensure you are keeping your remarks relevant to the subamendment that Mr. Bergeron has put on the table.

Thank you.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** On a point of order, Mr. Chair, could you clarify your ruling? May I speak?

**The Chair:** Yes, Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you very much. I wouldn't want to be accused of speaking when I didn't have the floor.

Could you clarify if comments about the situation in Ukraine would, in your view, be deemed relevant? It seems to me that the subamendment changes the requirements around the study in Ukraine. Whereas the previous amendment requires the completion of the study in Ukraine, the subamendment would eliminate the requirement for the completion of the study on Ukraine to proceed. It would seem to me that when it come to comments about the situation in Ukraine, although the subamendment doesn't add or remove the word "Ukraine", it changes the words immediately before the word "Ukraine", and it changes whether the completion of a study or simply a decision about the study would be required.

It would seem to me, based on that, quite obvious that discussion about the situation in Ukraine is relevant, and Ms. Gray is speaking about the situation in Ukraine. Could you maybe just clarify your ruling? Are comments about the situation in Ukraine relevant to the subamendment? I think they obviously are.

**The Chair:** I did hear your remarks, Mr. Genuis. Upon close reading of that subamendment, I think it's pretty clear that the subamendment deals with sequencing as to when those studies are to take place. It's not about getting into the substance of the amendment before us.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** If I could further clarify—

**The Chair:** It's a procedural issue, and I think the question before all of us here, and every member who actually does speak, is to speak to that very narrow issue as to whether that is a good idea or a bad idea, not to delve into the substance of the debate about the economic ramifications of the war on Ukraine.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, I have a follow-up to the point of order.

It's not entirely clear to me how we would ever make determinations about sequencing without consideration for the substance of the things we are sequencing. Isn't that relative importance precisely the basis on which you would make determinations about sequence?

**The Chair:** If you read the subamendment, Mr. Genuis, it says that the subcommittee would assume responsibility for that, correct?

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** The subamendment says that the committee—not the subcommittee but the committee—makes decisions on the studies before it on Ukraine, so it removes the requirement for the completion of the study on Ukraine and replaces it with a requirement for the committee to make a decision about the study on Ukraine.

It seems to me that the substance of the situation in Ukraine would likely inform whether or not members thought it was vital to complete or make a decision about that.

I completely accept what you're saying—

**The Chair:** Mr. Genuis, are you challenging my ruling?

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** No, I'm just asking you to clarify it.

**The Chair:** I think it's pretty clear for anyone who does actually read this.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Yes, Mr. Oliphant.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Could you let the committee know that there's no such thing as a point of clarification. There are very strict understandings of what a point of order is, and to clarify is debate. I think that the point of order I am making is about what a point of order is. However, there's no such thing as a point of clarification. It does not exist in our standing orders in any sense.

If people want to debate, the purpose of debate is for clarification, not a point of order.

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

**The Chair:** Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Okay, with respect to the matter of order before the committee, I did not say, "point of clarification". I was raising a matter of order that was a clarification of a ruling of the chair. Mr. Oliphant is correct, broadly speaking, that a person can't just claim the floor to make a comment expressing an opinion, which is perhaps what he just did, but as a matter of order, if the chair makes a ruling, members have to understand, as a matter of order, what the requirement there is.

I understand that the chair is directing us to make arguments about sequencing. Those arguments about sequencing obviously have to be informed by the reasons why we might or might not sequence in a particular way, and that makes sense, but that involves Ukraine.

**The Chair:** Mr. Perkins, you have a point of order.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** On a point of order, Mr. Chair, I'm looking at the amendment that changes the motion, and I don't see the word "subcommittee" in reference to your ruling. I see "committee". The committee makes this. This isn't a subcommittee issue.

**The Chair:** Yes, thank you, Mr. Perkins. I had an opportunity to confer with the clerk. It's not specifically stated, but it's quite clear that it is a reference to the subcommittee even though it's not explicitly stated here.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Mr. Chair, I would ask where it's clear, because it's not clear to me, sorry.

**The Chair:** This is what we had. That the words “and that this study not take place until the committee makes a decision on the studies before it on Ukraine, vaccine equity and Taiwan, as well as studies on legislation sent from the House of Commons; and further that it not take place until the subcommittee on agenda and procedure submits a report specifying the manner in which the studies be undertaken”, be inserted between the words “rights globally” and the words “and that the committee report its findings to the House.”

Thank you, Madam Clerk.

Ms. Gray.

**Mrs. Tracy Gray:** Mr. Chair, thank you for reading out what I originally read out at the start of my intervention. I think we're on the same page, because that's what I read out when I first started to speak. I am on the correct amendment.

Based on that, what I've been speaking about with respect to Ukraine, when you look at the order of what might be discussed, I'm laying the groundwork for the importance of Ukraine. If I'm understanding it correctly, as the committee decides the order of these various studies, I'm setting the stage to say how important Ukraine is, and how it's affecting Canada.

My points haven't been specifically about what's happening in Ukraine, which is a whole other discussion. I've been setting the tone as to what's happening in Canada, how it's affecting Canada, how important it is, and how it's affecting our citizens here. That's why this is such an important topic at the top of the line, while this committee looks at what order to follow in its studies.

I would hope I could continue with that conversation in that vein, because that's where I was coming from. After hearing from the chair, it seems that it's right where I set the tone, from the very beginning, and where I was going. I would like some clarification on that, considering we brought us back to the same point I started on, Mr. Chair.

May I continue?

**The Chair:** Yes, but bear in mind that I think members were provided with the scope of the subamendment. It was pretty clear that it's not only a sequencing exercise, but also an instruction to the subcommittee.

Therefore, please ensure that your comments fall within the scope that was determined, Ms. Gray.

**Mrs. Tracy Gray:** Therefore, continuing with the importance of this particular topic—

**The Chair:** Continue with the subamendment, Ms. Gray.

**Mrs. Tracy Gray:** Right, with the subamendment—

**The Chair:** I understand, if I'm not mistaken, that you were referring, again, to the amendment, not the subamendment.

**Mrs. Tracy Gray:** The subamendment refers to how the sequencing might happen—

**The Chair:** Between the various reports this committee is—

**Mrs. Tracy Gray:** —as discussed between the various reports. Based on that, talking about why one particular topic may be more important than another would be relevant in this discussion, I would believe, to say the rationale.

Would that be correct, Mr. Chair?

**The Chair:** The extent to which there is any argument as to the substance of these reports and which one should take precedence over the other is abundantly clear. Given the wording of the amendment and subamendment, it would fall to the subcommittee.

That is not the challenge before the members here today.

**Mrs. Tracy Gray:** Right, so the subcommittee would be looking at—

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

I do not understand procedurally what is going on in this committee. Is this a discussion in the hypothetical between the member and the chair about what she can or cannot say, or is she using her speaking time at the moment to ask questions of you?

I am a new member and I do not understand the debate going on between the chair and the member. The member has the floor. She was instructed by the chair to remain relevant, because she was not. Now she is engaging in a lengthy debate about what she can or cannot say.

I would suggest that, if she has the floor, she should speak.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Bendayan.

I would have to agree. It's not for me to once again say what is debatable and what is not. I think all the members have been provided guidelines as to what the scope of the subamendment is. As to whether you feel you fall into it or not is a determination that you will have to make. We can't have this back and forth.

Ms. Gray, please, if need be, do read the subamendment and ensure that you fall within the scope of that subamendment.

The floor is yours, Ms. Gray.

**Mrs. Tracy Gray:** Mr. Chair, thank you for all of that clarification.

I know you had gone to the clerk numerous times to gain clarification and had let the committee know that. I think that, based on a lot of the questions that came here from a lot of the members, there needed to be some clarification. I'm not sure if we're still 100% clear, but it's good we've gone through some of that process.

Thank you for entertaining my questions. Perhaps each time I could do a point of order, but you were very accommodating there, so thank you for doing that.

As we're looking at bringing this forward to the subcommittee to have a look at how they are going to be reviewing this—if that is what's going to be voted on and what will happen—I guess the discussion is whether or not that is the appropriate place for that to be taking place. If my understanding is correct, that's what we're discussing here today. As part of that, the group will have to look at what the actual amendment is and whether the amendment should be discussed with the entire committee or whether it should be discussed with the smaller group.

I think if it's going to go in the direction where the subcommittee looks at this, the subcommittee needs to be aware as to what the thoughts are of the different members of this committee or those of us who are subbing in on some of those different topics.

We do have three very important topics. We have Ukraine, vaccine equity and Taiwan. I know this committee has looked at all three of these topics, although there's still a lot of work to do. I think that as that subcommittee goes away and deliberates—if that's the direction that this votes goes—it's really important for that subcommittee to know what the different thoughts are of all of the different members of this committee.

Based on that, Mr. Chair, I would like to express that I think that Ukraine should be really top of mind for that committee—or that subcommittee, I guess it would be, if that's the way the vote goes.

With a lot of what I've talked about already, I've just started to set the table as to why the topic of Ukraine is so important right now, especially to Canadians. We do have a lot of Ukrainians coming to Canada. We're seeing them come into every one of our communities.

Earlier today, I was looking at my constituency emails. Every day I'm getting emails from constituents who are either trying to help Ukrainians who are coming into our communities or maybe they want to help nationally. I think as that subcommittee does their deliberations, if that's the way that it goes, they need the tools to be able to confidently talk about the different members of this committee or those of us subbing on and where our thoughts are in order to prioritize which of the studies they are going to prioritize.

Based on that, Mr. Chair, I would like to bring up a couple of other points on why Ukraine would be a topic or study that subcommittee should really be considering as a top priority. We can look not even locally here, but internationally to other news articles and conversations.

For example, I will bring up The New York Times, and its article “Ukraine Invasion Threatens Global Wheat Supply”. I won't get into it because I know there were some members who had some issues with talking about wheat, but again, I'm just setting the tone as to why Ukraine is important for the subcommittee to be considering if, again, it does go in that direction.

There are a couple of points on that I just want to bring up because this is a national conversation, it's an international conversation, and of course at this particular foreign affairs committee we do need to look nationally and internationally. There was an article that was published on February 24, 2022, by The New York Times. It was updated on March 23, 2022, and it really does outline the Russian invasion of Ukraine and how it was threatening a lot of

supply chains. This was back in February and again updated in March. Since then we've now had several more months go by and we've seen how this has become even much more serious than it was back then.

I'll read into the testimony some of this article:

The Russian invasion of Ukraine is threatening to cut off some international shipments of wheat, spurring shortages and pushing the price of a vital crop higher when supply chain disruptions have already sent food costs spiraling.

Wheat futures on the Chicago Board of Trade rose 5.43 percent on Thursday, outstripping gains by other commodities like corn and soybean oil.

Russia and Ukraine together export more than a quarter of the world's wheat, feeding billions of people in the form of bread, pasta and packaged foods. The countries are also key suppliers of barley, sunflower seed oil and corn, among other products.

In recent days, the price of agricultural commodities has fluctuated sharply as tensions around the Black Sea threaten to disrupt global shipments of wheat, corn and vegetable oil. Disruptions and rising prices for those commodities—as well as the cost of fuel and fertilizer, important inputs for farmers—could further buffet global food markets and threaten social stability, analysts said.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** Yes, Mr. Oliphant.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** The honourable member mentioned that she wanted something read into the testimony.

**Mrs. Tracy Gray:** Into the record....

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** I would very much ask the chair to remind members that members of Parliament do not provide testimony as members of the committee. They may be invited to testify as a witness if they have a private member's bill. Unfortunately, because of the Conservatives' filibuster, we may never get to private members' business, which we have two pieces of, and one of the members has a piece of legislation I think he would like to have discussed.

I just want to remind the chair if we could ensure that our members understand that we do not give testimony, as members of Parliament, at committee.

Also, which is a true point of order, I believe, reading into a debate a document that is not related to the subamendment at hand is truly—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** This is a point of mansplaining and not a point of order.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** —not appropriate.

Actually, to read into testimony, as it has been called, a document that is unrelated to the subamendment at hand is certainly not relevant to our discussion.

I think the member should be asked to move on if the chair would like to do that.

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

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** No. There is a point of order.

You can speak to my point of order. You can't raise a point of order with a point of order on the floor.

**The Chair:** Mr. Oliphant, I—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Can we have some order, please.

**Mr. Ziad Aboultaif:** I have a point of order, Chair, in respect—

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** My point of order has to be ruled on before another point of order can be raised.

**Mr. Ziad Aboultaif:** On Mr. Oliphant's point of order—

**The Chair:** Could we have some order, please.

Order, Mr. Genuis.

The two points that Mr. Oliphant has raised are actually very valid in the sense that this isn't testimony; this is debate. That's the first thing. I think we can all agree on that.

On the second point that has been raised, he is absolutely correct. If you're going to read something into the record, which on its face demonstrates that it's not relevant to the subamendment, I would caution you not to do so—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** You've got to be fair.

**The Chair:** —but I leave it to your judgment, Ms. Gray.

Mr. Aboultaif, do you have a point of order?:

**Mr. Ziad Aboultaif:** Thank you, Chair.

On Mr. Oliphant's point of order, this is the second time that I warned against that. Mr. Oliphant has been trying to tell the chair what to do. I think that is an overreach for Mr. Oliphant. We have to keep things clear.

I believe the chair knows his job. For Mr. Oliphant, at every session, to suggest what the chair should do and what are the options for the chair, is not proper. I believe that this is kind of imposing on this whole committee.

That's why I asked Mr. Oliphant if he really feels that this committee is not run properly and if he wants to take the chair position, he can do so.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Aboultaif.

The points raised were truly procedural issues. I think they were issues that benefit us all, so we can ensure that we are adhering to proper procedure.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** He was trying to correct the words [*Inaudible—Editor*]. That's not in order.

**The Chair:** Ms. Gray, the floor is yours.

**Mrs. Tracy Gray:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I thank the member opposite for clarification for that one word I had used. Obviously, his experience in this place is showing.

I'm really glad that he followed procedure as well without just blurting out comments like he did earlier during this meeting. He did follow procedure, so thank you very much, Mr. Chair, for keeping order and keeping everyone on track. I will move on.

I had mentioned earlier that we're looking at this subamendment. For the subcommittee to decide on this subamendment, I think it would be important to explain to whoever is part of that group—if this vote does happen and it does go in that direction—about the topics they are going to be discussing and which would be the most important topics to this committee. I think it's relevant to talk about

the three different studies that are before this committee, so that the subcommittee can really ascertain from the members here clearly which ones would be of most importance since that conversation may not happen at the greater committee here.

That's really what we're talking about. If that subamendment does go through, that conversation will happen separately. It won't happen at the greater committee here.

It's important for those members to have an idea what the priorities would be from those of us who are here in these chairs. That's what the context is of my conversation today, in order to let those committee members know, if that's the way it goes, what would be imperative.

I am subbing on this committee for one of my honourable colleagues. I do appreciate that opportunity. I do have an interest in this topic from sitting on international trade for a time. Of course, there is a lot of crossover between trade and foreign affairs, so it's good to have some of that context as we're coming into this.

We do have these three studies that will be considered as priority. I want to let that potential subcommittee know the one that I think would be of real importance right now. The headlines all day right now are about Ukraine. It is something that affects every single one of our communities, I'm sure.

We have on the Hill young Ukrainian interns who are being supported by all parties. We actually had Vyshyvanka Day here on the Hill. Many of us met up with them right in Parliament. We had a picture taken. For those of us who don't have a traditional shirt, which I didn't, it was really great that one of my colleagues brought some extras. I was able to borrow one in order to take that picture. In fact, I actually wasn't going to come that morning because I didn't have a shirt, but I ran into some of the interns the night before and they were just so wonderful. We had great conversations and they encouraged me to come to the Vyshyvanka morning to have a picture taken, so I am glad that I did—

**Mr. Randeep Sarai:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Yes, Mr. Sarai.

**Mr. Randeep Sarai:** Mr. Chair, we all like our Ukrainian interns and interns in general who have participated and ethnic outfits, but I think the relevance of that, wearing those or having a special day on the Hill and having them around, has absolutely no relevance to this motion, the amendment, the subamendment or anything per se to this study. I think the member is struggling to fill time and is trying to recall anything that can be associated with the word “Ukraine” somehow.

I think your persistent efforts to bring clarity to what should be spoken have fallen on deaf ears. I ask that you make a ruling and pass the floor over to the next speaker. I don't mind if it's another Conservative speaker, or an NDP speaker, or anyone for that matter, but I think it's painful to hear somebody trying to anxiously fill time just for the sake of filling time. They've been doing this for over one month.

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

**Mr. Randeep Sarai:** You don't have the floor, Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Come on. You shouldn't talk that way about our members.

**The Chair:** You do not have the floor, Mr. Genuis. Please allow the member to finish.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** You can't let him go on disparaging other members, Mr. Chair. You have to provide some impartiality, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Mr. Genuis, you have not been recognized and you do not have the floor.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** You have to provide some impartiality when he's talking to a female member of our caucus like that.

**The Chair:** Mr. Genuis, you do not have the floor.

Yes. Mr. Sarai.

**Mr. Randeep Sarai:** We've been asking for four weeks. We've been waiting. We could have studied a lot of things during this time.

Mr. Chair, if my recollection is right, we started discussing this on May 16 and it's June 16 now, so we've been a full month discussing this amendment and subamendment. I think it's time to put it to an end or get on to the topic and actually discuss what's relevant about it.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Sarai.

Again, Ms. Gray, please do bear in mind the issues that are being flagged and raised by our colleagues. Please make sure that you keep your comments restricted to the subamendment that we are debating.

Ms. Gray, the floor is yours.

**Mrs. Tracy Gray:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I was glad to hear the other member's comment about the Ukrainian interns who we have here. I know that we've seen them around the Hill, so I appreciated his comment. I will just say quickly that the night before the Vyshyvanka Day morning, I asked one of the women I met if her family was safe. She looked right at me and said, "I don't know." I just wanted to bring that up, because it really did touch my heart actually, and it was one of the reasons why I came the next morning.

As I was saying earlier, there's the subcommittee that might be deciding on the studies, and it's relevant to hear from the members here about what would be important so that the members on that subcommittee know where the priorities are. I think it's difficult otherwise for them to really deliberate without having a clear understanding or a good knowledge as to what the priorities might be. What I'm attempting to do here, Mr. Chair, is to set the stage that, if this does go to the subcommittee, they have some thoughts, from my perspective anyway. I'm sure many of the other members here would agree that Ukraine is important, so in their deliberations they can have context as to where those conversations should be going.

I think it's just really important. We have a couple of other studies that are a priority as well, and they're all very important, but as we're moving forward potentially, it's really relevant to be mention-

ing the studies that are going to be talked about at the subcommittee. I'm not sure how members here at this committee could be saying that to even mention or talk about the studies that will be discussed at the subcommittee isn't relevant. That's what I'm trying to do here. I'm just focusing on one, because if it does go to the subcommittee, that would be the one I would think would be important, based on the input that I get from my community every day as to what's happening, the boots on the ground.

We do have refugees coming into my community. We have lots of community members who are trying to help citizens who have come from Ukraine, and I think it's important that the potential discussion at the subcommittee focus on what's happening across the country. I'm from British Columbia, and we have a very strong Ukrainian community in my community. I know they would appreciate that this committee would be continuing to focus on what's happening in Ukraine.

Again, bringing it back to the subamendment that we're talking about here, I don't know how we can talk about that without mentioning the three studies that they'll be considering. The continual points of order every time I bring up some of the rationale as to why one of those studies should be a priority just don't seem to make sense. I started out setting the tone, I think, setting the groundwork for where my conversation was going, and my rationale as to why I thought that Ukraine should be a priority.

I will just mention a couple of groups locally in my community that have been working with Ukrainians coming to our community.

The first one is the Bravery Foundation in Kelowna, but it's not just in Kelowna; it's actually across my entire region. We have another group, Kelowna Stands With Ukraine, that has been very active. They actually have done a lot of large fundraisers. I spoke at one of their fundraisers. They've had a lot of community support. A couple of the people who are really involved with them have been filling up luggage with all kinds of different items, flying to Poland and surrounding areas, and very carefully distributing them.

It's been amazing, actually, to see the amount of local community support. They've been taking some of the funds and buying different items. They've had people donating. They fill up all these luggage bags. Then they get on an airline and check all this extra baggage. That's how they're bringing a lot of these supplies to the people of Ukraine. The amount of dedication and time that something like that takes is incredible. These people all have jobs. They've been doing this in their free time.

I want to let that be known at this committee. If this does go to the subcommittee and they discuss this as a priority, I'd like to let them know how much of a priority this is for my community and just how it's affecting so many people, and how they're donating their time and their resources.

A couple of our local churches have done everything from bake sales to making by hand different items that people can sell. Then they'll go and buy different products. As I said, they've had people donating different items. It hasn't necessarily been simple things. They'll go out and buy bulletproof vests. They'll also bring medical supplies. It's a little bit of everything. People will donate these luggage bags, and then people will fly there and bring them with them.

It's been quite amazing, actually, to see the community spirit. In my community, I call it the "spirit of Kelowna", and it's not just around Ukraine. It's also around any time our community comes together to rally behind something. Right now what's happening in my community is that we have a flood.

I won't go there, Mr. Chair, because that's not relevant. It was just to talk about the spirit—

**The Chair:** You have conceded, Ms. Gray, that some of the points you're making are not relevant. That's the first part.

**Mrs. Tracy Gray:** Yes, about the flood; I won't talk about the flood.

**The Chair:** Second, you have spent quite some time talking about developments as they've been unfolding in your riding. Surely we can all agree that is not relevant to the subamendment here.

You have been provided with numerous warnings. This is truly the last warning I'm providing.

**Mrs. Tracy Gray:** Okay.

**The Chair:** Please ensure that your remarks are relevant.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** On a point of order, Mr. Chair, I'm not sure what our job is but to draw on—

**The Chair:** Mr. Genuis, you were not recognized.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I apologize. May I have the floor on my point of order?

**The Chair:** Yes, Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, I think it's core to our function as members of Parliament to draw on the things we're hearing in our riding and the concerns being brought to us by people in our riding insofar as we advocate for issues internationally. I mean, I do that often—

**The Chair:** Mr. Genuis, you're engaging in debate. That's not a point of order.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** It was actually about relevance. I mean, you—

**The Chair:** I can clearly tell you that it's not relevant to the subamendment before us.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I think that's a bit of a filter there, Mr. Chair, but I wanted to raise that point in any event.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Genuis.

Ms. Gray, the floor is yours.

**Mrs. Tracy Gray:** Great. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I appreciate Mr. Genuis's comment. Really, our purpose in being here in this place is to bring forth the voices of our community. I fully understand that we're talking about the subamendment, but everything we do in this place has to be with the mind of bringing our community to this place. Whatever topic we're discussing, whether it's legislation, amendment, subamendment or whatever it is, we always have to bring the voice of our community and keep that in mind, that filter, in everything we do here. I think it's important to do that as we're here.

Again, what I've been mentioning is that this subamendment talks about a committee discussing what studies are before it. It's important for the subcommittee to know what the members who are here think about the different studies they will be discussing. Otherwise, how could they possibly represent everyone? The whole purpose of a subcommittee is to represent everyone at the committee. That's the purpose of a subcommittee.

**The Chair:** Ms. Gray, I'd just like to remind you that, once a subcommittee does make a decision, then it comes back to the committee, and there can be debate at that particular juncture.

At this particular point, I'm asking you to keep your remarks relevant to the subamendment.

Thank you.

**Mrs. Tracy Gray:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I think what I'll do is move that we proceed to schedule additional witnesses on Ukraine, because I feel that we've had a number of references about relevance, so it's time to move on.

I'd make that motion.

**The Chair:** We will put that to a vote.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** There's no debate; it's a dilatory motion.

**The Clerk:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The motion is that you proceed to the scheduling of other witnesses for Ukraine.

Dr. Fry.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** Am I finally able to speak at this committee on my motion and the amendments to it? Why did someone call my name?

**The Chair:** Dr. Fry, we have a vote before us. Ms. Gray has brought a motion.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** Oh, it's a recorded vote.

(Motion negated: nays 7; yeas 4)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

Now we go to Mr. Genuis.

Mr. Genuis, the floor is yours.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

It's a pleasure to follow my colleague. I think it's important to speak here about the procedural context around this committee. Many members of other parties have made comments on it. I, in particular, reflect on the comments that Mr. Oliphant made and the comments made by Ms. McPherson on a "point of order".

Let's be very clear about the way this subamendment fits into the context of the committee's effort to discuss and define its foregoing business.



We had a motion put forward that sought to upend the normal process of committee, to use a majority to compel that a particular study take place in a particular way with the implication being that it take place at a particular time. We had some discussion about that at the beginning. My colleague Mr. Chong put forward some reasonable substantive amendments trying to wordsmith a little bit to say let's—

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** I have a point of order, please.

**The Chair:** Go ahead, Dr. Fry.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** Yes, I am just suggesting that nowhere in the motion under discussion, which has been amended and is being subamended, does it ask for this to happen now. It is just suggesting that we do the study. The committee will decide when it wishes to do that study. It is just asking for a certain number of days of meetings within which to study.

There has been no suggestion anywhere in that motion that we upend anything, that we bypass anything and that it happen immediately. Nowhere is the word “immediately” there. Nowhere is it saying that we should leave other studies that we are in the middle of doing, nowhere is it said.

That is not, Mr. Chair, information that's correct. It's disinformation.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Dr. Fry.

Mr. Genuis, the floor is yours.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

For once I do find myself agreeing with a few of the members across the way. As much as members may violently disagree with the things I say, it is not a violation of the rules of the House for me to have my opinion.

Ms. Fry essentially raised a point of order about the fact that she did not agree with something I was saying and I—

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Dr. Fry.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** You heard me; the whole committee heard me. I did not suggest that I was disagreeing with Mr. Genuis' opinions. I am asking him to be very clear that he provide the concise information about what the motion said. The motion did not ask for anyone to upend any studies that are ongoing at the moment. It just asks for it to be done as a motion to be studied in the future. It does not upend anything.

I am correcting Mr. Genuis. It is one thing for him to have an opinion, but it's another thing for him to not speak fact.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** It's a point of debate.

Thank you, Dr. Fry.

Mr. Genuis, please resume.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I think your ruling that that was a point of debate was, indeed, a very wise ruling, and I commend you for your sage wisdom. I prefer you as chair to Mr. Oliphant's pretensions at chairing the meeting.

Respectfully, to Ms. Fry's point, I do not accept that what I said was factually inaccurate, although even if it had been, it still would not be a matter of order or procedure. It would still be a matter of debate. Even when other members make errors in their comments—it never happens to me, of course—it is part of the cut and thrust of debate for people to get themselves on the speakers list and to offer substantive corrections, perhaps backed up by evidence, to support their conclusions.

However, given that Ms. Fry has made her points, I think it is important to respond to them and say the following. When her motion came before the committee, it was upending the normal process. It has long been that the committee sets an agenda through collaboration and discussion among parties, with the general implication that committees proceed in setting their agenda on something of a consensus basis. You have different parties that put forward different studies. Each party identifies its priorities and you try to set an agenda that reflects those priorities. You complete a tranche of studies. At the end of that tranche of studies, you define the next set of work that follows.

What we had instead was, in the middle of... At the time, there were three ongoing pieces of business, and now there are five. We had a motion put forward to have a different study on something else. I think the clear implication is that we should proceed to it within an expedited time frame.

In fact, at the time, we had moved to adjourn debate. We said to Ms. Fry's point, which was that we don't have to discuss this and you don't mean to get to the study now.... If you don't mean to get to the study now, what in the world is wrong with adjourning debate on it so that we can consider it as part of our next tranche of studies once the work that is being done on the existing study is completed? That was precisely the point that was made when this matter was first under consideration.

If you look at the time that we've been discussing this particular motion, it's been a constant feature that Conservative members have moved motions to adjourn debate and moved motions to proceed to other matters or return to the matters that are currently before the committee. We have also moved motions to refer this particular motion to the subcommittee. In every single case, our friends in the Liberal-NDP caucus have—should I have said “caucuses”? I don't know. Maybe I'm ahead of the times. Every time, the Liberal and NDP caucuses voted against those motions to adjourn debate, to proceed to other business and to allow other things to take place.

In a sense, we adjourned debate at one point in time. We had an informal in camera meeting that took place in the midst of this by unanimous consent. We also had an election of a chair that took place in the midst of this.

I have exhorted members privately and publicly to say that when you adjourn debate on something, it doesn't mean it's over. It doesn't mean we're not going to do it. It doesn't mean we're not going to talk about it further. It means we're setting aside the debate on that subject matter to be able to continue on with something else. Our position has consistently been, let's complete the work before the committee and let's have informal discussions among members at the subcommittee. Let's hash this out. We don't have to hash it out on the floor of the committee. Those conversations can happen while the committee hears witnesses, completes statements, completes reports and completes the work that's in front of us.

It's impossible for people to say that they are the ones who want to get on to other things, and yet continuously be the ones voting against our efforts to adjourn debate and move on precisely to those other things.

What was clear with the manner in which this was brought forward was that there was no interest in efforts to form reasonable accommodations and consensus to set a forward-going agenda. It was just about trying to overrule the consensus norms of committee and to insert a majoritarian norm in place of that.

What we said was let's be specific about adjourning debate until the committee completed its existing studies. That motion was ruled in order by the previous chair. We were debating that motion. That chair left Parliament to pursue other opportunities. We have a new chair, who retroactively ruled the previous motion that we had been debating out of order, and now we're on a subamendment to an amendment.

The amendment seeks to put into the motion precisely what some members, including Mr. Oliphant, have said they want to do. Mr. Oliphant has said that he is supportive of having the Taiwan study moved to the Canada-China committee—I think that's what he said—but that we would complete the work on Ukraine, vaccine equity and private member's bills, and have some discussions about the parameters of the motion of how a study would take place.

That is more or less exactly the amendment that we put forward. It is the profession of Dr. Fry and of parliamentary secretary Oliphant that, "Okay, we're not trying to prescribe a timeline and we're not trying to upend the agenda of the committee. No." What they're trying to do is simply put a stake in the ground—I think those were the words used—with respect to this motion, but we can come back to it and work on it at another time.

A simple way of demonstrating the genuineness of what you have professed to want to do would be to adopt the amendment that the Conservatives have put forward. It says precisely that. It says precisely that, yes, we would complete the existing work of the committee. After that, we would have consideration by the subcommittee of options, including this study. If the committee were to adopt the motion, it would be understood that the study would proceed, but it would proceed in a manner prescribed by the subcommittee. That would give the subcommittee the opportunity to address some of the concerns around exactly what the contours of the study would be, as well as to come to some determinations about things like the meetings and so forth.

We are trying to say, first of all, that we should adjourn debate to get back to the work that we should have been doing all this time. Secondly, insofar as continuous efforts to adjourn debate or proceed to other matters at the last sitting and this one were rejected by the NDP-Liberal group, let us try to put forward an amendment that will put into text of the motion the commitment that was verbally expressed by members anyway.

It becomes a bit suspicious when the same people who said this is their intention that they're not planning on upending the committee's agenda then come back to the point of saying well, actually, they're not going to support specific language in the motion that would have attended directly to that issue.

It raises the obvious question. What are we doing that has made the government not willing to support the amendment or the adjournment motion? It's basically the fact that the government and the NDP have made a political decision to refuse to allow adjournment, because they want to hold this committee hostage to demand that their particular agenda of upending the existing business of the committee happens. They are not going to let the committee do anything in the meantime. Again, if they wanted the committee to get on to other matters we could adjourn debate and they could bring this back at any time.

Sometimes I think there is a misunderstanding about adjourning debate. It's not defeating a motion; it's not sinking it forever. If we adjourn debate at 4:30 and then we hear a witness from 4:30 to 5:15, then someone can restart debate on the matter that was adjourned 45 minutes later, provided that something has happened in-between. It's not in any way a concession or an end, but simply to say, let's set this matter aside and proceed with other things.

I think that would be the healthy and natural way to proceed, but we've had a "no" to the amendment and a "no" to adjournment, and a "no" to our repeated suggestions that we proceed to other matters.

It just becomes hard to really take the things that, with all due respect, Dr. Fry and others have said about whether they are or aren't planning on upending the matter... To refer to the comments that other colleagues have made earlier today in this debate, first of all I do very much think it is important to establish the importance of the studies that we are talking about, because our proposals on proceeding to other matters and our proposals on adjourning debate speak precisely to what we believe the priorities of this committee should be.

We believe the priorities of this committee should be the war in Europe, the further invasion of Ukraine, which we're seeing have catastrophic implications for Ukraine, but that also raise massive questions and potential implications for global security. Tonight the House is doing a take-note debate on the global food crisis. A big part of that is, of course, driven by this invasion.

I believe what we're seeing from the Putin regime is in a sense a repeat of tactics that Stalin used, that is the use of starvation as a weapon of war in an attempt to erase and deny Ukrainian identity.

In this case, the victims of this tactic of trying to use starvation as a political tool, the victims of this, will be far beyond Ukraine. The victims will be those in many countries around the world that rely on the supply of food that comes from Ukraine.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** This speaks to the need to complete—

**The Chair:** Mr. Oliphant.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** I think we have gone once again far off the subamendment. Most of the discussion has been on the amendment, not on the subamendment. Now we are extensively into discussing Ukraine, and that is really not relevant to the debate on the subamendment, which simply makes a difference between the end of the study and the decision regarding the study.

Ukraine is not at debate in here; it is not at issue. The issue is about a study about Ukraine, which is an entirely different thing.

I would ask the chair to rule on relevance.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Oliphant. You raise a good point, Ukraine is not at debate here.

Mr. Genuis, I'd ask that you ensure that you do keep your debate restricted to the subamendment before us. Thank you.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, normally I don't appreciate being interrupted, but in full flight, Mr. Oliphant did give me an opportunity to take a sip of water, which I was grateful for.

I recall the 2015 promises of the Liberal Party that parliamentary secretaries would no longer run the business of committees. What a time that was in back in 2015, so long ago and so much hope and idealism that—

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** Mr. Chair, I have a point of order.

**The Chair:** Mr. Oliphant.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** The issue of the participation of the parliamentary secretaries, which has been approved by the House of Commons, is not at debate in this subamendment.

I think again the chair could ask the member to move to relevant discussion about the subamendment.

**The Chair:** Understood, Mr. Oliphant.

Mr. Genuis, once more I'm asking you to remain focused on the subamendment that we've been debating.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I think Mr. Oliphant has made my point for me again, so I see no need to develop it further. I thank him for assisting me in that way.

I've never disputed that he has a right to be here. I never thought parliamentary secretaries couldn't come and participate in committees. I will say, with respect, to the subamendment in particular, that the subamendment has two parts. The first part seeks to remove the words "after the completion of the committee's studies on" and replace them with the words "the committee makes a decision on the studies before it on".

As a matter of negotiation, if there's a will for us to try to come to terms and come to an understanding about a path forward, I think Conservatives would certainly be willing to engage in dialogue around those modifications. However, I do not believe they are ideal. I think the language of completion is preferable to the language of "make a decision on" because the language of completion is clearly stronger in expressing its commitment to actually doing the

work and completing the work and reporting that work to the House before then proceeding on to something else.

It is our conviction that if this committee is to in fact join many, many other committees in studying the abortion issue—because Liberals have continuously brought that issue to many, many, many committees throughout Parliament—then, as per the language in the original amendment that is removed by the subamendment, our preference would be that we complete the committee's studies on those issues.

Why then is it important for us to not just make decisions about but to complete the work on these issues? Well, it's because these issues are extremely important and also time-sensitive. There are many issues that are important that either could be studied by other committees or are being studied by other committees or are questions of ongoing importance, but we had in particular chosen to begin and seek to complete studies on Ukraine, vaccine equity and Taiwan, out of the conviction that those issues were, I think, emergent issues. They were not issues that have been studied, in the present context at least, before, and therefore it was important for us to engage with them.

My comments about the take-note debate happening tonight in the House are to underline the critical importance of this committee completing its study on Ukraine, because the process of completing the study on Ukraine, which is what the text of the subamendment proposes to remove, should help us to get to important conclusions about how we can confront this global food crisis that is driven by, in part at least, the use of starvation as a weapon by the Putin regime. There are many issues. If you listen to the debate in the House of Commons, there are so many issues that are tied back to the invasion of Ukraine, in terms of their ultimate cause, and again, this speaks to why the completion—not just the making of a decision about, but the completion—of the study on Ukraine is so important. The point that my colleague was making—I think very well despite being regularly interrupted—was that the economic challenges that Canadians are facing around affordability and around gas prices are also often attributed by the government to the invasion of Ukraine.

So this is obviously part of the case that needs to be made in defence of saying, hey, the completion of the work on Ukraine as well as the other matters before us, is extremely critical. If we think about the various issues at stake in that debate, for Ukrainians, these are of course their lives and the basic security and the defence of their country. There are also the ripple effects: the food crisis; the questions around energy policy that this raises for Canada, for Europe and for other countries; and the questions around gas prices and inflation. All of these things, it is often argued in the House, have some relationship to the very acute crisis caused by the decision of the Putin regime to further invade Ukraine.

This is why I would say respectfully that it is just not enough for the committee to say, broadly speaking, "Well, we're going to make a decision about". Making a decision about something.... Pardon me: I should say "making a decision on", but it's the same thing. For the committee, making a decision on the studies before it does not require the completion of those matters.

I will say this as well. Insofar as Dr. Fry, Parliamentary Secretary Oliphant and others have said—and I referenced their comments earlier—that they're not trying to upend the committee and they're interested in completing the work that is before the committee, it is not reasonable for them to then say, "Well, we actually don't want the language of completion to be in the amendment."

Mr. Chair, I think another important point to make about the work of this committee and other committees as a matter of process is that the question of how committees do their work and whether they seek the completion of studies before moving on to something else, or whether they seek to make decisions about it and move a whole bunch of pieces around at the same time, is I think very important for us to consider in terms of setting the stage for our work as we go forward.

When a committee is considering matters, it is of course sometimes natural for the committee to have more than one matter going on before it. There may be a number of crisis situations that require acute attention. There may be different parties that want different kinds of studies, so the way of building consensus is to say that we're going to move forward with a group of studies at a particular time. That also creates some potential challenges, in that when you have a number of different studies that are operating at the same time, it's a question of remembering and sustaining the work on that particular issue as, inevitably, a particular study takes longer if it's spaced out. Sometimes you have changes in committee membership and people coming and going in the middle of that study.

It has increasingly become my belief, just in looking at what leads to effective committee work, that you should finish one study or at least a particular group of studies and then move on to the next group of studies. This idea of working through one project to completion, of actually being able to set priorities as a committee and working through one project to completion and then moving on to the next project, is just good effective committee work, because otherwise you get situations where there are changes in committee membership, with people trying to remember—"oh yeah, we had this hearing on this eight months ago"—and connecting it with what a witness said today, and how do we draw conclusions, putting together...? Of course, we all have notes and we all have records that we can look at, but it's certainly much more natural for committees to be able to work through a particular issue in a period of time, to generate recommendations that come out of it and to then be able to move forward on that basis.

That is why our original amendment, which is now being altered by the subamendment, spoke specifically to the issue of not just "making decisions about" or "setting agendas on" but completion of that work.

I think, under most circumstances, most members would agree that to already have five agenda items before the committee, three studies that are under way and two private members' bills with studies not yet done.... Of course we have an obligation to get to them, because they have been referred to the committee by the House. The fact that we should work through the completion of those matters before proceeding to other matters is quite important.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

I just want to have a ruling from the chair with respect to the private member's bill and the public bill from the Senate of Canada, the other place. They have been received by the committee. Does the committee have to deal with them or can we simply allow that time to lapse and have them deemed considered by the committee with no testimony, no evidence and no opportunity for their sponsors in the House to be heard at committee?

It was raised as though it's an obligation of our committee to hear them, but I think they may be deemed having been heard and be returned to the House without any consideration by this committee.

It's a point of order, because looking at our future business, I'm just wondering about that. We may not have to deal with them.

I may be wrong on that. One is a Senate bill, and one is a House of Commons private member's bill—a public bill and a private member's bill. The rules on that may be different from House legislation, which comes from the government. I may be wrong on that.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** On the same point of order, Mr. Chair, insofar as it was an urgent matter for the member to get clarification on that issue, I do think it should be noted that these are both Senate public bills. Neither of them are bills from the House. They're both Senate public bills, the bill by Senator Atallahjan and the bill by Senator Dechêne.

**The Chair:** Thank you for that, colleagues.

I've been advised by the clerk that she will get back to us. As soon as she makes a determination, I'll share it with all of you.

Mr. Genuis, the floor is yours.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Perkins just suggested that we might suspend in the middle of my remarks until we get the ruling from the chair. So following that suggestion, I may have to find someone to run for the Conservative nomination in his riding—but all in good fun.

Mr. Chair, the point I was making before.... He says, "bring it on." Okay.

Before Mr. Oliphant intervened, though, I was speaking to the importance of committees completing work on one matter before proceeding to another matter. I was making the case that this is generally a good practice. It doesn't mean that committees can't then return to issues as there are emerging developments. I suspect that, following the completion of an initial study on Ukraine, there may be subsequent developments in future years over the life of this Parliament, depending on how long the Parliament lasts, that will lead us to want to return to that matter and perhaps do an update and make a statement in the context of that.

But the immediate issue of the completion of the study and of being able to produce a statement.... We know there's been some discussion about a statement or a report. We could get to that work right away, of course, if there is a willingness on the part of other parties to adjourn the debate or to proceed to that matter. But despite our efforts to do so, as members know, that hasn't been the case.

So we've spoken about the value of completing, as opposed to just making a decision on, the study on Ukraine. I do want to say that, with respect to the issue of Taiwan, obviously the committee began its study on Taiwan prior to the creation of the special committee on Canada-China relations. The issues that are being raised with respect to Taiwan are ones that could also be debated at the special committee on Canada-China relations. I think we can't necessarily take a decision at this committee before a decision is taken on what the appropriate actions are going to be by that other committee.

I don't think we can presume the special committee on Canada-China relations will be studying it. First of all, I know there's substantial overlap between this committee and that committee, and my understanding is that, based on the conversation that happened at Monday's meeting, the first meeting of the special committee, there was an interest in proceeding with consideration at that committee on the issue of Taiwan.

Therefore, I do think that if it's the will of that committee, it would be very reasonable for this committee to work with that committee on ensuring that it proceeds with the work that had been done here. I don't think the rules allow a subsubamendment, but I could certainly envision a revision to the original amendment that was not as, let's say, expansive as the subamendment that's before us, but that actually just sought to carve out something particular with respect to the dynamics around Taiwan—that is, that sought to say that in the case of Taiwan, we wouldn't require that the study be completed on Taiwan at this committee if it were taken up at another committee.

But I will just say, on the other hand, that with respect to Taiwan, the original language that is removed by the subamendment says, “and that this study not take place until after the completion of the committee's studies on Ukraine, Vaccine Equity and Taiwan”. I think one possible interpretation of that would be that the completion of the committee's studies could also mean the completion of the committee's studies by another committee. We would still, of course, want to see the completion of the committee's study on Taiwan, whether that be done by this committee or by the special committee on Canada-China relations.

I don't think anybody is speaking about not wanting to see the completion of that study. It's merely now, because we have this new committee that could potentially do work on that issue, that the question is whether that completion would move to another forum. It would still be the completion of the committee's study on Taiwan. It would be the committee transferring the study and the completion of that study in another place.

With respect to Mr. Bergeron's concern, when he moved this subamendment in particular he spoke about the Taiwan study perhaps needing to be considered in a different way in light of the fact that the Special Committee on Canada-China Relations may want to take it up. I don't think the language of the original amendment would actually have excluded the possibility of that work being transferred over, by mutual agreement, and proceeding to a completion at that point. Of course, the Special Committee on Canada-China Relations is welcome to take up the issue of Taiwan on its own, in any event, but I think it would wish to do so drawing from the

work that has already been done by this committee, being able to take that up and continuing that going forward.

Regardless of how the Taiwan issue is handled, I think it's very clear that there is an urgency to the completion of the committee's work with respect to Ukraine and vaccine equity. The dynamics around access to vaccines are, of course, changing constantly. There are different circumstances—

**The Chair:** My apologies for the interruption, Mr. Genuis.

First, I want to respond to the point of order raised by Mr. Oliphant and by you, Mr. Genuis. I've been advised by the clerk that the answer to that question can be found at pages 1158 to 1159 of the third edition of *House of Commons Procedure and Practice*. The relevant part reads as follows: “Should a committee fail to report back to the House as required, the bill is automatically deemed reported without amendment.” That is thanks to the guidance provided by the clerk.

In addition to that, the clerk has advised me that we've heard that there are not resources available to this committee past 5:30 p.m., so this meeting is suspended.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Mr. Chair, may I move a brief motion? I have 60 seconds left prior to 5:30 p.m.

**The Chair:** We already stand suspended.

*[The meeting was suspended at 17:30 p.m., Thursday, June 16]*

*[The meeting resumed at 11:08 a.m, Monday, June 20]*

**The Chair:** Welcome back to meeting number 21 of the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and International Development. Today, we will continue the discussion that first commenced on Monday, May 16, 2022.

As always, interpretation is available through the globe icon at the bottom of your screen. For members participating in person, keep in mind the Board of Internal Economy's guidelines for mask use and health protocols. Before speaking, please wait until I recognize you by name. When speaking, please speak slowly and clearly. When you're not speaking, your mike should be on mute. Once again, this is a reminder that all comments by members should be addressed through the chair.

Just to provide everyone an update on the speaking list as it currently stands, we now have Mr. Genuis, Mr. Aboultaif, Madam Fry, Mr. Perkins, Mr. Genuis and Mr. Zuberi.

Mr. Genuis, the floor is yours.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

It's good to see colleagues back here on Monday morning. In anticipation of maybe getting a signal, I'll proceed with making some arguments here as that process continues.

I know that we're currently debating a subamendment put forward by Mr. Bergeron to an amendment that I had originally put forward. The purpose of the amendment was to establish some general parameters around the timing that governs the way this prospective study would proceed, recognizing that the committee does have greater priorities in front of it, or certainly perhaps issues that are ongoing and that we're in the middle of studying—the situation in Ukraine, the dynamics around vaccine equity and the situation of prospective security threats to Taiwan.

The amendment was designed to respond to what I think was not the way in which committees should normally operate. In the middle of existing studies, there was a proposal put forward to say, “No, we should ignore what we're doing now and we should instead raise this political issue.” We said, “Okay, let's at least have some timelines in place around that, and then also prescribe the way in which the subcommittee should be engaged for that process.” The subcommittee on agenda and procedure should meet.

I do want to share that certainly we are hoping for some kind of constructive engagement to come to an understanding on an amendment to this motion that would make it work for the committee. I think committees are at their best when they're able to work on a consensus basis. Certainly from our side there is a desire to come to an understanding and to meet partway on certain aspects of this. One of the proposals I've mused about is saying that we've set a timeline on the subcommittee reporting back to the main committee as a mechanism of ensuring that the process would move forward in a reasonable fashion.

This is the general objective of the amendment. I appreciate the subamendment as a constructive proposal and as something that maybe provides some basis for some dialogue in terms of how we come to a consensus as a committee. When you do have a motion from one party, an amendment from another party and a subamendment from another party, that can seem unwieldy, but I think it actually is potentially very constructive that you have different parties playing a role in trying to flesh out the appropriate wording around the motion.

That's what brings us to the subamendment. It removes the words “after the completion of the committee's studies on” and replaces them with “the committee makes a decision on the studies before it on”. There's a part two to the subamendment, which I'll speak to in a moment.

The initial section here is substantive in the change that it proposes to make. The existing amendment prescribes a path forward that involves the committee needing to complete particular studies on Ukraine, vaccine equity and Taiwan. The revised version prescribes not that their studies be completed but that a decision be made on those studies.

Again, none of this is impossible to go back and forth on and try to establish a constructive way forward, but I do think that for at least some of these existing studies, it would be very important to say that we should not just make a decision on them but actually complete them. We've done a lot of work in terms of hearings on the issue of vaccine equity. I think it's evident that the dynamics around vaccine equity are constantly changing. There are some similar issues that are consistent over time.

When we initially talked about undertaking this work, there were questions about there being enough vaccines. We realized, as the study went forward, that there were issues around delivery and that delivery was a big issue. It's worthwhile, I think, seeking to complete that work.

In the spirit of wanting to complete that work, of course that's why we have, at many points, sought to adjourn the debate on this motion so we can get back to that work. Members of other parties have accused us of dragging this out, but that accusation is hard to square with the reality that we are the ones who are saying let's adjourn the debate on this issue so we can hash out the dynamics of our agenda going forward and, really, be able to focus on completing the work that's before the committee right now. It would be creating a little bit more space for conversation around the path forward, but in the meantime, adjourning debate...and not in a final way, of course. As members know, or should know, the procedure around an adjournment of debate isn't to make an issue disappear. Something can be brought back very shortly after something has been adjourned, but it does create a space for some of that dialogue to happen.

Insofar as we have had, informally at least, quasi-adjournment of debate.... For example, we had an in camera opportunity to hear from certain witnesses. These are things we've been willing to do in some cases but not others. This, in particular, as I was speaking to the issue of vaccine equity and the completion of that, not just the making of a decision about it but the completion of it, is something that, I think, would have been worthwhile and would be worthwhile to do as soon as reasonably possible.

On the issue of Ukraine as well, the completion of our work on Ukraine or at least the completion of the immediate phase of that work.... Again, this is where I think we could wordsmith in between. I don't think the procedures allow for sub-subamendments. I think you just do those as subsequent subamendments. The fact that the committee should complete an initial report or an initial statement—ideally an initial report—that puts forward the committee's work up until now on that particular issue, I think, would be very worthwhile.

Look, if the committee makes a decision to defer to another committee or set aside a study.... Obviously the work on Taiwan is important, but the work on Taiwan began before the special committee on Canada-China relations began. I think there would be an argument for continuing that work at either this committee or that committee. On the one hand, this committee has begun that work and there are many other issues at the other committee, but on the other hand, the other committee is there to specifically look at some of the issues around—among other things—aggressive action by the Chinese state. That work might fit well within the framework at that committee. This is where, I think, the issue of completion as opposed to making a decision about that work is important, but that completion could ostensibly take different forms.

I do think it's important to raise that the language of the subamendment does introduce some ambiguity where it maybe doesn't exist in the original version. The amendment uses the language of "makes a decision on". I think I've been saying "making a decision about", but it's "makes a decision on". It does not necessarily specify that this decision would be carried out prior to proceeding to the next phase of it. I think that's an area of ambiguity that needs to be taken into consideration in terms of the vote around this.

For example, if we were to make a decision about the Ukraine study.... Let's say we made a decision that, in fact, we wanted—in the case of the Ukraine study—to complete that study or complete an initial report before moving to this other prospective study. That would be making a decision about the matter, but it wouldn't necessarily be making a decision about and carrying out that decision. Carrying out that decision would be to actually make the decision to complete the report, in this sort of hypothetical instance, and then to actually complete the report.

This is a different matter than just making the decision, so I would worry insofar as there is ambiguity in the language around this. Were we to make a decision about it.... Let's say we make a decision. Okay, we're going to complete the vaccine equity report, hypothetically. That would satisfy the conditions of this subamendment. Then we would proceed to this other study envisioned in the original motion without actually carrying out the work prescribed by that decision, which is the completion of the report. The "making of a decision on" is conceptually distinct from "making a decision and carrying out that decision" on the same point. I think we need to have a greater degree of clarity around it.

In terms of the path forward for the three studies currently before the committee—Ukraine, vaccine equity and Taiwan—we might want to make decisions about those studies. Personally, I would suggest the completion language be stronger, but we might want to make decisions and carry out those decisions about those studies. We could say we're going to complete two of them and transfer one of them, or complete one, do an interim report on one, and then continue concurrently while we set aside one. These are the kinds of decisions the committee might make on how to proceed with those studies. I think that was, broadly speaking, the process envisioned in the development of this subamendment.

I don't think it's an unreasonable prescription to say we would want to leave ourselves some degree of flexibility. The existing text of the subamendment is not quite explicit in terms of how we would want that to unfold with respect to the making and carrying out of decisions, before proceeding to the subsequent matter that would then be before the committee.

The second part of the subamendment makes further changes that are noteworthy. The previous language prescribed the manner in which the study is to proceed and replaces that with specifying the manner in which the studies be undertaken. Again, it's replacing "prescribing the manner in which the study is to proceed" with "specifying the manner in which the studies be undertaken". I think the most substantive part of that change.... There are a few cases where the words are changed, and I think we need to note what's implied by the change in those words.

The most substantive part of that change is the shift from the language of "study" to "studies". The original amendment envisioned that the study would proceed after a subcommittee report was adopted. This described how the study originally envisioned by Dr. Fry's motion would proceed. I think the meaning is then shifted by the subamendment to say the subcommittee should meet and prescribe the manner in which all the committee's work would proceed—looking at this new motion, as well as the proposals around Ukraine, vaccine equity and Taiwan. I don't think that's a bad thing, actually.

I think the shift from "study" to "studies" is probably constructive. Really what it does is it invites us to say that the subcommittee should get together, talk about what the foregoing agenda is going to be and come to some kind of agreement on how to proceed with respect to all of the studies. This is, I think, how this should have proceeded all along.

The reason we are in this situation of hashing out an agenda at the main committee is that a member decided to bring it to the main committee in the middle of other studies instead of doing that work at the subcommittee, which is the normal process. I don't, of course, dispute the right of members to do that, but it's not the most effective way of—

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud (Avignon—La Mitis—Matane—Matapédia, BQ):** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Yes, Ms. Michaud.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm new to the committee, so I don't know how you usually operate. As I listen to the honourable member share his views on the Bloc Québécois's subamendment, I wonder whether we couldn't vote on the subamendment at this point, so we can get back to discussing the amendment.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Ms. Michaud, I've had an opportunity to confer with the clerk. Given that we currently do have a speaking list, we cannot vote on it.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Could you add me to the speaking list, then?

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Absolutely.

Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm sorry. I didn't have my earpiece in for the entire time of that, and my French is not always at its best on Monday after a red-eye flight, but I think I got the gist of it so I will just proceed for a couple more minutes.

I don't have that much more to say other than just to wrap up some of these thoughts around some of the distinction that's envisioned by the subamendment and trying to understand it and respond to the issues that it raises.

With respect to the issue of part two of the subamendment, the difference between "study" and "studies", I'm saying that I view this part of the subamendment as being constructive in the sense that it directs our attention towards the subcommittee to prescribe the manner in which the foregoing work or the studies of the committee would proceed. Then we can go from there.

This is why the very first time this was discussed, within the first hour of this being discussed, I know we had put forward a motion to just refer the entire matter to the subcommittee. Again, we could have done it. It would have made much more sense to have the subcommittee define an agenda going forward. Instead, a situation was created because other members of the committee insisted that, no, we can't adjourn the meeting, we can't adjourn debate and we can't do anything else until this matter is dealt with, which I don't think made sense and created a situation that is not really consistent with the professed desire of any members of the committee. However, we continue to move forward with some of these other proposals and they continue to not proceed.

I think that's important, but the idea envisioned through the subamendment of the subcommittee process moving forward is, I think, again worthwhile.

In terms of some of the word substitution the subamendment involves, it effectively replaces the word "prescribing" with "specifying." I looked the words up to get specific clarity around trying to understand what the difference was, because sometimes you have a subamendment or an amendment that changes words and you wonder if something different is being meant by those words. Clearly, this is an important committee. It's important to make sure that the words we're using are precise, or at least that when we are adopting measures with respect to a particular wording we understand what the wording is and what the meaning of those words are.

The word being removed, "prescribing", means to lay down in writing or otherwise as a rule or a course of action to be followed, appoint, ordain or enjoin—at least from Dictionary.com. Mr. Oliphant probably has opinions on whether that's the optimal linguistic source or not, but that's the one I used this morning. It's proposed to replace it with "specifying", which is to mention or name specifically or definitely to state in detail.

In this sense, I'm not sure why the preference was made for the word "specifying" as opposed to "prescribing." "Prescribing" seems more appropriate in that it's more definitive to the practice of a committee to lay down, to say this is what we're going to do. "Specify" has the nature of explaining in more detail, but not defining. Although it's not a hill to die on, I do think the word "prescribing" is more precise in the original formulation as opposed to the word that was put forward in the subamendment.

Then, also, in the second part of the amendment, it is replacing the word "proceed" with "undertaken", "proceed" being to move or go forward or onward especially after stopping, and "undertaken" being to take upon oneself as a task performance. Again, it does

seem to me looking at the change in language there from "proceed" to "undertaken" that both words could be appropriate. At least the implication is that "proceed" means after stopping might be appropriate, especially given, I think, the challenges we've had, but really either way "proceed" or "undertaken."

In general I'm trying to sort through the subamendment and ask if there are some things that make sense. Are there some things where words are being substituted where it's not entirely clear to me why? Sure. Are there other issues that are raised in terms of changing this?

I think the biggest substantive difference is this question of "makes a decision on" versus the "completion" of studies. We've made the case precisely because of the importance of the work we're doing and what constitutes good operating procedures for a committee to be able to finish one thing before going to another, or at least finish a package of things before going to another.

I would make the case that, with what we're doing, the idea of finishing or at least making a definitive decision and carrying out that decision with respect to the existing work of the committee is a better way for us to proceed than the other, of simply making a decision about.

I hope I've suggested in this intervention that we are looking to work collaboratively to establish a path forward here. We believe that committees have a mandate to try to work in a consensus way to whatever extent possible and that there's a need for us to do that. There's a value in us doing that, instead of people just dropping in and saying they want to upend the committee's agenda and do something different because there's a political imperative that's pushing them to do so.

We want to get back to the work of studying the horrific Russian invasion of Ukraine. We want to get back to completing the committee's work on vaccine equity and completing the work on Taiwan as well as proceeding with the legislation. That's what we've said all along. That's why we've moved motions to proceed to other matters, and that's why we've moved motions to adjourn debate. It's just, at the end of the day, pretty rich for folks to say, "We want the committee to get to other things too," but then to vote against those motions that are precisely about doing that and that say this is what we're going to do now.

Mr. Chair, in the spirit of that, I will move that the committee proceed to consideration of next steps on the study on Ukraine.

**The Chair:** Mr. Genuis if, before we take the vote, for the benefit of all members, you could read out the revised subamendment one more time, I think that would be helpful.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I'm sorry. It's not a subamendment.

**The Chair:** It's a motion.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** I moved a motion.

It's a motion that we proceed to the discussion of next steps on the study on Ukraine.

**The Chair:** Okay, absolutely.

Is there unanimous consent for that?

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** No.



**The Chair:** No, I'm afraid not.

We next go to—

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** It's a dilatory motion, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** We'll call a vote.

(Motion negated: nays 7; yeas 4)

**The Chair:** Thank you.

We now go next to Mr. Aboultaif.

**Mr. Ziad Aboultaif:** I would like to offer my time slot to our colleague from the Bloc Québécois.

**The Chair:** Madame Michaud, the floor is yours.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Mr. Chair, I'd like to thank the honourable member. That was very kind of him.

I was going to use my time to ask once again that we vote on Mr. Bergeron's subamendment, but I know we can't do that because there are still people on the speaking list.

I listened to what the honourable member had to say, and I want to thank him for his earnest examination of the subamendment. I didn't know it was possible to spend a whole five minutes talking about changing a word in the singular to the plural. I was trying to explain what a filibuster was to some colleagues and family members, but they didn't really get it. If they tuned in to this morning's proceedings, they just might.

Ms. Fry put forward a fine motion. I think the committee can move the discussion along and proceed swiftly to a vote. I've had a look at the studies the committee has begun, and they seem very worthwhile. A lot of work has been done. It's too bad that the committee is still discussing this motion.

That's all the time I'm going to take.

Thank you to the honourable member for giving me his time.

[*English*]

**The Chair:** Thank you, Madame Michaud.

We'll go to Ms. Fry.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I wanted to speak to the subamendment, but I want to speak to the whole concept that my motion originally was trying to supersede other motions. If you read my motion, it isn't. It is proposing a study. Why would I want to bump Ukraine, especially when, with regard to the study I am proposing, we heard from the ambassador-designate from Ukraine that Ukrainian women are being raped by Russian soldiers regularly?

These are the kinds of women who need access to safe and legal abortion. These are the kinds of women who need the services we're talking about to see if they have gotten any sexually transmitted diseases from the Russian soldiers. These are the women we want to talk about. They are fleeing as refugees to countries, two of which do not actually allow safe, legal abortion.

We're talking about Ukraine actually, but I still want to make the point, Mr. Chair, that I am not trying to supersede anything. Ukraine is a dire emergency. We are not done with COVID, or at least COVID is not done with us, if we look at the BA.4 and BA.5 strains that are now happening around the world. Yes, vaccine equity is very important. These two are really important things. No one is trying to supersede anything here.

I would just like to note that I brought forward a motion very similar to this in December. I don't know what happened to it. I'm on the subcommittee. Once again, it was a motion on sexual and reproductive health and the rights of women and girls around the world. The need for those services worsened during COVID. I don't know what happened to it. It was still bumped.

I just need to say that I hope we don't keep bumping this motion constantly because it is as urgent. Women are actually dying. I just want to read to you here that two million women were hospitalized in this year alone because of unsafe abortions. Sixty per cent of unintended pregnancies end in abortion and 45% of those are unsafe. Complications in pregnancy and childbirth are the leading cause of death for girls or young women between the ages of 15 and 19 in 2020.

This has been going on for a long time, exacerbated by COVID, by the Ukrainian war and by conflicts around the world, especially where rape has become a weapon of war. It's no longer a casualty of war.

These are some of the things I want to talk about. These are important issues. Women are dying. Their lives can be spared if we make this an important issue to study. It does not have priority over Ukraine or over vaccine equity. I'm not suggesting that at all.

Somehow this committee is going to have to study this issue that's been bouncing around since December of 2021. I just don't understand why it is not important. When you think of the number of women in the African region and in the Americas where the rates of maternal mortality, gender-based violence, adolescent pregnancy and poverty are rising, this has to be important to people. We have hundreds of thousands of women dying in pregnancy and childbirth because they don't have access to safe, legal abortions.

These are important issues. Women are dying. That's what I'm trying to say. I'm not pre-empting anything. I don't want to pre-empt Ukraine and I don't want to pre-empt vaccine equity because these are urgent issues, but I do think that somewhere along the way women have to become an urgent issue as well. Their deaths have to be meaningful to this committee.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Dr. Fry.

We next go to Mr. Perkins.

The floor is yours.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Dr. Fry's comments are interesting, particularly in light of the fact that those are real issues in Ukraine. Obviously it's one of the issues that the committee is able to consider in its ongoing discussion on Ukraine. The decision to put forward a subamendment that removes the language that says that the study would be considered "after the completion of the committee's studies"....

Mr. Bergeron has the implication, obviously, that somehow this study should begin before those other three studies that are ongoing with the committee are completed. Otherwise, why would you remove the words—I'll repeat them again—"after the completion of the committee's studies"? While I appreciate the intent of what Dr. Fry said, the direction of the subamendment that's before us leaves, in my view, a different impression about what the subcommittee on agenda should be considering and when it should consider the study that is being proposed by Dr. Fry.

I would think that, given some of the context of what's going on right now in Ukraine.... Last week we saw, on the day before the German leader and several other leaders were going to visit with President Zelenskyy in Ukraine, that Russia cut off the supply to the Nord Stream 1 pipeline the day before. I don't think that was a coincidence. They said it was because they have some parts issues. Shockingly, the only parts that are available for that turbine come from Canada. It's an attempt to influence what this government is doing, how it approaches the issue of Ukraine and how it approaches the issue of sanctions.

I know that speaks to the issue of why we are giving direction to the subcommittee in terms of the priority and importance of various studies that the committee has undertaken. I think those issues that are ongoing are critically urgent right now. The issues to which Dr. Fry spoke are issues that are ongoing now and why the Ukraine study needs to continue. The issue of the supply of oil and gas is now the issue of whether or not the sanctions that Canada has imposed do enough. Those are issues that this committee should be looking at now.

The issue is whether or not the Canadian government has done enough to mobilize world opinion on sanctions so that the sanctions that have been imposed by countries such as Canada are not being worked around, which they are. The committee has heard testimony that Africa and Latin America are not abiding by the global sanctions and are filling in the space that western countries have left. This speaks to the issue of examining now what's going on with regard to the government's response and whether or not it is taking a leadership role in multilateral organizations to put forward more penalties and get more allies around the world.

I've not ever heard the Minister of Foreign Affairs talk about putting forward motions to get the Organization of American States or other multilateral organizations on board with imposing sanctions to prevent those regions from filling in the gap. We even have G7 countries that have gone in and filled in the gap where our trade has stopped.

I think it's incumbent on the committee to get on to the work of studying Ukraine and completing that study right now, not waiting, as this motion implies, for the committee to make a decision on the studies before it. Those decision were already made. The decision was made by this committee to study Ukraine now. I don't know

why the subcommittee needs to study it again since the committee is in the middle of that study, the study on Taiwan and the study on vaccine equity. There is a work plan, as there is for every committee, that has, I think, 17 potential studies, and Dr. Fry's would make it 18 potential studies.

The normal flow of committees, as I understand it, is that committees work through their agenda to the end of the session, which is fast approaching here, and then, come the fall, revisit the work plan and reprioritize the undeveloped or lower-priority studies as part of the agenda when they come back in September.

Dr. Fry's motion is on notice. It can be considered in the context of all of those other motions that are on notice and that the committee has before it to consider in terms of what it could do next, but having four studies ongoing at one time seems excessive and seems like a recipe for trying to be all things to all people and achieving nothing, never completing a study, never getting anywhere, never dealing with vaccine equity or never dealing with the situation in Taiwan, which is, yes, impacted by what happens in Ukraine and Russia's attitude. Make no mistake: Everybody around this table understands that China is watching very closely what goes on in Ukraine and what the west's response is to that, a response that to date has been gradual and that we've supported, but that, I believe, needs to be stronger. That's why we need to look at such issues as the leakiness of the sanctions.

How is the Government of Canada going to deal with the issue of the turbine repair on the pipeline? Is it going to allow for an amendment to our existing sanctions against them? Is it, all of a sudden, now we have to provide it, so in this case we'll provide an exception and we'll provide another exception here and another exception there as Moscow and Putin continue to manipulate the west on what they're doing?

This government has been easily manipulated on the issue of Russia and they are constantly finding themselves in this position because they are viewed in the global community, in our response to this war, as weak. I would draw the attention of the committee as well to the idea that this is a larger issue than just one person at the head of the table in Moscow, because of the clampdown on freedom of speech that has happened in the Soviet Union.

That's another area the Ukraine study could take a look at, the fact that over 80% of Russians seem, according to polling, to support this illegal invasion of Ukraine. That's what happens when you restrict freedom of access to the press. You kick all the foreign press out, and there is manipulation going on. The reason sanctions, particularly from democracies, are so important is that they allow countries such as Canada, the western countries—and frankly it should be every country in the world as far as I'm concerned, because any country could be next—to cut off the cash, the flow of money that flows to Russia that allows them to wage this war. It helps to exhaust their financial resources in Russia.

We've seen the voluntary things, like what's happened with McDonald's and Starbucks. Now some of the oligarchs have come in and basically taken over that real estate in Russia and said, "I'll just operate McDonald's with a knock-off McDonald's burger", so that's not really having an impact. The Government of Canada has imposed individual sanctions on, I think it is, about 341 individuals in Russia. Now, people listening may not realize how big Russia is. Russia is a country of 144 million people, so the percentage of people being directly impacted by our sanctions is 0.0000024%. It's infinitesimal.

Unless we get to the point where sanctions are hurting and going beyond just the richest of the rich, who have their manners and ways to move their money around and protect their assets, and unless we start looking at the tools the Government of Canada is using in the study that's being delayed to understand why it is and how it is that we can change the minds of the people in Russia.... One of the ways, as it is with most people, is to be able to actually see a day-to-day impact in their pocketbook and their access to goods and services.

We saw this ultimately with Russia. It's one of the things that caused and contributed to the collapse of the Soviet Union. I spoke several meetings ago about the coup in Russia in 1991, when I worked for the foreign minister. The breadlines, people having to line up for bread in Moscow, and the lack of access to goods, ultimately drove the population, as it often does in such situations, to rise up against its leadership and change its form of government.

With the 80% support that there appears to be in Russia for Putin's illegal war, I would think that one of the things this committee would want to be urgently studying with its witnesses, and giving direction to the subcommittee on, are the priorities with which these studies should be taken—the 14 other studies and now 15 studies, if Dr. Fry's motion were to pass. These things are urgent.

We need to find a way to have more effective global sanctions on Russia. They need to be broader than 344 people, in my view. That's not having the impact, obviously. We're in month four of a war that was not supposed to last more than a week. However, through the resilience and incredible courage of the Ukrainian people, we see push-back against what was supposedly one of the world's great superpowers by the little Ukrainian army. It's quite impressive.

I think we need to be doing more. Certainly, it's not much to ask that this government take a broader and bigger leadership role in multilateral organizations, such as the OAS, and even the United Nations. I understand about the challenges with the Security Council and Russia having a veto, but that doesn't stop us from standing up.

Canada has achieved global sanctions on countries before by looking at the regional organizations, such as the Commonwealth and the Francophonie. If we feel, as we've heard from Ukrainian officials, that Africa is one of the leaky parts of the sanctions, then why is this government not working through the Francophonie and the Commonwealth to impose sanctions, to get those organizations to lead those countries toward a unified global voice for our country?

[Translation]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

[English]

**The Chair:** Yes, Ms. Michaud.

[Translation]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

With all due respect to the honourable member, I would like to remind him that the situation in Ukraine has absolutely nothing to do with the subamendment before the committee. The subamendment is straightforward. Instead of referring to the committee completing the studies, the motion would refer to the committee making a decision on the studies, and the word "study" would change to the plural "studies".

I'm well aware of what the member is trying to do, but I would ask him to focus on the subamendment and tell us what he thinks of it. I would like to hear where everyone on the speaking list stands on the subamendment. If the member were to agree to that, I would be grateful to him.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Michaud.

[English]

Mr. Perkins, as has become customary in this committee, it is important that members keep their remarks restricted to the issue at hand. In this particular instance, as you're well aware, there is a subamendment. I would ask that your comments relate directly to the subamendment, please.

Thank you, Mr. Perkins. The floors is yours.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Ms. Michaud.

I think the link, if I can, to what I was saying is in the words "after the completion of the committee's studies on" and then the motion goes on to say, "Ukraine, Vaccine Equity and Taiwan" and be replaced with "the committee makes a decision on the studies before it".

In order to make and give guidance to the committee and the subcommittee, in order to participate in this debate about whether or not to support the subamendment to this amendment, I think it's important for us to talk about why it is important to complete the studies, which is what is being proposed to be removed from this motion. The member's removal of the word "completion" I don't think is a small change. I don't think it's a modest change, and I don't think it's a grammatical change. It's a major change to the intent of the amendment.

The amendment said that Dr. Fry's motion that's before us should not be done until after the completion of the studies on Ukraine, vaccine equity and Taiwan. It is a major change to say "the committee make a decision on".

As I was saying, I don't know why the committee needs to make a decision on these studies. It already made a decision on these studies, and that decision was made quite some time ago to do these three studies. That's why we're in the middle of them. It's highly unusual, in my view, for a committee in the middle of studying three studies to say that, all of a sudden, now we're not going to complete those three studies and that what we're going to do is a fourth study.

I know we can all walk and chew gum at the same time—I get that—but having four studies ongoing just prolongs the committee's actually finishing any of its work. Three studies at one time is actually quite a lot for a committee to have ongoing, particularly on issues as important as the war in Ukraine and what we see going on with Taiwan and the potential for China to look at the precedent of what is going on with Russia and Ukraine.

Vaccine equity is a very valuable study. We're all very conscious and want to make sure that parts of the world that have not had the same access to COVID vaccines can prevent further death and long-term health problems as we have done in Canada with well over 80% of our population vaccinated. These are important studies to finish in order to provide valuable input to the government for their public policy decision-making.

I think what Ms. Michaud was probably referring to was some of Mr. Genuis's comments around the differences in the definitions of the words “undertaken” and “prescribing”. I found that actually fascinating because they do have different meanings. Words have meaning in this place. Every single word means something specific and is changed for a reason; otherwise, the change wouldn't be proposed in this subamendment.

As part of the relevance and of understanding why it is I believe these studies should be completed before we move on to other studies—the other 14, or if Dr. Fry's motion goes through 15, studies that presumably the committee will look at in the fall—if there is urgency related to women's health issues with what's going on in Ukraine, then that can be managed and discussed in the Ukraine study. I would encourage the committee to make that part of their study because obviously that's the most critical part of what is happening globally right now in terms of that issue.

I think the relevance, for those who are watching, is that there are multi-faceted approaches by western countries, particularly Canada, dealing with these issues, and in particular, dealing with the issue of this illegal war.

We have 1.4 million Ukrainians in Canada, and they want to hear and see the witnesses on this. They want to see Ukrainian officials come before this committee and publicly be able to bring us up to date. They want to understand whether or not the actions of this government on Ukraine and its sanctions are actually having any impact whatsoever in terms of bringing the Russian public and the powerful people in Russia to account for this terrible injustice they are doing. They'd like to hear from witnesses, I suppose, about what the end game is and what the alternative in going forward is.

There has always been a lot of discussion about the restraint that Canada and the western countries must have about Ukraine because of Russia's nuclear weapons. I don't believe that there has been a real discussion or debate on that. That's certainly something that's

appropriate for this committee in its priorities of trying to deal with whether or not the Ukraine study should be completed or whether or not it should just be one of another ongoing series of subjects—a fourth, a fifth, or why not add a sixth?

There are a lot of good things to study on the committee's docket. I spoke previously about Haiti. I understand that's a potential area. There are always ongoing issues in Haiti. There are a lot of other things around the world that this committee could be doing. Why not have a sixth, a seventh and an eighth committee study going on at the same time? Let's hold a meeting on each of those once every month or two months and take a year to go through the eight of them.

Meanwhile, thousands of people are dying in Ukraine and this government is not taking a global leadership role, as we have in the past. This country has in the past taken on global roles in trying to force the globe—even close friends like the United States and Great Britain—on the issue of sanctions on apartheid. I explained to members two meetings ago the role we had in leading the world on the sanctions on Haiti when I was in foreign affairs.

I seem obsessed, I know, on the issue of sanctions, but outside of military action, this is one of the most important tools we have in dealing with Ukraine and Russia in particular. My belief is that those sanctions need to be much broader than just what happened to 344 individuals in a country with a population of 144 million. I would suggest that's a vital part of looking at and understanding whether or not we are doing our part.

By the way, on the weekend, in my part of the world in Atlantic Canada, in an online news provider called the The Macdonald Notebook, there was an interesting interview with former prime minister Brian Mulroney about the status of things in the Ukraine. Of course, remembering that he is close friends with Mikhail Gorbachev and stays very well informed on all the international issues of the day, he was asked the question of whether or not the west should actually pursue military action.

He gave an answer that I think would probably surprise most committee members. He did not take the common view that the west has expressed on military action. Basically, the west has telegraphed that there is a limit to what we are willing to do. There is a limit there because of the nuclear arsenal of Russia and fear over the escalation of this war if NATO, or our partners, or a even a coalition of the willing, you might say—as was done in the first Gulf War, when it was called the “coalition of the willing”—went in and did an action to try to support our friends in the Ukraine.

Former prime minister Mulroney said that he believed that NATO and the western countries actually should be providing military assistance with troops on the ground and help for Ukraine. Being pushed back on that question, “what about the nuclear arsenal?”, he said that, no matter what Putin has done, he understands what the consequences of his engaging in a nuclear situation would be and that the consequences would be ruinous for... I almost said the Soviet Union. It's hard to break old habits, but Putin is acting as if he is the head of the Soviet Union and wants to reassemble it. He said there would be consequences.

Mulroney doesn't believe that the issue of the nuclear arsenal should constrain the west. If you start taking that...it's an area that this committee should take a look at. Should this committee be having a serious look at the issue of whether or not the nuclear threat in the war in Ukraine is a real threat? Have we just given away the store on this? Have we given away the store in terms of our telegraphing to the Russian regime that we will provide food aid and we will provide a certain amount of armaments, but we're not really willing to get into the fight to help protect Ukraine?

To me, that's an important distinction between a decision on a study that's already ongoing, which is kind of confusing to me when the original amendment says “completion” of the study. I don't know why you need to make a decision, as I've said before, on the studies before it, if that decision isn't to stop the study that we're already doing. What decision has to be made on the current studies that are ongoing, other than to continue them? One would think that's what we have to do.

In speaking to the subamendment, I'm speaking to the fact that, in order to get to completion, we have a lot of areas that this Ukraine study needs to look at, whether it's sanctions or whether it's food insecurity. Other members talked in the last meeting about the issue of food insecurity. Two weeks ago, I believe, the UN said that this has the potential this summer to have up to 47 million people starving immediately as a result of the cut-off of Ukrainian grain to the world. I suspect that number is going to grow quite a bit more, so I would think that the committee would want to complete the study in order to look at those issues, rather than delay and add a fourth, a fifth or a sixth study to its agenda.

As I've said, I believe that on those issues, which the committee will determine as the master of its own destiny, as every committee is, the committee can take a look at those studies and determine in the fall, once Ukraine, Taiwan and vaccine efficacy.... I suspect that all of that, if done properly, is going to take a lot of the agenda in the fall. I know that the committee has probably put forward a limited number of meetings, but as often happens in committees, once you get into a subject matter and you see the number of witnesses from the public who want to appear on that subject matter, quite often committees will change midway, not to go to another issue or to add another study, but to change and to add more meetings to the agenda because of the public interest, and also because when you start opening up an issue, it opens up more and more issues for the committee to study on that particular subject.

Quite often, I've found that committees will actually extend the number of meetings it has partway through a decision. I can't imagine that on Ukraine, given some of the things I have said, we wouldn't be finding that there would need to be a number of meet-

ings held on the issue of sanctions, that there would need to be a number of meetings on food security and that there would have to be and should be a number of meetings held on the issue of whether or not we have been too dismissive of the issue of providing troop support on the ground to our allies in Ukraine on this illegal war.

That's just on the one issue. On vaccine equity, obviously, there are a great many witnesses who will want to hear about and talk about the production of those vaccines: where they're being produced, their efficacy throughout the world, their access throughout the world and what's happening. In Canada, during the height of the pandemic, we actually took some of the vaccines that were set aside for poorer countries. We actually took them for ourselves.

Yes, we did replenish them later, but obviously if we're studying vaccine efficacy and access and equity throughout the world, one of the first things I would want to do would be to have some hearings on what led Canada to being in a position of having to take vaccines from poorer countries for ourselves. What decisions did this government make leading up to our taking that extreme case?

Some of us know. We can assume it had to do with the deal that the government initially did with China to bring a Chinese vaccine to Canada as opposed to one produced by the pharmaceutical companies. I think that obviously, if you're going to talk about vaccine equity, you're going to want to hear witnesses about what led to that. What happened on that? That's going to take some time.

There's the complexity of the “one China” strategy around the world, how it's evolved on Taiwan, the impact of Russia in Ukraine on Taiwan and the change in the leadership in China, which has led to a more aggressive and less democratic approach to foreign affairs by the Chinese government. Of course, what we're seeing in Hong Kong is a prime example, if you're not careful and vigilant, of what can happen. There's essentially a faux democracy, and everything is run by Beijing. China has never given up its rights, its assumed rights or its claim on rights, in the negotiations and in the global world order, to Taiwan. That's an important study, and an important study that shouldn't be stopped, as this motion or subamendment seems to imply. When you take the word “completion” out, you're implying that it's going to stop and that we're going to go on to something else.

I would urge members of the committee and the subcommittee, which will look at this agenda along with the 14 other.... I know I'm not allowed, Mr. Chair, to reference the details of what the committee has before it in future studies. I believe that document is not a public document and those motions aren't there, but I do know there are a lot of good and legitimate areas that need some urgent consideration too. The purpose of this debate here is to debate whether or not we should, essentially, in my view, when I read it, suspend these existing studies and do other things. I don't know why.

I know a lot of people will view the motion by Dr. Fry as being vitally important, but the most important parts of that can be dealt with within the existing studies that are ongoing, in terms of the use of certain tactics in war that are harmful and disgusting and that should be condemned by all. That's part of the Ukraine study. I don't know why we would want to suspend the study to go and basically do that study, to bring in another study to look at an area that, actually, the committee can already look at in its existing study.

I would consider that the subcommittee needs to understand that the priorities there need to be driven by the priorities of what's going on in the world. Everything that's going on in the world, and whoever it's happening to, can seem like the most vital and important thing going on. That's understandable. When we see democracy at threat or we see human rights at threat in many of the countries around the world, understandably, we want to help.

We're Canadians. We always want to help everywhere there's an issue. That's our great reputation. We actually go out and do more than speak nice words to organizations. We try to lead those organizations to a better conclusion to help people, whether that's in terms of the sovereignty of a democracy or whether that's in terms of individual human rights. Those are clearly the most important things in terms of the subcommittee's decisions and whether or not these studies need to be completed.

I mean, there are war crimes going on in Ukraine, and I think that studying those war crimes and giving the government advice from this committee needs to be part of that study as well. I don't know how that could get done in two more meetings.

There is an anti-western xenophobia that's been created in Russia through this that's going to take us a long time to get over in our relationship with Russia, which sometimes can be a confusing country to us in Canada. I remember the 1972 Canada-Russia hockey series. I was a very young guy. To this day, Russia still claims that they won that series. Do you know why they think they won it even though we won five games? They believe they won it because they scored more goals. You can always make something sound like a win even though ultimately the game of hockey is decided at the end of the third period or in overtime by goals.

We're up against a country whose population believes that this is a just war. We do know, though, that as progressive sanctions have happened over the last number of years in Russia on a number of things, the GDP per capita in Russia has declined as a result of those. These are just playing-at-the-edges sanctions. They're not dealing directly with the main issue. My understanding is that the GDP per capita in Russia in about 2013 was about \$16,000 U.S., and now it's down by about 40% to \$10,000 GDP annual income for every Russian.

Clearly, what the west has been doing, through a series of issues that started with the illegal invasion of the Donbass region during the Harper government, when Prime Minister Harper sent very clear messages to Vladimir Putin about how he had to get out or there would be consequences, the consequences of that began with the Harper government imposing these sanctions that have impacted the economy in Russia. To give the government credit, they've brought in a lot of very good sanctions as part of this targeting of

the oligarchs there, which is important. Although they obviously have the capacity to move their money, targeting very precise industries, which the government has done, all necessary technology industries, defence industries...these are all necessary.

I know that I got pushed back a bit by government members a meeting or two ago, but as you know, Tip O'Neill said that "all politics is local". The leaky sanctions that I speak of are the sanctions around the issue of snow crab. We are not trading snow crab with Russia because that's part of what we do as Canadians. As a result of that, most of our snow crabs are sold to Japan anyway. We were doing pretty well, but Japan has now broken all those contracts and is buying all its snow crab from Russia, providing the Putin war machine with direct cash. Here's a G7 partner that has filled in our sanctions where we left out....

I wouldn't exactly call snow crab, with all due deference to the fishermen who fish snow crab in Newfoundland, an essential food, and those things.... Food is exempted from the sanctions, and I understand that, but luxury foods such as that, or higher-priced foods, to me are things that this committee should study. Why is it that the sanctions we've imposed on food say that you can trade any food you want with Russia even though they've had an illegal invasion of Ukraine? Why isn't this committee looking into that as part of the food security issue and the effectiveness of our sanctions?

I suspect there are things that we and other western countries are trading, even in food, that members of this committee wouldn't consider essential. I don't know the last time members around this table ate snow crab. I hope they're eating a lot of lobster because that's the number one industry in my riding and we know that lobster is not being shipped to Russia, as far as I know. Why is it that the committee is unwilling to take a look at those issues and add a fourth, fifth or sixth study?

Why don't we create another study? I could easily move a motion suggesting we do a separate study on sanctions in Ukraine, and we could have a great debate on that over the next little while, about whether or not that's a subset of the existing study or whether it's an entirely new study, much in the same way Dr. Fry's motion—at least part of it—can be dealt with in the existing study if the committee chooses to do so.

I would ask that the committee continue to move and look at completing the study on Ukraine. What's happening in Ukraine, as we know, as I've said, is changing weekly, almost daily. I would ask that the committee continue to make that the priority when considering its future agenda. The implications of that on what happens in Taiwan are important, and I would also venture to say that the committee and the subcommittee on the agenda should consider all of the issues that are on its work plan. Dr. Fry has given her notice of motion. It can be considered as a notice of motion in the work plan without having to actually have a vote here, and the subcommittee can take a look at that with all the other elements that are on the agenda for potential study.

I still haven't heard an argument from government members or from the members of their coalition partner, the NDP, or from my friends in the Bloc as to why it is that the normal committee process of, once a notice of motion is done, it can be something the subcommittee on agenda considers, at any given time, is not just being considered and why there is a need for the government to push this through. It speaks to what I think are perhaps priorities that aren't in line with what most Canadians think are the issues of the day the foreign policy the committee should be spending its time on and hearing witnesses on.

I would offer up that perhaps there are other motivations behind this motion that only the government can answer to, as to why they want to all of a sudden study this issue, rather than the war in Ukraine and provide the government with the advice of all kinds of analysts, of all kinds of academics, of all kinds of Ukrainians who are experiencing this issue directly themselves, of the business community as to whether or not it believes the sanctions are effective, of the banking community as to how those sanctions could be made less leaky, and of the industries that are impacted and whether or not they can find other markets and whether or not, frankly, they feel unfair competition because they have lost the market and we have allowed other countries' businesses to go and fill in those markets—it's always hard to get a market back once you lose it—because the government hasn't chosen to use multilateral organizations, which is Canada's tradition, such as the Francophonie, the Commonwealth, the OAS and ASEAN as well as other Asian countries.

The Prime Minister was just at a meeting of the Americas, and I did not hear the Prime Minister propose that the western hemisphere impose western hemisphere sanctions on Russia and that they come in lockstep with us and the United States on imposing these issues. Why is it that the Prime Minister, once he left the country, didn't seem to think about the issues of Ukrainian Canadians, and the issues that Volodymyr Zelenskyy has raised about it being a good start on sanctions, and use his pulpit there in his bilateral meetings? The Prime Minister and the foreign minister have a lot of bilateral meetings on the side with their counterparts. Why is it that they didn't make a public statement saying that they want the western hemisphere to stop trading with Russia?

They didn't do that, and I think the government needs to come forward. I would venture that the Minister of Foreign Affairs needs to explain to this committee why the minister is not putting forward in the multilateral organizations what I would think is probably our most important foreign policy issue to discuss today, and explain why they are not taking that traditional Canadian role.

That all points to the subamendment issue and why we need to complete this study. There's still a lot of work to do here. There's still a lot of accountability here for the government, which I think has done a fairly timid job of putting pressure on Putin, his advisers, the Russian government and frankly the Russian people to put pressure on their own government that this is an unjust war and that they've been fed basically a propaganda set of lies. The only way that's going to happen, ultimately, given what's happened to the media and the fact that the world media has been thrown out of Russia, is through, in my view, is by putting a little more financial pressure

around access to day-to-day goods on the Russian people beyond what they see.

Quite frankly, they're not seeing the impacts. When a Russian oligarch can come in and basically take over the Starbucks chain or take over the real estate where McDonald's was and do their knock-off burgers and knock-off coffee, the Russian people aren't feeling the same sort of pressure. Therefore, they aren't putting any pressure on their government. Why isn't this committee looking at why that happened and why we haven't gone on in the international forum to propose resolutions?

The government is willing to propose resolutions here at committee on various issues unrelated to Ukraine, but it is not willing to propose motions in multilateral organizations to try to increase the effectiveness of the global effort to reduce the economic viability of the wealth of the oligarchs and the access to western goods that Russia so clearly loves. The government isn't doing that. The government didn't propose it. I would love hear from the government members on why it hasn't proposed doing that in any of those multilateral organizations.

Even on the basic sanctions that we have now on the 344 people, the oligarchs, and the limited targeted industries that the government has chosen, why hasn't it promoted those same rules being put in place around the world? I've sat in those meetings. I've sat in the Organization of American States meetings where we've put those forward.

It took a lot of work and a lot of bilaterals. I experienced the fact that leaky sanctions cause others to fill in. I was in bilaterals with European countries of the day when we were dealing with Haiti that said, well, you know, there are no UN sanctions, so we can't impose sanctions—but they can impose sanctions if their regional multilateral organization imposes sanctions.

Those organizations—the Francophonie, the OAS—because we've heard from officials in the Ukrainian government—

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair. Maybe it could also be a point of interruption to give the speaker a break, because he needs a drink of water.

I am wondering whether the member is actually suggesting that we.... All of the sanctions, the incredible and record-breaking number of sanctions that we have imposed against Russia since their illegal invasion of Ukraine, are tabled in Parliament and then referred to this committee. They come as an order of reference to this committee. We are able to study any and all of them at any time. I'm wondering whether he is actually inferring or requesting that this committee should be taking a look at those referrals, because we have not done that.

I might take this opportunity in my moment of interruption to also tell the committee members that I have two guests with me today. They are interns from the Embassy of the Kingdom of Denmark. They are two graduate students who are learning about Parliament as they shadow me today, and they're having a good lesson.

The member might want to respond to my point of order on whether or not he is actually asking for us to deal with those references, which come from the House.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Oliphant.

Allow me to welcome our two Danish friends here.

Welcome to the committee.

We will revert back to Mr. Perkins.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Mr. Oliphant. I did appreciate the chance to have a sip of a glass of water.

That's an interesting idea. It wasn't exactly what I was proposing. What I was proposing was looking at the inability or the lack of—in certain countries that we work with in multilateral organizations—implementation of those critical sanctions that Canada has.

I think these sanctions should be expanded. Certainly, if the subcommittee on agenda, which is, I assume, where such a thing would go, and Mr. Oliphant wanted to look at that, that would be of value, but I don't think it's necessary in the context of something separate. We already have an ongoing study on Ukraine where those things could be presumably incorporated by the committee into that study and the witnesses could incorporate a discussion on that.

I think it would make a very interesting part of this to analyze that, both the effectiveness of the existing sanctions and whether or not those sanctions should be broadened to include other areas that aren't included now for Canada, such as, as I said, some of the things that some might consider more as luxury foods and that perhaps are not things that Russia needs to survive day to day in terms of foodstuffs. Personally, coming from the south shore of Nova Scotia, I believe that lobster is a critical day-to-day foodstuff. I'm not sure everybody else would agree with me, but I certainly do. At the end of the day, what we're missing, I think, for the effectiveness of the sanctions is that broader question, Mr. Oliphant. Why are other countries not coming to the table the same way that Canada is, and what should Canada be doing to push forward an agenda that gets more effectiveness into those existing sanctions by bringing in our partners from around the world?

Going and having meetings with the western hemisphere, and the recent meeting in California, without actually coming forward with pressure on those allies to be part of our team, to be part of the team that is opposing the sanctions.... If anybody knows the effect of imperialism, it's countries in Central and Latin America. I would think that, more than most, those countries would be more sensitive to what's going on between Russia and Ukraine and would want to be partners in what we're doing, more than perhaps even other countries around the world. They are very sensitive to that in the OAS.

In 1991 they passed a declaration at the OAS declaring, for the first time—when 34 of the 35 countries were for the first time democratic and we first joined—a NATO type of solution, which is that any failing of democracy in the western hemisphere would be met with immediate action by the Organization of American States. That was a revolutionary thing. You have to remember that the meeting was held in Chile, in Santiago. I was at that meeting. Augusto Pinochet had given up the presidency only in the last year but

was still heading the army in Chile when that declaration happened, so it was quite remarkable that this declaration happened.

Given that this is the declaration, it's all the more surprising when the Prime Minister gets together with the western hemispheric and foreign ministers, with the western hemispheric countries, as he did recently, that he wouldn't be using that important turning point in the OAS as a reason, as a sensitivity barometer for them, as to why they need to join with us and not be trading with Russia, not providing financial services to Russia and not providing them with technology, military or other goods so that they can continue their illegal war machine.

This happened at a time when the U.S. had some history in central America, in Nicaragua and other places, and there is a deep sensitivity in Latin America to any country that interferes in the sovereign borders and the sovereign issues of other countries. It's why, in the past—although, for the most part, they have gotten together multiple times since then in the western hemisphere—they were initially reluctant to impose sanctions. They saw it as interference. Mexico and other countries saw it as interference in the domestic politics of a country.

I think most of the western hemisphere has grown since then in terms of joining the global nations. In their view, if you're going to protect democracy, you have to protect it with the use of all the tools you have. Some of the most effective tools, as we saw in South Africa and Haiti....

In fact, the Government of Canada currently has 21 countries it has economic sanctions against. Some of these go back to the 1990s, including Indonesia, Myanmar and others. Another great area for this committee to study at some point is why is it that we have sanctions—

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

I simply cannot listen to this anymore. It is disgraceful how irrelevant this member is when speaking about a subamendment on a motion to study women's reproductive rights.

I cannot believe that this committee is entertaining the wilful discussion by this man of what he thinks to be important future studies for our committee. Not only is he not a member of this committee, but his discussion about previous attendance at conferences in Latin America is so beside the point that I would ask the chair to rule on relevance immediately.

Thank you.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Could I speak to that point of order before you rule?

**The Chair:** Yes, Mr. Perkins.



**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Firstly, for the member to make any personal judgments about me or my reasoning for talking about why the completion of these studies is more important.... I think it is abhorrent that she would cast aspersions on me personally, and I would like her to apologize for that.

Secondly, she used the term “this man”. If I were to do that to the opposite gender, of course, I would be vilified in public opinion. It's another example of Liberal double standards, where a government member thinks they can bully the opposition into shutting up—

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** Is this debate?

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** It seems like the point of order was—

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** No. The honourable member was debating—

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Are you chairing the committee?

Does she have the floor? Does the member from Vancouver—

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**The Chair:** Yes, Dr. Fry.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** I'm sorry. This is so irrelevant. This is so personal. This is—

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** That's not a point of order.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** No, but this person—

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** It's not a point of order, Mr. Chair.

**Hon. Hedy Fry:** —is speaking off topic. If the honourable member let me finish my sentence.... We have listened to him now for so long that he might be respectful enough to listen to me speak.

Chair, this is irrelevant. I think, as Madam Bendayan has said, it is repetitive. It is talking about Haiti. It's talking about the Organization of American States. It's talking about everything but the sub-amendment. It is repetitive and irrelevant.

Thank you. That's my point of order.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Madam Fry.

We'll now go to Madam Goodridge.

**Mrs. Laila Goodridge (Fort McMurray—Cold Lake, CPC):** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

On this point of order, I believe we are starting to get into the realm—just on the points of order—of being very disrespectful. I understand that Mr. Perkins has spoken at length on some topics. I've learned quite a bit about Canada's history on sanctions, but I do not believe that the original points of order are necessarily called for.

I think that it is incumbent on each and every one of us as members to treat each other with respect. I don't believe I was hearing that as we were going on. I would argue that this is in fact a point of order.

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** On this point of order, Mr. Chair....

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Goodridge.

Go ahead, Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair.

With respect to the original point of order, I want to say that there's no hierarchy of speakers. We have associate members who follow the work of this committee. To diminish someone's contribution because they're an associate member, as opposed to a member who is not an associate member.... I wonder if we can get clarity from the clerk or the chair that anybody who's subbed in and is speaking has the full rights to make arguments. It's not germane to how their point is understood whether or not they're a regular member or an associate member.

On the other issue, with respect to the content of the subamendment, it deals with the question of completion of studies versus non-completion of studies. Surely, the nature of those studies that would or would not be completed is very much on the point of completion of studies or not. This is the core subject matter, so it's obvious that it needs to be part of the discussion.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Genuis.

I would just remind you that Mr. Perkins has not been subbed in. However, insofar as section 119 is concerned, he does have the right to have the floor.

Ms. Bendayan, did you have a point of order?

**Ms. Rachel Bendayan:** Mr. Chair, I would ask for a ruling on relevance. I can speak at length to the number of items that were completely irrelevant, but I think you heard very well the member opposite and I would ask for a ruling, please.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Bendayan.

Now, first of all, allow me to remind every member of this committee that it is imperative that we remain civil and we allow every member to have their say, so to speak. That would be the first thing.

The second thing is that it is important that members speak to the relevant issues at hand and that they do not engage in repetition. I think the member would concede that on points of order one of the other members of this committee said it's been fabulous because they've received a history on sanctions.

A history on sanctions, Mr. Perkins, is not relevant to the sub-amendment at hand, so I would ask, for the last time, that you do please keep your focus on the subamendment and ensure that the points you are raising are relevant and that they are not repetitive.

Thank you, Mr. Perkins. The floor is yours.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** I have a point of order, Mr. Chair.

I believe that if you seek it you will find agreement for a suspension of this committee until 10 minutes to the hour.

**The Chair:** Is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** Agreed.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

We are suspended for five minutes.

• (1246) \_\_\_\_\_ (Pause) \_\_\_\_\_

• (1255)

**The Chair:** If we could, we'll reconvene and resume debate.

**Mr. Rick Perkins:** Mr. Chair, I'll conclude my remarks there.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Perkins.

Next we go to Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** Thank you, Mr. Chair, but I will strike for now.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Genuis.

We next go to Mr. Zuberi.

**Mr. Sameer Zuberi:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'll also remove myself from the speaking list.

**The Chair:** Mr. Viersen is not here. We next go to Ms. Goodridge.

**Mrs. Laila Goodridge:** Thank you, Mr. Chair. I will also remove my name from the speaking list at this time.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Ms. Goodridge.

We next go to Madame Michaud.

[*Translation*]

**Ms. Kristina Michaud:** I would like to withdraw my name from the speaking list as well, Mr. Chair.

Thank you.

**The Chair:** Thank you.

[*English*]

Now, given that there's no longer debate on the subamendment, is there unanimous consent?

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Chair:** There is not, so we will have to.... I'm sorry...?

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** There's no unanimous consent. We'll do the vote.

**Mr. Marty Morantz:** We'll vote on the subamendment now.

**The Chair:** Yes, absolutely. We will put it to a vote.

(Subamendment agreed to: yeas 11; nays 0 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** Thank you very much.

Now we go to the amendment. Is there unanimous consent to accept the amendment?

**Some hon. members:** No.

**The Chair:** We will call the vote.

(Amendment as amended negatived: nays 6; yeas 5 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** The amendment is defeated. We now go to the motion.

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** I would have an amendment to that motion. I would like to add the words "and that this study does not begin prior to October 1, 2022".

**The Chair:** Is there unanimous consent to that?

Yes, Mr. Genuis.

**Mr. Garnett Genuis:** To very briefly speak to the amendment, we have had throughout the debate members of the government professing that they didn't want the amendment to the motion, professing that this study would not proceed until the previous work was complete. Those statements are on the record, so I hope we will be able to hold the government to the statements they've made.

The October 1 date does not mean that it would begin right away after that, obviously, as we do have important work to complete on other fronts, but I do think this is a good amendment. Thanks.

**The Chair:** Thank you, Mr. Genuis.

Do we have unanimous consent?

Excellent. Is there unanimous consent for the adoption of the—

**Hon. Robert Oliphant:** I would like a vote, please.

**Hon. Michael Chong:** Mr. Chair, just to clarify, are we voting on the motion as amended?

**The Chair:** We're voting on the motion as amended. That's correct.

(Motion as amended agreed to: yeas 10; nays 1 [*See Minutes of Proceedings*])

**The Chair:** The amended motion is adopted.

The meeting is adjourned.







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

---

### SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

---

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

---

### PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

---

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

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

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

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

---

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